ON LUWIANS AND HITTITES[*])

Itamar SINGER (Tel Aviv)

"History is written by the victors" is well demonstrated in ancient Anatolia. Most authorities would agree that Luwian was spoken by at least as many people as Hittite, yet books on the Hittites can easily fill up a library, whereas the reviewed monograph is the first to be entirely dedicated to the Luwians (except for dictionaries). Two ponderous circumstances have teamed together to create this disproportional picture, one inherent, the other accidental. For much of their common history the Hittites dominated the Luwian-speaking areas of Anatolia and, as a great power, they left behind extensive archives fitting their stature. The effects of this political disparity are further intensified by the fortuitousness of discovery. Not a single tablet was found *as yet* in the vast territories in which Luwian was spoken (as the main language). To be sure, there *must* be cuneiform tablets buried in the major sites of western Anatolia, since letters sent from there have been found in Hattuša.[1]) Ironically, even the first Anatolian tablet to be published in the late 19th century was sent from the Land of Arzawa in the heart of Luwian-speaking Anatolia. But then, this letter, which was discovered in 1887 at Tell el-Amarna in Egypt, was written

---

[1]) The letter of Mašhuiluwa, king of Mira (KBo 18.15), and the letters of Manapa-Tarhunta (KUB 19.5+KBo 19.79) and Mašturi (KUB 23.100), kings of the Šeha River Land, all in Hittite.

in Hittite, the *lingua franca* of second millennium BCE Anatolia. To round out these reflections on history and memory it should be added that the Luwian language survived many centuries after Hittite had already sunken into oblivion, and therefore had a more durable influence on subsequent linguistic and cultural developments.

The task undertaken by Craig Melchert and his four collaborators was not an easy one. How does one define 'Luwians' and where does one set the boundaries of this fluid subject? In his introduction the editor renounces the burdened terms of 'ethnicity', 'nationhood' or the like, and chooses a generally acceptable definition: 'Luwians' effectively means 'Luwian-speaking' population groups (p. 3). The chronological limits set by this definition extend from the 19th century BCE, when Luwian personal names are attested in the Old Assyrian texts from Kültepe, to the 7th century BCE, when the Assyrians liquidated the last Neo-Hittite state. The geographical definition is more or less agreed upon for the Bronze Age — from the Aegean to the Land of Kizzuwatna in Cilicia, where Luwian was spoken alongside Hurrian. For the Iron Age, however, the approaches of the various contributors to the volume differ considerably, from 'maximalists' (Hawkins, Aro), who include the Neo-Hittite[2] (or Neo-Luwian) kingdoms of Syria and southern Anatolia, to 'minimalists' (Bryce, Hutter), who find the evidence of monumental Hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions as insufficient to prove a Luwian appurtenance. The editor has wisely refrained from imposing an overall viewpoint.

The following review will first survey each chapter separately (not necessarily in the order of the book) and will conclude with some general observations and a postscript suggesting a hypothesis of the reviewer. Needless to say, the length of the discussion dedicated to each chapter here does not reflect upon its importance or quality, but rather upon the interests and the competence of the reviewer.

Scripts and Texts

I begin my review with the written evidence as summarized by David Hawkins (Ch. 4) for the simple reason that without it, as admitted by the contributors in the volume, one would hardly be able to distinguish a separate Luwian culture on the basis of the archaeological evidence alone.

Though we have some complementary data from Anatolian personal names attested in external sources,[3] the principal evidence on Luwian comes from Luwian-language texts written either in Cuneiform or in Hieroglyphic. Luwian is one of the rare examples of a language simultaneously written in two entirely different scripts. The circumstances which brought about this bigraphic situation are not easily understandable (see below). 'Cuneiform Luwian' (the same script that was used for Hittite and other Anatolian languages) appears mainly in incantations and cult songs within Hittite

rituals and festivals of Luwian background. As shown by F. Starke, the bulk of these texts were already composed in the earliest stages of the Hittite kingdom. The Luwian passages are introduced by the adverb *luwili*, the only known ancient designation of this language. In addition, there are many Luwian loanwords, mainly in 13th century Hittite texts, either marked with gloss wedges (*Glossenkeile*) or unmarked (see further below, under *Luwianisms*).

'Hieroglyphic Luwian' has a long and exciting history of decipherment, from its first identification on the 'Hama stones' in the 1870-ties (by William Wright and Archibald H. Sayce) to the crucial correction of several misapprehended signs a century later (by Hawkins, Morpurgo Davies and Neumann), which brought about the recognition that both Cuneiform and Hieroglyphic Luwian represent the same language. The few remaining differences are probably dialectal and/or chronological (see under *Language*).

The origins of the Hieroglyphic Luwian script are still veiled in mystery. The earliest appearance of symbols which later developed into a full-fledged writing system is found on seals from Karahöyük near Konya, Kültepe, Boğazköy and Tarsus in Cilicia, variously dated between the 18th and the 16th c. BCE. A glyptic origin of writing is also found in Crete and several scholars (including Hawkins in the past) have advocated an Aegean connection as an external model, or at least as a source of inspiration. However, the incentive to turn this loose system of symbols (such as "life" or "well-being") into a genuine writing system more probably came from Kizzuwatna in Cilicia, a highly-developed region with close Syrian connections. The 'spark' for the invention may have been the idea to 'transcribe' the Cuneiform legend in the circular border of a seal into a Hieroglyphic legend in the center-field. Tarsus produced the earliest datable example with the seal of the Great King Išputahšu son of Pariyawatri, a contemporary of Telipinu around 1500 BCE. It is not clear how the hieroglyphs 'Storm-god' and 'King' correspond to the cuneiform legend. They could possibly represent a second (Hurrian?) name of the king, like in later 'double-names'. In any case, the practice of bigraphic seals was adopted at the Hittite court of Hattuša in the the 15th century BCE and continued down to the end of the empire. Significantly, the first king presently known to have used a bigraphic seal is Tudhaliya I, who married a Kizzuwatnean princess and subdued her land. The same king may also be the owner of the exceptional silver bowl in the Ankara Museum inscribed with a Hieroglyphic inscription which celebrates his victory over the Land of Tarwiza (possibly Troy). All in all, I subscribe with more confidence to Hawkins's hesitant conclusion (p. 168 f.) that Cilicia is better suited as the birthplace of Hieroglyphic Luwian than western Anatolia.

As for Güterbock's question, "why if you are already familiar with Cuneiform invent a script like Hieroglyphic?" I would point out that new scripts usually develop in script-supported environments (unless of course there was nothing before to build upon). The case of Hieroglyphic Luwian is truly exceptional in *not* being graphically influenced by its possible sources of inspiration (in contrast to Ugaritic Cuneiform or Egyptian-influenced Proto-Sinaitic). But then, originality could be the very purpose for inventing a 'national' script, an originality best demonstrated by the most unusual choice of writing direction, *boustrophedon*, which has no parallels in contemporary scripts. Be it as it may, sometime around the mid-second millennium BCE Anatolia

---

[2] The use of the term Neo-Hittite in the book may seem somewhat confusing for the general reader: Neo-Hittite (*without* inverted commas) refers to the stage of the Hittite language employed in the imperial period, whereas 'Neo-Hittite' (*with* inverted commas) refers to the Iron Age kingdoms in Syria and southern Anatolia where Hieroglyphic Luwian was written. To avoid this confusion it is commendable to follow the terminology employed by the *Chicago Hittite Dictionary* and to distinguish between second millennium New Hittite (NH) and first millennium Neo-Hittite.

[3] See, e.g., R. Zadok, "On Anatolians, Greeks and Egyptians in 'Chaldean' and Achaemenid Babylonia," *Tel Aviv* 32 (2005), 76-106.

invented a script of its own, joining rather late the ranks of the other great cultures of the Near East and the Aegean with writing systems of their own.[4] The new script appealed to the rulers of Hatti to such an extent that after a while they started to use it not only in their seals, but also in monumental stone inscriptions. Why would a Hittite-speaking king inscribe his boasting military reports in a Luwian script? Again a difficult question, which may find its answer either in the aesthetic and communicative virtues of the script itself (in comparison to cuneiform), and/or in the cultural climate at the end of the Hittite Empire, a subject to be discussed at the end of this review.

