

Conference

Integrated Approaches to the Political Geography of Southern Anatolia, 1650-550 BCE



May 4-6, 2023
Bilkent University Main Campus
Faculty of Humanities and Letters
1st floor, room A130



Dates

Thursday, May 4th 2023 | 9:30-18:00 | **Conference**

Friday, May 5th 2023 | 9:30-17:30 | **Conference and reception**

Saturday, May 6th 2023 | 9:30-17:30 | **Conference**

Sunday, May 7th 2023 | 7:30-20:00 | **Field trip to Boğazköy and Yazılıkaya**

Location

Conference

Bilkent University Main Campus,
Faculty of Humanities and Letters (H Building)
İnsani Bilimler ve Edebiyat Fakültesi (H Binası), 1st floor, A130

Reception

“49 Bistro” (Old Rectorate House)

Integrated Approaches to the Political Geography of Southern Anatolia, 1650–550 BCE

Scope and aims of the conference

This conference, co-organized by Bilkent University and the British Institute at Ankara, aims to create an interdisciplinary platform to engage with the political geography of southern Anatolia between the mid-2nd and mid-1st millennia BCE. This region encompasses a significant range of diverse environmental and cultural landscapes. During the Late Bronze and Iron Ages, the region was also a fragmented political patchwork whose individual components reacted very differently to Hittite and Assyrian attempts of imperial control. While these sub-units have typically been studied independently, there is significant value in assessing them together and in integrating datasets, methodologies and conceptual approaches across archaeology, philology, history, and geography.

Supported by recent textual and archaeological research that has started challenging long-held tenets, this workshop brings together a range of specialists with different backgrounds to work toward a more holistic, comparative and long-term perspective on the political geography of southern Anatolia.

Conference Program

Thursday, May 4th

Session 1

Chair: Lutgarde Vandeput

9:30 - 9:50

Introductions

Dominique Kassab Tezgör
Lutgarde Vandeput
N. İlgı Gerçek
Michele Massa

9:50 - 11:10

Panel: Cultural Heritage in Post-Earthquake Southeastern Anatolia

Zeynep Boz
Elif Denel

11:10 - 11:30

Coffee Break*

Session 2

Chair: Adam Kryszew

11:30 - 12:15

The Language of Geography

N. İlgı Gerçek

12:15 - 13:00

From Words to Maps: A Network Analysis Approach to Hittite Political Geography

Muhammet Ali Akman

13:00 - 14:00

Lunch Break

Session 3

Chair: Carlo Corti

14:00 - 14:45

Between Space and Power: Was There a Territory of Ura?

Éric Jean

14:45 - 15:30

Kietis and the Western Extension of Hiyawa

Zsolt Simon

15:30 - 15:45

Coffee Break*

Session 4

Chair: Zsolt Simon

15:45 - 16:30

A View from the Frontier:

Historical and Cultural Geography of Hiyawa Portrayed at Azatiwataya
Ash Özyar

16:30 - 17:15

Hiyawa/Kawa and its Neighbours – The Border Marker Monuments of Arsuz, Hasanbeyli, Incirlik and Cebelireis in their Historical Contexts

Mirko Novák

17:15 - 18:00

Kizzuwatna in the Ortaköy Archives

Aygül Süel

*Coffee breaks will be served at the conference venue

Conference Program

Friday, May 5th

Session 1

Chair: Ilya Yakubovich

- 9:30 - 10:15 **“And He Made Them the Borders of the Sea” –
Border Descriptions and the Perception of Space in the Light of
Hittite Cuneiform Sources**
Adam Kryszewski
- 10:15 - 11:00 **From Landa to Tuwanuwa and from Ikuwanija to Hupisna:
Frontiers, Connectivity and Historical Geography in Southeast Konya
from the 2nd to the 1st Millennia BCE**
Çiğdem Maner
- 11:00 - 11:30 Coffee Break*

Session 2

Chair: N. İlgi Gerçek

- 11:30 - 12:15 **Between the Plain and the Mountain.
Luwian-Phrygian Contact Zone as a Geographical and Cultural Phenomenon**
Rostislav Oreshko
- 12:15 - 13:00 **The Luwians, 20 years after *The Luwians***
Federico Giusfredi
- 13:00 - 14:00 Lunch Break

Session 3

Chair: Çiğdem Maner

- 14:00 - 14:45 **The Kingdom and City of Tarḫuntašša:
An Integrated Textual, Geographic and Archaeological Analysis**
Michele Massa
- 14:45 - 15:30 **Along the Road to Tarḫuntašša: Journeys, Tributes and Celebrations**
Carlo Corti
- 15:30 - 16:00 Coffee Break*

