

# ***Antiquitates variae***

FESTSCHRIFT  
FÜR  
KARL STROBEL

INTERNATIONALE ARCHÄOLOGIE

*Studia honoraria — Band 39*

Begründet von  
Claus Dobiak und Klaus Leihdorf

Herausgegeben von  
Claus Dobiak, Friederike Fless und Eva Strauch

# **Antiquitates variae**

FESTSCHRIFT  
FÜR  
KARL STROBEL ZUM 65. GEBURTSTAG

herausgegeben von  
Renate Lafer, Heimo Dolenz und Martin Luik



Verlag Marie Leidorf GmbH · Rahden/Westf.  
2019

392 Seiten mit 131 Abbildungen und 6 Tabellen

Gedruckt mit finanzieller Unterstützung der  
FORSCHUNGSFÖRDERUNG DURCH DEN FORSCHUNGSRAT  
SOWIE DER FAKULTÄT FÜR KULTURWISSENSCHAFTEN  
UND DES KÄRNTNER UNIVERSITÄTSBUNDES



Bibliographische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek

**Lafer, Renate / Dolenz, Heimo / Luik, Martin (Hrsg.):**

Antiquitates variae. Festschrift für Karl Strobel zum 65. Geburtstag /  
hrsg. von Renate Lafer... .

Rahden/Westf.: Leidorf, 2019

(Internationale Archäologie: Studia honoraria; Bd. 39)

ISBN 978-3-89646-558-0

Gedruckt auf alterungsbeständigem Papier

Die Deutsche Bibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie.  
Detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.d-nb.de> abrufbar.

Alle Rechte vorbehalten  
© 2019



Verlag Marie Leidorf GmbH  
*Geschäftsführer:* Dr. Bert Wiegel  
Stellerloh 65 D-32369 Rahden/Westf.

Tel: +49/(0)5771/9510-74

Fax: +49/(0)5771/9510-75

E-Mail: [info@vml.de](mailto:info@vml.de)

Internet: <http://www.vml.de>

ISBN 978-3-89646-558-0

ISSN 1433-4194

Kein Teil des Buches darf in irgendeiner Form (Druck, Fotokopie, CD-ROM, DVD, Internet oder einem anderen Verfahren) ohne schriftliche Genehmigung des Verlages Marie Leidorf GmbH reproduziert werden oder unter Verwendung elektronischer Systeme verarbeitet, vervielfältigt oder verbreitet werden.

Umschlagentwurf: Joachim Pechtl, Geretsried

Titelvignette: Skizze einer Grabinschrift aus Tavium (Büyüknemes Haus Nr. 96), © Eva Christof 2001

Redaktion: Renate Lafer, Klagenfurt; Heimo Dolenz, Klagenfurt; Martin Luik, München

Satz, Layout und Bildbearbeitung: Christian Trapič, Klagenfurt

Für die Einholung der Bild- und Urheberrechte zeichnen die Autorinnen und Autoren selbst verantwortlich.

Druck und Produktion: druckhaus köthen GmbH & Co. KG, Köthen



Karl Robert

## Tabula Gratulatoria

Michele Asolati, Padova  
Giuseppina Azzarello, Udine  
Regina Barlovits, Pischeldorf  
Reinhold Bichler, Innsbruck  
Kai Brodersen, Erfurt  
Maurizio Buora, Udine  
Paolo Casari, Trieste  
Thomas Corsten, Wien  
Pierre Cosme, Rouen  
Heimo Dolenz, Klagenfurt  
Joachim Drexhage, Marburg  
Ulrike Ehmig, Berlin  
Johannes Eingartner, Augsburg  
Michael Erdrich, Lublin  
Christof Flügel, München  
Klaus Geus, Berlin  
Giovanni Gorini, Padova  
Kordula Gostenčnik, Wien  
Herbert Grassl, Salzburg  
Stefan Groh, Wien  
Mitja Guštin, Koper  
Rudolf Haensch, München  
Bernhard Hebert, Wien  
Herbert Heftner, Wien  
Friedhelm Hoffmann, München  
Marietta Horster, Berlin  
Andrea Jördens, Heidelberg  
Gabriele Koiner, Graz  
Bärbel Kramer, Trier  
Johannes Kramer, Trier  
Elisabeth Krieger, Xanten  
Thomas Kruse, Wien  
Hartmut W. Kuehne, Berlin  
Renate Lafer, Klagenfurt  
Ergün Lafli, Izmir  
Yann Le Bohec, Paris-Sorbonne  
Ute Lohner-Urban, Graz  
Martin Luik, München  
Stefano Magnani, Udine  
Federico Manuelli, Berlin  
Jacopo Marcer, Belluno  
Joseph Maran, Heidelberg  
Stefania Mazzoni, Florenz  
Laura Mecella, Milano  
Salvatore Ortisi, München  
Angela Pabst, Halle  
Michael Peachin, New York  
Dieter Planck, Stuttgart  
Simonetta Ponchia, Verona  
Hubert Presslinger, Leoben  
Michel Reddé, Paris  
Fabian Reiter, Bologna  
Marcus Reuter, Trier  
Erwin M. Ruprechtsberger, Linz-Enns  
Kai Ruffing, Kassel  
Ursula Schaching, Graz  
Philipp Scheibelreiter, Wien  
Wolfgang Spickermann, Graz  
Oliver Stoll, Passau  
Christian Wallner, Klagenfurt  
Ekkehard Weber, Wien  
Engelbert Winter, Münster  
Catherine Wolff, Lyon  
Klaus Zimmermann, Münster

## Inhalt

<b>Vorwort der Herausgeber</b>	13
<b>Würdigung des Jubilars</b>	15
<b>Abkürzungsverzeichnis</b>	19
<b>Beiträge</b>	21
Michele Asolati, Padova <b>Due argenti pseudo-imperiali dall'area prealpina nord-orientale d'Italia</b>	23
Giuseppina Azzarello, Udine <b>Zwischen den Zeilen</b> Revision einer Multiplikationstabelle auf einer Holztafel	27
Pierre Cosme, Rouen <b>À l'épreuve de la guerre civile</b> Le gouvernement de l'Empire romain de la mort de Néron à l'avènement de Vespasien	33
Heimo Dolenz, Klagenfurt <b>Lipidares aus und um Virunum</b>	45
Ulrike Ehmig, Berlin <b>Woher nehmen und nicht stehlen?</b> Überlegungen zur Beschaffung und Bearbeitung des Beschreibstoffes für antike Flüche	69
Klaus Geus, Berlin <b>Krokodile, Elefanten, Wale und Bohnen</b> Über Kontingenz und Valenz von zoologischen und botanischen Argumenten in den geographischen Konzeptionen der Antike	81
Giovanni Gorini, Padova <b>La qualità dell'argento dei Kugelreiter nel ripostiglio di Enemonzo</b>	97
Herbert Graßl, Salzburg <b>Eine epigraphisch-literarische Nachlese zum Grabgedicht aus Möderndorf (Kärnten)</b>	103
Stefan Groh, Wien – Ursula Schachinger, Graz <b>Inter Alpes Noricas</b> Römerzeitliche Siedlungen und ein Münzschatzfund im steirischen Salzkammergut	109
Rudolf Haensch, München <b>Zum bellum desertorum</b>	115
Herbert Heftner, Wien <b>Die Kapitulation von Tarent 272 v. Chr. und die Frage nach dem Todesjahr des Pyrrhos von Epirus</b>	121
Gabriele Koiner, Graz <b>Ein bärtiger Kopf mit Mauerkrone in der kilikischen Münzprägung des 4.Jh.v.Chr.</b>	127
Elisabeth Krieger, Xanten – Christof Flügel, München – Johannes Eingartner, Augsburg <b>Der Tempelbezirk des Mars und der Victoria auf dem Weinberg bei Abusina-Eining (Raetien)</b>	145
Thomas Kruse, Wien <b>Ein Lieferungskauf von Wein und Neues zu den Calpurnii von Oxyrhynchos</b>	161

Renate Lafer, Klagenfurt <b>Septimius Severus und seine Heimatstadt Leptis Magna</b> Überlegungen zum kolportieren Nordafrikabesuch des Kaisers in den Jahren 202/03 n.Chr.	169
Ergün Laflı, Izmir – Stefano Magnani, Udine – Maurizio Buora, Udine <b>A new milestone from Dokimeion in Phrygia (western Turkey)</b>	175
Yann Le Bohec, Paris-Sorbonne <b>Tacfarinas contre Rome</b> Étude d'histoire militaire	189
Ute Lohner-Urban, Graz <b>Die „Hellenistische Blüte“ in Side und Tavium aus archäologischer Sicht</b>	199
Stefano Magnani, Udine – Danila Piacentini, Roma <b>Eine palmyrenische Gemeinschaft in Moesia inferior?</b>	211
Federico Manuelli, Berlin <b>Carving the memory, altering the past</b> PUGNUS-mili and the earlier Iron Age rulers at Arslantepe/Malizi (South-Eastern Turkey)	227
Jacopo Marcer, Belluno <b>Spuren aus Feltria</b> Überlegungen zu Geld und Gesellschaft einer römischen Stadt in der Kaiserzeit	243
Laura Mecella, Milano <b>Die Rolle der Palastbeamten bei den diplomatischen Beziehungen zwischen Byzantium und den Persern</b> Beobachtungen ausgehend von Menander Protektor fr. 11 Müller	251
Angela Pabst, Halle <b>Die „Herren des Staates“?</b> Auf der Suche nach dem Einfluss des Militärs im klassischen Griechenland	265
Fabian Reiter, Bologna <b>Dokumentierung zweier Weizenzahlungen aus severischer Zeit</b>	277
Kai Ruffing, Kassel <b>Market Systems in the Roman Empire and Long Distance Trade</b>	281
Erwin M. Ruprechtsberger, Linz-Enns <b>Eine Phalerahalterung aus dem antiken Lentia</b> Mit der metallurgischen Analyse von Hubert Preßlinger	295
Hubert Presslinger, Leoben <b>Metallkundliche Untersuchungsergebnisse an der Phalera</b>	311
Philipp Scheibelreiter, Wien <b>Zwischen <i>beneficium</i>, <i>utendum dare</i> und <i>furtum usus</i></b> Überlegungen zu Geschichte und Datierung der <i>actio commodati</i>	315
Oliver Stoll, Passau <b>Ab und (wieder) auf!</b> Ein Beitrag zum Umgang mit Niederlagen in der römischen Kultur	337