The Hieroglyphic corpus is chronologically divided into an early group, dated to the Hittite Empire, and a considerably larger late group of the Iron Age Neo-Hittite kingdoms. Innovations and paleographic developments in the script may thus be followed over a period of nearly 800 years. There has been an enormous advance in the last decades in the reading and classification of the Hieroglyphic inscriptions, crowned by Hawkins's monumental *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions*, vol. I, *Inscriptions of the Iron Age* (published in 2000, exactly a century after Messerschmidt's *Corpus Inscriptionum Hettiticarum*). Vol. II by Halet Çambel is dedicated to the Karatepe bilingual discovered in 1946, and Vol. III (in preparation) will cover the inscriptions of the second millennium and will also include a signary and a grammar. With these lucidly presented and reliable tomes, Hieroglyphic Luwian is at last accessible to all scholars and students and occupies its appropriate place among the scriptural corpora of the ancient Near East.[5]

Prehistory and Language

The two chapters (2 and 5) written by Craig Melchert are obviously dependent on each other. His concise grammar of Luwian (with brief remarks also on Lycian, Carian, Pisidian and Sidetic) provides a very useful state-of-the-art overview of the latest progress in the research of this language complex.[6] From the outset he takes up the issue of the differences between Cuneiform and Hieroglyphic Luwian (e.g., 'rhotacism' attested only in Hieroglyphic). Melchert insists that though minimal, these differences cannot be ignored or brushed aside. If they represent different dialects, what would be the relationship between them, spatial or temporal? He opts for the former possibility, tentatively suggesting that the Cuneiform Luwian passages in cult texts represent an archaic dialect of Kizzuwatna, whereas the glossed words and other Luwianisms stand closer to the dialect represented by Hieroglyphic Luwian (p. 173 f.). A third dialect seems to be attested in the 'Ištanuwian songs'. No doubt, more evidence will be needed to firmly establish the distribution map of Luwian dialects. Melchert categorically refutes the commonly held view that first millennium Lycian is a direct descendant of Luwian. Rather, the two should be considered as related dialects belonging to a larger branch which may be assigned the cover term 'Luwic' (p. 177, n. 7). Carian, Pisidian and Sidetic may also be included in the same group, but our knowledge about them is very limited.[7]

From his basic analysis of Luwian, Melchert works his way from the bottom up to the more complex problems of the prehistory of Luwian and its closest relatives in Anatolia (Ch. 2). He prudently warns the reader from a simplistic correlation between the spread of language and population movements, and thence to a direct correlation between linguistic data and the prehistoric archaeological record. Only after his basic survey on the Anatolian languages (taking issues with controversial topics such as the language of Troy, the etymologies of *t/labarna-* and *tawananna-*,[8]) and the status of Hittite as a spoken language) does he turn back to the vexed question of Proto-Indo-European origins. He categorically refutes the theories of Renfrew (on Anatolian origins of PIE speakers) and Gamkrelidze-Ivanov (on an Eastern Anatolian-Caucasian homeland), and reinforces the standard view of Indo-Europeans being intrusive in Anatolia. On the other hand, he does not take a firm stand on the question whether the speakers of the Proto-Anatolian languages dispersed within Anatolia, or if they had already differentiated before their entry in several successive waves. As for the direction of their entry into Anatolia (at least a millennium before the first attestation of Anatolian languages), he joins the majority view of linguists who prefer a northwestern over a northeastern direction. On the other hand, archaeologists and art historians tend to give preference to the early contacts between Anatolian and Caucasian cultures, as exemplified by the exquisite third millennium silver cup with reliefs found in a cremation burial at Karašamb (north of Erevan), with its demonstrably Hittite parallels.[9] Burial customs (for which see below), a crucial element in any discussion of origins and ethnicity, are completely ignored in the volume.

History

Trevor Bryce's chapter on history (3) draws on his seminal *The Kingdom of the Hittites* (2nd ed. 2005) and on his numerous articles on western Anatolia. It opens with an examination of the much-discussed problem of ethnicity in early second millennium BCE Anatolia. As on previous occasions, Bryce expresses his skepticism over the possibility that the ethnic factor played any significant role in the political developments of the era and categorically states that "we should almost certainly discard the notion that the Old Kingdom began with the dominance of a distinct ethnic group of Indo-European origin who won supremacy over and imposed

[4] See I. Singer, "Cuneiform, Linear, Alphabetic: The Contest between Writing Systems in the Eastern Mediterranean," in A. Ovadiah, ed. *Mediterranean Cultural Interaction* (Tel Aviv, 2000), 23-32.

[5] A useful introduction for beginners has recently been published by A. Payne, *Hieroglyphic Luwian* (Wiesbaden, 2004). The earlier introduction of R. Werner, *Kleine Einführung ins Hieroglyphen-Luwische* (Freiburg & Göttingen, 1991) requires updating.

[6] His chapters on Luvian, Palaic, Lycian, Lydian and Carian in R. Woodard, ed. *Cambridge Encyclopedia of the World's Ancient Languages* (Cambridge, 2004), were written before this grammar.

[7] It might be worthwhile mentioning in this context M. Finkelberg's recent efforts to demonstrate that the Minoan language (Linear A) is closely related to Lycian and may even be its direct ancestor; "The Language of Linear A," in R. Drews, *Greater Anatolia and the Indo-Hittite Language Family* (Washington, 2001), 81-104 (with previous bibliography).

[8] For the latest contribution to the continuing debate on the etymology of *t/labarna* (Hattian or Indo-European), see O. Soysal, *Anatolica* 31 (2005), 189-209.

[9] R.M. Boehmer & G. Kossack, "Der figürlich verzierte Becher von Karašamb," in R. Dittmann et al., eds. *Variatio Delectat. Iran und der Westen. Gedenkschrift für Peter Calmeyer* (Münster, 2000), 9-71 (with refs. to the Armenian excavation reports); R.M. Boehmer, *Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran und Turan* 34 (2002), 195-207. Cf. also H. Klengel, *Geschichte des hethitischen Reiches* (Leiden, 1999), 19.

their authority upon an indigenous Hattian population" (p. 30). The present reviewer holds to his opposite view, claiming that in the Old Assyrian period, before Anitta's sweeping conquests, Anatolia was still largely divided along ethno-cultural lines, notably the Hattian 'Land of Hatti' and the Hittite 'Land of Kaniš/Neša'. This ethno-cultural division is best epitomized in the distinction between 'Our God' and 'Their God' in the Anitta inscription (see also Hutter, p. 216).

With regard to Hittite attitudes towards inhabitants of Luwiya (substituted by Arzawa in a later manuscript), the Hittite Laws provide the most direct evidence. Several clauses dealing with abduction and runaway slaves inflict a much harsher punishment on a Luwian offender than on a Hittite one. Hoffner takes this as an indication of Hittite domination over Luwiya at the time of the composition, which is also supported by historical allusions in later texts. Bryce, on the other hand (p. 30), doubts that we can determine the significance to be attached to these differences and suggests that the more frequent appearance of Luwians in the Laws, in comparison with other ethnic groups, may point to a special relationship between Hittites and Luwians which may go back to their common ethnic background. This may be so, but it seems almost impossible to brush aside the inequitable treatment of Luwians in the Laws, a stance which is also echoed elsewhere in Hittite texts. In his chapter on religion, Hutter (p. 217) calls attention to an oracle text according to which some female cult functionaries are the cause of divine wrath because they enter the temple without washing themselves and their clothes after having sexual intercourse with Arzawan men. Of course, purification after sex is a prerequisite for anyone who is about to enter a temple, but the specific mention of Arzawan men in this context seems to intensify the nature of the offense and not only to reflect on the sexual habits of the *dammara*-women.[10]

After introductory definitions, Bryce surveys the history of the Anatolian regions that had a significant Luwian component, moving from the west (Arzawa, Lukka) to the east (Kizzuwatna). Building on the recent redrawing of the Western Anatolian map, this concise overview presents the reader with a lucid and highly readable picture of the complex evidence. I concur with the majority of Bryce's views and therefore my comments are restricted to a few significant points of disagreement and additions.

