Chapter 15

Central East: Philology

Aygül Süel – Ankara Üniversitesi
Mark Weeden – SOAS, University of London

This chapter deals with toponyms associated with the areas to the immediate east of Hattuša, thus the eastern side of the plain of Alaca, the Kümbet Plain, the plains of Maşat and Zile as well as the Çeşerek and Özderesi valleys and the accompanying mountain ranges of the Karadağ and Buzluk Dağları. It thus largely overlaps with the area covered archaeologically by chapter 5 (Central East: Archaeology), although discussion of place-names closer to Hattuša, such as Arinna and Tahurpa, are to be found in chapter 14 (Hattuša and environs). The current chapter concentrates on toponyms found in connection with the centres Ortaköy-Şapinuwa and Maşathöyük-Tapikka. In both of these cases excavations have provided textual evidence that has led to an identification of the name of the settlement, in one case certainly, in the other with great likelihood. The remit of the chapter also borders the area discussed in that dealing with the “Upper Land”, and includes discussion of a number of toponyms usually associated with that region.

The evidence available for the discussion of the historical geography of this area consists mainly of data from the cuneiform texts from Boğazköy, Ortaköy and Maşathöyük, although in each case the text-genres are quite different. From Boğazköy the place-names are mentioned in historical texts concerning campaigns, in letters, omens, ritual and festival texts. A particularly important genre in this case are itineraries contained in oracular queries. These are questions to be answered by various oracular methods such as bird-observation, extispicy and KIN-oracles. The questions often have a similar form and content to each other. If the differences between itineraries contained in these texts are in fact small differences in directions for campaigns, among other things, then these fragmentary texts have a potentially high significance for the study of geography.¹ There is, however, still much that is poorly understood about the genre. The relevant textual distribution from Ortaköy seems to be mainly letters, omens and ritual texts, particularly those with a Hurrian background. According to the assessment thus far, all Ortaköy tablets belong to the late Middle Hittite period and are associated with the reign of Tudhaliya II (III). The Maşat texts that can be used for geographical research are mainly letters, along with a small number of economic documents, and also date to that king’s reign. Later classical and medieval texts, cult practices and place-names are also employed for comparison in research on this area, although these are of course to be used with the utmost caution.

Place-names relating to the sphere of Şapinuwa

The identification of Şapinuwa with the area discovered by survey and excavated near Ortaköy in the Çorum area (see chapters 3 and 5) has been made possible by the more than 4,000 tablets and fragments that have been found there in excavations. The name is mentioned frequently in the Ortaköy tablets, although all the contexts have not yet been published. The evidence for the identification has been collected by A. Süel, and is considered certain.² Perhaps one of the most striking elements is the fact that Boğazköy tablets of the Hurrian ḫalazi (“mouth-washing”) series refer to a longer version of the series, with twenty-two tablets as opposed to ten, which had been brought from Şapinuwa.³ Now it appears that parts of a longer version of the ritual have been found at Ortaköy, while the shorter version also clearly existed there.⁴ The colophon from Boğazköy also

¹ Haas 2008: 105-119.
² Süel 1995.
³ KBo 21.44 rev. 8'-12' // KBo 21.43 rev. 5'-7'.
⁴ De Martino, Murat and Süel 2013; de Martino and Süel 2015: 15-17.
refers to an *itkalzi* ritual performed at the king’s behest in the town of Zithara, which is thought to be in the region of Hanhana.5

KUB 38.7 is held to inform us about aspects of the cult of Šapinuwa.6 However, the traces of the place-name on the tablet at the beginning of the section are such as to exclude a full writing of the name Šapinuwa.7 Nevertheless, a number of names of divinities and places are contained in the section which are associated with the area in other texts, although not always in a straightforward manner: Mt Kuwarri (l. 16'); the deity Šuppiluliyûa (l. 12'); the river Zuliyû (l. 18'); the town Taptiqa (l. 20'?).8 A Hurrian tablet, KBo 15.62(+KBo 17.86), has a list of mountains which are “mountains, all of them of the land of Šapinuwa.” Those which are readable are: Halu'[na?]̣; Harana; Tahanzî[ya?]; Šarwa; Lapaš'nûnuwa; Hazalînû; Maššûnuwa.9 Offering tablets mention sacrifices to the male gods of Šapinuwa,10 and a text recently joined by C. Corti appears to detail offerings of bulls and loaves of the Houses of Šapinuwa and of a town called Zikkapara, which may or may not be in its vicinity.11

