CHAPTER 4

Cilicia in the Iron Age

H. Craig Melchert

1 Defining the Topic[1]

1.1 *The Location*

Classical Cilicia consisted of two discrete parts: Cilicia Trachea and Cilicia Pedia. Both were known to the Assyrians, whose name for Cilicia Trachea, *Hilakku*, is the source of Greek Κιλικία. However, the core of Cilicia Trachea comprised the mountainous terrain of the western Taurus Mountains, and our Early Iron Age sources for it are very limited. Our focus will thus be primarily on Cilicia Pedia, which is mostly well defined by the Amanus Mountains to the east, the Taurus to the north and west, and the Bay of İskenderun to the south.[2]

Only in the southwest is there no major barrier along the coastal plain. In the Treaty of Tuthaliya I with Šunaššura, the boundary is at the Lamiya River, and the city Lamiya belongs to the Hittite king. As emphasized by several scholars, this provision clearly reflects the Hittite preoccupation with maintaining control of and access to the crucial port of Ura (Silifke).[3] It is unknown whether

1 I am deeply indebted to Mirko Novák and Mark Weeden for promptly and generously furnishing me with PDFs of their publications, which were crucial to my being able to complete this essay. I extend my thanks also Dennis Pardee for important leads on articles that would otherwise have escaped my notice, to Alvise Matessi for sharing a portion of his chapter regarding Greeks in Cilicia, and to Mirko Novák for helpful comments on a draft of this chapter. The standard disclaimer applies, and I am responsible for all views not explicitly attributed.

2 Thus with Novák and Rutishauser (2017:134) with references to Trémouille 2001 and Forlanini 2013. See also Trameri (2020:42–62) for a review of the matter, including extensive and persuasive arguments with references for distinguishing Lawazantiya in Kizzuwatna (Cilicia Pedia) from a northern Lu/aḫuzantiya. However, in the extant Šunaššura Treaty, we do not have the northern and eastern borders of Kizzuwatna (see the map in Novák and Rutishauser 2012:269). That the Amanus formed the eastern border seems clear, but the northern limits are less certain. I doubt that any Hittite king would have yielded control of the area of the İMAMKULU, TAŞCI, and FIRAKTİN inscriptions, but the Hittites may well have included this area in Kizzuwatna (cf. Hawkins and Weeden 2017:293–294). There is also a growing consensus that Kummanni was a city of eastern Cilicia Pedia (Trameri 2020:62–65; Novák and Rutishauser 2017:138, et al.). Its precise identification remains debated, a point to which we will return below.

3 See in detail Novák and Rutishauser 2012:265. Later, Tuthaliya IV, in his treaty with Kuruntiya, likewise made sure that the Hittites maintained control of a coastal strip from the southern

© H. CRAIG MELCHERT, 2025 | DOI:10.1163/9789004729704_005
This is an open access chapter distributed under the terms of the CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 license.

any polity of Cilicia Pedia extended into Cilicia Trachea in pre- or post-Hittite times (cf. below on the Cebelireis Dağı inscription).

1.2 *The Name*

The land of Cilicia Pedia has been known by many names.[4] The most serious candidate for an autonym is 'the land of (the city) Adana,' reflected in Hittite KUR ^{URU}*Adaniya*, attested already in the Old Hittite Edict of Telipinu (KUB 11.5 obv. 14', Hoffmann 1984:26) and also in HLuw. *Adanawa-* (URBS) in KARATEPE 1 § 2 *et passim*.[5] Noteworthy is the wording of the Treaty of Tuthaliya IV with Šunaššura (KBo 1.5 iv 52–54) whereby the latter is to keep whatever has belonged to Adaniya "since ancient times" (thus with Goetze 1940:51 and also, cautiously, Schwemer 2005:106). Also significant is that the Hittite and Luwian designations contain the respective suffixes *-iya-* and *-wa-*, which are properly adjectives referring to city-states (NB: the KUR in the Hittite version). The self-evident word for 'land' is regularly omitted, resulting in the adjectives also being used for the city name.[6]

I must stress this point, since it is clear that two exonyms for Cilicia Pedia also are based on the names of city-states, despite attempts to obfuscate or deny

---

end of the Pusatlı subrange of the Taurus to Šaranduwa (Kelenderis, or a town even farther west on the coast), keeping Kuruntiya well away from Ura; thus, already in essence Dinçol et al. 2000:14, 19. See in detail Melchert 2007:509–511. Against de Martino (2022:50), the language of the Bronze Tablet is unequivocal that Šaranduwa is the *southeastern* terminus of the boundary on the seacoast. The *western* boundary on the coast is at Parḫa (Perge). There is no basis or need for a "corridor" through Tarhuntašša for the Hittites to reach Ura.

4 However, one oft-cited alleged name, *Qode* (*Qd*[*j/w*]) appearing in Egyptian sources, can be discarded. Simon (2011) has provided compelling arguments that this toponym cannot refer to Kizzuwatna. See further the discussion by Trameri (2020:36–38).

5 There can also be no doubt that *DNNYM* in KARATEPE 1 refers to the inhabitants of Adana(wa) and is based on a Luwian adjective **atanawann(i)-* (*pace* Trameri 2020:34–36, et al.). The absence of the initial aleph that appears in the city name *'DN = Adana* is hardly surprising. The length of the adjective and its likely accent on the suffix could easily have led to aphaeresis of the initial *a-* in the Phoenician. Whether this adjective for 'Adanean' has anything to do with the Tanaya and/or the Danuna/Denyen of the Late Bronze Age is an entirely separate question, but the connection must be regarded as at best unproven. That *á-**429*-wa/i-* in KARATEPE 1 is to be read as anything other than *á-TANA-wa/i-* has been refuted by Hawkins (2015b:55), citing the clear equivalence of §§ 5 and 37, where the Luwian has respectively *á-TANA-wa/i-za*(URBS) (TERRA+LA+LA)*wa/i-ra/-za* and *á-ta-na-wa/i-za-*(*ha*)(URBS) TERRA+LA +LA-*za* 'Adanean plain' for Phoenician *'MQ 'DN* 'plain of Adana.' The sophistic attempt by Yakubovich (2015b:57) to explain away this equivalence fails to convince.