With a somewhat poorly-documented Hittite presence in the West in the Old Kingdom, the first substantial and clearly documented involvement belongs to Tudhaliya I, the real founder of the Hittite Empire in the second half of the 15th century BCE.[11] Besides his annals and various later references, his victories in the West were also celebrated on dedicatory inscriptions.[12] However, these early successes were short-lived, and already in the next generation Hatti lost its grip on the West and eventually the tables turned. For a short interlude the Luwian kingdom of Arzawa became the domi-

nant power in Anatolia (though the term "Luwian Empire" seems somewhat exaggerated). And again the tables turned towards the end of Tudhaliya II's reign, who together with his son Šuppiluliuma conducted successful campaigns in the West. Such a hectic, 'roller coaster-like' course of events was not exceptional in Hittite history (cf., e.g., the rapid decline of Hatti shortly after the conquest of Aleppo and Babylon), and one wonders to what might it be attributed. One usually ascribes a sudden victory to the able leadership of a king or a military commander and the subsequent fall to the lack of leadership, but perhaps some additional explanations should be sought for this exceptional dynamism in Hittite history.

What is missing from Bryce's survey of the Early Hittite Empire (or the so-called 'Middle Kingdom') is any reference to the inter-connected treaties with Huhazalma (CTH 28) and with the elders of Ura (CTH 144). The former recounts how Huhazalma was forced to renounce the territories that he had once occupied, namely, the cities of Ura and Mutamutaši along the Mediterranean coast. The latter text contains the treaty concluded between Arnuwanda I and the elders of Ura. M. Forlanini and S. de Martino suggested that Huhazalma was a king of Arzawa, who must have reigned after Kupanta-Kurunta and before Tarhuntaradu.[13] To my mind, a more likely possibility could be that Huhazalma was a local chieftain who tried, like the contemporary Madduwatta, to carve out for himself a kingdom along the southern Anatolian coast.[14] In any case, these related texts contain, besides historical information, important data on the socio-political organization of the region ("the elders of Ura"), to its religious character,[15] and to its treaty-making customs.[16]

With regard to the sections on Lukka, I find it difficult to accept Bryce's assertion that a distinction might be drawn between a narrow use of the term, referring to the southwestern corner of Asia Minor, and a broad one, in which Lukka "may have extended to all Luwian-speaking peoples and Luwian-occupied regions of Anatolia" (pp. 44, 54, 73 ff.). The references adduced in support of this general use, mostly in enumerations of enemy lands, do not provide, as far as I can see, any proof for this purported northerly extension of Lukka. Such lists of enemies cannot be expected to be exhaustive and quite often they merely encompass the limits of the intended territory. For example, Azzi, Kaška and Lukka in KUB 26.12 ii 14 f. represent the eastern, the northern and the southwest-

[10] Cf. also the mock fight between 'the men of Maša' and the 'men of Hatti', which is won, obviously, by the Hittites (KUB 17.35 iii 1 ff.). One prisoner of war is devoted to the god, whatever that means. Strictly speaking, the Land of Maša did not belong to the Arzawa Lands, but it is still noteworthy that from all possibilities a western land was chosen to represent the archetypal enemy.

[11] For the dating of Tudhaliya I based on an Egyptian synchronism, see I. Singer in D. Groddek & S. Rössle, eds. *Šarnikzel. Hethitologische Studien zum Gedenken an Emil O. Forrer* (Dresden, 2004), 606 f.

[12] The bronze sword with the cuneiform inscription (p. 49) and the silver bowl with the hieroglyphic inscription (p. 69).

[13] M. Forlanini, *Vicino Oriente* 7 (1988), 161; *SMEA* 40 (1998), 234, n. 52; S. de Martino, *Eothen* 5 (1996), 63-79; id. in M. Mazoyer & O. Casabonne, eds. *Studia Anatolica et Varia. Mélanges offerts au Professeur Renée Lebrun II* (Louvan-la-Neuve, 2004), 105-112.

[14] Different locations have been proposed for this Ura. Whereas Forlanini and de Martino tend to identify it with the famous Ura in western Cilicia (probably at Silifke), Hawkins (*AnSt* 48, 1998, 27 n. 167) maintains that this must be another Ura because of its association with Mutamutaši, which he identifies with Mylasa in Caria. Without delving into the complex problems of Anatolian geography, I would merely remark that Ura and Mutamutaši do not need be adjacent to each other, but could rather mark the extreme ends of Huhazalma's sphere of activities, i.e., almost the entire stretch of the Mediterranean coast from western Cilicia to Lycia or Caria. If so, this would make him a serious competitor of Madduwatta, whose sphere of activities was in a more northerly area, but extending as far as Mutamutaši/a.

[15] For the drinking from (the rhyton of) the god Iyarri in the Ura Treaty, see H. Otten, *Ist Mit* 17 (1967), 60; M. Giorgieri, *Eothen* 11 (2002), 318 f.

[16] For the sheep slaughtering ceremony and its Semitic parallels, see Otten, op.cit., 61 with n. 18; M. Weinfeld in L. Canfora, M. Liverani, C. Zaccagnini, eds. *I trattati nel Mondo Antico: Forma, ideologia, funzione* (Roma, 1990), 186 f.

ern limits of Anatolia, respectively. Even the reference in the Alakšandu Treaty (iii 3 ff.), where Lukka is listed together with Karkiša, Maša and Waršiyalla as possible starting points for Hittite campaigns, is inconclusive. As a matter of fact, the continuation of the passage makes a clear distinction between campaigns setting out from "those lands" (Lukka etc.), i.e. the outer periphery, and campaigns setting out from "these land(s)", which must refer to the inner circle of Hatti and its vassal states. From all that we know, the Hittites distinguished quite clearly between the prosperous northwestern kingdoms of Arzawa and the rugged southwestern Lukka lands. As best described by Bryce himself in his book[17]) and his many articles on Lukka(ns) and Lycia(ns), the semi-sedentary population of this region was not organized as a political entity, but rather as an unstable aggregate of communities which were extremely difficult to control, both by the Hittites and the Ahhiyawans.

The sections covering the history of the Arzawa lands under Hittite rule are quite comprehensive, duly emphasizing such important topics as Mira's emergence as a regional power sharing in authority over weaker kingdoms with the Hittites; Ahhiyawa's increasing interference in western Anatolian affairs, which might have been more welcome by the locals than the Hittite texts might lead us to believe; the fundamental historicity of the tradition of the Trojan War as reflected in Hittite documents; and many more. Particularly illuminating is the section examining the diffusion of Luwians eastwards and westwards (pp. 84 ff.). The substantial numbers of Westerners deported to Hatti over two hundred years of campaigning and occupation must have made a major demographic and cultural impact on the regions in which they were resettled, a subject to be discussed in more detail at the end of this review. Western Anatolia was a major source of manpower not only for the Hittites but also for the Mycenaeans, although the evidence for this is more difficult to assess.[18]) These long-term demographic developments reached their peak in the late 13th and early 12th centuries BCE, when, driven by a severe famine, large groups of eastern Aegean sea- and land-raiders, designated in modern scholarship as the 'Sea Peoples', were dispersed throughout the eastern Mediterranean basin.[19])

The sections dealing with the Luwians in the Iron Age and later periods cover only the regions of southern Anatolia — Hartapu's kingdom, Tabal, Cilicia and Lycia (the last in very great detail). The Neo-Hittite states are deliberately excluded on the ground that "the discovery of a [Luwian] hieroglyphic inscription in a particular region is not in itself an unquestionable indicator that this was a Luwian-occupied zone" (p. 125). Whereas in southern Anatolia there is significant ono-

mastic evidence for the survival of Luwian population groups, such evidence is missing in Syria, and therefore, until further indications for a Luwian presence turn up, there is no justification to include these Neo-Hittite states in the historical survey. Perhaps the rationale behind this standpoint (also shared by Hutter) is comprehensible in the case of Syria, but it is less so in the case of the Anatolian kingdoms of Gurgum (Maraş), Melidia (Malatya), or Kummuh (Commagene), not to mention Karkamiš, who inherited the designation 'Hatti' in the Iron Age. To the cogent reasons given by Aro for the inclusion of the Neo-Hittite states of Syria in her survey on Luwian art (p. 282 f.), I would like to add two further arguments, the second of which has not been mentioned at all in the volume.

