

**Herausgegeben von Robert Rollinger,
Andreas Luther und Josef Wiesehöfer**
unter Mitarbeit von Birgit Gufler

Getrennte Wege?

**KOMMUNIKATION, RAUM UND
WAHRNEHMUNG IN DER ALTEN WELT**



VA
VerlagAntike

Die Herausgeber und der Verlag danken folgenden Institutionen für die freundliche Förderung der Drucklegung des Bandes:

Amt der Vorarlberger Landesregierung Abteilung 2b, Wissenschaft und Weiterbildung,

Amt der Tiroler Landesregierung, Abteilung Kultur,

Bundesministerium für Bildung, Wissenschaft und Kultur in Wien,

Dekanat der Philosophischen Fakultät der Christian-Albrechts-Universität zu Kiel,

Rektorat der Christian-Albrechts-Universität zu Kiel,

Institut für Alte Geschichte und Orientalistik, Universität Innsbruck,

Universität Erlangen,

Vizerektorat für Forschung, Universität Innsbruck.

Die Deutsche Bibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation

in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie

<http://dnb.ddb.de>

© 2007 Verlag Antike e.K., Frankfurt am Main

Satz Birgit Gufler, Innsbruck

Einbandgestaltung disegno visuelle kommunikation, Wuppertal

Gedruckt auf säurefreiem und alterungsbeständigem Papier

Printed in Germany

ISBN-13 978-3-938032-14-5

www.verlag-antike.de

The Luwian-Phoenician bilinguals of ÇINEKÖY and KARATEPE: an ideological dialogue*

Giovanni B. Lanfranchi

The Luwian-Phoenician bilingual of Çineköy, found in 1997 in the homonymous village near Adana in ancient Cilicia, and quickly edited by R. Tekoğlu and A. Lemaire in 2000,¹ celebrates the achievements of Warikas, the king of Hiyawa (the ancient name of Cilicia). Warikas must be identified with Urikki, king of Que (the Assyrian transcription for Hiyawa), mentioned in various Assyrian texts of Tiglath-pileser III (745-727) and Sargon II (721-705), and with Awarikus, king of Adanawa (the ancient name of modern Adana), mentioned in the KARATEPE Luwian-Phoenician bilingual.

As all Luwian inscriptions, ÇINEKÖY does not bear a date. Tekoğlu and Lemaire prudently suggested that it must have been composed at the close of Warikas's reign;² the exact date of its composition, however, is uncertain. In this text, Warikas celebrates his alliance with Assyria, a fact which, in Assyrian terms, should imply a tributary status; ÇINEKÖY, then, should have been composed when Hiyawa was tributary of Assyria. In some royal inscriptions of Tiglath-pileser III composed between 737 and 729 it is stated that Urikki (= Warikas) paid tribute to Assyria in 738:³ 738, therefore, represents a date *post quem* for ÇINEKÖY, even though it cannot be excluded that Que was already tributary before that year. From the Assyrian point of view, the tributary status of a country ceased when the country was incorporated in the empire and turned into a province: since this transformation necessarily implied the dethronement of the ruling dynasty, an inscription such as ÇINEKÖY could not have been composed when Hiyawa was an Assyrian province. The date *ante quem* for ÇINEKÖY, therefore, is the date of the annexation of Que/Hiyawa to the Assyrian empire. The annexation of Que/Hiyawa to the Assyrian empire, however, is not mentioned in the Assyrian royal inscriptions, so that it has not been possible to establish when it occurred.

The provincial status of Que seems to be attested beyond any reasonable doubt in a letter found in Nimrud/Kalhu, written by Sargon to Aššur-šarru-ušur, who is mentioned in other texts as the governor of Que; in the letter,

* The present article was completed and submitted before the publication of the important contribution by René Lebrun and Julien De Vos "A propos de l'ensemble sculptural de Çineköy" in *Anatolia Antiqua* XIV (2006) pp. 45-64.

¹ Tekoğlu – Lemaire 2000.

² Tekoğlu – Lemaire 2000, pp. 1004-1005.

³ Tadmor 1994, p. 268.

Aššur-šarru-ušur is encouraged by the king to exert his (provincial) authority over local princes. In the letter it is also stated that Midas, king of Phrygia, had delivered to Aššur-šarru-ušur a group of envoys who had been sent to Urartu by Urikki (= Warikas). Since Urartu was a formidable enemy to Assyria during Sargon's reign, it is easy to deduce that Urikki's/Warikas's envoy was a patent infringement of the duties of a king tributary to Assyria. This might imply that an Assyrian governor, probably but not surely Aššur-šarru-ušur, was installed in Que in the place of Urikki/Warikas, who might have been removed from his throne when his treason was discovered, as customary in the Assyrian political usage according to many Assyrian texts, or might have fled abroad to avoid punishment.⁴ There is also the possibility, however, that the treason was discovered only after Warikas died: in this case, the Assyrians would have annexed Que/Hiyawa in order to prevent a successor of Warikas from abandoning the alliance stipulated by him. The letter, as all Neo-Assyrian letters, bears no date. It has been generally dated to 709 BC, the year in which, according to Sargon's Khorsabad Annals, Midas sent an embassy to Sargon for establishing peace; in a previous study, I argued for a date in 715/4, when Sargon conducted a military campaign in Western Cilicia against Midas.⁵ In the letter, however, neither is stated when Warikas's treason was discovered, nor is specified when Warikas sent his envoys to Urartu, when Midas captured the envoys and how long he detained them before delivering them to the Assyrian governor. In principle, therefore, the date of the annexation, which must be later than Warikas's envoy, may be raised until 728, the year following that of the latest inscription of Tiglath-pileser III mentioning Que as a tributary state, and the composition of ÇINEKÖY may be dated accordingly. On the grounds of these complicated data, Tekoğlu and Lemaire, accepting 709 as the date of the Nimrud letter, prudently suggested that ÇINEKÖY was composed during the reign of Sargon; I argued for a date between the last years of Tiglath-pileser III and 715/4.⁶

In ÇINEKÖY there are many impressive similarities and parallelisms with KARATEPE. In the Luwian and in the Phoenician versions the phraseology and the terminology are often so similar that it has been possible to supply various fragmentary parts of ÇINEKÖY from passages of KARATEPE. According to the editors, the very palaeography of both versions of both texts is the same, although in the KARATEPE Phoenician text some signs are more evolved than in ÇINEKÖY.⁷ It is clear, anyway, that both texts stem from the same scribal

⁴ As I argued in Lanfranchi 2005, pp. 490-492.

⁵ Lanfranchi 1988, pp. 59-60, cfr. Lanfranchi 2000, footnote 43 pp. 489-490.

⁶ Tekoğlu – Lemaire 2000, pp. 1004-1005.

⁷ Tekoğlu in Tekoğlu – Lemaire 2000, p. 968; Lemaire, *ibid.*, p. 1001.

school, which was able to manage both Luwian and Phoenician languages and writings. This seems to imply that both inscriptions should have been composed in a relatively short interval of time.

Like ÇINEKÖY, KARATEPE bears no date, and its dating has been subject to an intense debate since its discovery. The palaeography of the Phoenician text and the graphic usage of the Luwian text point to a dating in the late VIIIth cent. BC.⁸ In KARATEPE there is no mention of the Assyrians, and Azatiwatas, the ruler who had it composed, seems to be fully autonomous from foreign dominion. Consequently, KARATEPE should have been composed when the Assyrians were not in control of Que. For sure, this might have occurred before the Nimrud letter was written, viz. before or during Sargon's reign; Sargon, however, was very active in southeastern Anatolia since the beginning of his reign, and there is a general agreement that KARATEPE cannot have been composed when he was king. From the Assyrian sources it is known that both the Assyrian kings Sennacherib (705-681) and Esarhaddon (680-669) conducted military campaigns in Cilicia – in 696 and in 677 respectively – for quelling local revolts. Accordingly, as it has been often suggested, KARATEPE might be dated to one of the periods immediately preceding one of the Assyrian campaigns, when Cilicia or a part of it had thrown off Assyrian yoke. In Sennacherib's texts there is no element which might be taken as alluding in some way to Azatiwatas. Esarhaddon, however, declares in his texts to have executed Sanduarri, king of the towns Kundu and Sissu (to be identified with the towns of *Kyinda* and *Sisium* in Cilicia mentioned in classical sources), and it has been suggested that this name may represent an Assyrian transcription of the name of Azatiwatas. Since all these solutions seem equally possible, the composition of KARATEPE can be only roughly dated to the period between the reign of Tiglath-pileser III and the first part of Esarhaddon's reign, Sargon's reign excluded.⁹

With these premises, the relative chronology of ÇINEKÖY and KARATEPE can be established only through the analysis of their contents. In KARATEPE, Azatiwatas declares to have been “promoted” by Awarikus/Warikas, king of Adanawa, to have established his lord's (= Warikas's) family on the throne, and to have submitted rebellious people to the “house of Muksas”.¹⁰ In ÇINEKÖY,

⁸ Hawkins 2000, p. 44, with bibliography. Hawkins also discusses and invalidates the argument that the style of the sculptures in Karatepe seems to be datable to the IXth century, cautiously suggesting the possibility that some monuments of the IXth century were reused in the building works of the VIIIth.

⁹ There is a vast bibliography on these problems: for thorough recent discussions, see Hawkins 2000, pp. 44-45, and Tekoğlu – Lemaire 2000, pp. 1003-1005, with previous bibliography.

¹⁰ Luwian Muksas is rendered as MPŠ in Phoenician. In its turn, MPŠ corresponds to Greek Mopsos, the name of a hero who arrived to Cilicia from Western Asia Minor

Warikas declares to belong to the “house of Muksas”. Therefore, the dynasty established by Azatiwatas was that of Awarikus/Warikas, and he who was enthroned by Azatiwatas was not Awarikus/Warikas himself. It follows that Awarikus/Warikas disappeared – for whatever reason – *before* KARATEPE was composed. J.D. Hawkins reached the same conclusion before the publication of ÇINEKÖY,¹¹ and the wording of ÇINEKÖY definitively confirms his hypothesis.

It is not possible to establish the chronological distance between the inscriptions. In KARATEPE, Azatiwatas boasts to have conquered foreign territories, to have quelled internal strife, and to have built many fortresses among which the town Azatiwatiya, to be identified with the Karatepe mound, on a monument of which he had the bilingual inscribed. These exploits, obviously, preceded the composition of the inscription. It is not possible, however, to establish whether Azatiwatas accomplished *all* such exploits *after* the disappearance of Warikas. Actually, he may have accomplished some of them as an official under the authority of Warikas when Warikas was king, and he may have avoided to mention this fact for whatever reason. Since the achievements listed in both inscriptions are rather similar (see below), it is also possible that all, or many achievements claimed by Warikas in ÇINEKÖY were performed by Azatiwatas as an official under the authority of Warikas. In principle, finally, it is even possible that Azatiwatas’s enthronement of the legitimate dynasty was the only fact which followed Warikas’s disappearance and which preceded the composition of KARATEPE: in this case, Warikas would have disappeared shortly before the composition of KARATEPE.

Some elements in KARATEPE seem to suggest that Warikas did not disappear shortly before the composition of KARATEPE. First, Azatiwatas attributes his exploits to divine protection (see below) and not to the protection of Awarikus/Warikas as his king, and this seems to suggest that he accomplished all the exploits he mentions in KARATEPE *after* the disappearance of Warikas. Second, Azatiwatas’s boast to have quelled internal strife might be taken as implying that Warikas had disappeared before the strife broke out, and that Azatiwatas needed some time to quell it. Third, Azatiwatas states to have established peace with “every king” and to have been acknowledged by “every king” for his wisdom (see in detail below). Since such institutional initiative and such international acknowledgment seem unfit for the office of an appointee when the legitimate ruler is on the throne, it might be submitted that Azatiwatas could act in that way only *after* Warikas’s disappearance, and this obviously takes an appropriate period of time. All these hypotheses, however, can be

after the Trojan war. For a discussion, see Tekoğlu – Lemaire 2000, pp. 1005-1006, with the relevant footnotes for previous bibliography.