6 Leading to doublets such as *Zalpa/Zalpuwa*, as first recognized by Carruba (1979:95). For the other, cf. *Hurna/Hurniya* (del Monte and Tischler 1978:126 with references), likely *Ikuna* (SÜDBURG § 1)/*Ikkuwaniya*, and similar pairs.

the evidence. One should hardly need to insist on the prevalence in the ANE of the names of lands based on city-states, even if fortune led a few to become empires (Assur, Babylon, Hattuša) or at least regional polities (Karkamiš, Gurgum, Malatya). Nothing alters the fact that the name of the land is always derived from that of the city.

Therefore, when Hattušili III reports (KBo 6.28 obv. 13–14) that *edez=ma* LÚ.KÚR ^{URU}*Armatanaš* [*uet*] *nu apāšš=a* KUR.KUR.M[EŠ ^{U}]^{RU}*Hatti harganut nu=za* ^{URU}*Kizzuwatnan* URU-*an* [ZAG-*an iya*]*t* "While from that direction the enemy of Armatana [came], and he too destroyed the lands of Hattuša, and he made Kizzuwatna the city the [border]," we must conclude that the use of the name (by outsiders!) for the land of Cilicia Pedia was also based on the name of one of its city-states.[7] The predominant use by the Hittites and the reference to Armatana in the passage quoted suggest that the city was likely in the eastern part of Cilicia Pedia, but one must be cautious about such inferences. In any case, the use of the name in the Šunaššura Treaty does indicate that, at certain times, Kizzuwatna did (at least for the Hittites!) refer effectively to the entire plain. It was thus at least roughly equivalent to KUR ^{URU}*Adaniya*, but we should avoid inferring that the exonym and likely autonym were coterminous (cf. fn. 2 above).

Of the line of cities running west to east in central Cilicia Pedia, the locations of Tarsus and Adana are secure, and the presence of seven springs argues that Tatarlı Höyük farther east is Lawazantiya (Novák and Rutishauser 2017:138; Hawkins and Weeden 2017:285). However, there is not yet any consensus on the location of Kizzuwatna/Kummanni. There is some attraction in adopting the identification by Casabonne (2002:188 *et alibi*) with Kastabala, designated as Hierapolis in Greco-Roman sources (*Kummanni* in Luwian is 'holy place') and taking Sirkeli Höyük farther west as Arušna (tentatively, Hawkins and Weeden 2017:285–286 and map 294). However, compare the different viewpoint of Novák and Rutishauser (2017:138, 144). Pending further discoveries, the question must remain open.

My claim that *Kizzuwatna* as a term for Cilicia Pedia is an exonym requires an excursus on proposed etymologies of the name. That of Neumann (1958), by which the name consists of Hittite *kēz* 'on this side' and a Hittite or Luwian

7 It is quite true that because city-states were the norm, Hittite scribes also referred to KUR ^{URU}*Mizri* 'Egypt' and by shorthand rarely even just ^{URU}*Mizra-* (see the use of ^{URU}*Ḫatti* in the citation clearly for the kingdom of Hattuša), but they knew enough never to refer to a nonexistent †^{URU}*Mizran* URU-*an*. It is totally unjustified to imply (Trameri 2020:30–31) that use with reference to the city is somehow secondary. It is purely coincidental that the Hittite sources had more and earlier occasions to refer to the land than to the city itself.

form of 'water' (and thus would mean 'on this side of the water') is not viable on multiple grounds. The Hittites referred to the Mediterranean as *aruna-* 'sea,' as shown by the use of *arunaz* 'toward the sea' in the Treaty of Tuthaliya IV with Kuruntiya.[8] Nor would the Hittites have used *kēz* 'on this side' to refer to a place so remote from Hattuša. In the treaty with Ulmi-Teššub, the southern and western boundaries of Tarhuntašša are referred to as *arahzenaza* 'on/toward the outside' (KBo 4.10 obv. 29), that is, from the perspective of Hattuša (see Melchert 2007:509–510).

The alternate account of Yakubovich (2010a:237, 274 with fn. 80) resolves these problems by suggesting that the term is an autonym created by Hittite and Luwian settlers of the region meaning 'country on this side (of the mountains).' However, it faces equally insurmountable problems. We may leave aside that the name was originally that of a city, not a country. A more serious matter is that in the FIRAKTİN hieroglyphic inscription, one of the earliest attested, the spelling is *ká-zuwa-na*(REGIO), a fact egregiously ignored in all discussions of the name Kizzuwatna. Yakubovich (2010a:291) argues compellingly that the syllabic value *ká* can reflect only Hittite *katta* 'down,' not Luwian *zanta*. It is hard to imagine that a scribe of the Empire period in the employ of a Hittite king would spell a name containing Hittite *kēz* (or arguably pretonic *kiz* in a compound) with a sign based on Hittite *katta*. What the alternative spellings of cuneiform *Kizzuwatna* and hieroglyphic *Kaz*(*z*)*uwa*(*t*)*na* recall is the unexpected Anatolian hieroglyphic spelling *I-ma-t*(*u*)- (REGIO) for the land that appears consistently in Assyrian as *Amat-/Hamat-*. It further reminds us of the discrepancy between Greek Ephesus and Lesbos and *Apaša* and *Lazpa* in Hittite cuneiform. The likely identification of Hama with *é-ma-du/at*^{KI} in Ebla sources (see Hawkins 2000:400 with fn. 29) suggests the answer: we are, as in the other cases, facing a quite ancient name with a vowel that speakers of both Semitic and Indo-European had difficulty assigning consistently to one in their own languages.