Christian Wallner, Klagenfurt <b>Grabinschriften aus Tavium</b>	347
Ekkehard Weber, Wien <b>Wieder einmal</b> Die römische Straßenverbindung zwischen Virunum und Iuvavum	357
Catherine Wolff, Lyon <b>Les centurions et autres officiers dans les textes du Digeste</b>	365
<b>Schriftenverzeichnis von Karl Strobel</b>	379
<b>Verzeichnis der betreuten Abschlussarbeiten</b>	391



## Carving the memory, altering the past

PUGNUS-mili and the earlier Iron Age rulers at Arslantepe/Malizi (South-Eastern Turkey)

Federico Manuelli

### Problematic and aims

In October 2008 I was invited by Karl Strobel to contribute to the international workshop “Empires after the Empire” held at the end of that year at the Alpen-Adria-Universität Klagenfurt. It was only later that I acknowledged how important that moment was for my career path. That was the year we resumed excavations on the 1<sup>st</sup> millennium BC levels at Arslantepe, and the workshop in Klagenfurt represented my first contribution to the study of the Anatolian Iron Age. Ten years later, it is a pleasure for me to present the development of that research on the occasion of Prof. Strobel’s 65<sup>th</sup> birthday.<sup>1</sup>

In this contribution, I will provide historical and ideological appraisals of the stone bas-reliefs inscribed with the name of the ruler PUGNUS-mili, found at the site of Arslantepe (Malatya, SE Turkey) and dated to the 12<sup>th</sup>-11<sup>th</sup> century BC. The sculptures stimulated a vibrant discussion among scholars from the moment of their discovery.<sup>2</sup> Despite the fact that a general agreement about their chronological evolution has been reached in recent years, quite a few issues still require some careful inquiries and methodological refinements. These mostly concern the lack of a detailed relative sequence of the single slabs and the related need for a better assessment of the unclear lines of descendants of the Early Iron Age rulers at the site. These problems mostly stem from the fact that studies have been so far based either on a philological/paleographical analysis of the inscriptions or on an iconographical/stylistic examination of the sculpted images, but very little has been written about the interplay between the two aspects.<sup>3</sup> In the following pages I will analyze the relationship “images-words” attested in a subset of bas-reliefs from Arslantepe where the

name of the ruler PUGNUS-mili is associated with the title “King’s seed”.<sup>4</sup> The aim is to try to establish a better chronological sequence of these reliefs by identifying and interpreting the carving activities performed on the stone blocks. I will also focus on evaluating how in this context texts and figures coalesce in order to create specific messages that express social identity and collective memory.<sup>5</sup>

The architectural reliefs engraved with the name PUGNUS-mili were all discovered during the first round of explorations and excavations undertaken at Arslantepe at the beginning of the previous century.<sup>6</sup> They have been found, together with other sculptures, either reused in the so-called “Lions Gate” or nearby emerging from the mound surface. After the discovery of the “Lions Gate”, it slowly became clear that its decorative apparatus mostly consisted of *spolia* blocks collected from earliest Iron Age structures.<sup>7</sup> Since they were sculpted over different periods and assembled in a context dated considerably later than their manufacture, a fundamental challenge for scholars has been to sort the artworks into reliable groups reflecting consistent iconographic, stylistic or paleographic criteria. Additional difficulties rose from the attempts of ordering the names of the kings carved on the bas-reliefs in clear genealogies, as well as identifying correspondences with the rulers known indirectly from Assyrian and Urartian sources. This was further complicated by the fact that some of these names were also attested on inscriptions found in the surrounding of the site, creating links with additional ancestors or descendants. This resulted in a puzzling scenario, and for a long time, it seemed hard to synchronize all the characters involved.

The first step towards a better evaluation of these sculptures has been undertaken in the pivotal work of W. Orthmann, whose classification of the whole collection

<sup>1</sup> This article was first conceived as a lecture held in July 2017 in the framework of the seminars organized by the “Lehrstuhl für Altorientalistik” at Würzburg University. I thank Daniel Schwemer for his invitation and the stimulating discussions that represented a first step towards the realization of this paper. I am grateful to Sanna Aro (Helsinki), Jörg Klinger (Berlin) and Mark Weeden (London) for reading a first draft of this contribution and providing valuable suggestions for its improvement. I am also thankful to Ana Arroyo (Madrid), Costanza Coppini (Berlin), Francesco Di Filippo (Rome) and Nathalie Kallas (Berlin) with whom I had the chance to discuss various topics pertaining to the content of this paper. This article falls within the scope of my current research project funded by the German Research Foundation (DFG project # 127370).

<sup>2</sup> See MANUELLI – MORI 2016, 222-224 for an updated synthesis.

<sup>3</sup> POLI 2012, 207.

<sup>4</sup> The meaning of the hieroglyphic compound REX.\*462 has been debated by scholars, especially because of the uncertain translation of the sign \*462 (HAWKINS 2000, 107, 307; GIUSFREDI 2010, 82-87). At the current state of research, the previously proposed translation “Potent King” should be definitively rejected since the interpretation of \*462 as “seed” seems to be “the only one which could give sense in all cases” (DINÇOL *et al.* 2014, 150). I warmly thank Mark Weeden for updating me on this topic and for sharing the results of his current research.

<sup>5</sup> See FELDMAN 2014, 67-72.

<sup>6</sup> DELAPORTE 1940. The whole set of reliefs discussed here are exhibited at the Museum of Anatolian Civilization at Ankara. I was able to directly view and examine this collection in May 2018.

<sup>7</sup> See HARMANŞAH 2011, 71 with related bibliography.

into three iconographic and stylistic cycles is still largely accepted.<sup>8</sup> In this regard, the blocks inscribed with the name PUGNUS-mili have been clustered, together with others, within the so-called “I Malatya Style”.<sup>9</sup> The subsequent comprehensive publication of the Iron Age Luwian hieroglyphic inscriptions carried out by D. Hawkins allowed the reconstruction of the genealogical sequence of the local rulers at the site and a better chronological arrangement of the Arslantepe sculptural cycles towards the last centuries of the 2<sup>nd</sup> millennium BC.<sup>10</sup> Simultaneously, the acquisition of new sources for comparison, like the complete excavation of the ‘Ain Dara sanctuary and the discovery of the Storm-God temple at the citadel of Aleppo, supported a dating of the bas-reliefs between the 12<sup>th</sup> and the 10<sup>th</sup> century BC.<sup>11</sup> The recent development of paleographic and philological studies, as well as the synchronization with the dynasties ruling at Karkemiš, has further refined the identification of the lineages of power attested at the site.<sup>12</sup> Alongside the philological and artistic scholarship, an essential contribution to the topic has been provided by the excavations recently resumed in the area of the “Lions Gate” at Arslantepe itself. The stimulating discoveries there are enriching the picture and enabling a better chronological and cultural contextualization of the older finds.<sup>13</sup> With all this in mind, the final arrangement of the “Lions Gate” can be dated to the beginning of the 8<sup>th</sup> century BC and the main collection of sculptures discovered at the site to the 12<sup>th</sup>-11<sup>th</sup> century BC. Subsequently, the reliefs inscribed with the name PUGNUS-mili should cover the period from the early-12<sup>th</sup> to the early-11<sup>th</sup> century BC.

### A sketch of the history and archaeology of the kingdom of Malizi

The relief sculptures and rock-inscriptions discovered at Arslantepe and its surroundings indicate the existence of an important Early Iron Age (ca. 12<sup>th</sup>-11<sup>th</sup> century BC) regional polity, named Malizi, with its capital at the site and its domain extending to its western valleys.<sup>14</sup> The analysis of the Luwian hieroglyphic inscriptions carved on these monuments show traces of cultural and political continuity with the tradition of the Hittite Late Bronze Age (ca. 14<sup>th</sup>-13<sup>th</sup> century BC). They record the early rulers of the city as direct descendants of Kuzi-Tešub, son of Talmi-Tešub, the last known Hittite viceroy ruling at Karkemiš and great-great-grandson of the “Great King” Šuppiluliuma I.<sup>15</sup> This testifies that

while the central power at Hattuša, the Hittite capital, had vanished at the beginning of the 12<sup>th</sup> century BC, a surviving line of viceroys at Karkemiš was tied with a dynasty of Arslantepe kings.<sup>16</sup> Specifically, the rock-inscriptions from Gürün and Kötükale and the stele from Ispekçür, all dated around the mid-12<sup>th</sup> century BC, attest the genealogical lines linking Kuzi-Tešub with his grandsons Runtyas and Arnuwantis, namely the “County-Lords of the city of Malizi”.<sup>17</sup> Besides stressing their lineage with the “Great King” of Karkemiš, Runtyas and Arnuwantis also declare themselves the sons of PUGNUS-mili, a character that in all the three inscriptions is surprisingly never associated with any titlature.<sup>18</sup>

The discovery of the bas-reliefs from the “Lions Gate” at Arslantepe inscribed with the name of “PUGNUS-mili, King’s seed” have further enriched this picture with new data and questions. The figurative repertoire of images and scenes associated with these inscriptions are characterized by a strong continuity with the Hittite iconography and ideology, perpetuating a codified idea of political power.<sup>19</sup> This discovery allowed us to place Arslantepe at the center of the abovementioned historical scenario, stressing its cultural and political relevance in the period following the dissolution of the Hittite empire. These facts have been further confirmed and emphasized by the discovery at the site during the 1960s of a *cretula* bearing the inscription “Runt(yas), King of the land of Ma(lizi)”.<sup>20</sup>

The line of descendants established through these findings becomes more complex when we consider the inscription carved on the stele from Darende.<sup>21</sup> Here the “Country-Lord of the city Malizi” Arnuwantis claims himself to be the son of PUGNUS-mili and the grandson of king Arnuwantis. This not only implies that the author of Darende is the grandson of a previous king bearing his own name, but also that the latter is most probably the Arnuwantis from Ispekçür, entailing the existence of two PUGNUS-mili.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>8</sup> ORTHMANN 1971, 459-467.

<sup>9</sup> ORTHMANN 1971, 91-92.

<sup>10</sup> HAWKINS 2000, 282-329.

<sup>11</sup> See ORTHMANN 2002, 154-157; MAZZONI 2013, 471-474.

<sup>12</sup> See HAWKINS – PEKER 2014; DINÇOL *et al.* 2014, 147-151; HAWKINS – WEEDEN 2016, 10-11.

<sup>13</sup> See LIVERANI 2012; MANUELLI 2018, 146-150.

<sup>14</sup> See BRYCE 2012, 98-105.

<sup>15</sup> HAWKINS 2000, 282-306.

<sup>16</sup> HAWKINS 2002, 144-148.