Session 4

Chair: Michele Massa

- 16:00 - 16:45 **Vincebamur a victa Graecia: The Annexation of Kizzuwadna and
its Consequences through the Prism of Comparative Philology**
Ilya Yakubovich
- 16:45 - 17:30 **The Land of Tuwan(uw)a Between the Late Bronze and the Iron Age**
Lorenzo d'Alfonso

Reception at 49 Bistro Restaurant, 18:30

Conference Program

Saturday, May 6th

Session 1

Chair: Federico Giusfredi

- 9:30 - 10:15 **Hattusili and Piyamaradu: Conflicts in South-Central Anatolia?**
Max Gander
- 10:15 - 11:00 **KARAÖREN 1+2**
Mark Weeden
- 11:10 - 11:30 Coffee Break*

Session 2

Chair: Kimiyoshi Matsumura

- 11:30 - 12:15 **The Farthest Cities of Phrygia: Cultural Landscapes and Political Interactions in the Anatolian Southern Plateau during the Iron Ages**
Alvise Matessi
- 12:15 - 13:00 **Technological Choices and Cultural Identities in Konya and Niğde at the Beginning of the Middle Iron Age**
Alessio Mantovan
- 13:00 - 14:00 Lunch Break

Session 3

Chair: Max Gander

- 14:00 - 14:45 **Speculations on the Territories of Phrygia and its Neighbours**
Geoffrey Summers
- 14:45 - 15:30 **Changing Geographies of Power in Anatolia in the Eighth Century BCE: A View from Lydia**
Güzin Eren
- 15:30 - 16:00 Coffee Break*

Session 4

Chair: Alvise Matessi

- 16:00 - 16:45 **Towards the Neo-Assyrian Mental Map? The Anatolian Aspect**
Selim F. Adalı
- 16:45 - 17:30 **Situating the Kingdom of Hartapu: The Context of the Rise of an Iron Age Polity**
James Osborne

Field trip to Boğazköy and Yazılıkaya

Sunday, May 7th

7:30 - 20:00

Participants

Selim F. Adalı, *Social Sciences University of Ankara*

Muhammet Ali Akman, *Bilkent University*

Zeynep Boz, *T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Kültür Varlıkları ve Müzeler Genel Müdürlüğü*

Carlo Corti, *Turin University*

Lorenzo d'Alfonso, *New York/Pavia Universities*

Elif Denel, *American Research Institute in Turkey*

Güzin Eren, *Koç University*

Max Gander, *Zurich University*

N. İlgi Gerçek, *Bilkent University*

Federico Giusfredi, *Verona University*

Éric Jean, *Hitit University*

Adam Kryszewski, *Marburg University*

Çiğdem Maner, *Koç University*

Alessio Mantovan, *Pavia University*

Michele Massa, *Bilkent University*

Alvise Matessi, *Verona University*

Mirko Novák, *Bern University*

Rostislav Oreshko, *CNRS/Harvard University*

James Osborne, *Chicago University*

Aslı Özyar, *Boğaziçi University*

Zsolt Simon, *Hungarian Research Centre for Linguistics*

Geoffrey Summer, *University of Nantes*

Aygül Süel, *Hitit University*

Mark Weeden, *University College London*

Ilya Yakubovich, *Marburg University*



Titles and Abstracts



Towards the Neo-Assyrian Mental Map? The Anatolian Aspect

Texts are but one of the several sources needed to better understand the political geography of Anatolia. In this regard the interpretation of Neo-Assyrian texts a vital source. It is proposed in this paper that interpreting the pertinent descriptions in Assyrian texts requires understanding the underlying mental map of which traces can be viewed according to the different genres of Assyrian texts. This paper will focus on Neo-Assyrian texts and the place of Iron Age Anatolia according to variations of this proposed Neo-Assyrian mental map. This “mental map” is to be understood differently in different genres of Neo-Assyrian texts as to how they conceive routes, spaces, and political mobility. Some genres build the picture of a great mountain frontier covering parts of Anatolia and Iran. Discussion will also be sought regarding certain aspects of the more complex political and economic relations on the Neo-Assyrian frontier and how these relate to this mental map.

From Words to Maps – A Network Analysis Approach to Hittite political Geography

The study of Hittite political geography often includes an a priori selection of a group of texts or regions that limits our understanding of the system as a whole (Barjamovic 2011, 66). This paper introduces a novel quantitative approach that avoids arbitrary limitations on regions or texts through the employment of network analysis. The primary dataset is a sample of over 20,000 Hittite toponyms, containing more than 2000 unique instances, created by Dr. Adam Kryszewski through the project “Toponymie der Hethiter” (Kryszewski 2019).

Drawing on Tobler’s first law of geography, which suggests that geographically close places are more related to each other than distant places (Tobler and Wineburg 1971), this study hypothesizes that the co-occurrence of toponyms in Hittite texts reflects their geographical relatedness. Therefore, the study expects the detected communities of the co-occurrence network to broadly correspond to geographical regions. The quantitative representation of toponyms allows the integration of textual evidence with archaeological and geographical data. To suggest localizations for disputed toponyms, the resulting networks are projected onto real-world maps using known geographical anchors. While this model cannot provide exact locations of places, it can support or challenge suggested localizations constructed through traditional methods.