What is truly fatal, however, for the analysis of Kizzuwatna as containing Hittite *kēz* or *kiz* is that it first appears already in the Treaty of Telipinu with Išputahšu (KUB 31.81 obv. 6′, rev. 10′), a clearly Old Hittite text in Old Script. Furthermore, by Yakubovich's scenario, the term is surely a pre-Old Hittite creation by Hittite and Luwian settlers. However, in Old Hittite, the only form of 'on/to this side' is the instrumental *kēt* (note also *kit-pantalaz* 'from this time

8 Also in the votive prayer of Queen Puduḫepa (KUB 56.15 ii 15′ ff.) when she goes to Izziya to entreat the Sea God to deliver the troublemaker Piyamaradu to the Hittites (see the edition by Beckman in Beckman et al. 2011:250–251).

on'). Hittite created ablatival *kēz* only in Middle Hittite (Early New Kingdom). Thus, Kizzuwatna cannot contain Hittite *kēz/kiz* 'on this side.'

The alternative of a Hurrian name (Goetze 1940:5, fn. 20) cannot strictly be disproven, but renderings of Hurrian /i/ and /e/ in Hittite contexts are quite consistent, so the hieroglyphic spelling *ká-zuwa-na* is equally problematic for a Hurrian word.[9] Place names are notoriously persistent through changes of population groups, and the Hurrians, like the Luwians, are surely intrusive to Cilicia Pedia. At present, an indigenous name for the city seems most plausible.

The second well-established exonym for Cilicia Pedia is also based on the name of a city-state. It is entirely illicit to dismiss the clear evidence for Assyrian use of *Q(a)we* for a city as well as a land (*pace* Hawkins 2000:40) and to reject the connection of the city Kawa with *Q(a)we* on the grounds that the latter is the *equivalent* of Hiyawa (Simon 2011:260, followed by Gander 2012:291–292). An eventual basic equivalence as a term for Cilicia Pedia is likely (see below), but to derive Assyrian Qawe from Hiyawa is linguistically impossible, despite the widespread belief to the contrary. The discrepancy between the initial emphatic stop and the fricative is not a serious obstacle (as shown by the Neo-Babylonian version, Hume, and other examples), though a Luwian dorsal stop is just as plausible a source. Syncope of the medial syllable of Hiyawa would also not be surprising. What is simply not credible is that in no version of the Assyrian rendering or any other is there any trace whatsoever of the high front vowel [i]. Contrast its presence in Urikki from Warika and in Hilakku. Furthermore, Simon himself (2011:261) cites the settlement *KW* in the Phoenician inscription of Cebelireis Dağı, where the presence of *WRYK* (= Warika = Urikki) makes a location in Cilicia Pedia likely.

The context of the occurrence of Kawa in KARKAMIŠ A11b+c § 7 also supports identification as a city of Cilicia Pedia: *a-wa/i* |*kwi/a-a-ti-i* |(ANNUS)*u-si-i ka-wa/i-za-na*(URBS) |(CURRUS)*wa/i+ra/i-za-ni-ná* |PES$_2$*-za-ha* "In which year I drove the Kawean carriage."[10] Based on the following lines, the reference is to a triumphal procession (text in Hawkins 2000:103). In view of other evidence for the fame of Qawe's equine culture (see Section 2 below), the boast of Katuwa the Country Lord is surely that he could afford to ride in a luxury horse-drawn

9 There definitely is no connection with ^{URU}*Ki-zi-ú-wa$_a$-ar* [*sic*] in KUB 57.82:3 and 57.84 iii 19, a text referring to cities of northern Anatolia.

10 I must insist on this interpretation, based on the fact that the determinative of *wa/i+ra/i-za-ni-ná* is manifestly a wheeled vehicle. Direct reference to a military campaign (tentatively Hawkins 2000:105; unjustifiably without qualification Novák 2021:404) is implausible on multiple grounds. Moreover, its four wheels preclude that it is a war chariot and suggest an elaborate carriage.

vehicle from Kawa. I must insist that the Assyrian evidence confirms that Qawe, like Kizzuwatna, reflects the name of a city-state that for the Assyrians was also the primary name in the Iron Age for Cilicia Pedia. As in the case of the use of Kizzuwatna by the Hittites, one is tempted to suspect a place that the Assyrians would first encounter. However, the likely reference to *KW* in the Cebelireis Dağı inscription in the context of *WRYK* (Warika) bids caution, and we should likely refrain from any conclusions beyond that Kawa is the source of the principal exonym of Cilicia Pedia for the Assyrians. The accounts of Shalmaneser III (see Hawkins 2000:41), with his report of having marched to the sea and of having eventually deposed Kate, the king of Que, again suggest effective reference to the whole of Cilicia Pedia, but once again we must be cautious about supposing that the Assyrian conception of Qawe/Que entirely matched that of the autonym Adaniya/Adanawa.