<sup>17</sup> HAWKINS 2000, 295-304. For discussions of the title “Country Lord” (REGIO.DOMINUS), see HAWKINS 2000, 96; GIUSFREDI 2010, 77, 97-101; GILIBERT 2015.

<sup>18</sup> For a discussion on the name PUGNUS-mili, see HAWKINS 2000, 286-288; SIMON 2016. For the title “Great King” (MAGNUS.REX), see GIUSFREDI 2010, 43 with related bibliography.

<sup>19</sup> See SEEHER 2007, 711-715; MANUELLI 2016, 28-30.

<sup>20</sup> HAWKINS 2000, 575-576; MORA 2013, 270-272.

<sup>21</sup> HAWKINS 2000, 304-305.

<sup>22</sup> It suggests the following succession (HAWKINS 2000, 286-288): Kuzi-Tešub – PUGNUS-mili (I) – Runtyas – Arnuwantis (I) – PUGNUS-mili (II) – Arnuwantis (II).

This scenario raises several questions, such as: which one of these is the PUGNUS-mili who claims himself to be “King’s seed” on the reliefs from Arslantepe? And why are none of the characters bearing this name associated with any titulatures when mentioned by their descendants?

The annals of Tiglat-pileser I of Assyria provided some initial help in clarifying this tangled picture. They document for the year 1100 BC the receiving of tributes from a king called Allumari from Milidia, whose name might be identified with PUGNUS-mili of Malizi.<sup>23</sup> On the other hand, the investigations resumed since 2008 by the Italian expedition in the area of the “Lions Gate” at Arslantepe are providing new insights to better contextualize and to understand this historical development. The excavated sequence goes back to the 12<sup>th</sup> century BC, when the site was enclosed by a massive city wall.<sup>24</sup> A continuation of the fortification eastwards was identified during the 1960s and the presence of a gate-system can be assumed at the conjunction of the two areas.<sup>25</sup> This is further confirmed by the discovery in 2010 of two bas-reliefs found on a plastered floor associated with the enclosure and sealed by the collapse of the fortification wall.<sup>26</sup> The results of C14 analyses of organic samples from the destruction level allowed us to set the collapse of the wall at the end of the 11<sup>th</sup>/beginning of the 10<sup>th</sup> century BC.<sup>27</sup> The fortification wall had in any case a rather long life, from at least the mid-12<sup>th</sup> century BC. It seems plausible to assume that most of the Arslantepe figurative reliefs found reused in the “Lions Gate” or emerging for the surface of the mound might be originally located in this context.<sup>28</sup> The two new bas-reliefs revealed exact correspondence with other specimens discovered at the site in the past, allowing the reconstruction of a coherent sculptural group, the so-called “III Malatya Style”.<sup>29</sup> Their context of discovery suggests that they might represent the last phase of decorative renovation of the citadel of Arslantepe before the conflagration that brought an end to the settlement at the beginning of the 10<sup>th</sup> century BC.<sup>30</sup> In this perspective, the iconographic development of the Malatya sculptural cycles from approximately the early-12<sup>th</sup> to the early-10<sup>th</sup> century BC would correspond with an evolution

of the ideological and celebratory messages conveyed through the use of monumental representations.

### Images and words – Perpetuation and memory

These forms of visual and written communications were used during the Hittite imperial period on both steep rock facades and stone slabs.<sup>31</sup> The employment of monumental representations as the expression of political and ideological messages matches the spread of the Luwian hieroglyphic linguistic code, until then only used by the Hittites on the more modest glyptic surface.<sup>32</sup> This tendency towards monumentality that involved decorating citadel-gates and temples with massive sculptured orthostat programs, as well as engraving living rocks with impressive epigraphic and pictorial representations, has many possible explanations.<sup>33</sup> The phenomenon might be explained in the general framework of the increasing territorial scale of interaction and antagonism, as well as cultural and political networking and syncretism involving the Hittite court during the 14<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> centuries BC.<sup>34</sup> It prompted the Hittite kings and princes to develop proper forms of visual propaganda and to pursue a rhetoric of permanence in order to produce, in relation to specific and strategic places, a sort of collective identity.<sup>35</sup>

Following the Hittite glyptic model, anthropomorphic figures and inscriptions carved on monumental stone were interrelated through an exclusive relationship conceived as an univocal medium.<sup>36</sup> The inscriptions were not just meant to display the name of whoever was represented there or commissioned the work, they were also intended to permanently commemorate that person as well as memorialize a specific place.<sup>37</sup> Yet the monumental dimensions, such as those offered by the large stone surface, soon encouraged new spatial arrangements and innovative visual codes.<sup>38</sup> On one hand, the appearance of proper long inscriptions marked the development of the writing message. On the other hand, the texts underwent a process of oversimplification involving the simple use of those onomastic signs enabling the identification of their accompanying figures, as a label in a typical “vignette” style.<sup>39</sup>

<sup>23</sup> See HAWKINS 2000, 283 with related bibliography. For an identification with PUGNUS-mili II see also SIMON 2016.

<sup>24</sup> See LIVERANI 2012, 336-339; MANUELLI 2018, 146-150.

<sup>25</sup> PECORELLA 1975, 15-17; MANUELLI – MORI 2016, 220-222.

<sup>26</sup> MANUELLI 2016, 27-30.

<sup>27</sup> MANUELLI – MORI 2016, 220-221; MANUELLI 2018, 149-150.

<sup>28</sup> MANUELLI – MORI 2016, 220-222.

<sup>29</sup> ORTHMANN 1971, 94-95; MANUELLI – MORI 2016, 222-228. See also GILBERT 2015, 143-144.

<sup>30</sup> MANUELLI – MORI 2016, 225-226.

<sup>31</sup> See EHRINGHAUS 2005; KOHLMAYER 2011; SEEHER 2011; SCHACHNER 2013, 534-543; HARMAŇSAH 2015, 90-116.

<sup>32</sup> SEEHER 2009, 125-138; MARAZZI 2010, 219-224.

<sup>33</sup> See BONATZ 2007; SEEHER 2009, 136-138; GLATZ – PLOURDE 2011; HARMAŇSAH 2013, 153-180.

<sup>34</sup> See VAN DEN HOUT 2007; BRYCE 2012, 24-30.

<sup>35</sup> FELDMAN 2014, 67-76; HARMAŇSAH 2015, 93-100.

<sup>36</sup> SEEHER 2009, 129-130.

<sup>37</sup> ARROYO 2015-2016; HARMAŇSAH 2015, 100-110.

<sup>38</sup> See MARAZZI 2010, 241-245; PAYNE 2015, 75.

<sup>39</sup> The definition “iscrizione a fumetto” has been appropriately coined by M. MARAZZI (1990, 24).

The final development in the relationships between texts and images characterizes the period following the collapse of the Hittite empire. During the Iron Age a proliferation of stone monumental art is attested. Iconographic and textual repertoires were marked by a strong continuity with the Hittite prototypes. They reveal the intent of the new ruling class to adhere to a codified idea of political power and to legitimate their local authority by generating consensus and building forms of collective memory.<sup>40</sup> Long Luwian inscriptions were spread on stele and rock facades or, in association with carved figures, on stone reliefs, statues and protomes.<sup>41</sup> It is therefore interesting to stress the changing message linked to this form of art from the Late Bronze to the Iron Age. It switched from the desire to perpetuate and immortalize names or events, into the necessity of create specific awareness and memory of a glorious and heroic past. From a technical point of view, it is also significant that the whole set of surviving Hittite and post-Hittite stone inscriptions shows the presence of two different types of signs: three-dimensional carved “in-relief” signs and linear engraved “incised” ones. Despite the latter bearing a closer resemblance to the handwriting system than the first, their alternation seems not to be connected to any specific chronological or geographical issue.<sup>42</sup> Indeed, in-relief signs were preeminently used in both the Hittite and the post-Hittite period, while the incised ones, although equally occurring throughout time, were always less attested than the first. In this scenario, the case study of the relationships between images and words engraved on the monuments belonging to the “I Malatya Style” at Arslantepe is unique in the framework of the Syro-Anatolian world. Indeed, even though hieroglyphics are always realized in-relief, a fascinating repetition of incised signs on the same slab is observable. This combination of differently produced hieroglyphic signs clearly denotes a convention and reflects a kind of codified relationship existing with the associated carved images. Indeed, this co-occurrence is exclusively attested on those blocks where the name of the ruler PUGNUS-mili is related to the title “King’s seed”. This issue raises intriguing questions, such as: what was the meaning behind this repetition and what are the historical and ideological implications that can be inferred from this practice? Which contribution does it provide to the dynamic of relationships that intertwining texts and images?

<sup>40</sup> MAZZONI 2013, 472-473; FELDMAN 2014, 67-72.

<sup>41</sup> See HAWKINS 2000; PAYNE 2012.

<sup>42</sup> D’ALFONSO – PAYNE 2016, 108-109.

### PUGNUS-mili and the development of a sculptural program

To attempt a suitable response to these questions, I will examine the bas-reliefs in which the ruler PUGNUS-mili and the title “King’s seed” are attested using a comprehensive semantic approach that considers each monument in its entirety as a composite visual and epigraphic expression. Despite the fact that they are just a part of the Iron Age artworks discovered at the site and its surroundings, they represent an iconically coherent collection in terms of their visual and written message. The entire repertoire of figurative stone-sculptures coming from Arslantepe consists to date of a total of 26 specimens (Fig. 1).<sup>43</sup> On a total amount of 19 bas-reliefs, 10 belong to a homogeneous group, traditionally known as “I Malatya Style”.<sup>44</sup> The identification of the group has been made by technological, dimensional, iconographic and stylistic considerations, as well as the presence and type of inscription.<sup>45</sup> They are solid rectangular stone blocks all dressed on the front and the two side faces as well as on the top and the bottom, while the back side is left unworked. The blocks are characterized by the presence of dowel-holes drilled on the top and the bottom, which were needed to fasten the stones to longitudinal beams and integrate them into the wall superstructure.<sup>46</sup> The sizes are in general standardized within three-dimensional clusters.<sup>47</sup> Iconographically, the sculpted blocks are marked by the presence of ritual and religious themes, mostly involving libation scenes.<sup>48</sup> Stylistically, figures are carved in-relief with slightly bevelled and rounded edges, flat and even surfaces and a well-defined characterization of the anatomic details and the garments.<sup>49</sup> The whole collection is carved on its front side exclusively, with the exceptions of two specimens where figures are also engraved on one short face, most probably because of their use as corner blocks.<sup>50</sup>

<sup>43</sup> The chart here proposed is an update of the classification already offered by MANUELLI – MORI (2016, 223, fig. 7). It is basically developed from the system adopted by ORTHMANN (1971, 91-99, 519-523) with the proposal of a new numeration.