Bibliography

Barjamovic, G. 2011. *Historical Geography of Anatolia in the Old Assyrian Colony Period*. Copenhagen, Denmark: Museum Tusulanum Press.

Kryszewski, Adam. 2019. “Hittite Toponymy: An Overview.” *Altorientalische Forschungen* 46 (1): 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1515/afo-2019-0001>.

Tobler, W., and S. Wineburg. 1971. “A Cappadocian Speculation.” *Nature* 231 (5297): 39–41. <https://doi.org/10.1038/231039a0>.

Along the road to Tarḫuntašša – Journeys, Tributes and Celebrations

The importance of Hittite Southern Anatolia is well known, mainly because it was the key area of connection between the core of the Hittite Empire and the contemporary's kingdoms of North-western Syria, Mesopotamia and Egypt. Differently from Northern Anatolia and the Central Black Sea area, for this region we have few sources describing ritual pilgrimages and/or travels of the royal family and the court during festivals, which could help in giving a more accurate knowledge of its territory.

In this paper I will examine the content of some Hittite tablets dealing with the journey of an unknown official along the road that goes from Central to South Anatolia, reaching the area of Tar untašša and beyond. With the help of these sources, and others relevant for our purposes, I will try to explore new paths in the study of the Hittite Lower Land from a geographical and liturgical perspective.

The Land of Tuwan(uw)a between the Late Bronze and the Iron Age

As is often the case, textual sources and archaeological record concerning South Cappadocia during the Late Bronze and the Iron Age offer a quite divergent picture. Hittite sources provide evidence for a very early Hittite political control over the region, and the continuity in toponyms and cults into the Iron Age was suggestive of a direct continuity of Hittite political and cultural features in the LBA-IA transition. Archaeological data, however, provide a different picture. Excavations at Niğde Kınık Höyük have brought evidence of political complexity in the region as early as the turn of the 2nd into the 1st millennium. On the other hand, this is very different archaeologically from the evidence of political continuity emerging from the Upper Euphrates and from the northern Levant. Also, upon closer scrutiny, I will suggest that Warpalawa's Tuwana and his Tarhunza, once considered proof of long continuity going directly back to Hittite Tuwanuwa and its Storm-god, has to be envisioned as a new, splendid but ephemeral political project bringing into south Cappadocia cults and symbols of power deriving from the late Syro-Anatolian Culture Construct as it developed in Cilicia and the southern Levant.

Changing Geographies of Power in Anatolia in the eighth century BCE – A View from Lydia

The records of the eighth century BCE feature a power struggle in Anatolia: territorial polities clashing particularly in the (central-)southern region. In this paper, I look outside this zone to the west—the region considered to be a power-vacuum at the time—to discuss preliminary evidence for Lydia’s participation in and response to this competition by shaping western Anatolian political geography. This evidence has only recently started emerge from the Lydian capital Sardis: a ruling elite center (Lydian III) encircled by monumental urban terraces. Introducing its intermediate position within the long sequence of large-scale building programs and its role in shaping the settlement in at least two socio-spatial tiers, I argue that the Lydian III center manifests the stabilization of ruling elite in Sardis. A comparative regional assessment further reveals a hybrid approach to this center’s production. On the one hand, its conspicuously dominant character within a multi-tier organization resembles that of the major citadels in (central-)southern Anatolia; thus, this center underlines the Lydian elite’s continued emulation of royal ideologies for centralized governance and power display. On the other hand, the use of standalone terraces to demarcate the Lydian III elite center, instead of citadel fortifications, is more akin to the spatial modeling of sacred spaces in the Aegean, while the closest parallels for these terraces’ polygonal construction technique are found in the refuge citadels that proliferated western Anatolia from the eighth century BCE onwards. Collectively, these observations offer a working hypothesis: Lydian III ruling elite directed their initial ambitions to the west, where most settlements were dispersed and undefended, because the rival polities to their east formed an insurmountable power block against eastward expansion. Besides providing a motivation for the new citadel constructions on the western coast, this scenario foregrounds the previously unsuspected role of Lydian actors in shaping the eighth century BCE Anatolian geographies of power and submits a more gradual background to the Mermnad Dynasty’s expansionist actions in the following century, which are otherwise characterized as suddenly aggressive based on Herodotean accounts.

Hattusili and Piyamaradu: Conflicts in South-central Anatolia?

The Annals of Hattusili III (CTH 82) mention an enemy who seems to have conquered towns that are known from the Bronze Tablet and KBo 4.10 and thus have to be in order bordering on Tarhuntassa. It was, however, never quite clear who this mysterious enemy was and how extensive his campaigns were.