A further reason for caution is that, as conceded above, there is no doubt that in the ÇİNEKÖY inscription of Warika the Luwian equivalent of Phoenician *DNNYM* is *hi-ya-wa/i-* (URBS), not *ka-wa/i-* (URBS). We must now confront the popular, but by no means consensus, view that Hiyawa is derived by aphaeresis from Ahhiyawa and refers to Greek immigrants into Cilicia Pedia in the early Iron Age (see for an extensive presentation of this hypothesis Yakubovich 2015a, with copious references to other works, as well as those cited in Gander 2012:283, fn.19, 23). A full reconsideration of the various arguments made in support of this quite dramatic claim is necessary.[11]

Since the first publication of the KARATEPE 1 bilingual the figure of Mopsus has played a key role in the question of a Greek migration into Cilicia by at least the 8th century, since he is referred to as a dynastic founder not only in the KARATEPE 1 text, but also now in those of ÇİNEKÖY and İNCİRLİ. Yakubovich (2015a:36) characterizes it as the "strongest philological argument for the Greek migration hypothesis," while Gander (2012:297–302) expends considerable effort in seeking to undermine the status of Mopsus as genuinely Greek. The latter's strongest point is that the name cannot be Greek in the sense of the Indo-European speakers who migrated into Greece. It not only has no Indo-European etymology; realistically, it cannot have one. The *-s-* of a preform **mokʷso-* may be a suffix or a so-called "root enlargement," but there is nowhere in Indo-European any trace of a PIE root of the shape **meKʷ-*, where

11 I wish to make clear that, for my own purposes, I would very much like to believe in a significant Greek presence in Cilicia in the Early Iron Age or even at the turn from the Bronze to the Iron Age, and I will be quite happy if subsequent new evidence refutes what follows here. However, I can base my current conclusions only on evidence now available, and reconsideration has led me to find no compelling support for the alternative hypothesis.

**K*^{w} stands for any labiovelar stop. However, this does not preclude that the name originated solely in a Greek context, and Gander's assumption of a secondary confusion with an Anatolian name with a dorsal stop and a "sound substitution" in Phoenician *MPŠ* is very weak.

Nor does Gander refute Yakubovich's arguments (2015a:37), adopted from Oettinger 2008, that the Anatolian—in particular, the Luwian—reflexes must represent an adaptation of the older Greek form **mok*^{w}*so-* and not an independent reflex of the same preform, which could have produced only **Mukkussa-* or **Mukkussu-* in Luwian and Hittite (Oettinger 2008:64).[12] This argument is by no means ironclad. A Greek word with a very clear PIE etymology is νύξ 'night,' which can hardly represent anything except PIE **nók*^{w}*t-s*. By a development known as *Cowgill's Law*, first promulgated by Cowgill (1965:156), the **o* was raised to **u* between a nasal and a labiovelar, and the latter was then delabialized by dissimilation to the preceding **u* (a conditioned change seen elsewhere in Greek). Vine (1999), after a very thorough review, concludes that many instances of *u* in Greek attributed by Cowgill or others to this change should be accounted for otherwise. However, νύξ remains one of the most secure examples (Vine 1999:582). A preform **mok*^{w}*so-* of whatever origin with an initial *m-* would be even more subject to such a combinatory change: in the Anatolian languages, **o* would have raised to **u* between a labial nasal and labiovelar stop, and the latter would have been unrounded by dissimilation to the preceding **u*. That it did not occur in the Greek variant, as in νύξ, would indicate that **mok*^{w}*so-* entered Greek after the Greek change in inherited words had run its course. Of course, an Anatolian version of *Cowgill's Law* is entirely hypothetical, but it is not an unnatural change.[13] At a minimum, this possibility suggests that the claim of Mopsus as the founder of a dynasty in Cilicia cannot alone bear the weight attributed to it by Yakubovich for the Greek migration hypothesis (see also Simon 2018b:319 for a Pre-Greek-Aegean source of the name).

As a second piece of support for the Greek migration hypothesis, Yakubovich (2015a:37) cites the significant presence of Late Helladic IIIc pottery in Cilicia. However, there is also considerable evidence for Cypriot pottery in Iron Age

12 I should acknowledge that I am thanked for offering helpful advice on this point (2008:65, fn. 6). I can say only that the possible relevance of the Greek parallel cited here had not occurred to me in 2008.

13 It should also be noted that spellings in Hittite and Luwian with *u*-signs may stand for a vowel lower than /u/ that is likely close to [o]: see, among others, for Hittite Kloekhorst EDHIL:35–60 and for Luwian Melchert 2019a:571–573. That a foreign [o] might be preserved in a robust rounding environment is quite credible. An Anatolian *Cowgill's Law* is thus not strictly necessary, and unrounding of a labiovelar adjacent to a rounded vowel is commonplace.

Cilicia (see Novák 2021:426–435 with references regarding both Karatepe and Sirkeli Höyük). More generally, one must assume very lively trade in wares of various kinds that encompassed the Levant, Cyprus, Cilicia, Lycia, and Mycenaean Greece. The degree of cultural interaction in this region makes pottery styles a dubious basis for positing the movement of people (similar conclusion by Simon 2018b:318).

Greek etymologies have been proposed (along with others) for both *Á-wa/i+ra/i-ku-* = *'WRK*, name of the King of Adanawa appearing in KARATEPE 1 and also attested in Phoenician in the Hasanbeyli inscription likewise as *'WRK*, and for *Wa/i+ra/i-i-ka-* = *WRYK*(*S*), King of Hiyawa in ÇİNEKÖY, İNCİRLİ and Cebelireis Dağı (see for a summary and evaluation of proposals Simon 2014:93–95). In evaluating the multiple competing proposals, I must insist on one point: the two names cannot possibly be the same: see Simon 2014:91–93 and Novák 2021:411, both with a tabular summary of the extant evidence. The first name is a *u*-stem in Luwian, has an initial aleph but *no* internal *y* in either occurrence of the Phoenician. The second is an *a*-stem in Luwian, always lacks an initial aleph in Phoenician but in all complete occurrences has an internal *y*. One must take the scribes' spellings seriously: the first name is Awarku (less likely Awaraku), while the second may be read as Wrayka, Wrika or Warika. Yakubovich (2015a:39), in assessing possible Greek readings of the two names likewise treats them as distinct, preferring Εὐαρχος 'fit for ruling' for the first and Ῥοῖκος 'lame' for the second. These are in principle quite reasonable, but it is incoherent to suppose that the Luwian author of KARATEPE 1 adapted one Greek *o*-stem as a *u*-stem and the other as an *a*-stem—especially in view of the rarity of *u*-stems in Luwian, including in personal names. Simon (2014:95) recognizes this problem, but still advocates taking Wrayka (*sic*) as reflecting Greek Ῥοῖκος. But if the first name cannot be Greek, why should we believe that the second is either? While a reduction of the diphthong to merely an /i/ (as suggested by Urikki) is quite possible, the multiple ambiguities of the Anatolian hieroglyphic script leave the matter anything but assured.