<sup>44</sup> From A1 to A10 in Fig. 1.

<sup>45</sup> See ORTHMANN 1971, 91-92; ÖZYAR 1991, 115-165; HAWKINS 2000, 306-313.

<sup>46</sup> ÖZYAR 1991, 133-135.

<sup>47</sup> Group one: A1, A2, A5, A7, A8. Group two: A3, A4, A6. Groups three: A9, A10.

<sup>48</sup> See POLI 2007.

<sup>49</sup> ORTHMANN 1971, 91-92.

<sup>50</sup> A3 and A7.

	Orthmann (1971)	Hawkins (2000)	Delaporte (1940)	Finding location	Dimension (H/L/TH.in.m)	Sculpted figures/theme	Type of inscription	Associated character and title
<b>BAS-RELIEFS</b>								
A1	A/3	MALATYA 9	B	Lions' Gate	0.36/0.61/0.25	Libation scene	In-relief and incised signs	PUGNUS-mili "King's seed"
A2	A/4	MALATYA 10	C	Lions' Gate	0.41/0.78/0.32	Libation scene	In-relief and incised signs	PUGNUS-mili "King's seed"
A3a	A/5a	MALATYA 11	D	Lions' Gate	0.46/1.27/0.74	Libation scene	In-relief and incised signs	PUGNUS-mili "King's seed"
A3b	A/5b		D	(face B of A3a)		Tutelary figure		
A4	A/6	MALATYA 12	E	Lions' Gate	0.45/1.01/0.43	Libation scene	In-relief signs	PUGNUS-mili
A5	A/7	MALATYA 6	I	Emerging from the <i>tell</i>	0.48/0.73/0.48	Libation scene	In-relief signs	Tuwatis "Princess(?)"
A6	A/8		H	Emerging from the <i>tell</i>	0.43/1.90/0.42	Mythological scene?		
A7a	A/9a		G	Emerging from the <i>tell</i>	0.48/0.69/0.43	Tutelary figure		
A7b	A/9b	MALATYA 5	G	(face B of A7a)		Libation scene	In-relief and incised signs	PUGNUS-mili "King's seed"
A8	A/10	MALATYA 7	J	Emerging from the <i>tell</i>	0.49/0.56/0.38	Libation scene	In-relief signs	PUGNUS-mili
A9	A/11	MALATYA 8	K	Emerging from the <i>tell</i>	0.87/1.95/0.65	Libation scene	In-relief and incised signs	PUGNUS-mili "King's seed"
A10				Unknown provenience	0.83/0.51/0.43	Libation scene?	In-relief and incised signs	PUGNUS-mili "King's seed"
B1	B/1	MALATYA 1	L	From the Orduzu village	0.43/0.78/0.17	Hunt scene	In-relief inscription	Halpasulupis "Lord"
B2	B/2	MALATYA 3	M	Unknown provenience	0.55/1.23/0.20	Hunt scene	In-relief inscription	Maritis
B3	B/3	MALATYA 2		From the Orduzu village	0.54/0.71/0.12	Hunt/banquet scene	In-relief and incised inscription	
C1a	C/1a			From the Orduzu village	0.68/0.53/0.50	Apotropaic creature		
C1b	C/1b			(face B of C1a)		Single-god image		
C1c	C/1c			(face C of C1a)		Naturalistic image		
C2	C/2			From the Orduzu village	0.75/0.39/0.44	Apotropaic creature		
C3	C/3			From the Orduzu village	0.69/0.91/0.55	Antithetic creature		
C4				Unknown provenience	0.68/0.52/0.30	Apotropaic creature		
C5				<i>In-situ</i> from A1278	0.66/0.53/0.32	Apotropaic creature		
C6				<i>In-situ</i> from A1278	0.68/0.82/0.37	Antithetic creature		
<b>PORTAL LIONS</b>								
D1	A/1		A	Lions' Gate	1.43/1.19	Tutelary figure		
D2	A/2	MALATYA 4	F	Emerging from the <i>tell</i>	1.24/1.43	Tutelary figure	Incised signs	Halpasulupis "King's seed"
<b>STELE</b>								
E1	B/4	MALATYA 13		Unknown provenience	1.30/0.90/0.32	Facing divinities	Incised inscription	
E2	D/1	MALATYA 14		From the neighbourhood of the site	0.60/0.45/0.20	Libation scene?	In-relief signs	PUGNUS-mili "King's seed"
<b>STATUES</b>								
F1	C/4			From the neighbourhood of the site	ht. 0.32	Statue head		
F2	C/5			From the neighbourhood of the site	ht. 0.42	Statue head		
F3	A/12		Statue	Lions' Gate	ht. 3.80	Standing statue		

Fig. 1: Classification of the Iron Age stone sculptures coming from Arslantepe and its vicinity

Nine bas-reliefs out of ten are characterized by the presence of Luwian inscriptions. These always consist of few hieroglyphic signs that simply specify the name and occasionally the title of the depicted figure in a "vignette" style. Inscriptions are always realized in-relief at the same height as the associated sculpted figures, testifying to a pre-established program wherein words and images were planned and perceived as part of a same shared message.

Eight out of nine of the inscribed bas-reliefs show the presence of the ruler name PUGNUS-mili (Fig. 2).<sup>51</sup> On six of these the name of PUGNUS-mili is attested in association with the title "King's seed".<sup>52</sup> Each time this combination of name and title is shown, the hieroglyphic inscription, originally realized in-relief, is

entirely or partially doubled with incised signs.<sup>53</sup> The presence of duplicated inscriptions has been already noted by scholars and taken to suggest the reuse of the artworks over time.<sup>54</sup> Nonetheless, this issue has never been comprehensively and suitably examined. Indeed, a proper attempt to create a sculpting sequence for the single blocks, one that considers the diverse stages in which images and texts were carved in order to establish different phases of use and reuse of the reliefs and a better evaluation of the kings' genealogies, has never been attempted.

<sup>51</sup> A1, A2, A3, A4, A7, A8, A9 and A10. It should be noted that besides these bas-reliefs, PUGNUS-mili is also attested on a broken stele (E2), see HAWKINS 2000, 313-314.

<sup>52</sup> A1, A2, A3, A7, A9 and A10.

<sup>53</sup> On reliefs A4 and A8 PUGNUS-mili is not associated with any title and the inscriptions are only carved in-relief. On the stele E2 the name of the ruler is associated with the title "King's seed" only carved in-relief, but the fragmentary nature of the artwork does not allow for any ultimate conclusions. Moreover, it should be considered that the title "King's seed" is incised on one of the portal lions of the "Lions Gate" (D2), in this instance in association with the name of the ruler Halpasulupis (HAWKINS 2000, 320-321).

<sup>54</sup> ÖZYAR 1991, 138-139; HAWKINS 2000, 306-313; POLI 2007, 303-304; POLI 2012, 213-214.



Fig. 2: Sculptures inscribed with the name PUGNUS-mili

First of all, three different groups of bas-reliefs can be identified based on the interplay between carved signs and images.

- In sculptures A1 and A2, PUGNUS-mili is depicted in front of the Storm-God, libating some liquid in his honour and followed by a young attendant driving a bull. The inscriptions “Storm-God of the city POCULUM-ta / PUGNUS-mili” (A1) and “Storm-God of the city Malizi / PUGNUS-mili” (A2) are carved in-reliefs and also incised, while the title “King’s seed” is only incised on both blocks after the name of the ruler.<sup>55</sup>

- In sculpture A7, PUGNUS-mili and his attendant are depicted. The king is libating in front of the God Imralli standing on his stag.<sup>56</sup> The inscription “The God Imralli the King / PUGNUS-mili” is carved in-relief, while the signs for “King’s seed” are incised following the name of the ruler.<sup>57</sup>

<sup>56</sup> The updated transcription of this theonym is now (DEUS) IMRA2+ra/i-lá/i that should be read “God Imralli” (RIEKEN – YAKUBOVICH 2010, 211-212) and replaces the previous interpretation of “God Parata” (HAWKINS 2000, 306-307). I thank Mark Weeden again for this update and related bibliographic references.

<sup>57</sup> There is consensus among scholars that the in-relief sign “King” should be seen here as referring to the God instead of the ruler himself (HAWKINS 2000, 307). This is also clear when looking at the distribution of the signs on the slab.

<sup>55</sup> See HAWKINS 2000, 320-322.



- On block A3 and A9, PUGNUS-mili, followed by his attendant, is pouring liquids for a procession of gods and goddesses (A3) and for a doubly-depicted Storm-God (A9). The inscriptions “King PUGNUS-mili King’s seed” (A3) and “Storm-God / King PUGNUS-mili King’s seed” (A9) are carved in-relief, while only a further sign for “seed” is incised.<sup>58</sup> The same scheme is reproduced on the fragmentary block A10, which seems to represent an exact duplication of A9.<sup>59</sup>

In summary, every time an inscription records “PUGNUS-mili”, the title “King’s seed”, or part of it, is always incised. Of course, this fact cannot only be a coincidence. It can neither be related to a lack of planning, nor to an act of carelessness and forgetfulness on the part of the sculptors. It is not the correction of some possible mistake, rather it shows that after the sculptures have been firstly carved there was some specific reason to add or duplicate some of the signs of the inscriptions. An interesting point of reflection is offered by the possibility of isolating the single carving activities in a logical sequence, so as to establish a more concrete evolution of the inscriptions in relation to their associated figures.

Five carving activities can be identified on the basis of the occurrence and association of in-relief and incised signs on each sculpted block.

- Blocks A1, A2 and A7 are sculpted with the name PUGNUS-mili only carved in-relief. The names and titles of the gods are realized with in-relief signs as well.
- On blocks A1 and A2 the whole inscription is duplicated with incised signs. Moreover, the title “King’s seed” is added with incised signs next to the name of the ruler.
- On block A7 the title “King’s seed” is added with incised signs next to the name of the ruler. The rest of the inscription is not reproduced.
- Blocks A3, A9 and A10 are sculpted with the inscription “King, King’s seed” already carved in-relief next to name of the ruler. On A9, the name of the god is realized with in-relief signs as well.
- On blocks A3, A9 and A10 the incised sign “seed” is added next to the in-relief sign of “King”.

Of course, ordering these activities in a proper temporal sequence is challenging, because the carving succession of the blocks is not always certain. What is sure, however, is that incised signs have been always carved on the slabs after those made in-relief. Following this, it is possible to hypothesize the existence of at least four different phases

of use of the bas-reliefs.