The Annals of Muršûli II inform us that the king reviewed his troops in Šapinuwa before leading them on campaign.12 The places visited by the campaign are the city of Ta/uhmûtnara, the lands of Kaškama and Šuḫurriya, followed by the land of Huršama and the city of Ta/uhmîtnara. Three of these occur again in the Annals as cities or countries which attack Ḥattuša from the direction of Ḥakpiš, as opposed to other enemies which attack from the area of Durmitta.13 Assuming a location of Ḥakpiš up towards but south of Nerik in the northeast, this gives a credible location for these areas somewhere north of the Karadaš range towards Merzîfûn or Amasya.14 The line of mountains of the Karadaš would have offered protection and cover for a mustering prior to a sortie in those directions.15

The oracle query KUB 22.51 obv. 10-15 has the kind (subject assumed) sleeping at Šapinuwa, but the army resting at Hanziwa, before proceeding “down past” (*kattan arha*) the town of Šuppiluliyûa and attacking the town of Šahuzzîniššû.16 He sends a deputy to attack Tahašta from there and other officers to attack the same town from Mt(?) Kuwarînî as well as from the city of

---

5 KBo 21.44 rev. 8' // KBo 21.43 rev. 3'. See Corti, this volume; Kryszeñ 2016: 185-187, with rejection of the hypothesis of two towns named Zithara.
7 KUB 38.7 rev. iii 10' *ira* ša-pi'-x(-x)-az'-x. Photo: BoFN 02096b. An abbreviation is possible.
8 See Forlanini 2008b: 147 with notes for discussion. Taptiqa, for which the reading is very uncertain, might be related to the Taptiûka known from Mašṭathûyûkû, which could also be related to Taptakka, that has itself been compared with the unlocated Persian district of Amasya called Daptakane, known from an inscription in Yassuçal. See Alp 1991b: 43-44; Forlanini 1997a: 405-6; id. 2002: 263 (at or in the region of the Kocamanîtepe);
9 KBo 15.62+ obv. ii (1') HUR.SA[G ...] (2') HUR.SAG uk-[-...] (3') HUR.SAG pu-u[š-ku-ru-nu-wa?] (4') HUR.SAG ha-la-u-n[a?] (5') HUR.SAG ha-ra-na (6') HUR.SAG ta-ar-zi[-ya?] (7') HUR.SAG ša-a-ar-wa (8') HUR.SAG la-pa-šu-nu-wa (9') HUR.SAG ha-za-al-mu (10') HUR.SAG šu-wa HUR.SAG* MES[-n[-n]] (11') šu-wa-ni-el-la (12') mu-in-ne-bi-na.
11 Bo 4949+Bo 6108 r. col. 37', 48'. Cf. LUB[MEŠ] URU za-ga-pu-ra KUB 40.96 iii? 16. Information courtesy C. Corti. Possibly compare the place name *URU za-ga-pu-ra* in HKM 102 (see below), which might belong to an area relevant to but outside of the direct administrative reach of Mašṭathûyûkû, in the same way that Kammama could also be said to be.
12 KBo 7.17+KBo 16.13 i 5-13.
14 See discussions of Ḥakpiš/Hakmiš and Ištahara by Corti, this volume; furthermore Murat 2008.
15 A location of Ḥakpiš at Doğantepe directly to the northwest of the Karadaš range, one of the options considered at Alparslan 2010: 38 (see Glatz this volume fn. 76), would entail that the other sites mentioned by Muršûli II are to be found in the corridor reaching along the Çekerek northeast from Ortaköy–Šapinuwa, or possibly in the parallel valley between the Kırlar mountains and Karadaš. This would mean a somewhat restricted radius of his campaign, but is not inconceivable.
Kammama. The continuation of a parallel oracle query (KUB 50.108, 16') mentions “the next day” (lukkattima), from which A. Kryszeń infers that the action mentioned previously (passing Ṣuppišuliya and the attack on Šahuzimiša and Tahašta) all happened within a day, in which case all these places (Šapinuwa, Hanziwa, Ṣuppišuliya, Šahuzimiša and Tahašta) would have to be close to each other. J. Börker-Klähn has supposed that Ṣuppišuliya, which is used as a name for a river or spring, a deity, as well as a town, should be found in the region of the settlement complex at Kazankaya south of the Çekerek canyon. If this were the case, we might expect Hanziwa to be on the other side of the steep hill separating Kazankaya from Ortaköy-Šapinuwa, possibly in the region of Yuğhöyük, just on the other side of the Özdereşi from the main building complexes at Ortaköy-Šapinuwa. This is a strategically fitting location.