¹¹ Hawkins 2000, p. 44.

easily contradicted. As for the first, to state that all or some enterprises were performed by the appointee under the authority of the appointing king cannot be taken as a *compulsory* obligation for the appointee when that king is no more reigning, even though it is a common *topos* in the Luwian inscriptions. Such a mention might be merely dictated by convenience, or even conditioned by consolidated literary or ideological *topoi*. The missed mention of Warikas's authority, therefore, proves nothing. As for the second, we do not know whether the strife broke out already *during* Warikas's reign, and, if so, how long it lasted before his disappearance, and/or whether the strife provoked in some way his disappearance (assassination, expulsion, etc.); neither we know how long the strife lasted after Warikas's disappearance until it was finally quelled by Azatiwatas. Consequently, it might be that Azatiwatas had KARATEPE composed after the quelling of a strife which had lasted for a long time *during* Warikas's reign and had finally provoked in whatever way his disappearance, but took a very short time to be finally quelled. To the third hypothesis, which may appear the most likely, it can be objected, on the one hand, that the "kings" not necessarily needed a long time to acknowledge Azatiwatas after his quelling of the internal strife, and on the other hand, that the sentence in KARATEPE is an ideological boast rather than a reference to historical reality. In any case, since we do not know what were the duties and the rights of an appointee such as Azatiwatas during the reign of the appointing king, the third hypothesis remains totally unproven.

In sum, there is no cogent element for establishing how long ÇINEKÖY preceded KARATEPE. It may have been composed indifferently many years or a very short time before it, whatever date may be attributed to one of them on the grounds of Assyrian sources. Even the most extreme hypothesis, which would have ÇINEKÖY composed as early as in the last part of Tiglath-pileser III's reign, and KARATEPE as late as shortly before Esarhaddon's campaign against Sanduarri, might be accommodated to the wording of the inscriptions, and to the fact that both were composed by the same scribal school. In such an extreme hypothesis, Warikas might have disappeared during Tiglath-pileser III's reign, and Azatiwatas, installed by Warikas, might have remained submitted to Assyrian dominion for a long time, and would have thrown off the Assyrian yoke at the beginning of Esarhaddon's reign.

With these premises, we may attempt to find supplementary elements by a detailed comparison of the contents of both inscriptions. It seems useless, however, to trace a comparison on the historical level, since the historical data stemming from both inscriptions are few, and, as discussed above, basically devoid of any precision. It seems more profitable to trace the comparison on the ideological level, singling out the main themes developed in both of them,

cross-checking and comparing the inscriptions on the grounds of such themes, and examining the points in which the inscriptions coincide or oppose each other. In this way, it might be possible to single out some other element hinting at the chronological distance between them. It must be taken into account in anticipation, however, that such a comparison may not lead to a diriment outcome.

In any case, the ideological analysis is extremely interesting from another point of view. ÇINEKÖY is one of the rare example of an inscription written by a ruler who was, as far as it can be assumed looking at the text, a staunch supporter of the Assyrian empire, and who exalted overtly his alliance with Assyria. Its only companions are the inscriptions of Bar-rakib of Sam'al, who proudly declared to have “run at the wheel” of the Assyrian king, and exalted his fathers’s alliance with, and submission to the king of Assyria.¹² Therefore, the comparison with KARATEPE, which was apparently written when Que/Hiyawa was free from the Assyrian dominion, is crucially important for understanding what might have been the ideological attitude towards the Assyrian dominion of an autonomous local ruler like Azatiwatas, and, more generally, for studying the impact of the Assyrian empire on its periphery, the modalities in which it was perceived in the peripheral cultures, and the ideological devices which were developed for presenting it in official texts. What I would call the “ideological dialogue” between ÇINEKÖY and KARATEPE, actually, may be extremely productive for the study of the final part of the VIIIth century in the Ancient Near East.

Principles of the comparison

In order to perform an in-depth comparison of the inscriptions from the ideological point of view, I have divided the text(s) into blocks, aimed at representing the basic elements to be taken into consideration. In this way, it will be possible to compare the sequences of identical, similar or contrasting text blocks, considering especially the order in which they, or their components, are reported in both texts; actually, the order in which identical or similar events are listed is extremely important for a correct ideological analysis (as in the case of the order of the epithets of the Assyrian kings in the Neo-Assyrian royal inscriptions¹³).

¹² Sendjirli orthostat of Bar-rakib, in Donner – Röllig 1962, no. 216, 8-9, p. 40, and 1964, p. 233; Sendjirli statue of Panammuwa II erected by his son Bar-rakib, *ibid.*, no. 215, 6-7, 10-14, pp. 39-40, and 1964, pp. 223-224.

¹³ Liverani 1981.

Except for a single instance, these blocks will be labeled “(sets of) achievements”, referring to the fact that both in ÇINEKÖY and in KARATEPE the text is modeled as a narration of royal activities or enterprises in the 1st singular. I have selected and delimited them according to an *artificial* principle, viz. distinguishing sets of “internal achievements”, of “international achievements” and of “conquest and colonization”. In the first set I included the royal “enterprises” which are described as involving the territory or the population of the kingdom of Hiyawa (the “Land of the plain of Adana”).¹⁴ In the second set I included those royal “enterprises” which are described as involving foreign institutions, such as inter-state relations. In the third set I included various sets of royal “enterprises” dealing with the transformation of foreign territory into national territory, such as territorial conquests and annexations, deportations from regions external to Hiyawa, installation of Adanaweans into conquered territories, etc. The distinction between the first two sets is aimed at stressing the basic ideological opposition between the relations entertained by the king (or by the ruling authority) with his own country, population, and gods, and the relations entertained by the king/ruling authority with the external world; the third set (“conquest and colonization”) represents a blending between the first and the second, the “external” being turned into “internal” by the king’s/ruling authority’s action. In the first and in the second set a “static” view of the institutional and political situation is at work, in which there is no change in the status or role of the entities which entertain mutual relations: the king is, and remains the king of his country; the king’s country and the external world remain neatly separated from the institutional point of view. In the third set, instead, a “dynamic” view is at work, since, from the institutional point of view, the external loses its autonomous role and is transformed into internal.

The only exception, as anticipated, is represented by what I call “second self-introduction”. This is a short sentence through which, in both inscriptions, the (royal) “author” introduces himself (with the 1st singular pronoun) for a second time, at the beginning of the narration of the royal *res gestae*.

It would have been extremely productive to introduce a further division of the texts into blocks determined through their original syntactical value, i.e. according to the various linguistic elements which were used to mark the beginning of the various sentences. This would have been extremely useful for preserving the logical partitions which were voluntarily introduced by the author(s)/scribe(s) in the process of structuring and composing the text, and consequently for cross-comparing these partitions with the “artificial” ideological blocks. In both texts, two elements are clearly used for this purpose: a) the

¹⁴ For these terms, and for their equivalence as the designation of Cilicia, see Hawkins 2000, pp. 39-40, 43-44, and Tekoğlu in Tekoğlu – Lemaire 2000, pp. 981-983.

Ist singular personal pronoun (“I”), either independent, or nominalized (“I am”), or merged with an enclitic subordinative particle (“and I”); and b) the temporal locution *amiṣa haliyaṣa* (“in my days”). Other elements are easily detectable, but their exact value cannot be established with certainty, due to the limited knowledge of Ist millennium Luwian syntax. On the one hand, there are either the subordinative conjunction *-wa/i* or the mere juxtaposition without any specific marker (as in the case of a sequence of epithets); on the other hand, the particle REL(-i)(-pa)-, which is frequent in both texts. According to Hawkins, the latter is a “non-subordinating introductory particle”, which possibly had a “resumptive force” (accordingly, he translated it with “so”).¹⁵ The difference between *-wa/i* and REL(-i)(-pa)-, however, is not immediately detectable as regards the relations between the sentences which contain it and the previous or the following sentences: this difficulty is mirrored in the Phoenician versions, where almost invariably *w-* corresponds *both* to *-wa/i* and to REL(-i)(-pa)-.¹⁶ Consequently, I have avoided any attempt to trace syntactic distinctions between the sentences introduced by *-wa/i* and the sentences introduced by REL(-i)(-pa)-, and I have limited to the two clear markers listed above (Ist singular personal pronoun and temporal locution *amiṣa haliyaṣa*).

The Luwian text only is treated here: for the aims of this analysis, the Phoenician text of both inscriptions can be *a priori* considered totally dependent on the Luwian text, as a direct translation from Luwian. Only the Phoenician passages preserving the translation of text broken or unclear in the corresponding Luwian version, or providing meaningful variants will be explicitly quoted.¹⁷

The structure of the ÇINEKÖY text

According to these principles, the structure of the ÇINEKÖY Luwian text is the following (Table 1):

¹⁵ Quoted from Hawkins 2000, p. 60 (*ad* § XI, 56); cf. also pp. 61 (*ad* § XXIII, 119), 62 (*ad* § XXVIII, 142; *ad* § XXXI, 153; *ad* § XXXV, 182), 63 (*ad* § XL, 209), 66 (*ad* § LIII, 303). Hawkins 2000, p. 60, notes that this particle seems to be “unrepresented by a Phoen. correspondence”.

¹⁶ Hawkins 2000, p. 63, suggests that only KARATEPE § XL, 209 attests a correspondence between REL(-i)(-pa)- and Phoenician *k*, “as; since”.

¹⁷ The translation of the ÇINEKÖY Luwian version follows the edition of the text as given by Tekoğlu (Tekoğlu – Lemaire 2000, pp. 970-972); the translation of the KARATEPE Luwian version is literally quoted from Hawkins 2000, pp. 48-53.

<i>Titulary</i>	
A. Name	§1) [I am] Warikas,
B. Dynastic epithets (filiation, ancestry)	son of [...], descendant of [Muka]sas,
C. Institutional role (king)	Hiyawe[an] king,
D. Devotional epithet (Tarhunzas)	Tarhunza[s's servant,
E. Devotional epithet (Sun-god)	the Sun-blessed (?) man].
<i>Res Gestae</i>	
<i>A. Second self-introduction</i>	(§2a) [I], Warikas (Phoen., 3: “who”),
<i>B. Internal achievements 1</i>	
1. Expansion of the country	(§2b) expanded [Hiyawa,]
2. Prosperity of the country	(§3a) [and (- <i>wa/i</i> ?)] I caused the] plain of [Hi]yawa to prosper (<i>omitted in Phoen.</i>)
3. Divine sanction (of activities A and B)	(§3b) by Tarhunzas and my paternal gods
4. Increase of the size of the army	(§4) and (<i>wa/i-ta</i>) I made horse upon horse, (§5) I made ar[my] upon arm[y].
<i>C. International achievements</i>	
1. International recognition	(§6) So (REL- <i>p[a]-wa/i</i>) the/an Assyrian king and the whole Assyrian “House” were made a fa[ther and a mo]ther for me,
2. High ranking status (melting with Assyria)	(§7) and (<i>-wa/i</i>) Hiyawa and Assyria were made a single “House” .
<i>D. Conquest and colonization</i>	
1. Destruction of enemy fortresses	(§8) So (REL- <i>pa-wa/i</i>) I destroyed [powerful] fortresses (<i>omitted in Phoen.</i>),
2. Building of fortresses	(§9) [and I built] (restored from Phoen., 10: “and I built, I”) to the East 8, and <to> the West 7 fortresses.
3. Settlement of people	(§10) So (REL- <i>pa-wa/i</i>) these places were (...) for the “House” of the Land of the plain (= the kingdom of Hiyawa) (Phoen. 13-16a?: “And in the pla[ce(s) ? ...] / [...] / [...] / (those who are) oppressed / in trouble I settled t[here ...]”). ¹⁸
<i>E. Internal achievements 2</i>	
1. Prosperity of the kingdom (?) and of the king (under divine sanction ?)	(§11) I, for me, in the land [...] (§12) [all] good things [...] (Phoen., 16b?-18: “ <i>Ba'al</i> / of KR [...] quietness, richness, abundance and [<i>all</i> (?) good / to this king <i>and also in this</i> [...]”).

Table 1. ÇINEKÖY inscription, Luwian text: ideological structure.

¹⁸ The text of the Luwian version seems to be much shorter than the corresponding text in the Phoenician version, which is also damaged. I follow Tekoğlu's and Lemaire's reconstructions, and I understand this section as referring to the settlement of Hiyaweans.