One can, with some effort, analyze several Iron Age Cilician rulers' names as Luwian (Kate, Kirri, Pihirim as attested in Assyrian sources, and also Warika, if read thus), but the operative phrase is *with some effort*, and I will spare readers such attempts. Etymologies of personal names are useful as evidence only if they are transparent, such as Luwian *Aza-tiwada-* 'the Sun God favored/favors' (see on this analysis Melchert 2021:370), **Sanda-warri-* 'the help of Sanda', the correct Luwian source of *Sanduarri* attested in Assyrian sources (with Simon 2014:97–98),[14] *Massana-azammi-* 'favored by the gods' attested in *MSN*(')*ZMŠ*

14 *Pace* Hawkins (CHLI I:45), the equation with *Azatiwada-* is quite impossible and must be emphatically rejected, along with the historical inferences based on it (see further below).

in Cebelireis Dağı.[15] Furthermore, as is widely acknowledged, in the cultural melange of Iron Age Cilicia and surrounding areas it is dangerous to draw any inferences from personal names about the heritage or self-identity of the bearers. Nothing requires that Awarku or W(a)rika have any identifiable linguistic affinity (Indo-European, Hurrian, or Semitic), any more than their putative forebear Mopsus.

A final putative trace of Greek in KARATEPE 1 is the Phoenician epithet of Ba'al *KRNTRYŠ*, analyzed by Schmitz (2009) as reflecting Greek *κορυνητήριος 'mace-bearing,' comparing Phoenician *B'L ṢMD* 'Ba'al of the mace.' One may ask, with Younger (2009:16), why a Phoenician text would use a Greek term instead of the Phoenician. Matessi (in this volume) has suggested rather that *KRNTRYŠ* reflects a toponym, namely Kelenderis, referring to one of many local hypostases of Ba'al. This is formally impeccable, but the distance from Karatepe to Kelenderis is considerable, and the role of Ba'al *KRNTRYŠ* in KARATEPE 1 is surprisingly prominent for an imported deity: he is not only established by Azatiwada in his new eponymous city, but is also to be worshipped by all the river lands, to bless Azatiwada with life and health and preeminence over every king, and is (somewhat redundantly), along with all the gods of the city, to give Azatiwada long days, many years, and old age.

The Luwian text in the first mention (§ 47) is, unhappily, lost, and in the third mention, (§ 51) has only the decorative epithet *ARHA u-sa-nú-wa-mi-sá* 'highly blessing, beneficent.'[16] However, the reference in the latter to ("CASTRUM") *há+ra/i-ní-sà-si* |DEUS-*SA*$_4$-*zi* 'the fortress's gods' is highly suggestive[17] because in § 40, Azatiwada claims that Ba'al (= Luwian Tarhunza) at least supported

---

There is no evidence that *Azatiwada-* ever contained a nasal. One should also avoid translating Luwian *aza-* as 'to love.' It is used exclusively with deities as the subject (Gérard 2004) and takes as a determinative (LITUUS) and (OCULUS), making it a verb of vision (NB: [1]DEUS-*na*-(OCULUS)*á-za-mi-sá* KARATEPE 4 § 2). Its primary sense is thus 'to regard,' hence 'to have high regard for, favor.' It has nothing to do with emotional or physical passion.

15 This is not the place to discuss in detail the personal names of that inscription, but if one is to treat *'ŠLPRN* quite plausibly as an *a*-stem **Assulaparna-* and take the final *-š* in *MSN(')ZMŠ* as the reanalyzed Luwian nominative ending /-is/, as seems necessary, then consistency demands that one analyze *MTŠ*, *KLŠ*, and *PHL(')Š* also as reflecting Luwian *i*-stems, not *a*-stems. The alternative suggestion of Mosca and Russell (1987:11), that *KLŠ* matches Κιλλις attested in Greek sources, is far superior to that of *Kulla* in Hittite.

16 Given all that he is asked to do for Azatiwada, this active reading of the participle is far more likely than 'highly blessed.' As in Hittite, Luwian past participles without expressed object can be active in sense. Cf. "EDERE"-*tà-mi-i-sa* |*u-wa/i-mi-i-sá* 'having eaten (and) drunk' KULULU 2 § 3.

17 I retain the standard rendering of Luwian /xarnis(a)-/, but it is clear that here and elsewhere it does not refer to a purely military installation, but rather to a fortified city,

him in building the fortified city, if he did not instigate it. This suggests that the subsequent epithet *KRN-TRYŠ* is a rendering of a Luwian one naming the Ba'al of the /xarnis-/ (omission of the suffix /-is-/ in a compound would not be surprising). Analysis of the second part is less certain, but Luwian has a verb /tarrawa-/ with the sense 'to establish, institute' (see Melchert 2020a:547), and Hittite attests also a participle *tarrawīmmiuš* (KBo 64.15 ii 1 in broken context), suggesting that there was a competing stem **tarrawi-*. A derived noun **tarrawiya-* 'act of establishing, instituting' would be expected (for the process, see Sasseville 2020:129). I therefore suggest, with due reserve, that *KRN-TRYŠ* reflects a Luwian epithet **harna-tarrawiyassis* 'of establishing the fortified city,' a hypostasis of Ba'al as the founder and patron of the city Azatiwadaya.[18]