A further possibility is that Hanziwa is located at the southern end of the Çekerek canyon near Kazankaya itself, where the mouth of the canyon offers an appropriate environment to station an army. This would mean that Hanziwa was on the other side of the Buzluk-Alan Dağlıları from Ortaköy-Šapinuwa, and there are some other indications that this might be the case (see below). Ṣuppišuliya and the other sites would then need to be somewhere else, although likely in this same region. Problematic in both these localisations is that the Kazankaya group of mounds and cemetery are Middle Bronze Age/Old Hittite, thus not contemporary with the 13th century omen queries. The eventual location of Ṣuppišuliya obviously has ramifications for the location of the other place-names, the only otherwise well attested one of which is Kammama, which seems to be one of the three directions, along with Ṣuppišuliya and Mt(?) Kuwarina, from which Tahašta is being attacked. It seems possible that Tahašta is thus somewhere to the north of Mašathöyük.

A text from Ortaköy-Šapinuwa gives a number of intriguing details with regard to Kammama. A portion of the tablet has been published thus far in transliteration and Turkish translation. The tablet lists cities where sacrifices are to be offered and apparently mountainous routes between them, which could conceivably be special cultic routes rather than the normal way one would go.

---

9° I road (is) from (the town of) Iškamah, and (it goes) via Mt Uşnaïtena, (it is) Hanziwa, (it is) Anziliya

---

17 See Kryszeń 2016: 329-330. The parallel oracle query KUB 50.108, 7'-12' has the same run of events as far as the mention of Tahašta, after which the query diverges. Tahašta is otherwise mentioned in a fragmentary and uninformative context in a letter from Mašathöyük: HKM 40, 6' (Alp 1991b: 192); it is “oppressed”? on the left (GUB-la) coming from Katapa in oracle itinerary KUB 40.99, and mentioned in unclear context, most likely another oracle itinerary, at KBo 43.63, 4’ (annalistic fragment at de Martino 2003: 155 fn. 428; Forlanini 2008b: 179 fn 18). KUR ku-va-ri-na-za is interpreted as a mountain(-land) by Forlanini (2008b: 146), as a mountain by Kryszeń (loc. cit.), but as a country by Imparati (1999: 159). Forlanini 2008b: 146-7 with fn. 19 refers to HUR.SAG ku-wa-ar-ri (KUB 38.7 iii 16’), which might be mentioned in the same tablet as belonging to the cult of Šapinuwa, as is also the Zuliya river (but see above). For the restricted and rare use of KUR to determine Hurrian mountain names see Gonnet 1968: 96; Weeden 2011a: 528.


19 Börker-Klähn 2014, using a supposedly continued cult of a divinised spring Ṣuppišuliya as evidence (see KUB 38.7 iii 18’), given that a Hellenistic period relief relating to the cult of the Persian Anaitis was found in the canyon, although rather towards its north (Atalay and Ertekin 1986; Summerer 2006). This is also roughly the area, namely on the middle Çekerek, in which G. Barjamovic (2011: 283-284) supposes Ṣuppišuliya to have been on the basis of Old Assyrian evidence. Note, Barjamovic (2011: 284 fn. 118) supposes that KUB 22.51 and KUB 50.108 give evidence that Šapinuwa was on a river called the Ṣuppišuliya. This is not the case, the place-name is clearly a settlement (URU) in this text.

20 Forlanini 2008b: 146 comes to the opposite conclusion, namely that it must be located to the west or northwest of Ortaköy-Šapinuwa. However, there is no candidate for a Mt Kuwarina in this area, unless it is the hilly area at the southwestern stretch of the Karadağ range or the Kırlar Dağı just to the northwest of the Karadağ.


22 The transliteration at Süel 2005: 682 has ššššš, followed by Kryszeń 2016: 335, while the translation has “Iškamah”. As per the translation in Süel (loc. cit.) the tablet has šššššššš.
The syntax of the passage is dense. It is not entirely clear what the function of the cases is: from town X (ablative), via/in/at Mountain (dative-locative), town Y (nominative). Possibly the offerings are to be made at the towns in the nominative being brought from the towns in the ablative via the named mountains. This would mean that there were three possible routes between Kammama and Anziliya. It would also mean that one could get to both Anziliya and Hanzwiwa via Mt Uşnaïttena. Anziliya has been associated with Zile (classical Zela), despite doubts concerning the 2nd millennium occupation of the mound there. It may be part of the same region as Maşatöyük, probably being attested in two Maşat economic documents (HKM 104 and 107) as Inzili, although it is difficult to know what to make of this. If Hanzwiwa is close enough to Ortaköy-Şapinuwa for the army to be stationed there while the king stays at the city, then Mt Uşnaïttena would have to be part of the Buzluk Dağları range, which could be said to link locations on the east and on the west of the chain.