1) First, blocks A1, A2 and A7 were sculpted with their inscriptions only carved in-relief. In this phase the name of PUGNUS-mili was not associated with any title. The existence of this first phase is also supported by looking at the size, iconography and carving styles of the blocks.<sup>60</sup> Indeed, the three reliefs share the same dimensions and presence of figures defined by compact and heavy traits, which allow to cluster them in a rather homogeneous group. Nonetheless, some differences can also be stressed. Despite similarities, A7 displays a better definition of both the anatomic features and the garment of the king as well as the occurrence of the God Imralli in the scene. Moreover, A7 is the only relief in the whole repertoire where the libation is not poured into a jar. A1 and A2 seem to be instead basically identical. However, interesting reflections may arise considering the evolution of the hieroglyphic sign “TONITRUS” that is associated in both reliefs with the image of the Storm-God.<sup>61</sup> Indeed, on A2 the Storm-God still carries on his hand the W-like sign that is used in the Luwian script to depict his proper name, following a tradition attested during the Hittite imperial period.<sup>62</sup> In view of the other reliefs from Arslantepe, the Storm-God as well as other deities and figures bearing the three-pronged tool in their hand that might represent an iconographic evolution and stylization of the W-like sign.<sup>63</sup> In this scenario, A1 can represent a transitional phase and might have been carved slightly later than A2, since it shows the W-like sign for “TONITRUS” carried by the God on top of the above-mentioned three-pronged tool.<sup>64</sup>

2) Only later, blocks A1, A2 and A7 have been altered with the addition of the incised signs “King’s seed” next to the name of the ruler. On A1 and A2 the entire inscriptions previously made in-relief has been duplicated with incised signs as well. This should correspond to a phase during which PUGNUS-mili became to be associated with this specific title. In this context, it must be stressed that “King’s seed” is used by the “Country Lord” Suhi I at Karkemiš, at the beginning of the 10<sup>th</sup> century BC, to underline his kinship and consanguinity with the appointed “Great King” Ura-Tarhunta.<sup>65</sup> It seems plausible that the same title have

<sup>58</sup> See HAWKINS 2000, 309-310, 312.

<sup>59</sup> MORA 2013, 272-274.

<sup>60</sup> See ÖZYAR 1991, 129; POLI 2007, 305-306.

<sup>61</sup> See HAWKINS 1992.

<sup>62</sup> See BUNNENS 2006, 34-35 with related examples and bibliography.

<sup>63</sup> HAWKINS 1992, 57-58. It might represent an early version of the more canonical image of the smiting Storm-God with trident-thunderbolt that appears in the late-10<sup>th</sup> century BC, see BUNNENS 2006, 53, 111-118.

<sup>64</sup> HAWKINS 1992, 57.

<sup>65</sup> DİNÇOL *et al.* 2014, 148-151; HAWKINS – WEEDEN 2016, 11.

been previously used at Arslantepe by PUGNUS-mili in an attempt to emphasize his high rank and importance of his genealogy.

3) A third phase corresponds to the sculpting blocks A3, A9 and A10. They do not only show that the use of “King’s seed” was already codified, but also that, for the first time, PUGNUS-mili was a proper “King”, since both titles are carved in-reliefs on all blocks. The fact that these three blocks belong to a different sculptural program compared to the above-mentioned A1-A2-A7 group can be further supported by means of iconographic, stylistic and dimensional parameters. First of all, A3, A9 and A10 have a longer rectangular shape than A1, A2 and A7.<sup>66</sup> This provides more space for a larger number of figures and variations as seen in the later group, while the earlier group always depicts a one-to-one god-king offering scene. Moreover, although the iconographic details of the two groups are very similar, we can also note that stylistically A3 and A9 are characterized by slenderer, better modelled and more lively figures, especially when compared to A1 and A2. In addition, greater care was taken in realizing the hieroglyphic sign of the Storm-God on A9 in comparison with A1 and A2.<sup>67</sup>

4) There is finally a last phase during which a further incised sign, “seed”, is added on blocks A3, A9, A10 next to the primary in-relief carved inscription. It is difficult to explain why the three blocks A1, A2 and A7 were not modified during the last two phases. Two hypotheses can be proposed. The first that there was not enough space on these blocks for the addition of new signs next to the name of the king, and the second that there were no plans to integrate them into the last stage of refurbishing. Actually, a look at block A3 can challenge the first assumption. Here the sign “seed” has been incised in a very narrow surface, mostly using the outline already carved for the realization of the sign “King” and the cap of the ruler. This clearly emphasizes that if necessary, new signs might have been added even in almost invisible and clearly unsuitable spaces.

### **An ideology of reuse: emulation, legitimation and pragmatism**

The last issue allows broader considerations on the meaning of the reuse, which must clearly have been balanced between practical reasons and ideological purposes. The described cases from Arslantepe show that reusing can involve not just the sudden appropriation of an object produced earlier, but also its continuous use over

generations with the gradual introduction and addition of new distinctive features. In this context, it should be noted that the secondary use of sculpted monuments is a practice widely attested in antiquity. Indeed, the theme of reuse, emulation and appropriation of objects, images and especially monuments has become very popular in recent years and has been explored by scholars through many perspectives and in many different ages.<sup>68</sup> In the field of ancient Near East studies, the manipulation and reproduction of the past has been examined from several theoretical and ideological viewpoints pertaining to the transmission of knowledge as well as the desire to celebrate a golden age and to stimulate processes of collective memory and identity.<sup>69</sup> There are of course also clear cases based on undeniable utility, since it is easier to reuse materials that have been already shaped than to produce something entirely new.<sup>70</sup>

For the specific case of the Syro-Anatolian societies, it must be considered that practices of constant renewal of the decorative and ideological equipment of the citadels of several sites from the end of the Late Bronze Age to the Iron Age were common.<sup>71</sup> The renovation of the 11<sup>th</sup> century BC Storm-God temple at Aleppo with the incorporation of sculpted blocks that date back to the Hittite period is probably the most striking example of this practice.<sup>72</sup> Based on the early dating of the latter, a similar chronological assessment and related reuse of some of the sculptures that adorned the 12<sup>th</sup> century BC phase of the ‘Ain Dara sanctuary has been proposed.<sup>73</sup> Recently, it has also been suggested that the bas-reliefs of the “South Gate” at Zincirli might have originally been located at the nearby Pancarlı Höyük and later reused when the site was re-founded at the end of the 10<sup>th</sup> century BC.<sup>74</sup> Moreover, the development of the “Water Gate” at Karkemış from an earlier 2<sup>nd</sup> millennium BC prototype, including the renovation and refitting of its decorative apparatus, has been suggested.<sup>75</sup>

A related aspect still open to contradictory debate is instead the reuse of epigraphic monuments. At Tell Halaf, some of the so-called small-orthostates discovered in the 9<sup>th</sup> century BC “Temple-Palace” of Kapara present, next to the inscriptions belonging to this period, earlier epithets that might testify their reuse and the

<sup>66</sup> Although block A10 is fragmentary, it is possible to assume, based on its height, that it was very similar to block A9. Block A3, on the other hand, is shorter than A9-A10. In any case, A3 is definitively longer than A1-A2-A7 and it is unquestionably to be associated with A9 and A10.

<sup>67</sup> POLI 2007, 306.

<sup>68</sup> See BRILLANT – KINNEY 2011; FREY 2016, 9-44; DI PAOLO 2018a; JEVTIĆ – YALMAN 2018

<sup>69</sup> HARMANŞAH 2013, 180-183; FELDMAN 2014, 65-78; DI PAOLO 2018b.

<sup>70</sup> See examples in HAWKINS 2000, 492-493; ARO 2016; WEBER 2017, 87-91.

<sup>71</sup> HERRMANN 2019.

<sup>72</sup> KOHLMAYER 2013, 516-518.

<sup>73</sup> NOVÁK 2012.

<sup>74</sup> HERRMANN 2017, 261-265; HERRMANN 2019, 405-413

<sup>75</sup> ÖZYAR 1991, 102-105; ÖZYAR 1998, 634-635; GILIBERT 2011, 25-28.

later addition of engraved signs.<sup>76</sup> Instead, in the gate structures of the 8<sup>th</sup> century BC fortress of Azatiwata at Karatepe, some slabs controversially show traces of refitting and possible integration of later inscriptions next to pre-existing images.<sup>77</sup> Moreover, cases of objects carved with inscriptions that have been reused or altered over time are regularly attested. This is especially evident for portable items and luxury goods. During the Iron Age, a clear example is represented by the so-called inscribed “Speaking Bowls”, the reuse of which was intended as an extension of the memory of the owner over time.<sup>78</sup> The “Ankara Silver Bowl”, which recent studies date to the beginning of the 12<sup>th</sup> century BC, might have been used for a significant length of time and its inscribed texts added on different occasions.<sup>79</sup>

When considering objects with names carved on them, the best cases of reuse is represented by seals. Although this contradicts their main function, which has been traditionally understood as strictly related to a specific individual owner, there is clear evidence that seals were also used by people other than those named on them.<sup>80</sup> Indeed, seals could have been passed down from a generation to the next, mostly as an act of political legitimacy and identity. The most renowned case is represented by the “Dynastic Seals” of Mitanni, first carved with the name of a specific king and later reused by several of his successors to establish dynastic claims and express their right to rule.<sup>81</sup> It seems that the Hittite royal seals might have been also sometimes used after the death of the king whose name was engraved on them.<sup>82</sup> In this context, it is fascinating the presence of the so-called “Anonymous Tabarna Seals” of the Old Hittite Kingdom, which were probably used by some high-ranking local bureaucrats on behalf of the Hittite king in the specific cases of official land donation.<sup>83</sup> Moreover, texts from Emar were authenticated by means of seals originally belonged to ancestors or other persons related to their current owners.<sup>84</sup>

It can be said that borrowing or inheriting the seals connected the new owners with the previous users, establishing memories that consolidated communities through

time and space.<sup>85</sup> Unlike seals, which were used on documents to which only a restricted number of people had access, carved stone monuments were intended for public display and viewed by many individuals. Even though addressed to wider segments of the society, the reuse of the bas-reliefs, besides its obvious practical utility, also served to claim legitimacy by means of mnemonic messages.