We inevitably return to the matter of whether Hiyawa, in reference to a region of Cilicia Pedia, is derived from Ahhiyawa, now almost universally recognized as referring to Mycenaean Greece or some part thereof. As already indicated above (fn. 5), there is no merit to the proposal of Oreshko (2013) that *Á-*429-*wa/i-* in KARATEPE 1 is to be read as *Á-HIYA-wa/i-* instead of *Á-TANA-wa/i-* (see also the criticism by Simon 2018b:316–317). Furthermore, against the implication of Yakubovich (2015b) the evidence of the ARSUZ inscriptions (text in Dinçol et al. 2015) also argues decisively against Oreshko's reinterpretation. As already argued by Hawkins (2015b:54) (see further Melchert 2019b:362, fn. 18, also on the readings) the ARSUZ text §§11–14 (cited here from the more complete A.1) precludes that *429-*sa* and *hi-ya-wa/i*(REGIO) have the same referent: *429-*sa-pa-wa/i-mu*(URBS) (LIGNUM)*tara/i-wa/i* |PONERE-*wa/i-ta a-wa/i* SUPER+*ra/i* CRUS-*ha wa/i-tá-*a* |*hi-ya-wa/i-ha*(REGIO) |(PES$_2$)*tara/i-zi-i-ha a-wa/i* |PRAE-*i* CAPERE+CAPERE-*417-*na*(URBS) *mi-na-*a* |*273-*i-na* |*hi-nu-wa/i-ha* "Adana put the *stick* to me, and I prevailed. I also turned to Hiyawa and caused my weapon to reach forth (to) (the city) X."[19] The action against the city in Hiyawa cannot possibly refer to the response to the aggressive act by Adana.[20]

---

one with walls and likely a citadel (Hittite URU.BÀD or URU *witant-* 'built' cities), usually implying a city of some importance. Cf. Trameri 2020:283–287 on the treaty of Zidanza with Pilliya of Kizzuwatna and the remarks of Casabonne (2002:188). In KARATEPE 1, the Phoenician consistently has *QRT* 'city' for Luwian /xarnis(a)-/ when it refers to Azatiwadaya.

18 One does miss any trace of the *-w-*, but the same is true of *DNNYM* < **Adanawanni-*.

19 While /taru-/ in Luwian can mean 'wood' or 'tree,' it is not clear that it can mean 'stick.' I therefore take the spelling "LIGNUM"-*ru-wa/i-i* in A.2 §11 as nom.-acc.sg. of a derived /tar(u)wit-/ 'thing of wood, stick,' allowing the more natural expression 'put the stick to me' for the surely hostile act of Adana. Since the last sentence surely reflects a military action, I also assume with Yakubovich (2019:549) that *273-*i-na* is /warpin/ 'weapon.'

20 The attempt of Yakubovich (2015b:58) to circumvent this by referring to the action taken

However, Yakubovich (2015b:57) is quite right to reject the false contrast of Hawkins (2015b:54) between Adana the city and Hiyawa the land, in an effort to equate them. The variation between *429-*sa* … (URBS) in ARSUZ 1 and *429-*sa* … (REGIO) in ARSUZ 2 merely reconfirms that Adana was both a city and a city-state with territory. Moreover, in the 10th century, the latter and Hiyawa may easily have been *separate* territories. The phrasing of the passage suggests that Suppiluliuma first repulsed an attempt by Adana to interfere with his capture of Arsuz and then forestalled any interference from Hiyawa with a show of force against one of the latter's cities.[21] A century later, Shalmaneser III treats Que as a unified kingdom in his narratives. Whether it included Hiyawa is hard to determine; by the 8th century, it did, at least according to the account of Warika (see below).

As to Hiyawa, the characterization by Trameri (2020:41, with fn. 10) of what I wrote in Melchert 2019b:361–362 is highly misleading. I said merely that aphaeresis in Luwian of a foreign name was possible—not that it was true in this case—and I explicitly cited as cause for doubt what was (and is, in my opinion) the convincing identification by Gander (2012:287–289, following others) of ^{URU}*Hi-ya-*[] in the Annals of Arnuwanda I (KUB 23.21 ii 6') in the context of *Adaniya* and [*Š*]*inuwana* as *Hiyawa*.[22] There is no chance that Greeks were present in significant numbers in Cilicia in the late 15th/early 14th century.

Furthermore, this occurrence also tells us that, once again, Hiyawa began as yet another city-state, as already shown by *hi-ya-wa/i-sa-ha*(URBS) in ÇİNEKÖY §§1 and 6. The narrative in ARSUZ suggests that it was distinct from, but not far from, Adana or Arsuz. That the city Hiyawa appears only once in Hittite sources argues for its being in the south of Cilicia, and in the Bronze Age it was likely a minor center without political or religious importance. That in no way precludes its having gained prominence centuries later due to actions of Warika. It is worth underscoring, however, that the Phoenician version of ÇİNEKÖY employs *DNNYM* in §6 for *hi-ya-wa/i-sa*(URBS). It would appear that Warika

---

against 'this city' (i.e., Arsuz or a place very near it) in §§9–10 is futile. The 'also' makes absolutely clear that the action against Hiyawa in §§13–14 is *in addition to* and thus separate from that against Adana in §12.

21 The Luwian verb *hi-nu-* 'cause to reach' (or similar) may be construed with an accusative plus dat.-loc. of goal or with a double accusative (cf. KARKAMIŠ A6 §§2–3; text Hawkins 2000:124). The city name may thus be either. Against Dillo 2016:45 et al., PRAE-*i* is Luwian /pri:/ 'forth, out,' not /parran/ 'before, in front.' Non-use of 'prevailed' or 'took down' still suggests a display of force rather than an attack.

