Recent Developments

in

Hittite Archaeology and History

Papers in Memory of Hans G. Güterbock

Edited by

K. Aslihan Yener and Harry A. Hoffner Jr.

with the assistance of

Simrit Dhesi

Tarḫuntašša in the SÜDBURG Hieroglyphic Inscription

H. CRAIG MELCHERT
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

The Hieroglyphic Luvian inscription from the "Südburg" in Ḫattuša promises to be a significant new source of historical and linguistic information. However, as emphasized by Hawkins (1995) in his critical first edition, the text presents particularly formidable interpretive challenges. Like other HLuvian texts of the second millennium, it makes heavy use of logograms, including rare and unique signs, but is sparing with phonetic complements that mark nominal and verbal endings. It is unusual in using almost no sentence connectives, notably lacking entirely the quotative particle /wa/.

We therefore face not only the usual ambiguities regarding subject and object and person, number, and tense of the verb, but also serious problems even in determining clause boundaries. Under these circumstances, it will surely take some time to achieve anything close to a consensus about the meaning of the text. I have only high praise for Hawkins's first edition as a presentation of the text (see my review, to appear in *BSOAS*). However, I cannot agree with some fundamental aspects of his overall interpretation.

Hawkins (1995, esp. 54ff.) sees the text as an account of military conquests and building activities of Suppiluliuma II. There can be no doubt about the latter, but I see not an iota of evidence for military activity in the SÜDBURG text. Hawkins (1995: 28, 40) bases his interpretation in large part on an alleged parallel with the YALBURT inscription of Tuthaliya IV, which certainly does recount that king's campaign in Lycia (see Hawkins 1995: 68ff. for translation and commentary, and Poetto 1993 for a full edition of this text). The YALBURT text predictably uses well-known Luvian equivalents of the corresponding Hittite terms in the royal annals: /tub(a)i-/ 'strike' (= CLuvian *tup(ā)i-*, Lycian *tub(e)i-*) matching Hittite *walḫ-*; /muwa(i)-/ + reflexive /-ti/ 'conquer' (= CLuvian) matching Hittite *tarḫ-* plus reflexive *-za*; and the logographically written DELERE 'destroy' (for which see Melchert 1988: 34ff.) matching Hittite *ḫarni(n)k-*.

If Suppiluliuma II in SÜDBURG is describing military actions, it is extremely peculiar—for me, simply not credible—that he uses not a single one of the established Luvian terms, all of which *are* used by his own father in his inscription scarcely

a generation earlier. Hawkins would have us believe that Suppiluliuma II uses instead one expression (putatively INFRA *á-ka*) which is attested nowhere else in Luvian and another (PUGNUS.PUGNUS) whose other attestations are without exception non-military in sense.

As Hawkins himself ably summarizes in an appendix (1995: 118ff.), the HLuvian verb PUGNUS.PUGNUS is in several of its occurrences an *intransitive* verb, for which the contexts suggest a meaning 'live, endure, stay', a sense that also fits SÜD-BURG, as we shall see below. I cite here only the greeting formula of the ASSUR letters (a/b/d, §2): |*sa-na-wa/i+ra/i* PUGNUS.PUGNUS-*si* 'You shall stay well'. In the one example of a transitive PUGNUS.PUGNUS whose context is reasonably clear, there is no evidence at all for any military sense (SULTANHAN, §§43–44): |*a-wa/i* |REL-*sá* |REL-*sa* |*za* |LOCUS-*ta₅-za*⁻ⁱ PUGNUS.PUGNUS-*ta* |*wa/i-tà* |NEG-' |*HWI/A-sa-ha* |*mu-wa/i-ta* 'Whoever P.P.-ed this place, no one *muwa*-ed it'. Hawkins attempts to make capital out of the presence of /muwa(i)-/ in the next sentence, but note the significant absence of the reflexive particle. In Hittite, *tarḫ-* only means 'conquer' when accompanied by -*za* (see Friedrich 1952: 213), and likewise /muwa(i)-/ is accompanied by reflexive /-mi/ in the meaning 'overcome, conquer' in all of its occurrences in YALBURT. Given that the verb /muwa(i)-/ is denominative from /muwa-/ 'strength, might', I suggest for the simplex verb a sense 'strengthen, make strong'. In any case, Hawkins himself concedes that the context of SULTAN-HAN, which concerns the reestablishment of a vineyard for the god Tarhuntas, gives no support for a military sense in either /muwa(i)-/ or the transitive verb PUG-NUS.PUGNUS.