However, many questions remain regarding the other mountain names, especially if Anziliya is at the northeast of the Buzluk Dağları, as it would be if it were near modern Zile, and Hanzwiwa were at its southeast or southwest. İskamaha is attested in at least two further tablets from Ortaköy and was probably also nearby. It is also mentioned along with the group Makkewaliya, Katapa and Tahașta in the oracle itinerary KUB 40.99, where Tahașta and İskama[ha] may both be being attacked. Kammama is also mentioned, but in a different group belonging to operations on the next day (lukkattima). The fact that Kammama is associated in the Ortaköy text with two places that must have been near Şapinuwa should also indicate that it was also in the region west of the Buzluk mountains, probably in in the area of the Göynücek plain, although there seem to be more than one route from there in the direction of Anziliya. Possibly if one goes to Anziliya from İskamaha one is going the long way round the south of the Buzluk-Alan mountains, and thus the mention of Hanzwiwa. Mt Uşnaïttena, then would be the Alan Dağı or another nearby elevation to its southwest, near Esentepe. On the other hand, if one is going to Anziliya from Kammama one might go primarily via the north of the Buzluk range, and thus the mention of Mt Uşhupitiş, which may be a mountain-name related to the name of the land of İşhupita. For İşhupita see Alparslan (this volume), with a location between Tokat and Turhal, which does not exclude İşhupitta being associated with a mountain, Uşhupitiş, at the northeast end of the Buzluk Dağları. In the Extensive Annals Murşili II marches into the Upper Land against Kathaituwa, otherwise unattested, and then against İşhupita, from where his vassals Nunnuta and Pazzana

23 Alp 1991b: 9; Börker-Klähn 2014: 136-137; Barjamovic 2011: 382 thinks Anziliya would have taken over from Kuburnat as the central location of the region after the end of the Middle Bronze Age. Kryszeń 2016: 335.
24 Forlanini 2008b associates the mountains mentioned in this fragment with the Karadağ range behind Ortaköy.
26 For Kammama see also Corti, this volume. Forlanini places Kammama on the other side of the Karadağ range from Ortaköy (Forlanini 2008b: 167-169).
27 Süel 2005; Kryszeń 2016; Forlanini 2008b has placed İskamaha to the west of Ortaköy, which relates to his location for Tahașta. See also Forlanini 2002: 263 fn. 23, with İskamaha on the other side of the Karadağ from Ortaköy.
28 Forlanini has placed İşhupitta further to the northeast in the Niksar region (2002: 269; 2008b: 170 map), which would preclude an association with the mountain mentioned in this Ortaköy text.
presumably flee, although the passage is broken, to Palhuişā, which may therefore be further away but still a neighbour.29 In the similarly broken 10-year Annals, the words “in the Kaška land” are preserved, which may qualify the location of Palhuişā (not preserved).30 After he destroyed Palhuişā he “went back” to Ištahara and offered an ultimatum to the people of Kammama where the two rebels had fled again.31 For a location of Ištahara south of Amasya, see Corti, this volume. If Kammama is in or north of the plain of Göynücek, it would thus seem that the rebels have fled from Palhuişā towards Hittite territory, but Kammama seems not to have been entirely on the Hittite side.

In the next year the king camps in Palhuişā and is able to go “over” from there (albeit after a battle with the Kaška at Kuzaštarnina) to Anziliya.32 If Anziliya is in fact in the Zile region then a location of Išhupitta and Palhuişā to the northeast and east of Zile is likely, in a region from where one can reach Kammama in the Göynücek region, Ištahara somewhere near Amasya and Anziliya/Inzili somewhere in the Mašat-Zile area. Further close contacts between the Mašat-Zile region and Išhupitta are indicated in the Mašat letters, where considerable numbers (1,760) of Išhupittan troops are mentioned that are to be sent (from Mašat?) to the king at Šapinuwa in two days.33 Somewhere in the Ezinepazar area and the mountainous terrain to the east of that might be a possibility for Išhupitta and Palhuişā (see fig. 15.1), or possibly Išhupitta is somewhere between Turhal and Tokat, as hypothesised in this volume by Alparslan, and Palhuişā is in the Ezinepazar region.34