According to the standards of almost all Near Eastern royal inscriptions, ÇINEKÖY is formed of two main parts: an introduction dedicated to the self-presentation of the king “authoring” the text, and a longer section describing the king’s *res gestae* – a section which in many texts includes also his building activities.

The introduction reports king Warikas’s titulary: name, filiation,¹⁹ dynastic background,²⁰ institutional title, and two devotional epithets connecting Warikas with the god Tarhunzas and the Sun-god.²¹ The *res gestae* section opens with the 1st singular pronoun followed by Warikas’s name:²² this is the subject of a long series of sentences dealing with Warikas’s accomplishments. Then, ÇINEKÖY deals with Hiyawa’s *internal* scenery: Warikas declares to have enlarged his kingdom, to have given prosperity to his country through the divine help of Tarhunzas and of his paternal gods, and boasts to have increased the size of his army. After a REL(-i)(-pa)- particle, the narration moves to the *international* scenery. Warikas celebrates his alliance and the “melting” of his dynasty or country with Assyria,²³ thus stressing the high level international recognition

¹⁹ Unfortunately for the modern historian, the name of Warikas’s father is broken both in the Luwian and in the Phoenician versions.

²⁰ Warikas declares to be a descendant of Muksas (MPŠ in Phoenician). In KARATEPE, this name appears in the formula “house/dynasty of Muksas (MPŠ)”; and Awarikus/WRK (Warikas of ÇINEKÖY) is described as belonging to that dynasty. For the long-debated problem of his identification with Muksas, mentioned in the “Madduwatta text”, and with the seer Mopsos, mentioned in some Greek texts, see the partial bibliography given in Tekoğlu – Lemaire 2000, pp. 1005-1006.

²¹ In the Phoenician version, it is not clear whether the epithet connecting Warikas to Tarhunzas is omitted, or has been lost in the broken part of line 2, where Lemaire supplies the title “roi des Danouniens?”; here – as in KARATEPE – the name of Tarhunzas is rendered as Ba’al.

²² In the Phoenician version, the personal pronoun is replaced by the relative pronoun Š, “who”, strongly stressing the continuity between the introduction and the *res gestae*.

²³ The sentence may be translated “Hiyawa and Assyria were made a single ‘House’”. For the translation of the verb employed at this point, *izī(ia)-*, “to make”, in the form *izīiasī-*, corresponding to Phoenician KN, “to be, to be established”, I repeat here what I have already stated in Lanfranchi 2005, p. 483 footnote 11. Tekoğlu (in Tekoğlu – Lemaire 2000, p. 980 with fn. 21) interpreted the verb form as a Preterite 3rd plural, and translated “sont devenues,” although stressing that this intransitive meaning contrasts with the transitive meaning of the same verb in §§4-5 (“I made horse upon horse, (and) I made ar[my] upon arm[y]”). Hawkins 2000, p. 64, noted that Phoenician KN usually corresponds to Luw. *asa-*, but that in two clear instances (KARATEPE, Hitt. version §§ LIV and LV = Phoen. version, 306 and 315, in Hawkins 2000, pp. 55-56) corresponds to (imperative) *izīyaru-* (a broken form *i-izī-ī...*) corresponding again to Phoenician KN appears in KARATEPE § XLIV). Hawkins suggested that these forms must be understood as Preterite Medio-Passive, although stressing

granted to his country, which is ideally brought to the status of a major power. International diplomatic hierarchy, which has Assyria as the most prominent power, however, is duly respected here through the adoption of the metaphor depicting Assyria and its king as “father and mother” to Warikas himself and to Hiyawa. Then the text moves to *conquests and colonization*. Warikas boasts to have destroyed fortresses in unnamed regions (but evidently lying in foreign territory),²⁴ and to have built 15 fortresses in the East and in the West (probably alluding to territorial conquests to be stabilized by defensive control structures). As far as it may be deduced from the comparison between the Luwian and the Phoenician texts (the Luwian version, which is much shorter than the Phoenician, has a still untranslatable *bapax legomenon* in the crucial passage²⁵), the next sentence(s) too pertain(s) to the *conquest and colonization* scenery. In the Luwian version, the role of the new fortresses is linked in some way to the dynasty and/or country of Hiyawa; the badly worn Phoenician version, according to the interpretation given by Lemaire, seems to deal with the settlement of people (who are described as to have been formerly in distress) in the new fortresses.²⁶ At the end, the inscription turns to *internal* achievements. The text is half-broken in the Luwian version and highly fragmentary in the Phoenician, but from the comparison between them it seems clear that Warikas refers to the prosperity granted by Tarhunzas/Ba‘al (in Phoenician labeled with KR, perhaps an epithet or a place-name; the Luwian god name, if present, is broken away)²⁷ to Hiyawa and to Warikas himself.

that Medio-Passive forms are very rare and that no examples of Preterite Medio-Passive have been identified so far. He noted, however, that another Medio-Passive form *izjyari*, “is made,” is to be sought in two other passages (MARAŞ 14, §5 and TÜNP 1, § 7, respectively in Hawkins 2000, p. 266 and pp. 155-156 with philological commentary). Hawkins’s translation seems preferable. The deep political meaning of the sentence is not immediately clear. “House” may be taken either as hinting to the Assyrian and Hiyawean royal families (Phoen. *BT* as “dynasty”), or to the institutional or bureaucratic structures of both states (Phoen. *BT* as “administrative structure (of a state)”, to be compared with the parallel meaning of *bīt* in Neo-Assyrian usage (Fales 2000). The former case can be taken either as a rhetoric, abstract celebration of friendship, or as a reference to the establishing of a parental link, *e.g.*, through a dynastic marriage. A century and a half before Warikas’s celebration, a daughter of a king of Que had married Shalmaneser III after the establishment of peaceful relations between Que and Assyria (Grayson 1996, A.0.102.40, iii, 7-8 p. 119).

²⁴ This is reported in the Luwian version only; the fully preserved Phoenician text is not concerned with this subject. The sentence is introduced by REL(-i)(-pa)-.

²⁵ Tekoğlu in Tekoğlu – Lemaire 2000, p. 989 *ad* *180+*311-za.

²⁶ Lemaire in Tekoğlu – Lemaire 2000, p. 999.

²⁷ I agree with A. Lemaire’s proposal (Lemaire in Tekoğlu – Lemaire 2000, pp. 999-1000) to consider KR a place name rather than a divine attribute or title.

Ideological patterns in ÇINEKÖY

From the ideological point of view, the sequence of the events described in the inscription is structured and oriented according to a continuous positive progression. For sake of clarity, it must be stated that the concept of an “ideologically oriented progression” does not imply a “falsification” of the historical succession of the events. The positive events to be celebrated may simply be “selected” among others; thus, the term “progression” must be understood so as to imply that the text reports a succession of truly chronologically consecutive events, which were selected for their positivity among many other events considered less meaningful for the main purpose of the text. Consequently, the succession of the events described in the inscription must be considered “true” in principle. The inscription was envisaged not only as a celebration of the royal career of Warikas as a whole, but also and especially as a *crescendo* of his political action.

As seen above, the inscription starts with Warikas’s establishment of his internal power and/or prosperity;²⁸ then it moves to his success in the international arena; then mentions the conquest and colonization of external territories; finally, it concludes with an increased prosperity of the kingdom. From the point of view of space, the succession may be summarized in the sequence INTERNAL → INTERNATIONAL → EXTERNAL TURNED INTO INTERNAL → INTERNAL; if this sequence is considered from the point of view of chronology in connection with the progression of Warikas’s political activity, and from the point of view of the amount of prosperity of his kingdom, four consecutive ideological “steps” may be detected (cf. Table 2, below):

a) Warikas’s accession (and obviously the first political acts of Warikas, not described in the text), reassumed in the titulary which opens the text, favours the enlargement of the territory, the prosperity of the country, and the strengthening of the Hiyawean army;

b) the extension, prosperity and military power achieved through Warikas’s “first” activity favour the insertion of his country in the international scenery, with the stipulation of an alliance with a high-ranking power – the Assyrian empire;

²⁸ Admittedly, the first event should be considered as regarding the international scenery, since the “enlargement” of the kingdom involves obviously foreign territory. The exact semantic range of the verbs employed in the text (Luwian: TERRA(-)*lata*/*i*-, Phoenician: *RḥB*: see Hawkins 2000, p. 318, and Tekoğlu – Lemaire 2000, p. 976), however, may be taken either as a “factual” enlargement through the conquest of foreign territory, or as a “rhetorical” allusion to a generic “to make great, prosperous, glorious”.

c) the international importance achieved by Warikas through the alliance with Assyria favours military successes (destruction of foreign fortresses) and the incorporation of territories (in which fortresses are built for securing the population installed there);

d) the territorial expansion favours prosperity in the kingdom (Luw. “[all] good things”/Phoen. “quietness, richness, abundance and [all(?)] good/to this king *and also in this* [...]”).

Both the starting point and the end of this progression are connected with the divine world. The positiveness described in the first set of internal achievements (expansion, prosperity and enlargement of the army) is accomplished with the help of Tarhunzas, and that described in the last set of achievements (prosperity) is accomplished with the help of Tarhunzas/Ba‘al (of?) KR. The positiveness of the whole sequence of events described in the inscription is thus attributed to the divine favour and protection, and conversely also Warikas’s “royal career” is put under the same positive shadow.

STEP 1	Warikas’s ACCESSION (and first political activity)	favour the achievement of	success in the INTERNAL scenery through divine assistance: expansion (?) of the country prosperity of the country enlargement of the army
STEP 2	The achieved INTERNAL success	favours the achievement of	success in the INTERNATIONAL scenery: Assyrian king and “House of Assyria” father and mother to Warikas melting of both states / dynasties
STEP 3	The achieved INTERNATIONAL success	favours	CONQUESTS AND COLONIZATION destruction of enemy fortresses building of fortresses resettling people in a peaceful dwelling
STEP 4	CONQUESTS AND COLONIZATION	favour	success in the INTERNAL scenery: prosperity of the country <i>and of its king</i> (?)

Table 2. Ideological pattern of the progression of Warikas’s enterprises.

The various events described in each ideological “step” are also arranged according to the pattern of a “continuous positive progression”. In STEP 1, the enlargement of the kingdom favours the prosperity of the kingdom, and this prosperity fosters the enlargement of the army. The logic of this progression appears very “factual”: an enlarged territory offers more resources, and with these resources a larger army can be assembled. In STEP 2, the alliance with Assyria favours the achievement of a new, higher status for the kingdom; the following “melting” of both nations gives Hiyawa new strength. In STEP 3, the new strength enables Warikas to conquer further territory, and to build there

new fortresses. In STEP 4, finally, the settlement of previously troubled Hiya-waeān people in the new fortresses grants prosperity to the kingdom and to its king. It should be noted that the length of the text which forms STEPS 1-3 is roughly similar (it is impossible to establish the length of the text of STEP 4 since it is broken at the end).