As to the alleged verb INFRA *á-ka* (that is, /katta aka-/) 'subject', there is first of all the question of whether this is the proper reading of the signs. This sign combination occurs seven times in SÜDBURG, always with a horizontally oriented INFRA and the signs Á + KA. Hawkins assumes that, as often, we should read the top sign (INFRA) first and then the other two, left-to-right or right-to-left according to the direction of reading for a given line. However, as his excellent photographs and drawing show, in every single instance the scribe has written the Á as a ligature with the INFRA. Indeed, in most cases these two signs are written as a single continuous sign without even a dividing line between them. The sign Á is not *under* the sign INFRA. If the intended reading was the INFRA and then the sequence *á-ka*, we would expect to find, at least once, simply INFRA above the other two signs. Because we are dealing with a unique sign combination, and because, furthermore, Hawkins's reading produces a totally unattested Luvian word, I believe an unprejudiced analysis must begin with Á+INFRA-*ka*.

Hawkins's interpretation INFRA *á-ka* with preverb plus verb also leads to serious syntactic problems. In three of seven instances, this produces either asyndetically linked verbs or (assuming omission of a sentence connective) verbs with no expressed subject or object. While the latter is not totally impossible, it would be highly unusual in Hittite or Luvian phraseology. The awkwardness and artificiality of such an assumption is manifest in Hawkins's own translation (clauses §§8, 12, and 15, p. 23).

Finally, while it is quite plausible in general linguistic terms to attribute a sense 'sub-ject, sub-due' to a combination with a preverb /katta/ 'down', sound method demands that we give most weight to the evidence immediately at hand, that of the languages of the author of the text: Hittite and Luvian. Suppiluliuma II is writing in a well-developed annalistic tradition, and all available evidence suggests that the use of Luvian instead of Hittite does not affect this tradition. In Tuthaliya IV's YAL-BURT text, for example, we find the Luvian versions of the well-known topoi of the deity "running before" the king (12, §4) and of women and children of a city kneeling before the king (15, §1; cf. KUB XIV 15+ iii 46–47 and iv 28ff.; Götze 1932: 56–57, 70–71). We therefore have every right to expect that INFRA (that is, /katta/) /aka-/ would conform to known Hittite annalistic usage. To my knowledge, there simply is no Hittite expression for anything like 'subdue, subject' using the preverb *katta*.[1]

I therefore conclude that Hawkins's assertion that the SÜDBURG inscription refers, to military conquests is without foundation. As always, it is far easier to argue against an interpretation than to provide a persuasive alternative, and I make no claim to a full understanding of the text. I do believe that the general thrust of the last half is reasonably clear. I cite this portion in full for reference, with my readings (to which one should compare Hawkins 1995: 22–23):

§8 MONS.IUDEX?.QUINQUE *416-*wali-ní* Á+INFRA-*ka* PUGNUS.PUGNUS

§9 PURUS.FONS-*má* MAGNUS.REX *416-*wali-ní* Á+INFRA-*ka*
   MONS.IUDEX?.QUINQUE X

§10 CAPUT.VIR MONS.IUDEX?.QUINQUE *zila-la-há* PUGNUS.PUGNUS

§11 TONITRUS(URBS) REGIO *416-*wali-ní* Á+INFRA-*ka*
   PUGNUS.PUGNUS

§12 *pu-wali-ti* AVUS.*506-*na* NEG-*wali-tá* REL-*ti-ha* *507

§13 PURUS.FONS-*má* MAGNUS.REX *416-*wali-ní* Á+INFRA-*ka* CAPUT.VIR
   TONITRUS(URBS) REGIO Á+INFRA-*ka* *ARHA* CAPERE

§14 *ta*-NEG(URBS) AEDIFICARE

§15 TONITRUS(URBS) x+*rali-sà-ma*(URBS) INFRA.*122(URBS) *137-*ha-sà*
   DEUSi-*zila* DARE-*ha*