Place-names primarily associated with Mašathöyük-Tapikka

Tapikka was established as the likely name of Mašathöyük by S. Alp on the basis of the mention of this toponym in a letter addressed to Adad-Beli, one of the scribes who appears to be based at the settlement of Mašat and receives many letters there.35 The identification has not gone unchallenged, but is likely to be the case.36 It is also the most frequently mentioned toponym in the administrative tablets from Mašathöyük.37 The text KUB 48.105+KBo 12.53 from the late 13th century BC lists offerings to various gods that are supplied by His Majesty and the king of Tummana in different areas and the individual towns within those areas, which are enumerated. The section concerning the “land of Tapikka” includes the towns of Gaggaduwa, Zapişhuṇa, Ištarwa and Anziliya.38 It is not clear that all of these always belonged to a province of Tapikka.39 Particularly intriguing is the appearance of the toponym Tapikka in an administrative document from Mašathöyük where bronze axes are registered for Tapikka and various other towns: 30 in Gašipura, 20 in Karahna, 20 in Gašaša, 30 in Inzili and 100 in Tapikka.40 However, it would be rash to conclude that the number of axes in any way correlates to the size or importance of the settlement. Karahna, for example, must have been a large

---

29 KUB 14.16 i 29-36; KUB 14.15 i 1-12 (Goetze 1933: 30-35).
30 KBo 3.4 i 56 (Goetze 1933: 30-31).
31 KUB 14.15 i 10-20 (Goetze 1933: 34-37).
32 KUB 14.16+ ii 8-22 (Goetze 1933: 42-45).
34 For a location of many of these places much further west, including Palhuişā at Kale/Aydıncık south of Kazankaya and Kammama at Akköy in the north of Alacahöyük, see Forlanini 2002: 262 with fn. 22. For a different interpretation of the campaign of Suppiluliuma used by Forlanini as evidence, see Corti in this volume. The region between Turhal and Ezinepazar is filled with Tahazzimuna by Forlanini (2002: 266 fn. 35) which was associated with the well known but not definitively identified medieval Dazimon by Alp 1980: 48 fn. 43; Forlanini 1983: 16 fn. 10; Alp 1991b: 39. This Tahazzimuna may otherwise also be slightly to the east of Turhal.
37 Del Monte 1995.
38 KUB 48.105+KBo 12.53 rev. 37-45. Offerings made by the “troops/people of Išhupitta” and the “salt-men of Happala” are also mentioned in this section. Archi and Klenzal 1990: 146. The connection of the Mašat area with salt is also attested in an administrative document, HKM 114 (del Monte 1995: 134-136).
40 Del Monte 1995.
and important cult city. Possibly it is the cultic character of Karahna by contrast with a more military profile for Tapikka which is reflected by the number of axes registered.\footnote{Forlanini 2002: 259.}

Mainly on the basis of Old Assyrian evidence a location of Karahna somewhere between Šamuha (now established as Kayalıpinar on the Kızılırmak) and Kuburnat is to be expected, as well as on the end of a route from Hattiš via Šüpilluliyā.\footnote{For Karahna as the stop before Kuburnat at the head of the smuggler’s passage referred to as the “narrow track”, Barjamovic 2011: 273; for Karahna as a destination from Šüpillululiyā and Hattiš, see the letters Kt n/k 388 and Kt n/k 211 (Günbattı 1996; Barjamovic 2011: 283-4). Börker-Klähn 2014: 142 has Karahna at İgdır at the foot of the Buzluk Dağları.} A. Mouton has recently re-asserted an identification with the settlement at Sulusaray/Sebastopolis, just to the south of the Deveci Dağları from the plain of Maşat and the Silisözü valley and 32km to the west of Boloshöyük, also south of the Deveci and their eastern continuation, the Akdağlar.\footnote{Forlanini 1992a: 301 with fn. 94; Mouton 2011. It is slightly premature to see the equation of Karahna with Sulusaray as a “fixed point”, as with Barjamovic 2011: 228.} Part of the argument for specifically selecting Sulusaray, in addition to one of its possible classical names being Karana, is the fact that classical inscriptions from the site record a cult of Zeus Pylaios (“of the gate”), while the worship of “the storm-god of the city-gate” (\textsuperscript{40} KÁ.GAL) is attested for the cult of Karahna in one Hittite text.\footnote{Mouton 2011: 105, citing KUB 25.32 i 21 (van Gessel 1998: 782). Mouton emphasises that this deity is only attested for the cult of Karahna. Her argument that the local Heracles cult from the classical period is derived from that of the “tutelary deity” of Karahna is less convincing as a supporting argument for the identification, even if the town was at one point called Heracleopolis. It would need a clearer relationship between Heracles cults in Anatolia and those of tutelary deities/stag-gods to be established before one could accept the argument more easily. Such a connection is easily imaginable, as the stag-god or tutelary deity’s name can be Innara meaning “strength”, an attribute associated with Heracles.} Sulusaray is located in a small plain which is linked to the plain and valley on the other side of the mountains to the north by a narrow and difficult pass. Karahna appears to have been part of the Upper Land.\footnote{Forlanini 2002: 269; id. 2008b: 154; Mouton 2011: 105.} This fits with its being on the other side of the mountains south from Maşat, but one wonders why Karahna should then be included in a list of axes found at Maşathöyük.