The first is a comment on the extent of the use of Hieroglyphic Luwian in Iron Age Syria. Obviously, almost the entire corpus consists of stone monuments of various types, and these may be regarded, as Bryce says (p. 125), as "one of the trappings of kingship adopted by later and lesser kings." In consequence, these representative or propagandistic inscriptions should not be given undue significance in our quest for ethnicity. Though Bryce, following Hawkins, admits that the inscribed lead strips from Kululu (near Kültepe) containing letters and economic documents indicate a wider use of the script, he prefers to await a greater range of finds of this nature, especially from Syria. In fact, a small but significant collection of non-monumental inscriptions *was* found in Syria, namely in the Danish excavations at Hama. They have now been republished in detail in Hawkins's *Corpus*.[20]) These include a clay tablet bearing the impression of a cylinder seal with numbers and an unintelligible three-line hieroglyphic inscription (HAMA 4); a shell inscribed with the name of "King Urhilana" (HAMA 5; similar to seven fragments found at Nimrud); an ostracon (inscribed sherd) fragment, perhaps containing a letter (HAMA 6); and a group of bullae with hieroglyphic inscriptions (HAMA 7-10). One of the bullae contains the key word 'sheep' and punched numerals, probably a docket with a tally of sheep. Now, this small corpus, in particular the economic text and the letter(?), testifies for a more widespread use of Hieroglyphic Luwian in Iron Age Syria than merely for prestige display. We should hardly expect to find more than this in excavations, since documents of this kind were probably written on perishable material. In short, a city like Hamat, which may be representative of northern and central Syria, used concomitantly three writing systems (at least) representing three written, and probably spoken languages: Cuneiform Akkadian,[21]) Aramaic,[22]) and Hieroglyphic Luwian. This reflects on the special blend of ethnic elements in Iron Age Syria, though it would be extremely difficult to establish their relative proportions and their socio-political structures.[23])

---

[17]) *Lycian in Literary and Epigraphic Sources* (Copenhagen, 1986).

[18]) See J. Chadwick, "The Women of Pylos," in J.-P. Olivier & T.G. Palaima, eds. *Texts, Tablets and Scribes: Studies in Mycenaean Epigraphy and Economy* (Salamanca, 1988), 43-95; V. Parker in S. Deger-Jalkotzy et al., eds. *Floreant Studia Mycenaea*, Band II (Wien, 1999), 495-502. For the abduction of western Anatolian craftsmen to Ahhiyawan territory, see I. Singer, "Purple-dyers in Lazpa," in B.J. Collins et al., eds. *Proceedings of the Conference "Hittites, Greeks, and Their Neighbors in Ancient Anatolia" (Atlanta, 17-19 September, 2004)*.

[19]) The connection between Western Anatolia and the 'Sea Peoples', which has been questioned for a long time, is recently returning to the foreground. See I. Singer, in M. Heltzer & E. Lipiński, eds. *Society and Economy in the Eastern Mediterranean* (Leuven, 1988), 239-250; A. Yasur-Landau, *Social Aspects of the Aegean Migration to the Levant in the End of the 2nd Millennium BCE.* (Ph.D. dissertation; Tel Aviv University, 2002); P.A. Mountjoy in R. Laffineur & E. Greco, eds. *Emporia. Aegeans in the Central and Eastern Mediterranean (Aegaeum 25*; Liège, 2005), 423-427.

---

[20]) P.J. Riis & M.-L. Buhl, *Hama II 2: Les objets de la période dite Syro-Hittite (Âge du Fer)* (København, 1990); J.D. Hawkins, *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions I* (Berlin/New York, 2000), 420-423 (abbr. *CHLI*).

[21]) For the small cuneiform archive found in Building III, see S. Parpola in Riis & Buhl, *Hama II 2*, 257 ff.

[22]) For the Aramaic inscriptions (mostly graffiti), see B. Otzen in Riis & Buhl, *Hama II 2*, 266 ff.

[23]) For the Iron Age cultures of Syria, see, e.g., the articles assembled in G. Bunnens, ed. *Essays on Syria in the Iron Age* (Louvain, 2000) and in "Canadian Research on Ancient Syria," *Bulletin of the Canadian Society for Mesopotamian Studies* 36 (2001).

My second witness, which in my opinion is even more consequential, are the burial customs of the Neo-Hittite cities of Carchemish and Hama.[24] Cremation burial is a well-known Indo-European practice which is attested both textually and archaeologically in second millennium Anatolia, from Troy in the west to Hattuša (Osmankayası) and beyond in the east.[25] It stands to reason that this burial practice, which was absolutely abominable in the eyes of the Semitic peoples of the Fertile Crescent, slowly advanced southwards along with the Hittite domination of Syria, especially in places that were turned into Hittite governmental centers. The cemeteries of Late Bronze Age Carchemish and Aleppo remain to be found, but in the city of Alalah (Tell Atchana), which also became the seat of a Hittite governor, there is indeed some evidence for the gradual spread of the custom, though the absolute numbers are small.[26] The massive introduction of cremation into Syria really occurred only after the fall of the Hittite Empire. Sir Leonard Woolley excavated the extensive Iron Age cemeteries of Carchemish (at Yunus and Deve Hüyük) and found exclusively cremation burials deposited in urns.[27] There were also a few burial stones decorated with banquet scenes, like the ones from Maraş. One stone and one urn carried Hieroglyphic inscriptions. In short, there can hardly be any doubt that the buried persons were either of Anatolian origin, or if not, they must have adopted Anatolian practices which were totally foreign to them. I assume that cremation was already practiced in Carchemish in the Late Bronze Age, but the evidence has yet to be unearthed.

The same picture emerges from the Iron Age cemeteries of Hama which were excavated by a Danish team in the 1930-ties.[28] During the four periods of burial, extending from the 12th century to the Assyrian takeover of Hamat in 720 BCE, all the bodies (except for babies) were cremated and the remains were buried in urns. Around Hama several funerary monuments inscribed with hieroglyphic inscriptions were found.[29] Now, the Hama evidence is even more significant than the one from Carchemish. Whereas the latter became a Hittite city already in the 14th century, central Syria was never 'Hittitized' and continued to be ruled by local dynasts. The best way to account for the massive presence of cremation burials in Hama[30] is by assuming that Anatolian population groups immigrated in large numbers into central Syria during and after the fall of the empire.[31] I assume that

it was from these Neo-Hittite kingdoms of Syria that the Phoenicians later adopted cremation, despite its original incongruity with Semitic burial practices.

In conclusion, burial customs are one of the most conservative aspects of human culture and may therefore serve as a good diagnostic separator between ethnic groups. All the more so when the distinction is between drastically different practices, such as cremation versus inhumation. One may argue, of course, that even burial customs change over time (as in the case of the Phoenicians), but then, the same could be said, even more emphatically, about personal names, which usually serve as the foremost criterion for ethnicity, including 'Luwianness'.[32] Obviously, we are touching here upon the most fundamental problems of definition of 'ethnicity' and this is not the place to delve into this extremely complex issue. But unless one is inclined to follow postmodernist trends in deconstructing ethnicity altogether,[33] one has to strive at putting together a certain set of criteria for ethnicity, at least as a working hypothesis. In the case of Iron Age Anatolia and Syria I would argue, that a place whose inhabitants cremated their dead and whose ruling classes used Hieroglyphic Luwian on their seals and on their stone inscriptions, is "entitled" to be viewed as a cultural descendant of the Hittite/Luwian Bronze Age cultures of Anatolia, even at the "risk" of taking in some Aramean-speaking, Hurrian-speaking, or 'Other'-speaking inhabitants who simply adopted these Neo-Hittite customs.