Through a new evaluation of the texts of the aforementioned texts in combination with texts treating similar events, I will try to show that at least a part the Annals of Hattusili III deal with an attack by Piyamaradu. So this notorious troublemaker not only caused problems in western Anatolia but proceeded far inland and worried Hattusili even in an area normally thought to be under steady control by the Hittites in that period.

The Language of Geography

Hittite texts offer us not only a vast number of toponyms, but also a considerable repertoire of spatial terminology and geographical descriptions which allow us to investigate political processes and their mutually-structuring relationship with space, place, and territory in Hittite Anatolia. In this opening paper, I will focus on the language of geography to consider the roles of geographical knowledge and geographical discourse in the ideologies, strategies, and mechanisms of Hittite imperialism. Setting out with the proposition that geographic representations – be they conveyed through word or image – are subjective constructions, I will first explore how political spaces are constructed and communicated in various kinds of Hittite texts. Through close analysis of Hittite toponymy, spatial terminology, and geographical discourse, I will attempt to trace key moments and processes in Hittite history in or during which spaces, places, and territories were reimagined, rescaled, reorganized, or renamed to serve political, ideological, and/or strategic ends. Lastly, by juxtaposing Hittite concepts of (political) space and our modern analytical and conceptual units, I will highlight key methodological, empirical, and epistemological issues at the intersection of historical geography and political history.

The Luwians, 20 years after *The Luwians*

After the publication of the volume *The Luwians* in 2003, which was edited by Craig Melchert just a few years after David Hawkins published his *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions*, much has happened in the field of Luwian studies. The works by linguists such as Melchert himself, Elisabeth Rieken and Ilya Yakubovich have highlighted the enormous importance of the Luwian language in the Final Bronze Age, with a very recent proposal for a fine-grained dialectology of Luwian that was advanced by Yakubovich and Alice Mouton. New models for the historical interpretation of the first centuries of the Late Bronze Age called for a re-evaluation of the cultural and political geography of Anatolia in the phase we now call early empire. New data pertaining to the 12th century Dark Age also emerged, and documents that were previously dated to the late II millennium have been now recategorized, at least tentatively, as having been composed much later. The models produced by different scientific approaches, however, are not always entirely compatible with each other, and in some cases some interpretations may require adjustment. In the present paper, I will try to assess the current interpretive models deriving from contact-linguistics, philology, and history and propose a partial revision of some aspects of the scenario as it is currently generally reconstructed.

Between Space and Power – Was there a Territory of Ura?

Before appearing in Hittite documentation, Ura had long been famous for its merchants and goods. In the Ebla texts (3rd millennium BC) “the place-name ù-ra(ki) was closely associated with various precious colored fabrics” (Pasquali 2015), which recall the supply of “blue-violet wool” via the city of Ura mentioned in Ugarit letters (13th century BC). The text KBo 12.42 suggests that the port of Ura was very active during the time of the Old Hittite Kingdom, and even during that of the Assyrian trading colonies (Ünal 2018). During the reign of Neriglissar (560-556 BC), Ura was the metropolis of the kingdom of Pirindu, and in his chronicle the Neo-Babylonian king describes Kiršu (Meydancikkale) as the “royal city of the Ancestors” of Appuašu, king of Pirindu, whose territory therefore extended from the coast far into the hinterland (Casabonne 2005). In CTH 144 (ca. the end of the 15th century BC), the Hittite king makes an agreement with the “elders of Ura”, whose indication of the places of origin can also suggest the idea of a territory of which Ura would be the metropolis (Casabonne 2005). The hypothesis of a territory of Ura during the Hittite period was stated by Dinçol et al. (2000), who extend this territory in the 13th century BC to the southeastern coastal boundary of Tarhuntassa at Saranduwa, which would correspond to Kelenderis (Dinçol et al. 2000; Melchert 2007) or Selinunte (Gazipaşa) (Casabonne 2005). Ura needed a hinterland, especially for the supply of wood essential for shipbuilding. This hinterland was probably also a land of production and marketing of other products, such as the Red Lustrous Wheel-made ware (RL). Its distribution to Hattusa and central Anatolia was through the Göksu Valley (Kozal 2018), and its supposed origin in Rough Cilicia (Kibaroglu et al. 2017; Kozal 2015). This hypothesis is reinforced by the fact that RL is mainly found in Kilise Tepe and Rough Cilicia but much less frequently in Plane Cilicia, while Cypriot pottery is found throughout Plane Cilicia but almost absent from Rough Cilicia. Through an integrated approach bringing together written and archaeological sources as well as landscape studies, this paper aims to argue the idea that there was indeed a territory of Ura, and will attempt to define this territory as a regional space linked to the Hittite power, although no mention of “country” of Ura is mentioned in the texts.