The other names on the list of axes (HKM 104) include Inzili. If this form is equivalent to Anziliya and if Anziliya is identical with Zile, then this was 20km away to the northeast, and likely to have been an independent centre of its own, although still part of the area of Tapikka according to KUB 48.105+. Gašipura was thought by Forlanini and Alp to be a variation on Gazziumera, the Hittite toponym that seems so close to Gaziura, the classical name for Turhal.\footnote{Mouton 2011: 105.} This would also indicate a fairly significant centre, 36km off to the northeast and not necessarily under the immediate influence of Maşat. However, the phonetic difference is quite significant here so that this comparison must be regarded with some suspicion. Not only is one here relying on an erratic method of comparing sound shapes of contemporary as well as classical names, albeit in an intriguing cluster, it is quite possible that the text listing the axes (HKM 104) does not indicate towns that belong under the administration of Maşat at all. In this case the motivation for including Karahna on the list would be unclear, as also that for including the others. The other name on the list, Gašaša, occurs in connection with Malazziyā, Panata, Gašipura and Tapikka in a Maşat letter regarding observations of birds.\footnote{HKM 47 (Alp 1991b: 203-207). The mention of Takkaša in this context is not immediately geographically relevant, as it forms the subject of the augury while the other places are the locations of the observations. See further Doğan-Alparslan 2012: 407. Forlanini 2002: 258 with fn. 7 associates Gašaša with the name of the Kaz Gölü to the east of Zile, with reference to its occurrence as Qazgöl in a medieval Turkish epic, the Danishmendname.} An administrative
document from Maṣat also records quantities of seed and yield for various cereals and beans over three years in Gašša, which seems to suggest it was under the direct administration of Tapikka.48

In the Annals of Muršili II a campaign against Arzawa begins from Anziliya, and deportees from Arzawa are reported for various cities in the Tapikka section of KUB 48.105+, where Anziliya is also mentioned.49 Here also we learn that the deity Anzili was worshipped at Zapišhuna in the land of Tapikka. The identity of the deity Anzili with the goddess of love and war, Istar/Šauska, appears to be quite likely,50 which may provide a background for Muršili beginning a military campaign at the homonymous town, even if it is going in the opposite direction. A city Zipišh[una] is mentioned as being rebuilt in a fragment of the Annals of Šuppiluliuma,51 the city had an AGRIG-official according to Hittite texts and was thus presumably a distribution centre,52 and a Zimišhuna appears in the Old Assyrian texts.53 Forlanini supposes it might have been in the region east of the Çekerek near its confluence with the Yešilirmak, i.e. on the other side of the Buzluk mountains from Anziliya/Zile, and points out that it is not mentioned in the tablets from Maṣat, which may mean the province of Tapikka was extended beyond the natural boundary of these elevations during the 13th century.54 However, the association with Panata and thus also with Malazziya, and Gašša may indicate a location slightly further to the southeast closer to the region around Turhal, on the eastern outskirts of the land of Tapikka, and thus nearer to Anziliya if it is Zile.55 The distance between the proposals is not great.

Beyond the lists of axes discussed above, the seventeen administrative tablets from Maṣat contain significant toponyms which are likely to belong to the core area of Tapikka.56 These can be organised into groups that partially co-occur with each other and may indicate areas at increasing distances from Maṣatköyük. The closest ones appear to be the following:

HKM 103:57 Šašipaduwa(?), ..., [Pu]putana, Šalewanta, [Št]tišuwa(?), Tapikka, 
[Daha]šara?, Muru(?), Hananak, Šariya, Kišdumīša, Gaggaduwa, Uwahšuwanta, Dupitta, 
Zišpa, Zikkištā 
HKM 99:58 Zikkašta, Gawattaru, Hantišizzuwa, Hananakka, Dahašara, Anziliya, Šariya, 
Kappaduwa, Kappušiya 
HKM 111:59 Wahšuwata, Tapikka, Hariya

If it is identical with Hanaknak known from Old Assyrian sources, as likely, Hananak(ka) is probably two stops south of Tapikka (Old Assyrian Tapaggaš).60 We have seen Gaggaduwa in KUB 48.105+. Kappušiya seems to have had a palace of the queen and Hariya also had a palace.61