Religion

Manfred Hutter's definition of the time and space frame for the study of Luwian religion (Ch. 6) is similar to Bryce's: from Arzawa and Lukka in the west to the Lower Land and Kizzuwatna in the east, focusing mainly on the period contemporary with the Hittites (p. 215). On the basic question of whether one may successfully separate a Luwian religion of its own from the large 'melting pot' of Hittite state religion, Hutter, with due reservations, provides a more optimistic answer than did for instance, J. Klinger with regard to the Hattian religion (p. 216 ff.).

Luwian gods already appear in the Old Assyrian texts, and in fact, among the gods to whom the "singers of Kaneš" sing there are several important Luwian deities, including Pirwa and Kamrušepa.[34] The gods heading the Luwian pantheon are basically the same as those heading the Hittite one — the Storm-god (Tarhunta), the Sun-god (Tiwat) and the Protective/Tutelary-god (Kuruntiya) — but their character, epithets and attributes are somewhat different. There is a significant

[24] I have dealt with this topic in detail in an article which appeared so far only in Hebrew: "On Hittite Burials," in E.D. Oren & Sh. Ahituv, eds. *Aharon Kempinski Memorial Volume* (Beer-Sheva, 2002), 47*-58*.

[25] For Anatolian burial practices see J. Seeher, *IstMit* 43 (1993), 219-226.

[26] C.L. Wooley, *Alalakh, an account of the Excavations at Tell Atchana, 1937-1949* (Oxford, 1955), 203-223; P.A. Bienkowski, *Levant* 14 (1982), 80 f.

[27] C.L. Woolley, "The Iron-age Graves of Carchemish," *Liverpool Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology* 26 (1939-40), 11-37.

[28] P.J. Riis, *Hama II.3: Les cimetières à crémation* (Copenhague, 1984).

[29] J.D. Hawkins, "Late Hittite Funerary Documents," in B. Alster, ed. *Death in Mesopotamia* (Copenhagen, 1980), 213-225; D. Bonatz, "Syro-Hittite Funerary Monuments: A Phenomenon of Tradition or Innovation?" in Bunnens, op.cit., 189-210.

[30] It is difficult to establish how far south cremation advanced, but it is almost entirely absent in Palestine. See I. Singer, "The Hittites and the Bible Revisited," in A.M. Maeir & P. de Miroschedji, eds. *Archaeological and Historical Studies in Honor of Amihai Mazar on the Occasion of his Sixtieth Birthday* (Winona Lake, 2006).

[31] But cf., e.g., G. Bunnens, "Syria in the Iron Age: Problems of Definition," in G. Bunnens, ed. *Essays on Syria in the Iron Age* (Louvain, 2000), 17, who sees no evidence for an immigration into Syria and claims that "the spread of the Neo-Hittites is best explained in terms of cultural choice."

[32] For the notorious deficiencies of the onomastic evidence in establishing ethnicity, see, e.g., the roughly contemporary picture from Kassite Babylonia, as recently analyzed by J. A. Brinkman, *JAOS* 124 (2004), 284 f. One text, for example, lists seventeen persons in a group labelled "Assyrian," but in fact, only one of them has an indisputably Assyrian name, whereas the rest are Hurrian, Babylonian, or undefined. In this case "Assyrian" may indicate domicile rather than linguistic affiliation, but there are many examples of siblings bearing names that are ethnically diverse, Babylonian-named fathers who have Kassite-named children, etc. The situation in Anatolia was probably similar; consider, e.g., Muršili II's four children, who bore (according to Hattušili's Apology) a Hurrian, a Hattian and two Luwian names.

[33] See, e.g., M. Banks, *Ethnicity: Anthropological Constructions* (London, 1995), but cf. H.B. Levine, "Reconstructing ethnicity," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 5 (1999), 165-180.

[34] See now A. Archi, "The Singer of Kaneš and his Gods," in M. Hutter & S. Hutter-Braunsar, *Offizielle Religion, lokale Kulte und individuelle Religiosität* (Münster, 2004), 11-26.

distinction, for example, between the Luwian Storm-god, whose chariot is drawn by horses, and the Syro-Hurrian[35]) Storm-god, whose chariot is drawn by bulls. Several other Luwian deities are also connected with horses, including Kamrušepa, Malia and Pirwa.

Several epithets of the Storm-god are clearly Luwian, the most significant of which are *muwatalli-* (NIR.GÁL), 'mighty', and *pihaššašši-* (ḪI.ḪI), 'of the lightning'. Besides their theological and iconographic profile as described by Hutter, (pp. 221 ff.), it is well to note the historical dimension of their first appearance in the foreground of Hittite religion. *muwatalli-* first appears as an epithet of the Storm-god in texts of Muršili II,[36]) and *pihaššašši-* in texts of his son Muwatalli II.[37]) One can hardly avoid the conclusion that Muršili raised the Mighty Storm-god to prominence on the occasion of his campaigns to Arzawa. His son, who actually took up or was given the name 'Mighty', carried on the tradition of a personalized Storm-god and 'invented' his own Storm-god of Lightning, who later became the patron god of his new capital at Tarhuntašša. Thus, religion joins history and language in indicating the major turning point in the Luwianization of the Hittite heartland, a subject to be discussed further below.

The Luwian Sun-god Tiwad, whose name is etymologically linked to Indo-European *diēu-*, '(sky) light', is clearly a male deity, unlike his Hattian-Hittite counterpart with its complex gender profile. However, Luwian religion shared with other Anatolian religions the concept of a Sun-goddes of the Earth (*tiyammaššiš* ᴰUTU-*za*). The protective or tutelary gods, whose sacred animal was the stag, were particularly popular in the Luwian realm.[38])

Although, in true Indo-European tradition, the top of the Luwian pantheon was dominated by male deities, several goddesses play dominant roles especially in ritual and magic. In particular, Kamrušepa, the healing goddess *par excellence*, stands out through her prerogative of picking out the sacrifice animals from the flocks of the Sun-god.[39]) I am not fully convinced that Hutter has sufficiently proven his observation that "Luwian religion seems to be closer to early Indo-European thought than 'Hittite' religion" (p. 215), but I leave this important question to the inspection of Indo-Europeanists.

Perhaps the most interesting aspect of Luwian religion is the rich world of magic and ritual as recorded from the mouth of various practitioners, both women and men. Hutter, with good reason, deals separately with each region, from the 'purest' expression of Luwian religion in Arzawa, through the 'buffer-zone' of the Lower Land, to its most 'mixed' form in Kizzuwatna, where it blends with Hurrian and north Syrian traditions. The detailed study of these ritual texts has flourished in recent years, with special attention given to their redactional history, structural analysis, and performative tra-

dition.[40]) Hutter completes his detailed survey by raising the important question of why these magical rituals were meticulously recorded and copied in the Hittite capital. He offers a distinction between rituals (such as Tunnawiya's *taknaz dā-*ritual) that provided well-being for the royal couple, and as such were fully incorporated into 'Hittite political religion', and between rituals aimed at curing sick or bewitched persons. Although these 'private' Luwian rituals were thought to be useful for everybody, they were mainly practiced to cure patients of Luwian stock (p. 255). I find this last conclusion debatable. I would rather think that the Hittites, who were exceptionally open and susceptible for the import and absorption of foreign techniques, literary traditions, and even gods, considered these 'exotic' rituals of foreign magicians and 'Old Women' as yet another manifestation of 'cosmopolitan knowhow', which they willingly adopted for their own benefit (anticipating certain 'New Age' practices).