“And He Made Them the Borders of the Sea” – Border Descriptions and the Perception of Space in Light of Hittite Cuneiform Sources

The intent of the paper is to analyse how the Hittites perceived the political borders that the rulers of *attuşa* were so eager to create and control, both with the neighbouring countries as well as within their own land. We find talk of borders in numerous genres, ranging from international treaties, through edicts, historical narratives, law collections, to magic rituals and festival texts.

Rather than to identify those borders on the map, however, this paper will investigate the role the borders play in the ideology of kingship, how they were created, as well as the way they were described. The latter issue notoriously eludes easy interpretation, mainly due to the complex structure of border descriptions, which lack cardinal points, using internal reference system instead. The investigation will be both diachronic, in that it will follow the evolution of functionally similar passages over time, as well as synchronic, as it will attempt to elucidate the general structure of such passages.

From Landa to Tuwanuwa, from Ikuwanija to Hupisna – Frontiers, Connectivity and Historical Geography in Southeast Konya between the 2nd and the 1st millennia BCE

Much is known about the historical geography of South Central Anatolia from primary sources dating to the 2nd and 1st Millennia BCE, however only very few sites can be located on the map and equated with archaeological sites. Specifically the Konya and Ereğli-Bor plains are important during the Bronze and Iron Ages. The accumulation of sites in this region dating to these periods is astonishing. The southeastern corner of the Konya plain, has been systematically surveyed between the years 2013-2021 (KEYAR survey project). One of questions during the KEYAR survey project was, if it is possible to equate surveyed sites with places mentioned in Hittite sources, specifically the ones on the Bronze Tablet, from Boğazköy. A second aim was to understand political dynamics and how the landscape and geoenvironment has affected the location of settlements. The results of the survey shed light on the Bronze and Iron Age settlement distribution, reasons for settlement locations, road networks, borders and raw material control and procurement, such as salt and metal, which will be discussed in this paper.

Technological Choices and Cultural Identities in Konya and Niğde at the Beginning of the Middle Iron Age

The 9th century BCE is a crucial moment in the history of Central Anatolia, and is chosen by many scholars to mark the transition between the Early and Middle Iron Ages, since there are elements of discontinuity such as a new hierarchy in settlement patterns, the diffusion of wheel-made pottery, and the appearance of new burial customs (Genz 2011; Summers 2008).

Genz (2011) recognises two distinct ceramic zones in Central Anatolia during this phase: one to the west characterised by the presence of monochrome Gray Ware, and one to the east characterised by the presence of Alishar IV-style ceramics. Recently it has been proposed to backdate the production of Alishar IV-style pottery to at least the 10th BCE (d'Alfonso et al. 2022), while the spread of Gray Ware is associated with the Early Phrygian period (Henrickson 1994). New studies demonstrate that these wares spread along more elaborate spatial-temporal trajectories.

Aim of the paper is to investigate whether different technological styles could be an indicator of a different cultural identity between the Niğde and Konya area and how these different technological traditions may be interpreted. Firing a vessel in a reducing or oxidising environment does not have different functional necessities, but what does change is the symbolic value of an oxidising vs. reducing ceramic. Many ethno-archaeological studies show how making one technological choice over another can be linked to the symbolic-cultural value that such a choice entails (Sillar and Tite 2000). In this paper I will deal with the technological aspects of the Gray Ware, presenting two different study cases, one from the excavated site of Kınık Höyük in Cappadocia, and the other concerning survey materials from the KRASP project. Analysing the production of the two regions, we can observe remarkable differences from a functional and technological point of view. I will investigate how these differences could be connected to different cultural identities in the two regions.

Bibliography

- d'Alfonso, Lorenzo, Basso Elena, Castellano Lorenzo, Mantovan Alessio, and Vertuani, Poala, «Regional Exchange and Exclusive Elite Rituals in Iron Age Central Anatolia: Dating, Function and Circulation of Alişar-IV Ware», *Anatolian Studies* 72, 2022, pp. 37–77.
- Genz, Hermann. «The Iron Age in Central Anatolia». In *The Black Sea, Greece, Anatolia and Europe in the First Millennium BC*, edited by G. R. Tsetskhladze, pp. 331–368, 2011.
- Henrickson, Robert C. «Continuity and discontinuity in the ceramic tradition of Gordion during the Iron Age». In *Anatolian Iron Ages 3: The Proceedings of the Third Anatolian Iron Ages Colloquium held at Van, 6-12 August 1990*, edited by A. Çilingiroğlu and D.H. French: 95–130, 1994.
- Sillar, Bill, and Tite, Michael, S. «The Challenge of 'Technological Choices' for Materials Science Approaches in Archaeology». *Archaeometry* 42, 2000, pp. 2–20.
- Summers, Geoffrey D. «Periodisation and Terminology in the Central Anatolian Iron Age», *Ancient Near Eastern Studies*, 2008, pp. 202–17.