---

48 HKM 109 (Del Monte 1995: 122). Marazzi 2008: 77-79. The yields are quite small, which may indicate the text is documenting exceptional circumstances.
50 Wilhelm 2010.
51 KBo 12.26 i 6'-8’ (Del Monte 2009: 50-51).
52 VBoT 68 ii 18’ (Forlanini 1980; 2007).
54 The association is made specifically with one of the mounds at Ayvalıpınar, Forlanini 2002: 265 fn. 33.
55 Forlanini 2002: 265 places Malazziya west of the Çekerek, but also mentions Zara, which is further east near Sivas. The location corresponds to his placement of Kammama further west than here thought to be the case.
56 Del Monte 1995.
60 Kt 91/k 437; Barjamovic 2011: 271-276.
61 For this reason Hariya (“valley” in Hittite) is associated by Forlanini 2002: 270 with the medium-sized site of Höyük, only a few kilometres to the east of Maṣat. As Alp 1991b: 11 pointed out, the palace of Hariya is associated with the palace of Kazzimara in the text Bo. 6661 r.col. 3, and the [LÜMEŠUR] [K]izzimara are attested along with the [LÜMEŠUR] Hariya at KBo 10.23 rev. vi 23, 26, both names which are linked with
A second group consists of towns that may be slightly further away on the basis of proposed identifications mainly on the eastern fringe of the region, or just over the other side of the Deveci mountains (Karahna?), but which still seem to belong to an area that Maşat had some sort of administrative jurisdiction over.

HKM 104: Gaşipura, Karahna, Gaşaşha, Inzili, Tapikka
HKM 105: Gaşaşha, Tapikka
HKM 107: Tapikka, Inzili, Gaşaşha, Gaşipura
HKM 109: Gaşaşha (see above)

The places mentioned in the following administrative documents might be a little further away again. HKM 102 details the origin of prisoners of war but seems to be from a time when some areas quite close to Hattuša, such as Kammama (see above) were in enemy hands. The other two seem to involve preparations for a journey and/or military movements or action.

HKM 102: Takkaşta, Gaşaharuga, Kutupitaşha, Kammama, Zaqapura(?), Iškila, Malazziya
HKM 112: Taptakeans of the city P[...]?eštišša; Hapareans(?) near to Iakkanuena; Gaštarrišduweans in Kuwaštuḫuruḫrišena
HKM 113: Kammama, Šuk(azi)ya

If the five mountains mentioned in the Ortaköy text concerning Kammama discussed above are to be associated with peaks of the Buzluk range and Alan Dağı, the other mountains associated with the cult of Šapinuwa in KBo 15.62+ may include parts of the Karadağ range under which the site of Ortaköy sits. S. Alp associated this range with Mt Šakkadunuwa, which is thought by M. Alparslan (this volume) to be further east. One interesting annalistic fragment (KBo 16.36+) mentions a campaign when the mountains Šakkadunuwa, Šišpinuwa and Šarpunwa became hostile and all the Kaška arrived and took possession of a bridge over the river Zuliya and knocked it down.68 The Hittite protagonist, thought to be either Šuppiluliuma I or Tudhaliya IV before his investiture, was initially overcome by the river Zuliya, but was rescued by Ištar of Šamuha. If the Zuliya is the Çekerek then these are further mountain names that may need to be accommodated in this area, along with the Kaška mountain-dwellers who descended from them. A different interpretation would have the Kaška crossing the Yeşilirmak (classical Iris, usually thought to be the river Kummešma) into more central Hittite territory from the east.69 The association of Mt Šakkadunuwa with Karahna, among

---

Gazziura by Alp 1991b: 21. According to the logic that associates palaces with larger mounds one could just as well associate Kappušiya with Höyük, due to its palace of the queen, or appurtenances thereof, which are attacked by the enemy in HKM 8, 3-11 (Alp 1991b: 130-133).

66 List of groups of enemies (?) from certain areas who are apparently in places different to those of their origin. Del Monte 1995: 133-134. Kuwaštuḫuruḫrišena may vaguely be compared to the name Kuzuštarina, scene of Muršili II’s battle with the Kaška before moving on to Anziliya (see above). Forlanini 2002: 266 fn. 36 compares Iagganuena with Aegonne, a name from the Tabula Peutingeriana between Tavium and Zela, although that would be to the west of Zile.
67 List of provisions for a journey with military actions (Del Monte 1995: 131-133).
69 The Kummešma is also associated with the Kelkit among others, for literature see del Monte and Tischler 1978: 535; del Monte 1992: 206; Cammarosano 2015: 227.
other mountains, may also have consequences for the localisation of either Karahna or Şakkadunuwa.\(^{70}\)