In his concise survey of first millennium religions of Anatolia and northern Syria Hutter finds little evidence for a genuine Luwian legacy, although here and there one comes across upon scattered indications for the 'survival' of certain Luwian deities (Šanta, Maliya, Kurunta/Runtiya) and elements of Luwian religion. I find his discussion on second millennium Wiluša (which strangely moved into the first millennium section, pp. 265 ff.) to be overly skeptical, but this is not the place to resume this endless debate. All in all, I concur with his general conclusions about the extremely motley (or 'globalised', to use Hutter's modernized expression) first millennium picture, in which it seems almost impossible to disentangle the Luwian, Greek, Hurrian and West Semitic elements. However, as argued above, I find the Luwian ingredients in the 'melting pot' to be more substantial than admitted by Hutter or Bryce. Through the special Luwian-Aramean symbiosis which developed in Syria, some Anatolian traditions and ideas also found their way to ancient Israel, and I fully subscribe to Hutter's suggestion that the southernmost Neo-Hittite kingdom of Hama "may have played a major role in transmitting Anatolian traditions to the biblical world" (p. 277).[41])

Art and Architecture

Sanna Aro's chapter also opens with questions of definition, pointing out the difficulties in drawing a clear line between Luwians and Arameans in Syria.[42]) Nevertheless, she chooses to include in her survey all those kingdoms of Anatolia and Syria that have produced Luwian Hieroglyphic inscriptions, arguing that "Iron Age rulers using Luwian language in their representational inscriptions did either speak it themselves or otherwise wanted to be identified as representatives of their Luwian-speaking people" (p. 282). The chapter deals with architecture and monumental art, but not with 'small objects' such as seals, ivories, metalwork or pottery. Although a basic archaeological survey precedes each section, the volume as a whole would have benefited from a separate chapter on archaeology and material culture.

---

[35]) As recently recognized by J.D. Hawkins in G. Beckman et al., eds. *Hittite Studies in Honor of Harry A. Hoffner Jr.* (Winona Lake, 2003), 169-175, the Storm-god in the eagle-chariot drawn by bulls on the seal of Muršili III, on the Imamkulu and Aleppo reliefs and elsewhere is in fact the Storm-god of Aleppo.

[36]) For refs. see CHD 3/3: 316 f.; F. Starke, *Untersuchung zum Stammbildung des keilschrift-luwischen Nomens* (Wiesbaden, 1990), 172 ff.

[37]) For refs. see I. Singer, *Muwatalli's Prayer to the Assembly of Gods Through the Storm-god of Lightning* (Atlanta, 1996), 185 ff.; *RlA* 10 (2005), s.v. *pihaššašši-*.

[38]) For the recent decipherment of the epithet of the 'Stag-god' of the Countryside (*imrassi- Kurunti(ya)-*) in Hieroglyphic inscriptions, see J.D. Hawkins in J.H.W. Penney, ed. *Indo-European Perspectives. Studies in Honour of Anna Morpurgo Davies* (Oxford, 2004), 355-369.

[39]) See A. Archi, *Or* 62 (1993), 404-409.

[40]) On the Kizzuwatna rituals, see now J. Miller, *Studies in the Origins, Development and Interpretation of the Kizzuwatna Rituals* (Wiesbaden, 2004).

[41]) For similar conclusions see I. Singer, *Fs Mazar* (op. cit. n. 30).

[42]) See now also M. Novák, "Akkulturation von Aramäern und Luwiern und der Austausch von ikonographischen Konzepten in der späthethitischen Kunst," in H. Blum et al., eds. *Brückenland Anatolien?* (Tübingen, 2002), 147-171. J. Gonnella, W. Khayyata & K. Kohlmeyer, *Die Zitadelle von Aleppo und der Tempel des Wettergottes. Neue Forschungen und Entdeckungen* (Münster, 2005). The Hieroglyphic Luwian inscription…

The deplorable state of research into second millennium Western Anatolia is duly emphasized. With only a handful of excavated (and published) sites at hand (Troy, Beycesultan and a few smaller sites),[43]) one can hardly elaborate on the characteristics of the early Luwian culture. To the small list of rock monuments (Karabel, Akpınar) one could add the spectacular sites of Eflatun Pınar and Fasılar, which must have belonged to the kingdom of Tarhuntašša.[44]) Aro's conjecture that "rock monuments could have a Luwian rather than Hittite origin" (p. 288) remains to be proven. In fact, the earliest dated rock monuments, those belonging to the generation of Muwatalli II (Sirkeli) and Hattušili III (Fıraktin), are in Kizzuwatna, a hybrid Luwian-Hurrian region that was annexed to Hatti more than a century earlier. Only in the next two generations did the burgeoning new fashion extend westwards into the Luwian heartland.

The sections on Iron Age Luwian art and architecture provide an excellent state-of-the-art survey, with descriptions and photographs of not easily accessible Anatolian monuments.[45]) There is little I can add to this meticulous and sagacious presentation, but I would like to stress one particular chronological aspect which might remain insufficiently noted by non-specialist readers. Until quite recently there was a general consensus regarding an almost undocumented 'Dark Age' which covered almost three centuries from the fall of the Hittite Empire to the first Assyrian conquests in the West. The 1986 discovery at Lidar Höyük of the seal impression of Kunzi-Tešub, son of Talmi-Tešub, a 12th century BCE king of Karkamiš, brought about a chain reaction with far-reaching implications. Two years later David Hawkins announced his ground-breaking discovery of the name of Kunzi-Tešub as the grandfather of two different kings, brothers, on their monumental Hieroglyphic inscriptions in the Malatya region (ISPEKÇÜR and DARENDE, respectively).[46]) Unless "grandson" actually meant no more than "descendant", these monuments and the closely related monuments from Malatya itself must be re-dated to the 12th-11th centuries BCE, at least two centuries earlier than the generally accepted date! Obviously, the re-dating of the Malatya sequence has overall implications on the entire Neo-Hittite corpus, notably on Karkamiš. In short, the notorious "Dark Age" has been "illuminated" to a certain extent, not only along the northern Euphrates Valley, but also through similarly dated finds from Aleppo and Ain Dara.[47]) It is more evident now that the architectural, sculptural and inscriptional traditions of the

Neo-Hittite states were directly derived from those of the Hittite Empire, without a considerable gap between them.

Luwianisms in Hittite Texts and Their Significance

An inclusive monograph like *The Luwians* usually ends with a chapter of General Conclusions or *Rückblick*. In this case, one can understand the editor's reluctance to impose his own conclusions on the four other experts who in some points express squarely opposing views. My tentative thoughts presented below are obviously not intended to supplement this concluding chapter, but rather to explore some potential directions for further research into the intriguing questions of Anatolian ethnicity. I refer in particular to aspects which are 'tucked away', so-to-say, between the clearly defined disciplines covered in the monograph, for example, demographic trends and their sociolinguistic consequences.[48]) These aspects could perhaps lead to a better understanding of the most intriguing question of them all: Why did Hittite totally vanish after the fall of the Empire, whereas Luwian continued to flourish for another five hundred years?

One conclusion which emerges clearly from the reviewed volume is the dominant role of language in defining the Luwian phenomenon. Despite the unrelenting efforts of Aro and Hutter to define what is specifically Luwian in art and religion, respectively, I doubt it that we would be able to distinguish between the ethnic groups of Anatolia without the evidence of language.[49]) Indeed, when one plunges into the illiterate periods preceding the second millennium BCE, the ethno-cultural map of Anatolia becomes increasingly blurred and ill-defined. There is no need to state the obvious that one cannot simply equate language with ethnicity, but (as well understood by the author of Genesis 11) how would we even start discussing ethnicity without the firm evidence of language? Therefore, the main key for a better understanding of the momentous ethno-cultural developments in Late Bronze Age Anatolia is a meticulous diachronic and synchronic study of its languages in contact and their correlation with recorded historical developments.