The Kingdom and City of Tarḫuntašša – An Integrated Textual, Geographic and Archaeological Analysis

Tarḫuntašša, first mentioned in early 13th century BCE texts as the chosen capital of Muwatalli, later becomes the centre of a vassal kingdom under Ḫattuššili, and probably rebels against Hittite authority between the rule of Ḫattuššili and that of the last king Šuppiluliuma in the early 12th century BCE. The goals of this paper are to refine our understanding of the kingdom of Tarḫuntašša, and to propose locating its capital city further north than traditionally suggested, through the combination of archaeological, textual and geographical evidence available for the area.

In particular, this contribution argues that a comparison between the two subordination treaties highlights significant gains by Kuruntiya, including territorial expansion toward the Mediterranean coast. Looking at the same treaties, and integrating them with archaeological survey data, topography, and movement analysis, the paper also proposes a new model for the internal political geography of the kingdom and its relation with the Hittite state. This model further challenges traditional hypotheses regarding the location of its capital city either in Rough Cilicia or in the Karaman Plain, and instead highlights the possibility that Tarḫuntašša could be located within the Çarşamba River delta, the area described as the “Hulaya River Land” in Hittite texts.

Finally, the presentation explores the connection between the Late Bronze Age kingdom of Tarḫuntašša and the Middle Iron Age kingdom that existed in the same area, ruled by a Great King Hartapu during the late 9th-8th centuries BCE. Integrating recent archaeological evidence for the existence of complex polities across the Early Iron Age in south-central Anatolia, it proposes that Tarḫuntašša might have survived the collapse of the Hittite state and existed in some form until at least the reign of Hartapu.

The Farthest Cities of Phrygia – Cultural Landscapes and Political Interactions in the Anatolian Southern Plateau During the Iron Ages

“The farthest city of Phrygia”... this is how Xenophon tersely describes the city of Iconion/Konya in the *Anabasis* (1.2.19). Although inspired by Greek geographical conceptions of Xenophon’s own time – the 4th century BCE – these words are very apt to capture the crucial notion that, in antiquity, Konya and the Anatolian Southern Plateau represented a persistent interface between several competing political, social and cultural networks. This paper aims to offer a historical perspective to this understanding by focusing the Early and Middle Iron Ages (ca. 1200-700 BCE). I will show that during this period, the area was subject to competing cultural and political influences from Phrygia, in the northwest, and the Syro-Anatolian polities of Tabal to the east. A multifaceted frontier thus emerged, arguable from distribution patterns of material cultural features and from the politico-geographical map reflected in extant epigraphic sources, namely Assyrian and Luwian Hieroglyphic inscriptions. On this basis, I will also explore the case of possible linguistic interactions in the target area.

Hiyawa/Kawa and its Neighbours – The Border Marker Monuments of Arsuz, Hasanbeyli, İncirlik and Cebelireis in their Historical Contexts

The marking of borders and areas of influence by means of stelae, inscriptions or rock reliefs had a tradition in the Ancient Near East dating back to the 3rd millennium BCE and is especially attested for the 1st millennium BCE. Often those monuments are difficult to identify as such or to place in their historical context due to unclear find contexts. These problems, but also the possibilities of a corresponding interpretation, will be demonstrated on the example of a series of monuments dating to the 10th–8th century BCE from the territory of the Iron Age kingdom of Hiyawa/Kawa in Plain Cilicia.

Rostislav Oreshko CNRS/UMR 8761 Orient et Méditerranée,
Center for Hellenic Studies (Harvard University)

Between the Plain and the Mountain – Luwian-Phrygian Contact Zone as a Geographical and Cultural Phenomenon

The present contribution aims to bring together different strands of evidence bearing on the phenomenon of Luwian-Phrygian contact zone. The latter can be defined as a cultural space which came into being at the interface between the ‘old-Anatolian’ population inheriting the traditions of the Hittite Empire (conventionally ‘Luwians’) and the peoples originating, in the long run, in the Balkan region who started to move to Central Anatolia around the mid 12th century BC (conventionally ‘Phrygians’). Although effects of this cultural contact can be expected to be found at different places, the phenomenon can be seen most clearly in the south-eastern parts of Central Anatolia: Lycaonia and Cappadocia. Picking up earlier discussions of onomastic evidence (Simon 2017 and Oreshko 2021), I will argue in the first part of the talk that Luwian inscriptions of Cappadocia may contain more non-Luwian names than previously thought. Another clue for the Phrygian presence in southern Cappadocia may be unusually frequent mentions of horses in the Luwian texts from the region. The third part of the talk will be dedicated to the historical evidence of the TOPADA inscription: bearing on a recent discussion of the text (d’Alfonso 2019), I will revisit the problem of identification and localisation of the city *Parzuwa(n)da*. In the last part of the talk there will be addressed the question of how the inscriptions of Hartapus can be integrated into the broader picture.