The pattern of an uninterrupted positive progression is aimed not only at extolling Warikas's career, but also, and especially, at appropriately framing the main political event described in the text, which is undoubtedly the alliance with Assyria. The relative shortness of its description does not diminish the centrality of its role, which is clearly attested by its location in the very middle of the story. Such a location seems rather natural, if it is considered from the mere point of view of chronology; nonetheless, its ideologically central role can be fully understood if the rhetorical devices adopted for its description are compared with the previous passages dealing with the "beginnings" of Warikas's career. The first accomplishments of Warikas are described with rather vague and unspecific sentences ("I expanded", "I caused (...) to prosper", and "I made horse upon horse, army upon army"), devoid of any geographical precision, which seem to be nothing else than mere stock rhetorical devices. On the contrary, the alliance with Assyria is described with *specific* terminology, which is geographically exact and politically meaningful, notwithstanding the employment of highly rhetorical formulas such as "were father and mother for me". The king of Assyria, the "House of Assyria," Hiyawa, Assyria (in Phoenician respectively *DNNYM* and Assyrians): all these terms are clearly defined *realia*, which can be immediately and easily identified in the political "mental map" of the reader. In general, it seems that the description of the first "step" of Warikas's career is voluntarily left in a sort of obscure "fog", in order to accurately prepare the brilliantly stressed bursting of the alliance with Assyria. It may be added that the crucial importance of this passage is neatly marked by the usage of a very peculiar terminology, such as the sentence "(Hiyawa and Assyria) *were made* a single 'House'", which is an *unicum* both in the Neo-Hittite and in the Phoenician text *corpus* if referred to political institutions.²⁹

The crucial importance of the alliance with Assyria is further stressed by the fact that the following achievements of Warikas consist of military conquests (which imply further territorial expansion) and important building activities. The rather undetermined and essentially rhetorical character of the sentences

²⁹ For this sentence, see fn. 23, above. The concept "to be father and mother", however, was used in connection with individuals, as in the Phoenician inscription of Kilamuwa king of Sam'al: "but for some (Muškabim) I (Kilamuwa) was a father, for some a mother, for some a brother" (Donner – Röllig 1962, no. 24, ll. 10-11, p. 4, and 1964, p. 31).

employed in describing STEP 1 is turned into detailed, even mathematical precision in STEP 3: the memory of specific achievements abroad and at home, certainly still vivid in the minds of Warikas's "audience", is subtly solicited through the mention of the conquered fortresses, of the fortresses built anew and of the settlement of people "previously in distress". Such a more precise description shows that the alliance with Assyria is presented as the real, factual cause of Warikas's stronger power, and as fostering further progresses in wealth. Finally, the sequence of positive events solicited by the alliance with Assyria is triumphally and piously concluded with the mention (in the Phoenician version) of the divine favour, and with the statement that the kingdom (and its king?) could finally enjoy peace, richness, and abundance (as far as it can be understood from the fragmentary text).³⁰ It is notable that at this point the rhetorical stress on the positivity of the final "step" reaches its highest intensity: the rhetorical formulas (in Phoenician) are more numerous and more complex than in the first "step" as regards the "prosperity" of the kingdom. It is also clear that the purpose of this final section is to demonstrate that the kingdom has reached its zenith, and thus to present a totally favourable "happy end" to the whole story.

The primary purpose of a royal inscription, however, is to extol the role of the king who had it composed; the royal person must absolutely prevail, the importance of the events described in it notwithstanding. In the story narrated in ÇINEKÖY, the crucial importance of the alliance with Assyria might potentially divert the attention of the "reading public" to the factual reality of the great Mesopotamian empire, and consequently shade the centrality of the role attributed to Warikas. Such risk is avoided inserting STEP 1 (the "rather undetermined" story of his reign before the alliance) in Warikas's positive career. The placement of the first achievements of Warikas in internal politics at the beginning of the story is aimed at suggesting that these very achievements made possible the stipulation of the alliance with Assyria. The structure given to the story suggests that Warikas was able to create the conditions for the stipulation of the alliance, since he had given prosperity and power to his kingdom and had strengthened his army. In this way, it is subtly submitted that, without these conditions, Assyria would not have been interested in the stipulation of an alliance with Hiyawa; and, on the contrary, that a more powerful Hiyawa was able to solicit the political attention of the Assyrian king. In conclusion, the inscription proclaims that it was Warikas's ability to foster such an extraordinary alliance; and, obliquely, that the alliance did not depend on an initiative of the Assyrian king, or that, even if it depended on an Assyrian initiative, it was suggested by the power which Hiyawa had obtained thanks to Warikas's

³⁰ Here too a set of rare or otherwise unattested Phoenician terms is introduced (Lemaire in Tekoğlu – Lemaire 2000, p. 1000).

achievements. On the other hand, the role of Warikas is extolled also through the statement that the king of Assyria and his whole “House” were “father and mother” to Warikas himself. In this way, the favour of Assyria is depicted as manifesting itself primarily towards the person of the king; and the career of Warikas, who had promoted his kingdom to a major role, is allowed to remain central in the stage.

It should be noted that, in the background of the sequence of events as described in this part of the inscription, a more general political concept regarding the international ranking of polities is at work. The power achieved by Hiyawa through Warikas’s political action (expansion of the country, enlargement of the army) is clearly depicted as the condition which favoured the alliance with Assyria. This implies that such alliance would not have been possible had Hiyawa maintained the status it had at the beginning of Warikas’s reign. In other words, here it is obliquely submitted that major powers like Assyria are interested only in “great”, powerful and prosperous states, and disregard the others; and, consequently, that Hiyawa was turned into a “major power”, worth to be considered as a potential ally of Assyria, thanks to Warikas’s political activity. Thus, Warikas is depicted as the promoter of the international rank of his kingdom, which is transformed into an internationally renowned power from a merely local entity. By the way, it must be remembered that until this point of ÇINEKÖY, notwithstanding the new major role assigned to Hiyawa by the logic of the text, Assyria is presented as the prevailing party in the political relations between both countries and also in the role of both rulers. To the king of Assyria and to his “House” is attributed the role of “father and mother”, i.e. persons who are obviously to be respected by, and have authority over the “son” – represented by Warikas. In this way, the true political proportions are carefully respected: in the international diplomatic rank, Hiyawa, however powerful it may have become, remains at a level lower than Assyria, and its king is placed in a subordinate position than the king of Assyria.

In conclusion, it seems clear that in ÇINEKÖY the main political fact is the alliance of Hiyawa with Assyria. The whole story as it was narrated in the text appears to have been constructed in such a way as to correctly frame that crucial event in the “career” of Warikas, the king who stipulated the alliance, and to demonstrate that such alliance was positive for Hiyawa and productive of further achievements and progress. In the background of the text, a dispassionate critical reader can easily detect not only the “public” who might have been favourable to such alliance, but also, and especially, those political and social components of the Hiyawean population who might have disliked or opposed it. The building of Warikas’s story is directed especially to the latter “public”, because such a hostile “public” needs a clear description of the

positiveness of the alliance, and an exact singling out of its “material” advantages (such as the conquest of fortresses). Thus, we may easily submit that the stipulation of the alliance with Assyria was a central problem in the political history of Hiyawa; that it was preceded and accompanied by a strong internal debate; and, finally, that perhaps it solicited opposition both to Assyria and to Warikas – an opposition unfortunately not attested in other written documents.

The structure of KARATEPE

Also the text of KARATEPE is perfectly coherent with the standard of the Luwian and Mesopotamian royal inscriptions. It contains not only the story of the “career” of its “author”, Azatiwatas, but also a very long section dealing with the building of the fortress *Azatiwataya* and with its dedication to the gods accompanied by the establishment of regular offerings; it closes with blessings to the fortress and its inhabitants, and with curses to those who would damage or delete the inscription, and appropriate the gates of the fortress itself. Consequently, the comparison with the text of ÇINEKÖY can be performed taking into account only the part dealing with Azatiwatas’s “career”.

The structure of the KARATEPE Luwian text is the following (Table 3):

<i>Titulary</i>	
A. Name	(§i) I (am) Azatiwatas,
B. Devotional epithet (Sun-god)	(§i) the Sun-blessed(?) man,
C. Devotional epithet (Tarhunzas)	(§i) Tarhunzas’s servant
D. Institutional role (“promoted” by Awarikus, king of Adanawa)	(§ii) whom Awarikus, the Adanawean king, promoted.
<i>Res gestae</i>	
<i>Second self-introduction</i>	(§iii) Tarhunzas made me (<i>wa/i-mu-n</i>) mother and father to Adanawa,
<i>Internal achievements 1</i>	
1. Prosperity of the country	(§iv) and (<i>-ha-wa/i</i>) I caused Adanawa to prosper,
2. Expansion of the country	(§v) and (<i>-ha-wá/i</i>) I extended the Adanawa plain on the one hand towards the west and on the other hand towards the east,
3. Richness of the country	(§vi) and (<i>-há-wa/i</i>) in my days there were to Adanawa all good things, <i>plenty</i> and <i>luxury</i> ,
4. Accumulation of alimentary stocks	(§vii) and (<i>-há-wa/i</i>) I filled the Pahrean granaries,
5. Increase of the size of the army	(§viii-xa) and (<i>-ha-wa/i-tá</i>) I made horse upon horse / and (<i>-wa/i-tá</i>) I made army upon army / and (<i>-wa/i-tá</i>) I made shield upon shield,
6. Divine sanction	(§xb) [...] all by Tarhunzas and the gods.

7. Re-establishment of internal order	(§xi-xiii) So (REL- <i>pa-wá/i</i>) I broke the proud ³¹ / and the evils which were in the land / I [remov]ed out of the land,
8. Benefits to, and enthronement of the legitimate dynasty	(§xiv-xvi) and (- <i>wa/i</i>) I blessed (?) my lord's house well / and (- <i>wa/i</i>) I did all good things for my lord's family, / and (- <i>wa/i</i>) I caused it/them to sit upon its/their father's throne.
<i>International achievements</i>	
1. Establishment of peaceful foreign relations	(§xvii) [broken in Hu.]/ omitted in Ho. (Phoen.: "and I established peace with every king"),
2. International recognition	(§xviii) and (- <i>wa/i</i>) every king made me father to himself because of my <i>justice</i> and my <i>wisdom</i> and my goodness,
<i>Conquest and colonization – Part 1</i>	
1.1. Building of fortresses on the frontiers and conquest of unsubmitted peoples	(§xix-xxiii) and (- <i>wa/i</i>) I built strong fortresses [...] on the frontiers / wherein were bad men, robbers / who had not <i>serv</i> ed(?) under Muksas's house / and (- <i>wa/i</i>) I, Azatiwatas, put them under my feet. / So (REL- <i>pa-wa/i-ta</i>) I built fortresses in those places,
1.2. Peaceful dwelling	(§xxiv) so that (REL- <i>i</i>) Adanawa might dwell peacefully,
1.3. Destruction of fortresses in previously not submitted regions	(§xxv-xxvii) and (- <i>wa/i</i>) I smote strong fortresses towards the west / which former kings had not smitten / who were before me.
1.4. Deportations	(§xxviii-xxx) I, Azatiwatas, smote them and (- <i>wa/i</i>) I brought them down / and (- <i>wa/i</i>) I settled them down towards the east on my frontiers.
1.5. Settlement of Adanaweans	(§xxxi) So (REL- <i>pa-wá/i</i>) I settled Adanaweans down ... there.
<i>Conquest and colonization – Part 2</i>	
1. Enlargement of the kingdom	(§xxxii) In my days (<i>a-wa/i á-mi-za</i> ("DIES") <i>ha-li-ia-za</i>) I <i>extended</i> the Adanawean frontiers on the one hand towards the west and on the other hand towards the east,

³¹ The transcription and the translation given here follow Hawkins 2000, p. 60. The reading and the exact meaning of the Luwian term rendered as "proud" (*pá?+ra/i-ia-mi-zi*) are unclear (the Phoenician correspondent *mšlm* is unclear too, Bron 1979, pp. 51-53). It is still debated whether the first sign of the Luwian word (*462) represents *pa-* or *ma-* (Hawkins 2000, pp. 36-37). Accepting *ma-*, Schwemer 1996 suggests "rebel(s)", and Hawkins 2000 (p. 60, cf. p. 37), cautiously traces a parallel with the IInd millennium term *mariannu*, "member of the equestrian class". In any case, the context points to someone or something worth to be eliminated in order to "remove the evil" from the country.

2. Peace in previously dangerous regions	(§xxxiii-xxxv) and (- <i>na/i-la</i>) even in those places which were formerly feared / where a man fears them (for) the road to go (it). / So (REL- <i>pa-wa-i-</i>) in my days (<i>mi-ia-za</i> (“DIES”)) <i>há-li-ia-za</i> even women walk with spindles
[3]. [Divine sanction]	(omitted/[broken]) (Phoen.: “by the grace of Ba’al and the gods”)
<i>Internal achievements 2</i>	
1. Prosperity of the country	(§xxxvi) In my days (<i>a-wa/i á-mi-ia-za</i> (DIES)) <i>há-li-ia-za</i> there was <i>plenty</i> and <i>luxury</i> and good living
2. Peaceful dwelling	(§xxxvii) and peacefully dwelt Adanawa and the Adanawa plain.

Table 3. KARATEPE, Luwian text: ideological structure.

As in ÇINEKÖY, in KARATEPE a short introduction is followed by the *res gestae*; the latter include Azatiwatas’s building activities, which, as anticipated, are excluded from this analysis. The introduction contains Azatiwatas’s titulary: the name, two devotional epithets connecting him with the Sun-god and Tarhunzas, and a short sentence explaining his institutional role as a royal appointee.