One further mountain that also needs to be located somewhere in this region is Mt Happiduini, which is also attested as a mountain associated with Karahna.\(^{71}\) A letter from Mașathöyük mentions both Mt Şakkadunuwa and Mt Happiduini.\(^{72}\) The enemy has crossed (the border?) at two positions (at the towns of İsteruwa and Zişpa) and can from (one of?) those go “over” to the land of Mt Şakkadunuwa or turn back into the country, where he might be able to cause damage. Zişpa may be related to the Mt Şişpinuwa which was the scene of an incursion along with Mt Şakkadunuwa in the annalistic account KBo 16.36+ discussed above. İsteruwa is presumably identical with the İstarwana mentioned as part of the land of Tapikka in KUB 48.105+. Later in the letter from Mașat the sender says he will send “spies of the long road” to Mt Happiduini and will only release the oxen and sheep from Tapikka when the message comes back that the mountain is free of the enemy.\(^{73}\)

There are different geographical reconstructions that can explain these arrangements, depending on where one locates the mountains. However, wherever these are located will have repercussions for the location of cities with which they are associated, especially Karahna. At the moment the Deveci mountains and Akdağ seem good candidates for the regions of the mountains Happiduini and Şakkadunuwa, partly because so many names are already associated on the basis of the text from Ortaköy with the Buzluk mountains to the north, and partly because of the close associations with Maşathöyük. Such a localisation would have to pull the action of the battle on the Zuliya mentioned in KBo 16.36+ much further south and east, and if it is the river Çekerek presumably closer to its source in the Sulusaray and Akdağ region. This would of course suit the intervention of İstar of Şamuha during a battle on this river, if Şamuha is to be identified with Kayalpınar some 55km to the southeast.

Mt Halu[na] may have been mentioned as one of the mountains of Şapinuwa (see above, KBo 15.62+). If it is identical with Mt Halwanna it would have to be near both the town of Urişa and the spring of Halwanna due to extensive details of rituals carried out there.\(^{74}\) Specifically there is mention of different places where the (image of) the (deified) mountain is to stand on the mountain during times when it (the mountain) “is threatened” by the enemy (when the deified mountain is placed at the stele by the poplar-tree) and times when it is not (in which case they set it up at the stele by the poplar tree beside the river). Presumably the river was a less elevated position than the mountain. The mountain has been associated with the southern side of the Buzluk Dağları, but should more likely be the northern side, closer to Şapinuwa, if it was a sacred mountain for this site.\(^{75}\)

The overview given here is for a comparatively small region. Even here, with two large-scale excavated sites that have produced cuneiform tablets, it has not proven possible to locate unequivocably the many mountain names preserved on tablets that the region must have had. The main river running through the region, the modern Çekerek, is most likely to have been the Zuliya. We have seen evidence for this name being relevant to both its upper and lower courses. In considering the settlement names of the Mașat tablets that seemed part of the same administrative area as Tapikka, S. Alp reckoned with seventy-eight place-names.\(^{76}\) Even if one subtracts from this number those places that were almost certainly geographically outside the immediate Mașat-Zile region, such

---

70 KUB 38.12 i 24, the festival for this mountain is celebrated every three years at Karahna. Börker-Klähn 2014: 142 has Beşik Tepesi on the Buzluk Dağları as Mt Şakkadunuwa.
71 KUB 38.12 iii 8.
74 KUB 25.23 i 10-25 (Hazembos 2003: 30-40).
75 Börker-Klähn 2014: 141 at Karacaören northeast of İğdir. The fact that a case concerning the “man of the son of the priest of Urişa” and a “woman of Gašša (?)” was to be judged in Maşathöyük/Tapikka according to HKM 57, 10-17, has no relevance for the location of the town Urişa. The dispute probably arose either in Gašša (?), where the woman concerned came from, or in Harpaşşanda, where the two men who intervened came from.
as Išhupitta and Gazziura to the east and Karahna to the southeast, and also disregards those which were more likely to have been closer to Šapinuwa to the north, one is left with a large number of names to be accommodated at 2nd millennium BC sites in the Mašat-Zile region, at a rough estimate fifty. The course of this research has also revealed a great many place names from the Boğazköy and Ortaköy texts which can, under certain interpretations, be associated with the area directly around Ortaköy and up along the Çekerek to the Plain of Göynüce. The discrepancy between the small number of sites identified in surveys as potentially belonging to the second millennium BC in these areas, and the large number of place-names attested in the tablets most likely reveals a problem of perspective, whether this be archaeological, historical or both. This discrepancy will be for future research to rectify.

Map showing possible locations of main places mentioned in the central east