#### **How many PUGNUS-mili are needed to make a relief?**

As seen, the presence of old sculptures in younger buildings, as well as the relocation and renovation of the artworks with the addition of new images and inscriptions, represents a natural tendency in the evolution of the Syro-Anatolian art. In this framework, the example of the bas-reliefs of PUGNUS-mili is a paradigmatic case of reuse. It suggests the existence of relationships with the past that are rather more complicated than the simple continuation of a tradition. On the one hand, it involved the appropriation and refurbishment of some previously manufactured artworks as an evident act of ideological interdependence with the past. On the other hand, it performed the manipulation and alteration of an already codified message of interplaying images and words, suggesting an ongoing process of innovation.<sup>86</sup>

It might be stressed that this succession and association of incised and in-relief carved signs also characterizes other monuments from Arslantepe and its territory besides those belonging to PUGNUS-mili. The stele from Darendé alongside the incised text also shows the presence of in-reliefs signs accompanying each single figure. A similar pattern is also visible on the stele from Işpekçür, where in-relief onomastic hieroglyphics and some additional incised signs coexist with the long primary incised inscription. They might both testify to different phases of carving and possibly reuse of the monuments.<sup>87</sup> Moreover, on a fragmentary hunting scene bas-relief found in the vicinity of Arslantepe, namely B3, some incised signs are placed alongside the in-relief text as a later addition for a new inscription that was probably never finished.<sup>88</sup>

But how might the scenario here described fit with what we know about the history of the Early Iron Age kings that ruled at Arslantepe and the kingdom of Malizi? The evolution in the use of specific titles in association with the name of PUGNUS-mili might reflect the growing authority and prominence achieved by the local rulers at the site from one generation to another (Fig. 3). Specifically, the existence of a first PUGNUS-mili whose name was not related to any title, as originally shown on the reliefs A1, A2 and A7 and confirmed by the inscriptions

<sup>76</sup> See GILBERT 2014, 42-43 with related bibliography and hypotheses.

<sup>77</sup> See ARO 2014, 24-27 with related bibliography and hypotheses.

<sup>78</sup> FELDMAN 2015, 299-300.

<sup>79</sup> See DUNFORD 2010; PAYNE 2015, 84-98, with related bibliographies and hypotheses.

<sup>80</sup> COLLON 2005, 123-130.

<sup>81</sup> See AUERBACH 1991 with related bibliography.

<sup>82</sup> See VAN DEN HOUT 1995, 559; HERBORDT – BAWANYPACK – HAWKINS 2011, 55.

<sup>83</sup> HERBORDT 2005, 27-28; RÜSTER – WILHELM 2012, 38-39.

<sup>84</sup> SINGER 1995.

<sup>85</sup> FELDMAN 2015, 299.

<sup>86</sup> See FELDMAN 2014, 70-72.

<sup>87</sup> POLI 2012, 212-214, 217-219.

<sup>88</sup> HAWKINS 2000, 327.

of his sons at Gürün, Kötükale and Ispekçür, might reflect an early phase during which no proper king ruled at the site, rather an official appointed by Kuzi-Tešub strictly dependent on Karkemiš.<sup>89</sup> In this framework, it seems reasonable to assume that Runtyas and Arnuwantis were appointed as “Country Lords” directly by Kuzi-Tešub, with different functions and roles compared to their father.<sup>90</sup> This is also emphasized by the references to Kuzi-Tešub in their own inscriptions, where they mostly stressed their lineage with the ruler who was the direct descendent of the “Great King” at Hattuša. Indeed, it must be also emphasized that Kuzi-Tešub always refers to himself as “King of Karkemiš” and exclusively on the inscriptions by Runtya at Gürün and Kötükale is he called “Great King”.<sup>91</sup>

The same PUGNUS-mili would have later refitted blocks A1, A2 and A7 with the duplication of the text and addition of the incised sign for “King’s seed”, maybe to further stress his blood relationship with the home of Kuzi-Tešub during the power void that occurred immediately after the death of the latter.<sup>92</sup> Even though none of the bas-reliefs from Arslantepe bear the name of Runtyas and Arnuwantis, the fact that the two “Country Lords” later became kings is known in one case from the *cretula* bearing the inscription “Run(yas), King of the land of Ma(lizi)” and in the other from Darende, where Arnuwantis II refers to his homonymous grandfather as a “King”.<sup>93</sup> They are the first rulers at the site that are specifically appointed with this title, probably as a result of the political independence that Malizi achieved from Karkemiš following the death of Kuzi-Tešub.<sup>94</sup>

<b>Ruler:</b>	<b>Title:</b>	<b>Mentioned in:</b>	<b>Carving Activity:</b>
1. Kuzi-Tešub	“King” & “Hero”	Seals from Lidar Höyük	
	“Great King”	Inscriptions from Gürün & Kötükale	
	“Hero”	Inscriptions from Gürün & Ispekçür	
2. PUGNUS-mili (I) (son of #1)	Phase 1: no title	Bas-reliefs A1, A2, A7 & A8? Inscriptions from Gürün, Kötükale & Ispekçür	➤ Carving A1, A2, A7 & A8?
	Phase 2: “King’s seed”	Bas-reliefs A1, A2 & A7 Stele E2?	➤ Refitting A1, A2 & A7 ➤ Carving E2?
3. Runtyas (son of #2)	Phase 1: “Country Lord”	Inscriptions from Gürün & Kötükale	➤ Carving Gürün & Kötükale
	Phase 2: “King”	Cretula from Arslantepe	
4. Arnuwantis (I) (son of #2 & brother of #3)	Phase 1: “King” & “Country Lord”	Inscriptions from Ispekçür	➤ Carving Ispekçür
	Phase 2: “King”	Inscription from Darende	
5. PUGNUS-mili (II) (son of #4)	Phase 1: no title	Bas-relief A4? Inscription from Darende	➤ Carving A4?
	Phase 2: “King” & “King’s seed”	Bas-reliefs A3, A9 & A10	➤ Carving A3, A9 & A10
	Phase 3?: “King’s seed”	Bas-reliefs A3?, A9? & A10?	➤ Refitting A3?, A9? & A10?
6. Arnuwantis (II) (son of #5)	“Country Lord”	Inscription from Darende	➤ Carving Darende

Fig. 3: Local rulers and associated titles evolution at Arslantepe and the kingdom of Malizi

<sup>89</sup> ÖZYAR 1991, 146.

<sup>90</sup> See HAWKINS 1995; GILIBERT 2015, 140; DINÇOL *et al.* 2016, 148-151 for the role of the “Country Lords”.

<sup>91</sup> ARO 2013, 256.

<sup>92</sup> The carving of the abovementioned fragmentary stele E2, where the name and title of PUGNUS-mili are realized in-relief, can be attributed to this phase as well.

<sup>93</sup> It must also be stressed that the inscription from Ispekçür refers to Arnuwantis as “King” and “Country-Lord”, emphasizing that the same character could also bear both titles.

<sup>94</sup> See BRYCE 2012, 102; HAWKINS–WEEDEN 2016, 10-11.

The inscription from Darendé also testifies that the second PUGNUS-mili underwent a phase during which he was not associated with any title. At that moment, he was probably still the direct successor to the throne of his father “King” Arnuwantis I, while his son Arnuwantis II was already appointed as a “Country Lord”. This shows that “Kings” and “Country Lords” must have coexisted, emphasizing a co-occurrence and a complexity of the ruling system that once again set a fascinating precedent for what would happen at Karkemiš from the 10<sup>th</sup> century BC.<sup>95</sup>

In this framework of growing political power, it seems reasonable to consider that when the second PUGNUS-mili ascended to the throne he commissioned the sculpting of his own new bas-reliefs, namely A3, A9 and A10, on which the new title “King” was carved in-relief next to the former “King’s seed”. It is hard instead to say when and why the second sign “seed” was incised on blocks A3, A9 and A10. Indeed, renovations and integrations may have been performed over both short- or long-term periods, as adjustments and manipulations to messages that were either codified or not. The symmetric arrangement of the titles on both sides of the name certainly recalls the so-called “Aedicula Seals” of the Hittite imperial period, in which the name of the ruler was framed by the hieroglyphic signs for “Great King” in the shape of Ionic columns and as a symbol of renewed power.<sup>96</sup> But arguing that the second sign “seed” has been added to pursue an idea of symmetry and emulation of a typical Hittite scheme, entails that the message carved on the reliefs had probably already lost part of its meaning. In fact, the addition of a further sign “seed” clearly implies a downgrading of the associated title and character, from a proper local king to just a direct kingsman.

Therefore, it seems difficult to support the fact that the same PUGNUS-mili should have carved these additional signs on his own reliefs and it is instead more reasonable to assume that the whole activity had happened in a later moment. In this framework, the possibility that at least from the 8<sup>th</sup> century BC, Malizi has been somehow again integrated under the power of Karkemiš must be stressed.<sup>97</sup> It can be thus speculated that the sign “seed” has been added on blocks A3, A9 and A10 during this period, under the reign of a third PUGNUS-mili or some other ruler.<sup>98</sup> The aim was probably to vanish and erase from the memory the independence of the local earlier ruler at Arslantepe and as an attempt to bring them back to their original subordinate role.

<sup>95</sup> See HAWKINS – PEKER 2014; GILIBERT 2015, 141; HAWKINS – WEEDEN 2016, 10-11.

<sup>96</sup> See HERBORDT – BAWANYPACK – HAWKINS 2011, 25.

<sup>97</sup> See HAWKINS – WEEDEN 2016, 14-15.

<sup>98</sup> The existence of a third PUGNUS-mili has been postulated by BRYCE (2012, 103-104). It led the scholar to think that PUGNUS-mili III is the author of the whole set of bas-reliefs from Arslantepe, a hypothesis that clearly clashes with the scenario reconstructed here.

The whole picture described here is clearly a complex historical puzzle still missing some pieces. It is actually still difficult to order some of the identified carving activities within a coherent sequence of events as well as to contextualize these into their proper historical scenario. Moreover, the logic behind some specific activity reconstructed here is still misleading and a full understanding of the whole carving process cannot leave aside the comprehensive analysis of the whole set of sculptures coming from the site. Indeed, before concluding, it is necessary to stress some of the main questions that still remain unsolved. First of all, there is still some doubt about where, in the above-mentioned sequence, we can place the bas-reliefs A4 and A8 in which only the name of PUGNUS-mili is carved in-relief with no additional incised signs. The dimensions, iconography and carving style suggest a similarity of A8 with A1 and A2, while A4 is definitively closer to the later A3 and A9. Is it possible that A8 and A4 belong to the two phases during which respectively PUGNUS-mili I and II were not rulers yet and that they were not reused when these gained their titles? A second delicate point, that goes slightly beyond the aim of this contribution, is related to the final position and discovery of the bas-reliefs within the 8<sup>th</sup> century BC “Lions Gate”. It must be remembered that only one sculpture stemming from the gateway or its vicinity bears on it a name different than PUGNUS-mili. This is one of the portal lions with the inscription “Halpasulupis, King’s seed”, namely D2.<sup>99</sup> Is it reasonable to assume that this last “King’s seed” was the one that commissioned the final reuse of A3, A9 and A10 and possibly integrated all the older reliefs into the “Lions Gate”? And if so, does it really make sense that this ruler decorated his own gate-system with a celebrative apparatus in which the name that mostly recurs is from one of his forerunners?