The *res gestae* section is opened by the 1st singular personal pronoun in the accusative, which introduces a short sentence in which it is stated that god Tarhunzas (the grammatical subject of this sentence) made Azatiwatas “mother and father to Adanawa”; then the subject turns abruptly to the 1st singular. The text first deals with Azatiwatas’s *internal* achievements: prosperity, expansion, richness, accumulation of alimentary stocks, and enlargement of the army; the list is closed by the statement that everything was achieved under Tarhunzas’s protection. After a REL-(-*i*)(-*pa*)-, Azatiwatas states to have re-established order in Hiyawa and to have granted benefits to the legitimate dynasty, after having installed it on the throne. Then the text moves to the *international* scenery. Azatiwatas affirms to have established peaceful relations with all kings,³² and to have been considered “as a father” by all kings for his justice and wisdom. *Con-*

³² This sentence is preserved only in the Phoenician version, and is introduced by the conjunction *w-*, like the previous and the following sentences; in the Luwian version, the text in the Lower Gate inscription (Hu.) is broken at this point, and that in the Upper Gate inscription (Ho.) omits this passage. This does not allow to decide safely whether a REL-(-*i*)(-*pa*)- or a 1st singular personal pronoun opened this series of sentences. For the purpose of this study, however, a perfect correspondence in the extension(s) of the “unit(s)” and in their succession is not crucial. There is, however, a strict correspondence with the following unit (Unit 4): this is formed of two sets of achievements (in the same order, internal - international), not separated by any of the markers selected as “unit separators”.

quest and colonization are the subject of the following series of sentences. Azatiwatas states to have built fortresses along the borders, which enabled the conquest of regions never submitted before;³³ after a clearly resumptive REL(-i)(-pa)-, he declares again to have built fortresses, and adds that these allowed a peaceful dwelling to the Adanaweans.³⁴ Then the narration moves to the detailed description of the conquests. Azatiwatas states to have destroyed fortresses never taken previously, and to have deported their inhabitants to the eastern borders of his country; his settlement of Adanaweans in the conquered fortresses is again introduced through a REL(-i)(-pa).³⁵ The temporal locution “in my days” opens a second section devoted to *conquest and colonization*, which is substantially resumptive of the previous one. Azatiwatas boasts to have widely expanded his kingdom, annexing territories which previously could not be passed through safely; a REL(-i)(-pa)- followed by the temporal locution “in my days” shortly comments upon the safety granted to the conquered lands, stating that there “even women may (now) walk (freely) with spindles (in their hands)”.³⁶ The Phoenician version adds a sentence about the sanction by Ba‘al and “the gods” (this part is omitted in the Luwian version). At the end of the part of the bilingual which is under scrutiny, a temporal locution “in my days” introduces a new set of *internal* achievements, such as the prosperity and the peaceful dwelling granted to Adanawa and to its country.

³³ This seems to be the only acceptable logic of the wording of this long sentence (§xix): Azatiwatas built fortresses (Phoenician: “walls”) on the borders of Hiyawa, and these enabled him to launch an expedition which concluded in the submission of foreign peoples. Otherwise, one might suspect that both in the Luwian and in the Phoenician versions the succession of events (first the conquest of external regions, then the building of the fortresses in the annexed territories) has been inverted; this, however, seems much less probable, especially because the building of fortresses is mentioned again in the following sentence (§ xxiii).

³⁴ For the resumptive value here, see Hawkins 2000, p. 61

³⁵ This is an extremely important attestation that the practice of cross-deportation, so widely attested in the Neo-Assyrian texts, was common in the Near Eastern milieu of the 1st millennium BC. May this be considered a political influence of Assyria? Further study in this field is needed.

³⁶ The syntax of §§ xxxii-xxxiv may be understood in this way: “I extended the Adanawan frontiers (...) to the west and (...) to the east, and also in those places which were formerly feared. So, in my days even women may walk with spindles” (but cf. the slightly different translation in Hawkins 2000, pp. 32-33).

Ideological patterns in KARATEPE

Like ÇINEKÖY, KARATEPE is clearly structured according to the pattern of a positive progression. It starts from internal achievements following Azatiwatas's accession to power, consisting of prosperity and increased military power; then it moves to Azatiwatas's successes in the international scenery; then gives ample space to the conquest and the colonization of foreign territories; and concludes with the increased prosperity of the kingdom. The sequence is essentially identical with ÇINEKÖY's sequence, although with different internal proportions: INTERNAL → INTERNATIONAL → EXTERNAL TURNED INTO INTERNAL → INTERNAL. Accordingly (see Table 4, below):

a) Azatiwatas's accession (which is reassumed in the titulary at the beginning, but is in some way specified in the second self-introduction) favours the prosperity, the expansion, and the richness of his country (also through the increasing of the alimentary stocks), the enlargement of his army, the re-establishment of internal order, and allows Azatiwatas to install the legitimate dynasty;

b) these achievements in internal politics favour the success of Azatiwatas in the international scenery: peace is established with all foreign kings, and all kings recognize Azatiwatas's intellectual and moral superiority;

c) the international recognition favours the incorporation of territories, which is obtained through the construction of fortresses, the submission of formerly independent people, and the destruction of enemy fortresses in regions whose inhabitants are deported and where Adanaweans are settled; the importance of this set of accomplishments is rhetorically stressed through resumptive sentences which refer to territorial expansion and to the establishment of peace in previously dangerous regions;

d) the territorial expansion favours prosperity and peace in the country.

Like in ÇINEKÖY, divine favour is mentioned in two occasions: in the first set of internal accomplishments, and at the end of the penultimate section, dealing with conquest and colonization.³⁷

³⁷ The text is preserved in the Phoenician version only; in the Luwian version, it is not present in the Lower Gate text, while the corresponding section is broken in the Upper Gate orthostat text. In the similar passage included in the first set of accomplishments, however, in the Lower Gate text there is no mention of the divine help, while the Upper Gate bears it ("all by Tarhunzas and the gods", Hawkins 2000, p. 50, *ad* § X). It is highly probable that the same situation may be envisaged for this passage too.

STEP 1	Azatiwatas's ACCESSION (and first political activity)	favour the achievement of	success in the INTERNAL scenery (with divine assistance): prosperity of the country expansion (?) of the country richness of the country enlargement of the army re-establishment of internal order benefits to the dynasty
STEP 2	The achieved INTERNAL success	favours the achievement of	success in the INTERNATIONAL scenery establishment of peaceful foreign relations international recognition (Azatiwatas father and mother to all kings)
STEP 3	The achieved INTERNATIONAL success	favours	CONQUEST AND COLONIZATION 1 building of fortresses conquests peaceful dwelling destruction of foreign fortresses deportations settlement of Adanaweans CONQUEST AND COLONIZATION 2 enlargement of the country peace in formerly dangerous regions (all with divine assistance)
STEP 4	CONQUEST AND COLONIZATION	favour the achievement of	success in the INTERNAL scenery richness and peace in the country

Table 4. Ideological pattern of the progression of Azatiwatas's enterprises.

Like in ÇINEKÖY, also the events which form each “step” are described according to the pattern of a “continuous positive progression”. STEP 1 is formed of two parts. In the first part, Azatiwatas's accession grants prosperity to his country; prosperity favours territorial expansion; territorial expansion favours the accumulation of extraordinary wealth (described both in general terms and in detail with the specific *topos* of the accumulation of alimentary stocks); and the accumulated wealth fosters the enlargement of the army. Here too, the logic of the sequence seems truly “factual”: a prosperous and enlarged territory allows the assembling of a larger army. The second part of STEP 1 is dedicated to the settlement of internal problems. Notwithstanding the uncertainty of some terms,³⁸ it seems clear that Azatiwatas hints at the quelling of internal strife. The “factual logic” of the progression from the first part to the second, however, seems less easily detectable. Actually, the quelling of internal strife should logically follow Azatiwatas's accession but *precede* the territorial expansion, since it is difficult to imagine that military successes were achieved abroad, and that the army was strengthened, when the country was in political or social

³⁸ See fn. 31, above.

turmoil. The assumed resumptive sense of the REL-*pa-wá/i* which opens the second part, however, might suggest that this part was meant as a sort of “commentary” to the first part. The “*broken proud*”³⁹ and the “expelled evil” might thus be interpreted as referring to the (political or social) reasons of the weakness of Azatiwatas’s country *before* his accession, which however remain unmentioned.⁴⁰ If a resumptive sense is not accepted, however, a temporal succession is to be accepted. Internal strife would have broken out and would have been quelled *after* the first successes of Azatiwatas; but in this case the conciseness of the sentences dedicated to that event sharply contrasts with the latter’s great ideological importance.⁴¹

In STEP 2, the establishment of peace with “every” king favours the international recognition of Azatiwatas’s superiority. In the background, there are the concepts that peace is the product of the moral qualities of the king, and that in peace these qualities are allowed to emerge more clearly than in war.

STEP 3, dedicated to *conquest and colonization*, seems to be formed of two sets of events. For the first, the building of fortresses on the borders favours the taming and the submission of independent hostile regions, thus securing Adanawa;⁴² all this then favours the conduction of military enterprises, ending up in the destruction of fortresses “in the west” never conquered previously, in the deportation of their inhabitants, and in the installation of Adanaweans in their place. For the second set, the expansion of Hiyawa “in the west and in the east”, in formerly very dangerous places, favours the establishment of public safety and of peace. It is not entirely clear whether the second set should be understood as the narration of events different from those described in the first set and following them chronologically, or simply as a rhetorical amplification of the first set. The first solution seems to be favoured by the fact that the second set refers to a geographical arena wider than that mentioned in the first (it has “west” *and* “east” vs. “west” only); but the “east” of the second set might have been intended as a resumptive reference to the “installation of the

³⁹ See fn.31, above.

⁴⁰ Hawkins 2000, p. 60, however, stresses, without further comment, that in this passage the resumptive sense is not apparent. Clearly, he sees no relations between the first part (Azatiwatas’s initial successes) and the second.

⁴¹ It is highly unlikely that this part may represent a kind of “afterthought” (a last minute insertion of a part previously omitted).

⁴² The building of fortresses is mentioned twice, first in connection with the submission of foreign territory, second in connection with the securing of Adanawa; the second is introduced by REL-*pa-wa/i-ta*. Probably, here the particle has a true resumptive value: the securing of Adanawa would be the final outcome of the building of the fortresses on the border which fostered the submission of the hostile regions.

Adanaweans in the east” which is mentioned in the first set. In both cases, however, STEP 3 clearly appears to have been structured following the “continuous positive progression” pattern.

STEP 4, finally, is structured in the same way. The conquests and the colonizations achieved in the previous step favour richness, abundance and “good living” in Adanawa; in turn, these grant peace to the capital and to the country.

The amount of space dedicated to each step is highly unbalanced, STEP 1 and STEP 3 being much longer and much more detailed than STEPS 2 and 4. STEP 4, however, may be excluded from this comparison, since it is a sort of “happy end” whose length is irrelevant to the development of the story; consequently, the disproportion remains between the conciseness of the text dedicated to the *international scenery*, and the detail of the text dedicated to the *internal scenery* and to the *conquests and colonizations*. Such disproportion suggests that in KARATEPE the description of Azatiwatas’s career is patterned aiming at concentrating the attention of the “reader” on the benefits granted by him to his own country through the accumulation of richness and power and through territorial expansion. His success in the international scenery, however important it may be considered, substantially represents a rhetorical digression, aimed at strengthening his image in the background of his *internal* successes.

Such a concentration on the relation between Azatiwatas and his country is perfectly consistent with the ideological pattern of all royal inscriptions, which are substantially dedicated to extolling the positiveness of the relations of the reigning king with his own country. In the specific instance of KARATEPE, however, such a special relation has further, crucial importance. As is well known, in his text Azatiwatas does not claim to be the legitimate king of Adanawa (in the text he never attributes himself the title “king”), but states to have been “promoted” to an otherwise unspecified authority by Awarikus (= Warikas), king of Adanawa. Clearly, this non-royal, albeit legitimate authority cannot be self-standing and ideologically non-questionable like the regular, paternal royal succession. Only a total, exact fulfilment of the duties ideologically pertaining to the authority assigned to Azatiwatas can grant his legitimate permanence in that authority. Consequently, the main problem for Azatiwatas is the justification *a posteriori* of his role, which can be legitimized only through the stress on his successes in benefitting his own country. In other words, Azatiwatas needs to stress to have well deserved being chosen (“promoted”) by Awarikus/Warikas. Needless to say, the protection of god Tarhunzas is mentioned. Since it appears at the very beginning and at the end of his *res gestae*, Azatiwatas’s accomplishment of the duties stemming from his having been “promoted” by Awarikus/Warikas is legitimized also at the divine level. This obviously strongly

reinforces both his role and his special relation with his own country, and raises him to a position similar to that of a true king, who normally is granted divine protection because of his legitimate descentance from another king.