Bibliography

d’Alfonso, L. 2019: War in Anatolia in the Post-Hittite Period: the Anatolian Hieroglyphic Inscription of TOPADA Revised, *JCS* 71: 133-152.

Oreshko, R. 2021: Phrygians in Disguise: Onomastic Evidence for Phrygian-Anatolian Ethnocultural Contact in Hieroglyphic-Luwian inscription PORSUK and elsewhere, *Res Antiquae* 18: 283-316.

Simon, Zs. 2017 : Kurtis : A Phrygian Name in the Neo-Hittite World, *News from the Lands of the Hittites Scientific Journal for Anatolian Research* 1: 113-118.

Situating the Kingdom of Hartapu – The Context of the Rise of an Iron Age Polity

The 2019 discovery of the TÜRKMEN-KARAHÖYÜK 1 inscription by “Great King Hartapu,” combined with the understanding of the scale of the associated site of Türkmen-Karahöyük, very likely Hartapu’s capital city, effectively placed a hitherto unknown Iron Age kingdom on southern Anatolia’s political map. There is still so much that is unknown about this polity, and even basic information is still lacking, largely due to a complete lack of excavation to date. Nevertheless, it is important to create models for various aspects of the kingdom’s sociopolitical organization that can be tested as new information comes to light. In this paper I ask, why did Hartapu’s kingdom appear to have thrived during the 8th century BCE in particular? And why in this region of the Konya basin? I will propose that there are several factors that explain why the kingdom’s apparently sudden florescence. These include environmental factors like the onset of the Beyşehir Occupation Phase and hyper-local geological settings, macroregional geopolitical factors like the Neo-Assyrian Empire and the Phrygian kingdom, and local contingent historical factors like peer-polity interaction among Tabalian kingdoms. At the same time, however, it would be misleading to neglect long-term issues like connections with the preceding Hittite Empire and the settlement history of Türkmen-Karahöyük that show that, in fact, the site was probably just as important in previous centuries as well. Ultimately, there’s something of a disjuncture between the sensationalism inspired by Hartapu’s monuments and their spectacular setting, and slower scale archaeological data, both of which need to be taken into account for a full understanding of Hartapu’s kingdom.

A view from the Frontier – The Political and Cultural Geography of Hiyawa Portrayed at Azatiwataya

As of 2000, an interest in the polity of Hiyawa located in Southern Anatolia was instilled and propelled with the publication of the well-known Çineköy inscription, a monument on a basalt base in the form of a pair of bulls pulling the chariot of one manifestation of the Storm God. In the light of this, the *res gestae* type of inscription and the sculpted images juxtaposed in the two main gates leading in and out of the Iron Age fortress Karatepe-Aslantaş or Azatiwataya, as it was designated by its patron in the early first millennium BCE, adds more food for thought on aspects of cultural geography at Hiyawa. Last, but not least, the location of the frontier stronghold may also contribute towards a better understanding of the layered geographical circumstances of this polity. I propose to revisit these well-known gate monuments to undertake a study of the political and cultural geography of Hiyawa as gleaned from the text and imagery of a citadel situated on the frontier of this small, yet intriguing kingdom.

Kietis and the Western Extension of Hiyawa

The historical geography of Hiyawa has several problems, one of them is the entangled question of its unknown western extension and the unknown affiliation of the Neo-Hittite king mentioned in the Cebelireis Dağı inscription. With a possible exception, local inscriptions of Hiyawa are concentrated in a small territory. However, there is some evidence that Hiyawa could have included a much more western territory as well (see esp. Lemaire 2006). Unfortunately, most of these arguments are inconclusive, as it will be discussed in the talk. The most important piece of this alleged evidence is the Cebelireis Dağı inscription referring to a local ruler WRYK (but without naming his realm), who might have been a member of the Hiyawa dynasty, based on his name. However, this is precisely the inscription that is located far away from the assured Hiyawa inscriptions, close to Alanya.

In this talk, I will argue that fresh evidence and a possible solution are provided by the region called K(i)etis known from Classical sources. K(i)etis is located between Anemurium (Anamur) and the Calycadnus (Gök Su). The origin of this toponym is unknown, but it has clearly nothing to do with Qode, contrary to the usual and frequent claim, on geographical and linguistic grounds (*contra* Bányai 2022, see already Simon 2011). Instead, it is transparently based on an epichoric stem *Kie-* that can regularly continue the Luwian term Hiyawa. If this is correct, then we have the first solid piece of evidence for a more western extension of Hiyawa, at least in a given period. Although this still does not cover the region of the Cebelireis Dağı inscription, it sets the westernmost area of Hiyawa radically closer to it than previously attested. Nevertheless, this reconstruction should also be reconciled with Pirindu and Hilakku both chronologically and geographically, which will be also addressed in the talk.