§16 *zila+a-ti* DEUS.202 *pa-ti-*' ANNUS *i(a)-zila*

For the last sentence "(I) in that year built here a Divine Earth-Road" (that is, ᵈKASKAL.KUR, a man-made entrance to the underworld), I merely refer to the

---

1. Nor, to my knowledge, is *katta* used in any other established Hittite expression for military activity or conquest. The single exception is in the Annals of Mursili (KBo III 4 iv 39–40): *nu= kan* ᵁᴿᵁ*Aripšan* ᵁᴿᵁ*Dukkammann=a zaḫḫiyaz katta daḫḫun* 'I *took down* Aripsa and Dukkamma in battle' (//KBo IV 4 iv 12). The detailed description in the latter of the city as being in a high and mountainous locale (iv 5ff.) makes it likely that this unique expression reflects the special topography involved in the assault. Hittite does also have an expression *katta damašš-* 'oppress', but in its use to describe military action from Old through Middle to Neo-Hittite, it occurs consistently without *katta* in the sense 'press hard'.

convincing analysis of Hawkins (1995: 44–45). The sense of the immediately preced-
ing sentence is also clear, thanks to the persuasive interpretation of *137-*ha-sà* as /mal-
hassa-/ 'offering, ritual' (= CLuvian *malḫašša-*) by van den Hout (1995: 562–63,
following E. Masson): "I gave (the city) Tarḫuntašša, (the city) X, and (the city) Y to
the gods as an offering." I wish to stress the full significance of this statement. By ded-
icating the capital Tarḫuntašša and two other cities to the gods, Suppiluliuma thereby
makes these cities taboo and off-limits to humans, in effect cursing them. Such a pun-
ishment is well-known from the Annals of Mursili: see KUB XIX 37 ii 15–19 on the
fate of Timmuḫala, where the motivation and ramifications of the act are spelled out
quite explicitly. The significance was clear to Götze (1932: 234), who compares also
KUB XIV 15 i 16 on the similar fate of Palḫuissa and KUB VII 60 iii 17.[2]

Hawkins (1995: 35–36) finds no convincing interpretation for CAPUT.VIR. I
would follow Otten (1989: 335–36) in seeing merely the equivalent of Hittite LÚ.
The logogram CAPUT is ambiguous in Luvian, standing for both /harmahi-/ 'head'
and for /zidi-/ 'person, man'. The function of VIR here is to mark clearly the latter
reading (in lieu of a phonetic complement -*ti*-). However, since the use of the ex-
pression LÚ ᵁᴿᵁX 'man of X' as a title ('prince/ruler of X') is attested only for Old
Hittite (Kempinski and Košak 1982: 97; Neu 1974: 36), I believe we must take the
phrase as a plural, the equivalent of the standard Hittite LÚ.MEŠ ᵁᴿᵁX 'men/people
of X' so frequent in the annals.[3] In the SÜDBURG text cited above, we have in par-
allel fashion the mention first of a mountain (§8) and then its inhabitants (§10), fol-
lowed by mention of the land Tarḫuntašša (§11) and then its inhabitants (§13).

Whatever the meaning of (*416-*wa/i-nì*) Á+INFRA-*ka* turns out to be, the sub-
ject of §13 is surely Suppiluliuma, and the object is the people of Tarḫuntašša: "(I)
Suppiluliuma, the Great King, . . . took away the people of the land of Tarḫuntašša."
Not only is deportation of people a well-attested practice of Hittite kings (during the
Empire and thereafter), but such an action also makes a logical preliminary to the
dedication of the capital Tarḫuntašša and other cities to the gods in §15 (see again
Götze 1932: 234, as cited above).