As seen above, the step dedicated to Azatiwatas's success in the *international scenery* (STEP 2) is placed after the sentences mentioning the quelling of internal strife. Even though this succession seems perfectly logical from the factual point of view (international recognition is expected to be obtained *after* the re-establishment of internal order), nevertheless it has a pregnant ideological significance. Here, the international recognition is obtained after the re-establishment of internal peace, but not after the accomplishment of conquests followed by colonizations. This implies that Azatiwatas's international recognition depends on the appreciation of his good government and of his behaviour loyal to the legitimate dynasty rather than of his military ability. Again, the focus is mainly on Azatiwatas's relation with his own country. This aspect is further strengthened if we consider that the outcome of Azatiwatas's establishing of internal peace is the "peace with every king" (in Phoenician only), which fosters Azatiwatas's appreciation abroad. This sequence obviously implies that the turmoil in Adanawa had somehow raised international hostility against Adanawa (perhaps war, but this cannot be inferred from the text); and consequently, it is subtly suggested that Azatiwatas's "breaking of the proud" was a mere accomplishment of the main duty stemming from his being "promoted", i.e. to benefit his own country also and especially through averting a potentially very dangerous foreign hostility. In conclusion, Azatiwatas's role is that of one who gives back to his own country an international role which had been somehow diminished and endangered by internal strife – a further legitimization of his role after having been "promoted".

Summing up, the *res gestae* of KARATEPE clearly appear as an exaltation of Azatiwatas's role in relation with his country. The attention of the reader is almost totally concentrated on this aspect, and the international scenery invoked in the short STEP 2 seems a mere rhetorical digression aimed at further extolling Azatiwatas's qualities.

ÇINEKÖY and KARATEPE: the ideological dialogue

The ideological structures of ÇINEKÖY and KARATEPE strictly follow the very same general pattern. Actually, both inscriptions start with the text author's titulary; in both inscriptions a second self-introduction opens the *res gestae* section; in both inscriptions the *res gestae* sections are formed of the same quadripartite sequence *internal achievements* → *international achievements* → *conquest and*

colonization → *internal achievements*. Moreover, many components of the “sets of achievements” appear in both inscriptions. A comparison of the structure of the inscriptions is illustrated in Table 5. The main text parts (titulary and *res gestae*), the “sets of achievements”, and the various components of the “sets” are arranged in columns, the identical or similar components are marked in bold.

ÇINEKÖY	KARATEPE
Titulary	Titulary
A. Name	A. Name
B. Dynastic epithets (filiation, ancestry)	B. Devotional epithet (Sun-god)
C. Institutional role (king)	C. Devotional epithet (Tarhunzas)
D. Devotional epithet (Tarhunzas)	D. Institutional role (“promoted” by Awarikus, king of Adanawa)
E. Devotional epithet (Sun-god)	
<i>Res gestae</i>	<i>Res gestae</i>
<i>A. Second self-introduction</i> [1], Warikas	<i>A. Second self-introduction</i> Tarhunzas made me (<i>wa/i-mu-n</i>) mother and father to Adanawa
<i>B. Internal achievements 1</i>	<i>B. Internal achievements 1</i>
1. Expansion of the country	1. Prosperity of the country
2. Prosperity of the country	2. Expansion of the country
3. Divine sanction (of activities 1 and 2)	3. Richness of the country
4. Increase of the size of the army	4. Accumulation of alimentary stocks
	5. Increase of the size of the army
	6. Divine sanction
	7. Re-establishment of internal order
	8. Benefits to, and enthronement of the legitimate dynasty
<i>C. International achievements</i>	<i>C. International achievements</i>
1. International recognition	1. Establishment of peaceful foreign relations
2. High ranking status (melting with Assyria)	2. International recognition
<i>D. Conquest and colonization</i>	<i>D. Conquest and colonization - Parts 1 and 2</i>
	1.1. Building of fortresses on the frontiers and conquest of unsubmitted peoples
	1.2. Peaceful dwelling
1. Destruction of enemy fortresses	1.3. Destruction of fortresses in previously unsubmitted regions
2. Building of fortresses	1.4. Deportations
3. Settlement of people	1.5. Settlement of Adanaweans
	2.1. Enlargement of the country

	2.2. Peace in formerly dangerous regions
	[2.3]. [Divine sanction]
<i>E. Internal achievements 2</i>	<i>G. Internal achievements 2</i>
3. Prosperity of the kingdom (?) and of the king (under divine sanction ?)	1. Richness in the country
	2. Peaceful dwelling

Table 5. Comparison of the ideological structures of ÇINEKÖY and KARATEPE.

From a cross-comparison of the texts, we can note that many components of ÇINEKÖY appear in the KARATEPE text, and that three “sets” of the KARATEPE inscription have (many) more components than the corresponding “sets” of ÇINEKÖY (*internal achievements 1; conquest and colonization; internal achievements 2*). Two components of ÇINEKÖY, however, are not present in KARATEPE: Warikas’s dynastic epithets and the description of the “melting” with Assyria. As seen above, they have a crucial ideological importance in ÇINEKÖY, and this implies that their omission in KARATEPE is ideologically pregnant. Consequently, we may exclude that the much longer KARATEPE text is a mere amplification of the ÇINEKÖY text, in which some episodes are expanded adding details or rhetorical parallels. With this consideration in mind, we may proceed to a detailed comparison of the correspondent “sets”, taking into account not only the presence and the omission of the various components, but also their relative order.

Crucial differences may be detected ever since the opening sections of the inscriptions, which contain the titulary of the rulers. Both are formed of a sequence of very similar concepts, which, however, are arranged in a different order. In ÇINEKÖY, the name of Warikas is followed by his filiation, by his institutional role (“king”), and by two devotional titles linked with the god Tarhunzas and with the Sun-god; in KARATEPE, Azatiwatas’s name is followed by two devotional titles (linked with the Sun-god and with Tarhunzas) and by his institutional role (“promoted” by Warikas, the king). The different arrangement depends on the different institutional roles of the rulers. Warikas’s titulary is that of a legitimate king, who succeeded to his father on the royal throne. As a legitimate king, he first receives his power from his (royal) father, and then is blessed by the gods just because he has got the throne through regular paternal succession. Azatiwatas, on the contrary, did not receive his power through a regular paternal succession, but through a royal appointment, as he openly declares in the text. Accordingly, he does not mention his filiation, but legitimizes his role through devotional epithets and through an appropriate institutional justification (his having been “promoted” by Awarikus/Warikas). The KARATEPE sequence (devotional titles → justification of power), however,

does not follow the pattern which would be fitting an appointee like Azatiwatas. In this case, the justification of power should precede the devotional titles, so as to stress that the gods were favourable to the appointee because his role was legitimated through the appointment by the king.⁴³ Azatiwatas, however, stresses that his “promotion” was essentially due to the manifestation of divine favour (whatever meaning might be attributed to the latter) *before* his being appointed by the king. This means that he needs to legitimize his having been selected among others, almost certainly hinting at the political problems which in the following he declares to have solved with his own activity. The main political problem in the background is clearly the fact that Azatiwatas is not the son of Warikas, who would have been the latter’s legitimate successor, and who did not succeed directly to his father. In other words, KARATEPE recognizes that Warikas’s son did not ascend to the throne, but stresses that Warikas effected the most correct choice in selecting Azatiwatas as a “leader” of Hiyawa (whatever institutional meaning may be assigned to his function), taking into account his previous positive career. Notwithstanding the differences, there is no ideological contrast between the texts. Both ÇINEKÖY and KARATEPE refer to the correct solution of an institutional problem, and KARATEPE shares and confirms the basic elements of ÇINEKÖY (Warikas’s royal rule, Warikas’s choice, and the legitimacy of Warikas’s dynasty).

A deep ideological contrast between ÇINEKÖY and KARATEPE, however, can be detected in the “second self-introduction” sections, which are totally different. ÇINEKÖY merely bears the name of Warikas as the subject of the following sentences; KARATEPE has the declaration that Tarhunzas made Azatiwatas “mother and father” to his country.⁴⁴ ÇINEKÖY follows the simple pattern normally fitting a legitimate king’s self-introduction: a legitimate king does not need to (re-)introduce himself with anything else than his own name, just because he has received his power through legitimate mechanisms of succession. KARATEPE too follows a pattern fitting a royal appointee’s self-introduction, since divine protection is invoked for legitimizing the governmental activities of the appointee listed in the following parts of the inscription. The relevant passage in KARATEPE, however, is a transformation of an almost literal quotation of a passage of ÇINEKÖY: the sentence about the favourable attitude of Assyria towards Warikas is transformed into a favourable attitude of Azatiwatas, fostered by god Tarhunzas, towards Adanawa.

⁴³ It is not possible to comment upon the inversion in the sequence of the devotional epithets, due to the scarce number of comparisons and to the difficulty of finding an adequate religious context which may attribute specific values to the epithets.

⁴⁴ The Phoenician text has “father and mother”.

ÇINEKÖY	KARATEPE
the/an Assyrian king and the whole Assyrian “House” were made	Tarhunzas made me (= Azatiwatas)
a fa ther and a mo ther	mother and father
for me (= Warikas)	to Adanawa

In KARATEPE, the transformation takes place in the background of a neat opposition to ÇINEKÖY. First, KARATEPE stresses the link of Azatiwatas with Tarhunzas, in contrast with ÇINEKÖY, which stresses the link between Warikas and a foreign country. With this replacement, on the one hand, Azatiwatas is legitimized by a god, in contrast to Warikas, who is legitimized “only” by a human; on the other hand, Azatiwatas is legitimized by an “internal” entity such as the national god Tarhunzas, in contrast to Warikas, who is legitimized by an “external” entity such as the Assyrian king. Second, KARATEPE stresses the parental relationship of Azatiwatas with his own country, in contrast to ÇINEKÖY which stresses the parental relationship of the Assyrian king towards Warikas. With this replacement, KARATEPE strengthens the image of an Azatiwatas totally devoted to the duty of protecting his country, in contrast with ÇINEKÖY, where the Assyrian protection on Warikas is extolled. Moreover, KARATEPE stresses the relationship of an individual (Azatiwatas) with his own country, rather than that of a foreign country (Assyria) with an individual (Warikas).

The polemic meaning of such a transformation is immediately clear, and depends on Azatiwatas’s will to strongly differentiate his political action from that of Warikas. In declaring to have started his activity under the parental protection of the national god, he diminishes and depreciates that of Warikas, who had celebrated the parental protection of Assyria as the true starter of his political action: Azatiwatas was inspired by a god, Warikas was protected by humans. Further, Azatiwatas presents himself as a nationalistic leader, who despises and refuses foreign support, and looks for his roots exclusively in his own national (religious) milieu. The alliance with Assyria is contrasted with Tarhunzas’s protection, so that the moral judgement on the former can only be totally negative. Finally, contrasting Adanawa as the target of his political activity with Warikas as the target of the political action of Assyria, Azatiwatas obliquely suggests that the achievements stemming from his political action were to his country’s advantage, while the protection of Assyria was only to Warikas’s advantage, albeit in his institutional role: Azatiwatas totally dedicates himself to his country, while Warikas had addressed foreign countries for his investiture.

Summing up, the main target of this passage in KARATEPE is Warikas’s celebration of his dependence upon Assyria. Through a refined rhetorical device, Azatiwatas criticizes the foreign policy adopted by Warikas, who had looked for Assyrian alliance, and introduces himself as the starter of a nation-

nalistic policy, which excludes external support and concentrates upon national autonomy and independency only.