One of the most telling linguistic phenomena in Late Bronze Age Anatolia is the increasing infiltration of New Hittite texts with Luwianisms, a subject which has only cursorily been addressed in the reviewed volume (p. 170). Rosenkranz and Güterbock have made important observations on the subject in the 1950-ties, but it is only due to the major improvement in our understanding of Luwian and to a systematic diachronic scrutiny of a much larger textual corpus that meaningful statistical results may be ventured. Besides various references in the seminal books on Luwian by Starke and Melchert, two important recent articles deal specifically with the question of Luwianisms in Hittite texts and their significance: Craig Melchert's article on "The Problem of Luvian Influence on Hittite,"[50]) and Theo van den

---

[43]) A promising western Anatolian site has recently been excavated by a team from the University of Izmir lead by Prof. Recep Meriç; Bademgediği Tepe, west of Torbali (between Ephesos and Karabel), may be identified with Puranda, conquered by Muršili II in his fourth year. See H. Gonnet, *Orient-Express* 2001/4, 120 f.; R. Meriç & P.A. Mountjoy, *Istanbuler Mitteilungen* 52 (2002), 80; R. Meriç, *Istanbuler Mitteilungen* 53 (2003), 79-98; id., *Metropolis, City of the Mother Goddess* (Izmir, 2004), 31-34.

[44]) I. Singer, *SMEA* 38 (1996), 65, n.7; Dinçol et al., *Anatolica* 26 (2000), 19. For an updated photographic documentation of these and other imperial rock reliefs, see now H. Ehringhaus, *Götter, Herrscher, Inschriften. Die Felsreliefs der hethitischen Grossreichszeit in der Türkei* (Mainz, 2005).

[45]) It is a pity though that the photograph of Ivriz on the cover of the book is partly shaded. One could surely have found a better photograph of this magnificent rock monument.

[46]) "Kuzi-Tešub and the 'Great Kings' of Karkamiš," *AnSt* 38 (1988), 99-108; id., *CHLI* I/1, 286 ff.

[47]) For the temple of the Storm-god discovered in the citadel of Aleppo, see K. Kohlmeyer, *Der Tempel des Wettergottes von Aleppo* (Münster, 2000). The Hieroglyphic Luwian iscriptions will be published by David Hawkins.

[48]) Other aspects which have almost not been touched in the volume are Luwian anthroponyms and toponyms. For some preliminary remarks on Hittite and Luwian names (and the difficult distinction between them), see E. Laroche, *Les Noms des Hittites* (Paris, 1966), Ch. VII (pp. 317-333).

[49]) Cf. also Hutter, p. 211: "It seems that language alone allows us to talk of Luwians at all."

[50]) G. Meiser & O. Hackstein, eds. *Sprachkontakt und Sprachwandel. Akten der XI. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, 17-23. September 2000, Halle an der Saale* (Wiesbaden, 2005), 447-460. The article is accessible online at Melchert's homepage: http://www.unc.edu/~melchert/index.html (under Recent Papers).

Hout's article on "Institutions, Vernaculars, Publics: The Case of Second Millennium Anatolia."[51]) Since this subject is essential for any discussion on the ethnolinguistic situation of 13th century Anatolia, I found it worthwhile to refer to these articles (with the authors' permission) in anticipation of their forthcoming publication.

Both articles supply valuable lists of Luwian words in Hittite texts, both marked and unmarked. Melchert's list is in chronological order (from Old to New Hittite), whereas van den Hout's two lists (glossed and unglossed) follow the thematical order of the *Catalogue des Textes Hittites*. With some 500 words altogether, representing more than one tenth of the Hittite lexicon, these references should suffice for some meaningful observations. But despite this laboriously achieved database, deciphering its rationale is anything but easy, and the two scholars differ in some of their conclusions.

To start with, it should be stressed that the glossing phenomenon in Hittite texts substantially differs from other glossing phenomena in the ancient Near East. In Mesopotamia, Amarna or Ugarit the gloss words are indigenous lexemes inserted within the sequence of the text either to clarify or to replace an Akkadian word or a Sumerian logogram which might be wrongly interpreted by the reader of the text. In the Amarna correspondence, for example, a scribe would add a gloss in his native tongue, either a Canaanite lexeme in letters from the south, or a Hurrian one in letters from the north.[52]) Whereas such an explanatory function may be detected in a few cases, the Luwian words in New Hittite texts, both glossed and unglossed, are, as a rule, *not* appended to difficult expressions or to logograms, but are rather "liberally sprinkled" throughout the text, to use Melchert's expression, with no apparent logical justification. It is also well to recall that other foreign words, such as Hattian and Hurrian, which would 'justify' glossing even more than the closely related Luwian words, are not marked at all.[53]) Unlike Luwian, the vocables or loanwords taken from other languages generally belong to a specialized vocabulary, such as ritual objects or architectural terms. Thus, the massive appearance of Luwianisms in late texts must have a completely different *raison d'être* than the customary cases of glossing. The only common denominator between the two phenomena could be the feeling of the scribe that he was writing his text *not* in his native tongue, a conclusion which, if proven, would have far-reaching consequences for the Anatolian situation.

Melchert submits the corpus of Luwianisms to a strict grammatical test, concluding that "the presence of the *Glossenkeil* is no guarantee of Luvian origin, and its absence is no argument against" (p. 2). Some unmistakably Hittite words are sometimes marked with a *Glossenkeil*, probably to call attention to unusual features (which he compares to a modern *sic* or exclamation mark). The next distinction made by Melchert is between true Luwian loanwords (e.g. *gur-šauwan-,* 'island')[54]) and Luwianisms, i.e. words character-

ized by uniquely Luwian inflection (e.g. *aparha*, 'I ruled'). Taking into consideration the close relationship between Luwian and Hittite (comparable to Italian and Spanish, for example), there is a considerable overlap resulting in a wide margin of error, especially with nouns and adjectives. I would not even exclude the possibility that in some cases the scribe himself hesitated whether a certain form is Hittite or Luwian, which would explain why the same word may appear in the same text, either with or without the gloss-wedge.

Moving to the diachronic segmentation of the corpus, Melchert stresses, following Starke and others, that a limited influence of Luwian is already found in Old Hittite texts, and this increases steadily from the 15th century on. Luwianization really becomes common only from Muršili II onward. However, in Melchert's view, the evidence is insufficient to establish whether this development was gradual or abrupt, and whether it should be attributed to some dramatic change in ruling hierarchy or more general social conditions (p. 16). In view of the many gaps in our information, Melchert finally forgoes any attempt at characterizing the Luwian influence on Hittite in terms of language-contact typologies.

Building on Melchert's study, van den Hout is more daring in his chronological and sociolinguistic conclusions. For a closer examination of the distribution of Luwianisms he divides the Hittite corpus into texts with a long term interest, usually preserved in multiple copies (Group A, including historical texts, instructions, mythology, rituals, festivals, prayers, etc.) and texts with ephemeral interest, usually preserved in single copies (Group B, including letters, administration, inventories, oracles, etc.). His results generally reconfirm earlier conclusions about a wide distribution in practically all genres, but the finer tuning of his examination adduces some important observations. One of them is that Luwianisms are more frequently used in the most ephemeral texts of Group B "where there was little or no influence of tradition and where elevated language was the least present" (p. 224). This conclusion should be pondered in combination with another chronological observation of van den Hout, namely, that the gloss-wedges preceding Luwian words and forms were introduced rather abruptly during the reign of Muršili II (p. 227).[55]) If so, the next step is to find the historical circumstances which may have produced this sudden increase in the use of Luwianisms in Hittite texts. Following earlier observations to this effect,[56]) van den Hout identifies the decisive demographic turning point to be the devastating epidemic which decimated the population of Hatti after Šuppiluliuma's victory in Amqa, followed by the mass deportations of Westerners to Hatti during Muršili's campaigns to Arzawa.[57]) The decrease in the population of the Hittite

---

[51]) Due to appear in S. Sanders (ed.), *Margins of Writing, Origins of Cultures* (Chicago, 2006). I wish to thank Prof. van den Hout for providing me with a preprint of his article.

[52]) Sh. Izre'el, "The Amarna Glosses: Who Wrote What for Whom? Some Sociolinguistic Considerations," *Israel Oriental Studies* 15 (1995), 101-122.