These questions offer new food for thought, suggesting that further developments and improvements are essential for a comprehensive understanding of the dynamics of political and social power that affected this site and its society at the dawn of the 1<sup>st</sup> millennium BC. The interplay between texts and figures allowed the creation of proper forms of kingship representation and personal celebration. The reuse of the carved architectural blocks shows how important it was to extend these messages over time with the aim of stimulating a collective memory and generating political legitimacy. Nonetheless, the whole process of carving, use, alteration and reuse did not always occur within a framework of coherent linearity. Indeed, innovations and modifications of the already codified means of communication allowed for the creation of new patterns that resulted in the establishment of new forms of tradition.

<sup>99</sup> The same name is mentioned in one of the hunting scenes bas-relief (B3) that might be dated to the late-11th century BC (HAWKINS – PEKER 2014, Tab. 1).

## Bibliography

- ARO 2013: S. ARO, Carchemish Before and After 1200 BC, in: A. MOUTON – I. RUTHERFORD – I. YAKUBOVICH (Hgg.), *Luwian Identities. Culture, Language and Religion Between Anatolia and the Aegean*, Leiden – Boston 2013, 233-277.
- ARO 2014: S. ARO, The Relief on the Slab NKL 2 at Karatepe-Azatiwataya: Neo-Assyrian Impact in Cilicia?, in: S. GASPA – A. GRECO – D. MORANDI BONACOSSO – S. PONCHIA – R. ROLLINGER (Hgg.), *From Source to History: Studies on Ancient Near Eastern Worlds and Beyond. Dedicated to Giovanni Battista Lanfranchi on the Occasion of his 65<sup>th</sup> Birthday on June 23, 2014*, Münster 2014, 11-31.
- ARO 2016: S. ARO, Dem Krieg trotzen. Die alte und aktuelle Situation der al-Qiqan Moschee in Aleppo und der Inschrift des Talmi-Šarruma an ihrer Wand, *Alter Orient aktuell* 14, 2016, 13-17.
- ARROYO CAMBRONERO 2015-2016: A. ARROYO CAMBRONERO, El significado simbólico del nombre en la cultura hitita y su relación con la figura a la que acompaña, in: J.M. CORDOBA – C. DEL CERRO – F.L. BORREGO (Hgg.), *De Egipto y otras tierras lejanas. Covadonga Sevilla Cueva In memoriam (= ISIMU. Revista sobre Oriente Próximo y Egipto ed la Antigüedad 18-19)*, Madrid 2015-2016, 379-390.
- AUERBACH 1991: E. AUERBACH, Heirloom Seals and Political Legitimacy in Late Bronze Age Syria, *Akkadika* 74-75, 1991, 19-36.
- BONATZ 2007: D. BONATZ, The Divine Image of the King: Religious Representation of Political Power in the Hittite Empire, in: M. HEINZ – M.F. FELDMAN (Hgg.), *Representations of Political Power: Case Histories from Times of Change and Dissolution Order in the Ancient Near East*, Winona Lake 2007, 111-136.
- BOSSERT 1942: H.Th. BOSSERT, *Altanatolien. Kunst und Handwerk in Kleinasien von den Anfängen bis zum völligen Aufgehen in der griechischen Kultur*, Berlin 1942.
- BRILLANT – KINNEY 2011: R. BRILLANT – D. KINNEY, *Reuse Value. Spolia and Appropriation in Art and Architecture from Constantine to Sherrie Levine*, Farnham 2011.
- BRYCE 2012: T. BRYCE, *The World of the Neo-Hittite Kingdoms: A Political and Military History*, Oxford 2012.
- BUNNENS 2006: G. BUNNENS, A New Luwian Stele and the Cult of the Storm-God at Til Barsip – Masuwari, Louvain – Paris – Dudley 2006.
- COLLON 2005: D. COLLON, *First impressions: cylinder seals in the ancient Near East (Rev. ed.)*, London 2005.
- D'ALFONSO – PAYNE 2016: L. COLLON – A. PAYNE, The Paleography of Anatolian Hieroglyphic Stone Inscriptions, *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 68, 2016, 107-127.
- DELAPORTE 1940: L. DELAPORTE, *Malatya I: fouilles de la mission archéologique française. Arslantepe, La Porte des Lions*, Paris 1940.
- DINÇOL *et al.* 2014: A. DINÇOL – B. DINÇOL – J.D. HAWKINS – N. MARCHETTI – H. PEKER, A stele by Suhi I from Karkemish, *Orientalia* 83/2, 2014, 143-153.
- DI PAOLO 2018a: S. DI PAOLO, Inquiry on the 'Unstable' Original – Copy Relation: Theoretical Foundations and Application Contexts, in: S. DI PAOLO (Hg.), *Implementing Meanings: The Power of Copy between Past, Present and Future. An Overview from the Ancient Near East (= Altertumskunde des Vorderen Orients Band 19)*, Münster 2018, 15-28.
- DI PAOLO 2018b: S. DI PAOLO, Copies and Degrees of Similarities: Accuracy in the Mimesis and its Violations in the Ancient Near East, in: S. DI PAOLO (Hg.), *Implementing Meanings: The Power of Copy between Past, Present and Future. An Overview from the Ancient Near East (= Altertumskunde des Vorderen Orients Band 19)*, Münster 2018, 29-70.
- DUNFORD 2010: S.P.B. DUNFORD, How old was the Ankara Silver Bowl when its inscriptions were added?, *Anatolian Studies* 60, 2010, 51-70.
- EHRINGHAUS 2005: H. EHRINGHAUS, *Götter, Herrscher, Inschriften. Die Felsreliefs der hethitischen Grossreichszeit in der Türkei*, Mainz am Rhein 2005.
- FELDMAN 2014: M.H. FELDMAN, *Communities of Style: Portable Luxury Arts, Identity and Collective Memory in the Iron Age Levant*, Chicago 2014.
- FELDMAN 2015: M.H. FELDMAN, Speaking Bowls: Early Iron Age Decorate Metal Bowls and the Inscription of Memory and Identity, *BAAL Hors-Series X*, 2015, 297-314.
- FREY 2016: J.M. FREY, *Spolia in Fortifications and the Common Builder in Late Antiquity*, Leiden – Boston 2016.
- GILIBERT 2011: A. GILIBERT, *Syro-Hittite Monumental Art and the Archaeology of Performance. The Stone Reliefs at Carchemish and Zincirli in the Earlier First Millennium BCE*, Berlin – New York 2011.
- GILIBERT 2014: A. GILIBERT, Death, Amusement and the City: Civic Spectacles and the Theatre Palace of Kapara, King of Gūzanā, *KASKAL* 10, 2014, 35-68.
- GILIBERT 2015: A. GILIBERT, Religion and Propaganda under the Great Kings of Karkemiš, in: A. D'AGOSTINO – V. ORSI – G. TORRI (Hgg.), *Sacred Landscape of Hittites and Luwians*, Florence 2015, 137-155.
- GIUSFREDI 2010: F. GIUSFREDI, Sources for a socio-economic history of the Neo-Hittite states (= *Texte der Hethiter* 28), Heidelberg 2010.