KARATEPE contrasts ÇINEKÖY also in the following section, which is dedicated to internal achievements. As shown in Table 5, this section has two parts, the first dedicated to various achievements, the second dealing with the establishment of internal order. As regards the first part, it is formed of the components *prosperity* → *expansion* → *richness* → *accumulation of alimentary stocks* → *increase of the army* → *divine protection*; the corresponding section of ÇINEKÖY, which is much shorter, has instead the sequence *expansion* → *prosperity* → *divine protection* → *increase of the army*. KARATEPE corrects ÇINEKÖY in three points: the *prosperity* component is moved to the beginning of the sequence; the *richness* and *accumulation of alimentary stocks* components are added; and the *divine protection* component is moved to the end of the sequence. All three modifications were clearly made on ideological grounds.

The first modification is another call to nationalistic sentiments. Moving the *prosperity* at the beginning of the section, KARATEPE places it immediately after the beginning of Azatiwatas's political activity, and before the *expansion*. In this way, it is suggested that it was just because of Azatiwatas's "first" activity that Adanawa obtained a new prosperity, and that only this prosperity later favoured its territorial expansion. In ÇINEKÖY, instead, the expansion is preceded by the establishment of the alliance with Assyria and is followed by prosperity, so as to stress that the alliance with Assyria was the ultimate starter of the prosperity of Hiyawa. The inversion in KARATEPE is a clear polemic against ÇINEKÖY. The ultimate starter of the prosperity and of the expansion of Adanawa is Azatiwatas, the ruler favoured by god Tarhunzas, not the alliance with a foreign country like Assyria; with the rule of Azatiwatas, the energies for a new status of Adanawa were searched and found inside Adanawa, not out of it as it had happened with Warikas.

The second modification is not simply due to the fact that KARATEPE was conceived as a text longer than ÇINEKÖY, since the addition of the *richness* and *accumulation of alimentary stocks* components after the *expansion* creates a sequence totally different from that of ÇINEKÖY. By this new sequence, it is suggested, on the one hand, that territorial expansion must be a consequence of prosperity, and, on the other hand, that expansion favours richness. The second concept is present in ÇINEKÖY, while the first is not: the latter is aimed at suggesting that a good ruler's duty is to strengthen his own country before attempting territorial expansion, in order to avoid the risk of dragging it through dangerous military adventures before that a prosperous economic structure is firmly established. Once more, there is a subtle polemic against Warikas, who had placed the start of territorial expansion immediately after his

self-presentation. In KARATEPE it is obliquely suggested that Warikas was in some way less prudent than Azatiwatas, since he had declared to have dragged Hiyawa through military enterprises *before* strengthening it. Azatiwatas, instead, accurately prepares his country to military enterprises. By this way, he introduces himself as a wise ruler – a *topos* of great ideological importance which will be further developed in the following part of his inscription.

In both texts, the increase of the army is placed *after* expansion and prosperity (in whatever order they may appear or in whatever form they may be expressed). This location suggests that in the background of both texts – like in general of all official texts in the Ancient Near East – is the well known militarist assumption that territorial expansion is one among the necessary prerequisites for getting stronger military power, clearly by means of the (forced or voluntary) recruitment of the military personnel of the submitted countries. It must be stressed, however, that this line of reasoning can be invoked only in a very general way, since in both texts it appears among sentences which do not describe specific historical events in detail, but are only generic and extremely condensed summaries.

The third modification – *divine protection* at the end – is aimed at placing the whole sequence of the first part of the section (*prosperity, expansion, richness plus alimentary stocks, and increase of the army*) under divine sanction. Azatiwatas definitely seals his first set of enterprises with the seal of god Tarhunzas, and in this way he overtly suggests to his readers that at this point of his “career” he is “ready” to re-establish the broken internal order, which will be dealt with immediately after. In ÇINEKÖY, however, the *divine protection* is placed *before* the *increase of the army*: the inversion operated in KARATEPE thus appears as a not too veiled reproach to Warikas (or to his scribes) to have attributed his organization of the military to his personal capacity only, not to Tarhunzas’s protection and favour. Again, Azatiwatas presents himself as a ruler who piously acknowledges the constant presence of divine assistance, and avoids any formulation which might be interpreted as an attempt to attribute any specific enterprise exclusively to his own capacity. In short, Azatiwatas declares to be not only wise and prudent, but also pious and humble, and with this he seems to criticize Warikas for not having been that, or for not having stated it (or not having had it stated by his scribes) correctly – a not too veiled accusation of arrogance or even of scarce piety.

In conclusion, in the first part of this section Azatiwatas amplifies and details his opposition to Warikas’s foreign policy. The very same *topoi* of ÇINEKÖY are quoted and aptly modified in order to suggest that Azatiwatas was wiser, more prudent and more pious than Warikas in the process of giving prosperity and military power to his country. By this way, the not too veiled criticism

against Warikas's trust on an external power put forward in the self-introduction is strengthened and connotated of a moral and religious aspect, and the negative judgement on Warikas's policy extends to his personal attitude to correctly exercise kingship. Such a multi-faceted criticism helps in strengthening the condemnation of the central achievement of Warikas celebrated in ÇINEKÖY, viz. his alliance with Assyria, which clearly emerges as the main theme of KARATEPE, albeit never expressed *apertis verbis*.

The neat opposition between KARATEPE and ÇINEKÖY, and between Azatiwatas and Warikas, explains why the part dedicated to the establishment of internal order and to the instalment of the legitimate dynasty is placed at this specific point. This location is aimed at interrupting the sequence of events as it was put forward in ÇINEKÖY, where Warikas's internal achievements bear as a consequence his alliance with Assyria. In KARATEPE, Azatiwatas's internal achievements are presented as the premises for his establishment of the legitimate dynasty, a crucial act for the benefit of his own country, and not for an exploit in the international scenario. Again, Azatiwatas stresses his total devotion to his country, following the pattern of the previous parts of the text, and contemporarily submits that he did not take advantage of his successes for claiming a stronger institutional power or role. As a humble servant of his country, he stresses to have acknowledged the legitimacy of Warikas's dynasty and to have enthroned a legitimate heir of Warikas.

In the framework of this *topos*, and of the polemics against Warikas's foreign policy, the sentence "So I *broke the proud* and the evils which were in the land I [remov]ed out of the land" may possibly be understood with a more precise meaning than the rather vague and undetermined indication of an internal opposition to the legitimate dynasty or to Azatiwatas himself. The "evil" which was removed cannot be detached from the political consequences of Warikas's alliance with Assyria, since the criticism to the latter is the main theme of the first part of KARATEPE. Consequently, this "evil" cannot be anything else than the pro-Assyrian sentiment solicited by Warikas's enterprises and celebrated in ÇINEKÖY, in whatever form or person it may have manifested itself. It can be suggested that at this point Azatiwatas probably refers not simply to (pro-Assyrian) political sentiments, but obliquely to the members of the pro-Assyrian party which had prevailed in Hiyawa when Warikas was sitting on the throne, or even to the Assyrian representatives themselves, be they diplomats, dignitaries, or military personnel. Their expulsion, actually, is the necessary prerequisite for Hiyawa/Adanawa to be recognized in the international scenery if the ideological progression of KARATEPE is attentively taken into account. If it is assumed, however, that it was Azatiwatas to rebel to the Assyrians, this "evil" might be identified *tout court* with the Assyrians themselves.

The polemics of KARATEPE against ÇINEKÖY continues in the section dedicated to *international achievements*. As seen above, in this section ÇINEKÖY first stresses the parental (“mother and father”) attitude of the king of Assyria towards Warikas, and then celebrates the “melting” of Assyria and Hiyawa; KARATEPE, however, celebrates first Azatiwatas’s establishment of peace with “every king” and then his being recognized “as a father” by all kings for his positive qualities. It is easy to note that the second part of the KARATEPE section is built as an almost perfect parallel with the first part of the ÇINEKÖY section. Both refer to a parental relationship (“mother” being omitted in KARATEPE), in both the active party in the relationship is a foreign institution (the Assyrian king in ÇINEKÖY, “every” king in KARATEPE), and in both the passive party of the relationship is the ruler of Hiyawa/Adanawa (Warikas and Azatiwatas, respectively). In KARATEPE, however, the verb is turned from passive/reflexive into active, and consequently a crucial inversion takes place in the meaning: in ÇINEKÖY it is the king of Assyria who plays the parental role, whereas in KARATEPE this role is attributed to Azatiwatas. The inversion in KARATEPE is not only aimed at attributing to Azatiwatas a high profile among the foreign kings and rulers, but also and especially at strongly differentiating Azatiwatas’s role from that of Warikas as regards the relations with the foreign kings. If Warikas was passive in his relationship with the king of Assyria (who acted as his parents), Azatiwatas is active, since it is he who is a “father” for the foreign kings. In ÇINEKÖY, Warikas is one who respectfully obeys, like a son should do with his parents, whereas in KARATEPE Azatiwatas is one who has leadership, like a father has over his sons. If this inversion is transferred to the institutional level, Azatiwatas stresses to have totally reversed the international role of his country, turning a respectful obedience to a foreign power into a moral superiority over the foreign kings. Once more, the ideological target of Azatiwatas’s criticism is the alliance with Assyria, which obviously implied the leadership of Assyria and the obedience of Hiyawa.

The wording of this section in KARATEPE further demonstrates that ÇINEKÖY is corrected and subtly criticized on another level. In ÇINEKÖY, as seen above, the reasons which fostered the paternal attitude of the Assyrian king are not mentioned explicitly, even though from the sequence of the events described before this passage it can be inferred that they were the territorial expansion and the military power achieved by Warikas. In KARATEPE, the events listed before this section are the quelling of internal strife and the enthronement of the legitimate dynasty (albeit preceded by exploits identical to those of Warikas), but the reasons which caused the foreign kings to consider Azatiwatas as their father are indicated clearly: they are Azatiwatas’s institutional (justice?), intellectual (wisdom?) and moral (goodness) attitudes.

The different structure of KARATEPE is aimed at stressing that the final outcomes of Warikas's and Azatiwatas's achievements were totally different: the territorial expansion and the military power achieved by Warikas ended up in a state of subordination to Assyria, while Azatiwatas's complying with the duties of a loyal appointee totally devoted to his country ended up in international superiority. Moreover, KARATEPE subtly suggests that Azatiwatas was internationally recognized for his moral qualities, while Warikas was esteemed worth of an alliance by the Assyrian only because of his territorial and military exploits. It is clear that here is at work a neat discrimination between military ability and wisdom: military ability alone may produce negative outcomes (submission to Assyria), while wisdom always produces positive outcomes (international recognition). But also another discrimination can be detected, that between proudness and humbleness: while Warikas trusted in territorial and military power exclusively, viz. in the classical virtues of a martial king, Azatiwatas duly complied to his duty of appointee, and did not attempt to obtain more power than that he had received by Warikas. Warikas was proud, Azatiwatas was humble: and, seen from the KARATEPE point of view, the final outcomes were negative for Warikas and positive for Azatiwatas.

A further inversion bearing a pregnant ideological value can be detected in this section. While in ÇINEKÖY only one king, the king of Assyria (even though with his "house"), is "father and mother" to Warikas, in KARATEPE Azatiwatas is "father" to "every king". On the political level, the inversion in KARATEPE is aimed at stressing that Azatiwatas's foreign policy was polycentric and universalistic, while that of Warikas was monocentric and particularistic. On the ideological level, however, the inversion is aimed at giving Azatiwatas a role much more prominent than that of Warikas in the international scenery. Azatiwatas is universally acknowledged, while Warikas was acknowledged only by one king; consequently, Azatiwatas puts his country in a position of moral superiority among all countries, while Warikas put his country in a position of subordination to a single country. Azatiwatas extols his country's role, while Warikas substantially diminished it. Once again, the polemic is against Warikas's foreign policy and his alliance with Assyria. With Azatiwatas, Adanawa is free from external conditioning, and can substantially choose its foreign political partners, while with Warikas Hiyawa was submitted to an invasive influence which prevented any autonomous decision. Substantially, with Azatiwatas Adanawa is free, whereas with Warikas Hiyawa was subordinate.