The intervening sentence §14 seems to say "(I) built (up) (the city) Tana." Haw-
kins (1995: 42) tentatively suggests identification with Adana (with non-writing or
genuine aphaeresis of the initial *A*-), but expresses misgivings due to the fact that
Adana was surely never a part of the land of Tarḫuntašša. The mention of building
(up) another city in the midst of discussion of Tarḫuntašša seems a non sequitur in any

---

2. The double-edged sense of Hittite *šuppi-* 'pure; taboo' was elaborated on by Watkins (1975),
who recalled the classic treatment of Latin *sacer* by Benveniste (1969: 2.187).

3. Neu admits the exceptional occurrence of the older usage in Neo-Hittite compositions,
citing LÚ ᵁᴿᵁ*Tipiya* as in KBo III 4 iii 71ff. The sense 'ruler, prince' does not seem strictly nec-
essary for this passage, but LÚ KUR ᵁᴿᵁ*Aššur* in KUB XXI 1 iii 12 (= LUGAL in KUB XXI 5
iii 26) in the company of three other "kings" seems clear enough. Such a reading is excluded for
SÜDBURG by the first occurrence in §5 not quoted above: CAPUT.VIR *HATTI* (REGIO) *430
'the people of all the lands of Hatti'. Suppiluliuma II would not have referred to himself as LÚ
KUR.KUR.MEŠ ᵁᴿᵁ*HATTI*.

case. I venture as a solution to this that we should understand Adana as the place (or one of the places) to which Suppiluliuma transplanted the people of Tarḫuntašša. Explicit expression of the resettlement was considered unnecessary in the context. We know that the Hittite kings used forced movement of peoples for multiple purposes. By deporting the people of Tarḫuntašša and making the capital off-limits to human habitation, Suppiluliuma seriously weakened chances of a rebellion. At the same time, he used the transplantees to reinforce his control over another boundary area.

The sense of clauses §§8–12 is obscured by the unidentifiable logogram for the verb in §9[4] and the quite legible but not yet interpretable sign *506, which appears to be the verb in §12 (on the latter, see Hawkins 1995: 42). I tentatively suggest, however, that these lines contain the stated pretext for Suppiluliuma's very severe punishment of Tarḫuntašša, which had, after all, enjoyed a very special status not that long before. In fact, I believe that the entire mention of the unidentified mountain in §§8–10 is merely to serve as a contrastive example to Tarḫuntašša, the real topic of the second half of the text.

Note that sentences §8 and §11 are entirely parallel. The mountain and Tarḫuntašša start out on an equal footing. The introduction of name and title in §9 strongly suggest a change of subject. Since the name of the mountain is the only noun phrase in §8, and we have no reason to suppose some other third party, the verb PUGNUS.PUGNUS is likely to be intransitive. The meaning 'live, abide, stay' suggested by other occurrences would thus also fit here, whatever the sense of the mysterious *416-*wali-ní* Á+INFRA-*ka*. The crucial point is that the action of Suppiluliuma in §9 in regard to the mountain must have been benign, because in §10 "The people of Mt. X also thereafter *stayed* (there)."[5] For a parallel for such merciful treatment compare the Annals of Mursili KUB XIX 37 iii 40, 46, where the Hittite expression is *n=at ešer=pat* 'And they remained (there)'. Note the striking parallelism of the Hittite and Luvian, which feel no need for a local adverb, unlike modern English or German (compare Götze 1932: 177, who likewise supplies 'dort').

The key to the drastically different treatment of Tarḫuntašša must lie in the difficult sentence §12. I follow Hawkins (1995: 41) in taking the logogram *506 (which

---

4. Hawkins very tentatively reads the verb as DARE 'give', but the orientation of the sign is the opposite of the clear DARE in §15, and the shape is also different. There is also obviously no indirect object available. Based on the comparable Hittite passages, we would expect an equivalent of Hitt. *ḫuldalā(i)*- 'spare, treat mercifully' or *arḫa dala*- 'leave alone' (see Götze 1932: 176–77 and KUB XIX 37 iii 40, 46). The vague shape of the logogram in §9 in SÜDBURG makes this hypothesis unverifiable.