- GLATZ – PLOURDE 2011: C. GLATZ – A.M. PLOURDE, Landscape monuments and political competition in Late Bronze Age Anatolia: An investigation of costly signalling theory, *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 361, 2011, 35-66.
- HARMAŃSAH 2011: Ö. HARMAŃSAH, Moving landscapes, making place: cities, monuments and commemoration at Malizi/Melid, *Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology* 24/1, 2011, 55-83.
- HARMAŃSAH 2013: Ö. HARMAŃSAH, *Cities and the Shaping of Memory in the Ancient Near East*, Cambridge 2013.
- HARMAŃSAH 2015: Ö. HARMAŃSAH, *Place, memory, and healing: an archaeology of Anatolia rock monuments*, London – New York 2015.
- HAWKINS 1992: J.D. HAWKINS, What does the Hittite Storm-God hold?, in: D.J.W. MEIJER (Hg.), *Natural Phenomena. Their Meaning, Depiction and Description in the Ancient Near East*, Amsterdam – Oxford – New York – Tokyo 1992, 53-82.
- HAWKINS 1995: J.D. HAWKINS, “Great Kings” and “Country Lords” at Malatya and Karkamiš, in: Th. VAN DEN HOUT – J. DE ROOS (Hgg.), *Studio historiae ardens. Ancient Near Eastern studies presented to Philo H.J. Houwink ten Cate on the occasion of his 65<sup>th</sup> Birthday (= PIHANS 74)*, Leiden 1995, 73-86.
- HAWKINS 2000: J.D. HAWKINS, *Corpus of hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions*, Berlin 2000.
- HAWKINS 2002: J.D. HAWKINS, Anatolia: The End of the Hittite Empire and After, in: E.A. BRAUN-HOLZINGER – H. MATTHÄUS (Hgg.), *Die nahöstlichen Kulturen und Griechenland an der Wende vom 2. zum 1. Jahrtausend v.Chr.: Kontinuität und Wandel von Strukturen und Mechanismen kultureller Interaktion*, Paderborn 2002, 143-152.
- HAWKINS – PEKER 2014: J.D. HAWKINS – H. HAWKINS, Karkemish in the Iron Age, in: N. Marchetti (Hg.), *Karkemish. An Ancient Capital on the Euphrates*, Bologna 2014, 107-110.
- HAWKINS – WEEDEN 2016: J.D. HAWKINS – M. WEEDEN, Sketch history of Karkemish in the earlier Iron Age (Iron I-IB), in: T.J. Wilkinson – E. Peltenburg – E.B. Wilkinson (Hgg.), *Carchemish in Context: The Land of Carchemish Project, 2006-2010*, Oxford – Philadelphia 2016, 9-21.
- HERBORDT 2005: S. HERBORDT, Die Prinzen- und Beamtensiegel der hethitischen Grossreichszeit auf Tonbullen aus dem Nišantepe-Archiv in Hattusa (= Boğazköy-Hattuša 19), Mainz am Rhein 2005.
- HERBORDT – BAWANYPACK – HAWKINS 2011: S. HERBORDT – D.Y. BAWANYPACK – J.D. HAWKINS, Die Siegel der Grosskönige und Grossköniginnen auf Tonbullen aus dem Nišantepe-Archiv in Hattusa (= Boğazköy-Hattuša. Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen XXIII), Mainz 2011.
- HERRMANN 2017: V.R. HERRMANN, Appropriation and Emulation in the Earliest Sculptures from Zincirli (Iron age Sam'al), *American Journal of Archaeology* 121/2, 2017, 237-74.
- HERRMANN 2019: V.R. Herrmann, The Reuse of Orthostats and Manipulation of Memory in the Iron Age Syro-Hittite Kingdoms, *Semitica* 61, 2019, 399-439.
- JEVTIĆ – YALMAN 2018: I. JEVTIĆ – S. YALMAN (Hgg.), *Spolia Reincarnated. Afterlives of Objects, Materials, and Spaces in Anatolia from Antiquity to the Ottoman Era*, Istanbul 2018.
- KOHLMEYER 2011: K. KOHLMEYER, Building Activities and Architectural Decoration in the 11th Century BC. The Temple of Taita, King of Padasatini / Palistin in Aleppo and 'Ain Dārā, in: K. STROBEL (Hg.), *Empires after the Empire: Anatolia, Syria and Assyria after Suppiluliuma II (ca. 1200-800/700 B.C.) (= Eothen 17)*, Florence 2011, 255-280.
- KOHLMEYER 2013: K. KOHLMEYER, The Temple of the Storm-God of Aleppo, in: W. ORTHMANN – MATTHIAE – M. AL-MAQDISSI (Hgg.), *Archéologie et Histoire de la Syrie I. La Syrie de l'époque néolithique à l'âge du fer*, Wiesbaden 2013, 511-524.
- LIVERANI 2012: M. LIVERANI, Melid in the Early and Middle Iron Age: Archaeology and History, in: G. GALIL – A. GILBOA – A.M. MAEIR – D. KAHN (Hgg.), *The Ancient Near East in the 12<sup>th</sup>-10<sup>th</sup> Centuries BCE. Culture and History*, Münster 2012, 327-344.
- MANUELLI 2016: F. MANUELLI, What remains when contact breaks off? Survival of knowledge and techniques in material culture of the peripheral regions of the Hittite Empire after its dissolution, in: E. FOIETTA – C. FERRANDI – E. QUIRICO – F. GIUSTO – M. MORTARINI – J. BRUNO – L. SOMMA (Hgg.), *Cultural & Material Contacts in the Ancient Near East*, Turin 2016, 26-35.
- MANUELLI 2018: F. MANUELLI, Drifting Southward? Tracing Aspects of Cultural Continuity and Change in the Late 2<sup>nd</sup> Millennium BC Syro-Anatolian Region, *Studia Eblaitica* 4, 2018, 139-186.
- MANUELLI – MORI 2016: F. MANUELLI – L. MORI, The king at the gate. Monumental fortifications and the rise of local elites at Arslantepe at the end of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Millennium BCE, *Origini* 39, 2016, 209-242.
- MARAZZI 1990: M. MARAZZI, *Il geroglifico anatolico. Problemi di analisi e prospettive di ricerca*, Rome 1990.

- MARAZZI 2010: M. MARAZZI, Scrittura, percezione e cultura: qualche riflessione sull'Anatolia in età Hittita, *KASKAL* 7, 2010, 219-255.
- MAZZONI 2013: S. MAZZONI, Arts and Cross-Cultural Communication in the Early 1<sup>st</sup> Millennium: The Syro-Anatolian Contact, in: K.A. YENER (Hg.), *Across the Border: Late Bronze-Iron Age Relations between Syria and Anatolia*, Leuven – Paris – Walpole 2013, 465-492.
- MORA 2013: C. MORA, Seals and seal impressions, in: F. MANUELLI (with contributions by L. BARTOSIEWICZ – G. BOZZETTI – S. BÖKÖNY – A. BUCCOLIERI – R. LAURITO – C. LEMORINI – C. MORA – A. SERRA – G. SIRACUSANO), *Arslantepe IX. Late Bronze Age. Hittite Influence and Local traditions in an Eastern Anatolian Community*, Rome 2013, 251-274.
- NOVÁK 2012: M. NOVÁK, The Temple of 'Ain Dāra in the Context of the Imperial and Neo-Hittite Architecture and Art, in: J. KAMLAH (Hg.), *Temple Building and Temple Cult. Architecture and Cultic Paraphernalia of temples in the Levant (2.-1. Mill. B.C.E.)*, Wiesbaden 2012, 41-54.
- ORTHMANN 1971: W. ORTHMANN, *Untersuchungen zur späthethitischen Kunst*, Bonn 1971.
- ORTHMANN 2002: W. ORTHMANN, Die Bildkunst Übergang von der Großreichszeit zur späthethitischen Periode, in: E.A. BRAUN-HOLZINGER – H. MATTHÄUS (Hgg.), *Die nahöstlichen Kulturen und Griechenland an der Wende vom 2. zum 1. Jahrtausend v. Chr.: Kontinuität und Wandel von Strukturen und Mechanismen kultureller Interaktion*, Paderborn 2002, 153-159.
- ÖZYAR 1991: A. ÖZYAR, *Architectural relief sculpture at Karkemish, Malatya, and Tell Halaf: A technical and iconographic study*, Ph.D. diss., Bryn Mawr College 1991.
- ÖZYAR 1998: A. ÖZYAR, The Use and Abuse of Re-use at Karkemish, in: G. ARSEBÜK – M.J. MELLINK – W. SCHIRMER (Hgg.), *Light on Top of the Black Hill. Studies presented to Halet Çambel*, Istanbul 1998, 633-640.
- PAYNE 2012: A. PAYNE, *Iron Age Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions*, Atlanta 2012.
- PAYNE 2015: A. PAYNE, *Schrift und Schriftlichkeit. Die anatolische Hieroglyphen Schrift*, Wiesbaden 2015.
- PECORELLA 1975: P.E. PECORELLA, *Malatya III. Rapporto preliminare delle campagne 1963-1968. Il livello eteo imperiale e quelli neoetei*, Rome 1975.
- POLI 2007: P. POLI, Le territoire de Malatya à l'époque post-hittite: matériaux et documents pour la reconstruction de son histoire et sa culture, *Akh Purattim* 2, 2007, 299-319.
- POLI 2012: P. POLI, A margine di alcune iscrizioni e raffigurazioni di epoca neo-ittita, in: P. COTTICELLI KURRAS – M. GIORGIERI – C. MORA – A. RIZZA (Hgg.), *Interferenze linguistiche e contatti culturali in Anatolia tra il II e I millennio a.C. Studi in Onore di Onofrio Carruba in occasione del suo 80° compleanno (= Studia Mediterranea 24)*, Genova 2012, 43-67.
- RIEKEN – YAKUBOVICH 2010: E. RIEKEN – I. YAKUBOVICH, The new value of Luwian signs L 319 and L 172, in: I. SINGER (Hg.), *Ipamati kistamati pari tumatimis. Luwian and Hittite Studies presented to J. David Hawkins on the occasion of his 70<sup>th</sup> birthday*, Tel Aviv 2010, 199-219.
- RÜSTER – WILHELM 2012: Ch. RÜSTER – G. WILHELM, *Landschenkungsurkunden hethitischer Könige (= Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 4)*, Wiesbaden 2012.
- SCHACHNER 2013: A. SCHACHNER, On the Development of Hittite Art and its Social Functions, in: M. DOĞAN-ALPARSLAN – M. ALPARSLAN (Hgg.), *Hittites. An Anatolian Empire*, Istanbul 2013, 534-564.
- SEEHER 2007: J. SEEHER, Eine Kultvase mit der Darstellung des Wettergottes von Halab aus Hattuša, in: M. ALPARSLAN – M. DOĞAN-ALPARSLAN – H. PEKER (Hgg.), *VITA. Festschrift in Honor of Betis Dinçol and Ali Dinçol*, Istanbul 2007, 707-719.
- SEEHER 2009: J. SEEHER, Der Landschaft sein Siegel aufdrücken – hethitische Felsbilder und Hieroglypheninschriften als Ausdruck des herrscherlichen Mach- und Territorialanspruchs, *Altorientalische Forschungen* 36, 2009, 119-139.
- SEEHER 2011: J. SEEHER, *Gods Carved in Stone. The Hittite Rock Sanctuary of Yazılıkaya*, Istanbul 2011.
- SIMON 2016: Z. SIMON, Wer war Allumari, König von Malatya?, *Anatolica* XLII, 2016, 67-76.
- SINGER 1995: I. SINGER, Borrowing Seals at Emar, in: J. GOODNICK WESTENHOLZ (Hg.), *Seals and Sealing in the Ancient Near East*, Jerusalem 1995, 57-64.
- VAN DEN HOUT 1995: T.P.J. VAN DEN HOUT, Tutdaliya IV. und die Ikonographie hethitischer Großkönige des 13. Jh., *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 52, 1995, 545-573.
- VAN DEN HOUT 2007: T.P.J. VAN DEN HOUT, Institutions, Vernaculars, Publics: The Case of Second Millennium Anatolia, in: S.L. SANDERS (Hg.), *Margins of Writing, Origins of Cultures*, Chicago 2007, 221-262.
- WEBER 2017: M. WEBER, Two (?) Lion Reliefs from Iron Age Moab: Further Evidence for an Architectural and Intellectual Koiné in the Levant, *Bulletin of the American Schools of the Oriental Research* 377, 2017, 85-106.
- YAZICI 2015: E. YAZICI, *Voice of Sculptures: Hittite / Neo-Hittite World*, Istanbul 2015.



### Figure Captions

Fig. 1: Classification of the Iron Age stone sculptures coming from Arslantepe and its vicinity.

Fig. 2: Sculptures inscribed with the name PUGNUS-mili (adapted from: A1, DELAPORTE 1940, pl. XIX.1; A2, DELAPORTE 1940, pl. XIX.2; A3, YAZICI 2015, 52; A7, BOSSERT 1942, 185: 775; A9, DELAPORTE 1940, pl. XXIV; A10, MORA 2013, 273; A4, YAZICI 2015, 56; A8, BOSSERT 1942, 185: 772; E2, PECORELLA 1975, tav. LXV).

Fig. 3: Local rulers and associated titles evolution at Arslantepe and the kingdom of Malizi.