Opposition between KARATEPE and ÇINEKÖY can be detected also in the section dedicated to *conquest and colonization*. The comparison, however, can only be partial and schematic, due to the fragmentariness of the ÇINEKÖY text (where, moreover, the texts in the Luwian and Phoenician versions seem to

diverge), and to the great disproportion of the text length. In KARATEPE there are three points which are dealt with in ÇINEKÖY, such as the destruction of enemy fortresses, the building of fortresses, and the settlement of (Hiyawean/Adanawean) people. KARATEPE, however, adds supplementary themes, such as a territorial conquest which precedes the building of the fortresses, deportations, territorial expansion, peace (which is mentioned twice), and, at the end, divine protection (preserved only in the Phoenician version); therefore, a comparison is possible between the elements which are common to both texts only. KARATEPE introduces another inversion in their sequence: the building of fortresses precedes the destruction of enemy fortresses, while in ÇINEKÖY destruction precedes building. Obviously, it cannot be established in principle whether, and how accurately, the inscriptions describe the true historical sequence of events; nonetheless, in this inversion it is possible to detect another ideological opposition. In KARATEPE, Azatiwatas first consolidates his country, reinforcing the borders with fortifications and securing border areas with the taming of unsubmitive people, and then attacks, destroying enemy fortresses and colonizing external regions. In ÇINEKÖY, however, the sequence is from attack to consolidation (destruction first, then building and settlement). The sequence in KARATEPE is aimed at presenting Azatiwatas as a prudent and wise ruler, who does not drag his country to military adventures before his country has gathered sufficient energies; and conversely, at suggesting that Warikas, because of his trust in the Assyrian king, behaved as a vehemently impulsive warrior, and moved to war when his country was not yet adequately prepared. As in the previous lines, the contrast is between prudence and impetuosity.

For strengthening this contrast, KARATEPE adds the reference to the divine protection at the end of the section. This addition is clearly aimed not only at positively sealing the career of Azatiwatas up to this point, but also, and especially, at pointing out that the progression of his achievements was planned in a pious attitude. The fact that in ÇINEKÖY the divine protection was not inserted at this point, once again, is subtly taken in KARATEPE as demonstrating that Warikas was not so humble to the gods as Azatiwatas, and preferred to have his enterprises attributed exclusively to his proudness (and obviously to his alliance with Assyria) rather than to his piety. In KARATEPE, the main theme of Awatizatas's confrontation with Warikas is given the highest intensity in the addition of a sentence stating that Azatiwatas conquered fortresses never conquered by the kings "who were before" him (perhaps the verb is an allusion to the death of Warikas). By this addition (which conforms to the well known *topos* of the "heroic priority" widely attested in the Near Eastern royal inscriptions, especially in the Assyrian), KARATEPE puts Azatiwatas in direct competition with Warikas, who too had declared to have conquered fortresses. And, finally,

Azatiwatas's superiority finds an expression more than cryptical, although the name of Warikas and the names of the other predecessors are prudently not mentioned, as it is normal in this *topos*.

Conclusion

The ideological analysis has demonstrated, I think, that KARATEPE opposes ÇINEKÖY as regards the political theme of the submission/alliance of Hiyawa to Assyria, and as regards the ideological theme of the moral qualities of the rulers. In KARATEPE, the pro-Assyrian policy of Warikas finds no mention at all, and is substantially dismissed, albeit not *apertis verbis* (it remains cryptical even if we admit that the “expulsion of the evil” refers to the Assyrians). Further, in KARATEPE the moral qualities of Azatiwatas are extolled so as to stress his superiority over Warikas, although the difference in their institutional roles is carefully preserved. The latter phenomenon, admittedly, may be considered as a mere variant of the *topos* of the superiority of the king who dedicates a royal inscription in front of his predecessors, which is widely attested in Mesopotamian and Near Eastern royal inscriptions. A good parallel from a country close to Hiyawa is again the inscription of Bar-rakib of Sam'al, who compares the beauty of his new palace with the awfulness of the palace of “his fathers”.⁴⁵ Considering the cruciality of the political opposition, however, it is clear that in KARATEPE this *topos* is used not only as a stock rhetorical device for extolling Azatiwatas, but also and especially for neatly differentiating his foreign policy from that of Warikas.

If the opposition to the pro-Assyrian policy is the main focus of KARATEPE, we may legitimately ask why this concept is not expressed clearly in the text. Admittedly, this problem cannot be given a firm historical answer, due to the fact that too many historical factors and events in that region remain totally unknown. From the point of view of the aims of a celebrative text, however, the problem of the “public” may be taken into account. Just like Warikas had most likely to deal with independentistic sentiments in the *élite* of his kingdom, most probably Azatiwatas had to deal with pro-Assyrian sentiments in the *élite* of his country. Certainly, in the period in which Hiyawa was strictly connected with Assyria, a part of the *élite* and of the population enjoyed ideological and material benefits, stemming from its insertion in the Assyrian imperial circuit. Rank, commercial and fiscal advantages were certainly assigned to individuals and social groups, in all probabilities often at the expenses of other individuals and

⁴⁵ Sendjirli orthostat of Bar-rakib, in Donner – Röellig 1962, no. 216, 12-16, p. 40, and 1964, p. 233.

groups. This pro-Assyrian part of the *élite* might have opposed Azatiwatas's foreign policy, and might thus represent an element of instability for Azatiwatas's rule (whatever it may have been), and it was necessary for Azatiwatas to handle it with extreme prudence. In this respect, KARATEPE might be seen as a text which *is aimed at convincing*, rather than a text which openly *celebrates*. The softness in the presentation of Azatiwatas's new policy might have been designed so as to introduce elements of doubt as regards the rightness of the previous pro-Assyrian policy, stressing the need of a deep, meditated comparison between Azatiwatas and Warikas and between the effects of their policies. In other words, Azatiwatas seems to move in a difficult political landscape, which forces him to adopt subtle rhetorical strategies in order to avoid negative reactions in the social corpus of his country. It cannot be forgotten that, in any case, Assyria itself should have been active in the political scenery, even in case of a temporary political or military weakness, either through its allies or through the pro-Assyrian parties in the neighbouring countries.

To this, it must be added that the opposition does not lead to any *direct* negative description of Warikas: in KARATEPE there are neither sentences nor even epithets dealing negatively with him, on the contrary, there is the duly acknowledgment of his institutional role. The comparison between the bilinguals, however, reveals, as seen above, a *moral* opposition between them as regards personal qualities like wisdom and prudence. This contrast may be explained both if we accept the hypothesis that the Assyrians expelled Warikas from his country after discovering his treason (*i.e.*, his envoy of emissaries to the king of Urartu) and if we accept the hypothesis that he died before his treason was discovered. According to the first hypothesis, Warikas would have changed his mind as regards the alliance with Assyria at a certain point of his reign, and would have attempted – like other rulers subject to Assyrian pressure as attested in Sargon's texts⁴⁶ – to find external support for throwing away the Assyrian yoke. In this case, the coexisting in KARATEPE of moral opposition and of institutional acknowledgment might be ascribed to an attempt to attribute the pro-Assyrian policy of Warikas only to a specific period of his reign, and to mark it as a period of unwisdom, imprudence and proudness in Warikas's life, preserving however the legitimacy of his institutional role (and obviously his having promoted Azatiwatas). In other words: the legitimate king was imprudent when he stipulated the alliance with Assyria and then celebrated it officially, but at a certain point understood its negativity and changed his mind; this, however, caused his dethronement, and the annexation of Hiyawa to the Assyrian empire. A moral teaching must be deduced from these events. Like in

⁴⁶ E.g., Pisiri king of Karkamiš, who wrote to Midas of Phrygia slandering Assyria, Khorsabad Annals 72-73, in Fuchs 1994, p. 93.

all mortals, in a king excess of proudness often induces imprudence; imprudence always bears negative effects; these effects fall not necessarily only on the king, but also and especially on his country; and finally, the king often cannot remove these effects when he attains consciousness of his imprudence. Warikas's rethinking and repenting about his alliance with Assyria were useless for his country, which was annexed to Assyria, and at the end were negative for him, since he was removed from the throne in favour of an Assyrian governor. If it is accepted, however, that Warikas died *before* his treason was discovered, the moral judgement does not change, but may seem more negative at some extent. The political decisions of a proud and imprudent king always provoke negative consequences for his country; if the king is for some reason so lucky as not to suffer personally such negative consequences, he results at the end even more reproachable, because he did not bear that personal responsibility which must be distinctive of a good ruler. In both cases, however, the attempt to throw off the Assyrian yoke remains in the background as an element which allows Azatiwatas to respect Warikas's institutional role, but to criticize, albeit never directly, his fundamental political choice, the alliance with Assyria.

From the point of view of the date to be attributed to ÇINEKÖY and KARATEPE, it must be acknowledged that the ideological analysis does not offer decisive elements. Actually, what can be ascertained beyond any doubt is the ideological opposition between the rulers and the texts which they had composed, and the prevailing nationalistic attitude of KARATEPE against the staunch pro-Assyrian attitude of ÇINEKÖY. Political sentiments and ideological positions, as all of us know, may be both long and short living, and may emerge both slowly and abruptly. It is conceivable that a crucial point like the relations of a peripheral country with an expanding empire like Assyria might have been subjected to frequent variations, so as to make impossible to us to correctly place any of them in the historical grid.

Finally, what emerges definitely is the centrality of the historical problem of the relations between the Assyrian empire and its periphery in the period in which Assyria dramatically expanded. This was certainly the major problem to be dealt with by the *élites* of the countries peripheral to Assyria. They were faced with a dramatic choice between autonomy and nationalism on the one side, and the wish to melt in a superior entity and to profess universalistic ideas on the other side, provided that both attitudes might have offered social and material benefits. This provoked opposition and confrontation, social turmoil and internecine war, namely, an unavoidable weakening – at the final advantage of the expanding empire. Ideology, certainly, was one of the main factors in such a dramatic process of assimilation.

Bibliography

- Bron, F. 1979, *Recherches sur les inscriptions phéniciennes de Karatepe* (Centre de recherches d'histoire et de philologie de la IVe Section de l'École Pratique des Hautes Études, Hautes Études Orientales, vol. 11), Genève
- Donner, H. – Röllig, W. 1962-1964, *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften*, Band I: *Texte* (1962), Band II: *Kommentar* (1964), Wiesbaden
- Fales, F.M. 2000, „bīt-bēli: An Assyrian Institutional Concept“, *Patanina Orientalia Selecta*, ed. Rova, E. (History of the Ancient Near East / Monographs, vol. IV), Padova, pp. 231-249
- Fuchs, A. 1994, *Die Inschriften Sargons II. aus Khorsabad*, Göttingen
- Grayson, A.K. 1996, *Assyrian Rulers of the Early First Millennium BC. II (858-745 BC)* (The Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia. Assyrian Periods, vol. 3), Toronto – Buffalo – London
- Hawkins, J.D. 2000, *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions*, Vols. 1 and 2, Berlin – New York
- Lanfranchi, G.B. 2005, „The Luwian-Phoenician Bilingual of Çineköy and the Annexation of Cilicia to the Assyrian Empire“, *Von Sumer bis Homer. Festschrift für Manfred Schretter zum 60. Geburtstag am 25. Februar 2004*, ed. Rollinger, R. (Alter Orient und Altes Testament, Bd. 325), Münster, pp. 481-496
- Liverani, M. 1981, „Critique of Variants and the Titulary of Sennacherib“, *Assyrian Royal Inscriptions: New Horizons in Literary, Ideological, and Historical Analysis. Papers of a Symposium held in Cetona (Siena) June 26-28, 1980*, ed. Fales, F.M. (Orientis Antiqui Collectio, vol. XVII), Roma, pp. 225-257
- Schwemer, D. 1996, „hethitisch *mad-* ‘widerstehen’ und hieroglyphen-luwisch *marijaninzi* ‘Rebellen’ in der Karatepe-Inschrift“, *Welt des Orients* 27, 30-35
- Tekoğlu, R. – Lemaire, A. 2000, „La bilingue royale louvito-phénicienne de Çineköy (with an introduction by I. Ipek and A.K. Tosun)“, *Académie des inscriptions et belles lettres. Comptes rendu des séances de l'année 2000*, fasc. 3, pp. 961-1006

Herausgegeben von

Stefan R. Hauser (Halle), Philip Huyse (Paris),
Erich Kettenhofen (Trier), Andreas Luther (Erlangen),
Joachim F. Quack (Heidelberg), Robert Rollinger
(Innsbruck) und Josef Wiesehöfer (Kiel)

Oikumene Studien zur antiken Weltgeschichte BAND 2