5. Contra Hawkins, I read sign 319 as syllabic -*há* 'and, also', not as *HATTI*. Hawkins concedes (1995: 25) that the latter reading causes problems of interpretation but argues against the phonetic value on the grounds that such a use is otherwise unattested in the Empire period. But he notes that phonetic -*há* does occur in the KARADAĞ/KIZILDAĞ inscriptions, which he himself has argued date to a period immediately following the end of the Empire. His objection thus carries no weight, since nothing precludes the innovation being a few decades earlier than previously thought. The sense 'also, even' for enclitic -*ha* fits well here and elsewhere in SÜDBURG.

looks like a ladle) as standing here for the value /han/ (compare with Hoffner apud Hawkins Hitt. *ḫan-* 'draw [liquid]'). The combination AVUS.*506-*na* is thus 'grandfather(s) and grandmother(s)'. Unfortunately, we cannot determine with certainty whether this phrase is subject or object, much less the meaning of the verb behind *507. The expression NEG REL-*ti-ha* could also be either a case form (dative singular) or adverbial. Hawkins takes "grandfathers and grandmothers" as the subject, and I cannot exclude this.

I find it more likely, however, that the land of Tarḫuntašša is the subject, as in the preceding sentence, and that it is being charged with some crime or delict against the ancestors. Given the presence of the negation, I would look for the meaning of the verb in the realm of 'honor, worship, sacrifice to': "It (Tarḫuntašša) did not formerly at all *honor* the grandfathers and grandmothers." The seriousness of the crime may involve more than mere impiety. As is well-known, when King Muwatalli moved the Hittite capital to Tarḫuntašša, he took with him the gods and the dead (Apology of Hattusili, ii 52, Otten 1981: 14). As Hawkins (1995: 42) points out, Urḫi-Tešub is reported to have brought the gods back to Hattusa, but no mention is made of the dead (Götze 1930: 46, text B 11–12), who may thus have remained in Tarḫuntašša. Impiety towards the dead would thus have involved Suppiluliuma's own royal ancestors, making the crime a very serious offense indeed.

The many textual uncertainties cited make this suggested interpretation of sentences §§8–12 provisional at best. What does seem reasonably clear to me is that the last portion of the SÜDBURG text describes the liquidation of Tarḫuntašša by Suppiluliuma II. Contrary to the claim of Hawkins, there is no evidence for any mention of military conquest. Control of Tarḫuntašša by Suppiluliuma is taken for granted, and he is free to dispose of it as he wishes.

Bibliography

Benveniste, Émile
    1969   *Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes*. Paris: Éditions de Minuit.
Friedrich, Johannes
    1952   *Hethitisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg: Winter.
Götze, Albrecht
    1930   *Neue Bruchstücke zum großen Text des Ḫattušiliš un den Paralleltexten*. MVAeG 34/2. Leipzig: Hinrichs.
    1932   *Die Annalen des Muršiliš*. MVAeG 38. Leipzig: Hinrichs.
Hawkins, J. David
    1995   *The Hieroglyphic Inscription of the Sacred Pool Complex at Hattusa (SÜDBURG)*. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten Beiheft 3. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
Hout, Theo van den
    1995   "Tutḫaliya IV. und die Ikonographie hethitischer Großkönige des 13. Jhs." *BiOr* 52.516: 545–73.
Kempinski, Aharon, and Silvin Košak
    1982   "*CTH* 13: the Extensive Annals of Hattus⟨ili I(?)." *Tel Aviv* 9: 87–116.

Melchert, H. Craig
  1988   " 'Thorn' and 'Minus' in Hieroglyphic Luvian Orthography." *AnSt* 38: 29–42.
Neu, Erich
  1974   *Der Anitta-Text.* Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 24. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
Otten, Heinrich
  1981   *Die Apologie Hattusilis III.* Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 18. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
  1989   "Ausgrabungen in Boğazköy-Hattuša 1988: Die Hieroglyphen-Luwische Inschrift." *Archäologischer Anzeiger* 333–37.
Poetto, Massimo
  1993   *L'Iscrizione luvio-geroglifica di* Yalburt. Studia Mediterranea 8. Pavia: Iuculano.
Watkins, Calvert
  1974   "La désignation indo-européenne du 'tabou'." Pp. 208–14 in *Langue, discours, société: Pour Émile Benveniste.* Edited by J. C. Millner et al. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.