22 Nothing has changed, to my knowledge: the only complete city name in Hittite sources with a comparable shape is ^{URU}*Hiyašna*, whose location near Tawiniya and Hattuša totally precludes its restoration in KUB 23.21.

had, for whatever motivation, made Hiyawa his capital and thus an autonym for his kingdom. The overall attestation of Hiyawa makes it hard to date the *interpretatio graeca* of Ὑπαχαίοι much earlier than Warika.

As argued by Novák (2021:403), the archaeological record shows a continuity that does not support dramatic changes in culture and identity in Early Iron Age Plain Cilicia. Furthermore, available evidence (Novák 2021:436–437) suggests Cypro-Phoenician influence, not Cypro-Greek (cf. Chapter 10 in this volume). One must stress that *influence* does not mean significant immigration of Phoenicians, either. In sum, I find none of the argumentation for the Greek migration hypothesis compelling. Use of Phoenician in public inscriptions is a cultural matter (*pace* Simon 2018b:326–327).[23] That Phoenician was held to be the prestige language is clear from the respective disposition of the Phoenician and Luwian inscriptions at both Karatepe and Çineköy. Yakubovich (forthcoming) has now presented compelling arguments (against Melchert 2021: 359–375) that the primary text of the Karatepe bilingual is Phoenician, which Azatiwada then had translated into Luwian. Whatever redactional relationship one assumes for the two versions, it reflects the dual goals of the local ruler who commissioned it: to display to all viewers that he knew the criteria that such a public inscription had to meet in the cultural milieu (in both language use and diction), but also to assert his own self-identity in the Luwian version. This is not the creation of a newcomer.

2 The Land

Cilicia Pedia is a rich alluvial plain dominated by several major rivers: the Göksu (Gr. Καλύκαδνος), Berdan (Gr. Κύδνος), Seyhan (Hitt. *Šamri/Sapara*, Luw. *Sabri*, Gr. Σάρος), and Ceyhan (Gr. Πύραμος).[24] Throughout its history, these rivers have brought alternating periods of both great agricultural-based prosperity and of widespread malarial swamps, right up to the 20th century CE. Achievement of the former has required intensive efforts at controlling water resources, while failure to do so has led to the latter (cf. Novák et al. 2019b:10; Rutishauser 2020:158–159, 164). It is thus no accident that both Azatiwada and Warika include land reclamation projects among their accomplishments (in

23 It is significant that IVRIZ 2 in Tabal (Tuwana) is a Luwian–Phoenician bilingual. It is hard to see how Greek immigrants would be responsible for this usage.

24 See Novák and Rutishauser 2017:135, but Hittite *Purana* is likely not the Πύραμος. See Hawkins and Weeden 2017:292–293. For a thorough treatment of the landscape, geomorphology, climate, and settlement patterns of Cilicia Pedia, see Rutishauser 2020.

the context of the Ceyhan and Seyhan, respectively). Oreshko (2019[2021]:230–231) has offered a compelling new interpretation of the difficult Luwian text of § 11 of KARATEPE 1: *kwi/a-pa-wá/í* |(*255)*ma+ra/i-ya-ní-zi* |*ARHA* |*ma-ki-sa-há*. Already van den Hout (2010) had disproven previous interpretations by pointing out that the determinative *255 was elsewhere associated with grain (and may represent a grain pit) and compared $^{A.ŠÀ}$*mariyani-* occurring in Hittite contexts and clearly referring to a type of field. He also argued correctly (2010:240–241) that use of the adverb /k^{w}ippa/ shows that § 11 must be the concluding clause of a series of ameliorative acts (against Oreshko 2019[2021]:231) and does *not* go with the following reference to removing evils from the land, as previously assumed.

However, as Oreshko correctly asserts, van den Hout's interpretation of the clause as "I thus accumulated the *mariyana*-field crops in great numbers" is not entirely satisfactory. First, in context it seems redundant following § 7 "I filled the Paharean granaries" (Hawkins 2000:49). Second, and more seriously, it does not work at all for the ritual context of $^{A.ŠÀ}$*mariyani-*, which serves as a dumping place for contaminated ritual materials. For the latter, a marsh or swamp is appropriate, and Oreshko makes a strong case for reinterpreting KARATEPE 1 § 11 as "I drained the swamps/marshlands."[25]

Oreshko (2019[2021]:225–229) and Hawkins (2017) differ significantly in their reading and interpretation of § 8 in ÇINEKÖY, but regardless of whether one thinks the reference is to marshes or barrages, § 9 makes clear that Warika reclaimed fields (one may think of polders) and settled towns in them.[26]

Iron Age Cilicia Pedia was also famous for its horses. The matter of the Kawaean carriage in KARKAMIŠ A11b+c § 7 has already been discussed above. The more famous episode is King Solomon's purchase of horses from Que (Kawa), reported in 1 Kings 10:28 and 2 Chronicles 1:16.

3 Languages and Speakers

It is easy to agree with Trameri (2020:102) that one should eschew references to ethnicity or identity and limit oneself to populations of speakers (cf. similar remarks in Melchert 2003a:2–3). However, the severe limitations of our sources

25 Since reclaiming the swampy ground for agricultural use would likely require use of dikes (see below on ÇINEKÖY), use of the determinative *255/256 is also entirely in order.

26 Hawkins's readings of the signs are far more convincing, but the resulting syntax is problematic. Oreshko's attempt to interpret *za-ya* as an adverb 'here' has no support anywhere in Luwian. Fortunately for our purposes, the basic sense of the passage is clear.

problematize even reference to speakers. Due to the importation and adaptation of Hurro-Luwian rituals and cults from Kizzuwatna by the Kingdom of Hattuša, we may reasonably infer significant numbers of Hurrian and Luwian speakers in Kizzuwatna in the Late Bronze Age (Trameri 2020:100–117). However, the indirect nature of this evidence prevents us from reaching any firm conclusions regarding relative proportions of speakers, the degree of bi- or multilingualism, and the presence (or absence) of other spoken languages among the general population.