Bibliography

Bányai, M. (2022): Qode – Kietis – Kataonien – Kappadokien – Kittim – ein Erklärungsversuch. *Ugarit-Forschungen* 52: 7-29.

Lemaire, A. (2006): La maison de Mopsos en Cilicie et en Pamphylie à l'époque du fer (XIIe–VIe s. av. J.-C.). *Res Antiquae* 3: 99-107.

Simon, Zs. (2011): The Identification of Qode. Reconsidering the Evidence. In: J. Mynářová (ed.): *Egypt and the Near East – the Crossroads. Proceedings of an International Conference on the Relations of Egypt and the Near East in the Bronze Age. Prague, September 1-3, 2010*. Prague, 249-269.

Speculations on the Territories of Phrygia and its Neighbours

This paper attempts to take a fresh look at the evidence for the territories of Phrygia and its neighbours in the Middle Iron Age, that is, in the time of the Dynasty to which King Midas belonged. Thus the timespan is from the ninth to the early seventh centuries BCE. The thrust will be to the east of Phrygia, essentially the lands that the Neo-Assyrians called Tabal, Cilicia to the southeast where Neo-Assyrian texts tell us that Midas was active, and to the south as far as the Mediterranean coast. The study builds on the author's recent paper on polities and territories (to be published in *AoF* 2023) at the same time as considering new evidence from ongoing work in the Konya plain and southwest 'Cappadocia'. While textual evidence is very thin and archaeological evidence even thinner, it will be argued that some speculative progress can be made, and that as a result a more nuanced picture of the Kingdom of Phrygia and be envisaged than that which has been forcefully proffered from the perspective of the capital city of Gordion.

Vincebamur a victa Graecia – The Annexation of Kizzuwadna and its Consequences through the Prism of Comparative Philology

The annexation of Kizzuwadna by the Kingdom of Hattusa in the early 14th century BCE is not directly addressed in any historical narrative preserved in the archives of Hattusa. Nevertheless, the reconstruction of this political event can benefit from indirect evidence that can be gleaned from the cuneiform sources found in Hattusa. Thus, we know that Nikkal-madi, the wife of Tuthaliya I, had a Hurrian name, while her frequent mentions in Hittite sources contrast with the rare appearance of the previous consorts of Hattusa kings in the same corpus. Therefore, claims have been made that a dynastic marriage played an important role in Hattusa's political expansion (de Martino 2011: 9 with ref.).

The purpose of this presentation is addressing new philological data that are relevant for reconstructing the impact of Kizzuwadna's annexation on central Anatolian culture. First, it is assumed that the transfer of the Kizzuwadna ritual lore to Hattusa involved a variety of methods, such as copying/adaptation of the pre-existing written texts and interviewing of the ritual practitioners by the scribes (Miller 2004: 511–530, Yakubovich 2010: 277–281). I would argue for the existence of an additional mechanism, namely the imitation of performances in the Kizzuwadna style at the court of Hattusa. Second, although the transfer of Kizzuwadna scribes to the court of Hattusa is not in itself a new idea (see, e.g., Güterbock 1956: 138), the existing linguistic arguments in favour of such a scenario have thus far remained inconclusive. I hope to demonstrate that the Hurrian technical terms borrowed via Luwian and found in Hittite secular texts furnish a proof of this hypothesis. Third, mass migrations or transportations from Kizzuwadna to Central Anatolia derive their only philological support from anecdotal evidence (e.g., Alp 1991: 263). The analysis of Hittite-Luwian conjurations emanating from the Taurisa tradition (Mouton and Yakubovich 2021: 38–46) is conducive to reconstructing the resettlement of a Luwian population group to the northeast of Hattusa and its subsequent acculturation, while I contend that Kizzuwadna emerges as its most likely place of origin.

Bibliography

- Alp, Sedat. 1991. *Hethitische Briefe aus Maşat-Höyük*. Istanbul: Türk Tarih Kurumu.
- Güterbock, Hans G. 1956. Notes on Luwian Studies (A propos B. Rosenkranz' Book "Beiträge zur Erforschung des Luvischen"). *Orientalia*, NS 25: 113–140.
- de Martino, Stefano. 2011. *Hurrian Personal Names in the Kingdom of Hatti*. Florence: LoGisma.
- Miller, Jared. 2004. *Studies in the Origins, Development, and Interpretation of the Kizzuwadna Rituals*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Mouton, Alice, and Ilya Yakubovich. 2021. Where did one speak luwili? Geographic and linguistic diversity of Luwian cuneiform texts. *Journal of Language Relationship* 19/1: 25–53.
- Yakubovich, Ilya. 2010. *Sociolinguistics of the Luvian Language*. Leiden: Brill.