We have even less to go on when it comes to Iron Age Cilicia Pedia. I have already discussed the status of Phoenician as a cultural language, and there is broad agreement that evidence for Phoenicians as a significant component of the inhabitants is lacking. The nature of the Luwian version of KARATEPE 1 gives some basis for inferring that Azatiwada identified himself culturally as Luwian, but we may question the extent to which such an attitude was shared by contemporary citizens. The degree of continuity in the archaeological record for Cilicia Pedia in the transition from the Bronze to the Iron Age following the end of the Hittite Empire (Novák 2021:403) leaves room for doubt that there were large-scale shifts in population. We thus have no strong reasons to think that the Luwian and Hurrian speakers all vanished, replaced by others. The honest answer, however, is that we just do not know which language(s) most inhabitants of the region used in their daily lives. The lack (to this point!) of any Aramaic inscriptions is striking, but what (if any) inferences we may draw from this is quite unclear. One would expect that increasing (if at times intermittent) control by Assyria would have had sociolinguistic consequences, but again we have no way to prove this. In sum, the fact that our few indigenous sources stem from elites renders any statements about language use in the general population little better than guesses.

4 History

I have already expressed my strong disbelief that the reference to Kawa in KARKAMIŠ A11b+c § 7 refers to a hostile encounter of Katuwa of Karkamiš and forces of Que/Cilicia (*contra* Novák 2021:404, who reads too much into the quite tentative remarks of Hawkins 2000:105, 2005:153). The episode described in ARSUZ 1 and 2 §§ 11–14 certainly does refer to a confrontation of a King Suppiluliuma of Palastin with both Adana and Hiyawa, which in the late 10th century are treated as distinct entities. It is important not to read too much into the expression of § 12 *a-wa/i* SUPER+*ra/i* CRUS-*ha* "I prevailed" (lit. "stood above").

This implies only that Suppiluliuma defeated an attack or incursion by Adana, not that he himself invaded the latter, much less conquered it (correct on this point, Dillo 2016:41–42). The further action against Hiyawa was also limited to a single city, whose name (as often) unfortunately is hidden behind a logogram combination.[27] We thus learn little about the location of Hiyawa other than further reason to locate it in the southern part of Cilicia Pedia.

For the history of Q(a)we in the 9th century, as reflected in Assyrian sources, I refer readers to the treatments of Hawkins (CHLI I:41 and 2006–2008:191–192) and of Novák (2021:405–406). I may also be brief regarding the history of Que in the 8th century, as I find entirely convincing the account of Novák (2021:444–446), specifically his Solution 1. I need only highlight the points that lead me to this conclusion, some of which have been cited earlier in this chapter. In addition to his archaeological arguments for redating Karatepe to the early to mid-8th century (2021:417–435), there is the total lack of mention of Assyrians by Azatiwada in KARATEPE 1. This is in stark contrast to the statement of Warika in ÇİNEKÖY § 6, that Hiyawa and Assyria had become 'one house.' KARATEPE must be older than ÇİNEKÖY, and Azatiwada must be older than Warika (2021:442). As we have already seen, this is not problematic, because the previous identification of Sanduwarri in Assyrian sources with Azatiwada is quite impossible. The latter represents a Luwian name **Sanda-warri* (with Simon 2014a:97–98).

As summarized by Novák (2021:442–444), Azatiwada played for the ruling house of Mopsus in Adana(wa) the role played by Yariri for the ruling house of Astiruwa in Karkamiš. By the authority of his lord, King Awarku, Azatiwada not only preserved, but by his account even expanded the power, wealth, and prosperity of Adana(wa). He further saw to it that Awarku's rightful heir assumed the throne. The lack of any *damnatio memoriae* at Karatepe suggests that Azatiwada, having passed on the power in Adana(wa), successfully withdrew to live in peace in Azatiwadaya.

Of the two alternatives suggested by Novák (2021:444–448), I strongly prefer the first. One reason has already been given: Awarku and W(a)rika cannot be the same name. Furthermore, I do not find it at all credible that Azatiwada, if he

27 The attempt of Dillo (2016:48–49) to read CAPERE+CAPERE (*42, a pair of downward grasping hands) as a variant of MAGNUS 'great' is quite impossible. The latter (*363) is attested in its standard shape already on Empire seals. In any case, Luwian *ura-* is always in cuneiform spelled ***u-ra-*** (pointing to /ora-/, as per note 13 above), whereas the city name is consistently spelled ^{URU}***ú-ru-uš-ša***. As per Novák (2021:405, fn. 31), the latter may be more plausibly identified with Rhosos = Arsuz. The attestations of ^{URU}*ú-ru-uš-ša* speak neither for nor against this (cf. Goetze 1940:41–47).

played the role of guardian for an underage prince, would say that he received his authority to rule Adana(wa) from the prince (KARATEPE 1 § 2).

I have only one reservation about the *Solution 1* presented (2021:444–446). The paleographic arguments presented by Lemaire (1983:16) for dating the Hasanbeyli inscription as contemporary with that of Karatepe remove any problem of identifying the Awarku of both as the same person. However, the dating of Cebelireis Dağı by the authors of the *editio princeps* to the late 7th century (Mosca and Russell 1987:4) must be addressed. If their dating is upheld, the *WRYK* = W(a)rika of that inscription cannot be the King of Adana/Hiyawa of the mid-8th century, but rather a later heir. A reassessment of the paleography is sorely needed.