[53]) With progressively fewer exceptions, such as *šinahila,* Hurrian 'second' (KBo 3.3 ii 7). For other examples, see van den Hout, ib., 222, n. 53.

[54]) 'Island' is a good example for the adoption of a loanword, since the first place the Hittites would have become acquainted with islands was the western Anatolian coastline. For the politically contested northeastern Aegean islands, claimed both by the Hittites and the Ahhiyawans, see

P. Taracha in Th. Richter, D. Prechel, J. Klinger, eds. *Kulturgeschichten. Altorientalische Studien für Volkert Haas* (Saarbrücken, 2001), 417-422; Singer, op.cit. (n. 18).

[55]) With one uncertain exception (see n. 59), the earlier use of gloss-wedges may have served other purposes (n. 227).

[56]) E.g., H.G. Güterbock, *Or* 25 (1956), 138; S. Košak, *Eretz-Israel* 15 (1981), 15*.

[57]) The numbers of deportees taken by Muršili II from Arzawa to Hatti (some 85.000 people altogether) may be somewhat exaggerated, but since we find similarly large figures in Egyptian and Assyrian records, one cannot entirely dismiss them. See A. Amer, "Asiatic Prisoners Taken in the Reign of Amenophis II", *Scripta Mediterranea* 5 (1984), 27 f. (with refs. to earlier studies); B. Oded, *Mass Deportations and Deportees in the Neo-Assyrian Empire* (Wiesbaden, 1979). Of course, plenty of captives were also brought to Hatti from other parts of the empire, but nothing comparable to the numbers given for Arzawa.

homeland combined with the sharp increase in Luwian-speaking deportees may certainly have tipped the demographic balance in favour of the latter, a development which was bound to have an impact *even* on the Hittite chancellery, let alone in more plebeian segments of Hittite society. There is no need to go a step further and to consider Luwian as the *only* vernacular language of late 13th century Hatti, leaving for Hittite the role of the standard chancellery language. The growing Luwian competition with Hittite should suffice to explain the survival of the former and the vanishing of the latter after the fall of the Hittite capital and its royal archives. Whether one accepts this theory or not, it undeniably provides an integrative solution for an important phenomenon in Late Anatolian culture by combining linguistic and historical data.

What remains to be investigated more closely is the impact of this major demographic shift in various domains of Hittite society and culture. Melchert's preliminary analysis of the Luwian loanwords in terms of their semantic fields has not produced significant results. His first impression speaks of a "quite variegated assortment" (p. 10), which includes not only items of food, clothing and utensils, but also terms relating to hunting/herding, military organization, religion and social order. While the first three categories could be viewed as colloquialisms, this would hardly apply to the last ones (including the title *t/labarna*). Van den Hout's investigation is primarily focused on the language of the scribes who used Luwianisms and less so on other segments of Hittite society. On this point I have to agree with him that the considerable increase of Luwianisms in texts written in the chancelleries of the Hittite capital must be indicative of the language of the scribes, either through intensive contact with Luwian speakers, or, more probably, as a result of the presence of many Luwians among the scribes of Hattuša (p. 227). Indeed, I can hardly see the logic in using ordinary Luwian words and forms which could just as easily be expressed in Hittite, unless, as stated by Güterbock half a century ago (1956: 139), these scribes "were not able to rid themselves from their own Luwian idiom, and this led to the development of a kind of 'Mischsprache'".[58] This situation recalls to a certain extent the mixed Canaano-Akkadian language employed by the scribes of Canaan in the Amarna Age, and I believe that there is a lot to learn from a systematic comparison of the two linguistic phenomena.[59]

Postscript: Luwians in the Hittite Army?

If I insist on deepening my quest for the sociological profile of the Luwian influence on Hittite society, this is not originally based on some solid evidence readily visible in the texts. If there were such explicit references, they would surely be well-known by now. Rather, I base my 'hunch' on historical analogies, notably those originating from the very same region from which the Luwian captives were brought to Hatti. I refer to the scores of choice Carian and Ionian mer-

cenaries who served in the armies of Egypt, Persia and other Near Eastern kingdoms in the first millennium BCE.[60] This well-attested phenomenon had its antecedents already in the second millennium, when various 'Sea Peoples', many of whom originated from Western Anatolia, served in elite corps in the Egyptian army.[61] Now, since Western Anatolia served throughout antiquity as a primary source for the recruitment of military men to distant lands, it would be strange *not* to encounter this phenomenon in the Hittite army as well, whose scope of action was constantly expanding and whose functioning was becoming increasingly difficult as the Empire was aging. In short, I strongly suspect that many of the Luwian deportees brought to Hatti ended up in various army units, just as their brethren in the Egyptian army. The preliminary remarks to follow cannot fully substantiate this hypothesis, but may initiate a scholarly discussion on the subject, which must obviously be investigated in-depth and not only through linguistic means.

An early clue for Luwian-speakers in the Hittite security forces has already been noted in the past, but it is worth to recall this case due to its exceptional importance. The Instruction for the Royal Bodyguard (LÚ.MEŠ *MEŠEDI)* is a Middle Hittite composition containing a detailed protocol on the daily exit of the king from the palace escorted by a selected group of bodyguards.[62] The last sections of the text, unfortunately badly damaged, describe the passing on of a command, probably emanating from the inner chamber of the palace (*dun[nakešar]*). The message is first transmitted in Hittite (*udan[du-war-at]*, "[Let] them bring [it]!") to the 'man of the golden spear' (LÚ.ŠUKUR.GUŠKIN), who then passes it on in Luwian (*luwili*) to the '(bronze) spear-men' (LÚ.MEŠ.ŠUKUR). Unfortunately, the content of this Luwian message is not preserved, but the large gap precludes that it was a simple translation of the Hittite message. Thereafter, a 'spear-man', whose bronze spear is apparently "tu[rned]down" (*katta ne[ian]*), goes to the kitchen and announces something from which only the first word, in Hittite, is preserved: "To the inner chamber […]!" As already noted by the editors, this detailed report seems to indicate that "the person of higher rank is addressed in 'literary' Hittite but tells it to the rank and file in the 'vernacular' Luwian."[63] Now, if this is indeed the situation in the innermost circle of the royal security ring, would it not be similar in other units of the Hittite army?

In the same text we find yet another meaningful Luwian clue. In §§6-7 instructions are given to guards who need to leave the palace premises in order to urinate (lit.: "go to the pot"). The request must be passed on to a 'third-in-command' ([LÚ]*tarriyanalli-*), thence to a 'second-in-command' ([LÚ]*duyanalli-*), and finally to a 'commander-of-ten

---

[58] Cf. also E. Laroche, *Dictionnaire de la Langue Louvite* (Paris, 1059), 13 f. (§§14-15).

[59] For Canaano-Akkadian see, in particular, A.F. Rainey, *Canaanite in the Amarna Tablets: A Linguistic Analysis of the Mixed Dialect Used by the Scribes from Canaan* (Leiden, 1996); Sh. Izre'el, *Canaano-Akkadian* (München, 1998); id., "Vocalized Canaanite: Cuneiform-Written Canaanite Words in the Amarna Letters: Some Methodological Remarks," *Dutch Studies — Society of Near Eastern Languages and Literatures* 5 (2003), 13-34.

[60] See, e.g., J.D. Ray, "Soldiers to Pharaohs: The Carians of Southwest Anatolia," in J.M. Sasson, ed. *Civilizations of the Ancient Near East* II (New York, 1995), 1185-1194.

[61] For the origin of the "Sea Peoples", see I. Singer in M. Heltzer and E. Lipiński, eds. *Society and Economy in the Eastern Mediterranean (c. 1500-1000 B.C.)* (Leuven, 1988), 239-250.

[62] Last treatment by H.G. Güterbock and Th. P.J. van den Hout, *The Hittite Instruction for the Royal Bodyguard* (Chicago, 1991). Cf. also the translation of G. McMahon in W.W. Hallo, ed., *The Context of Scripture I* (Leiden, 1997), 225-230. For the personnel mentioned in the text, see R. Beal, *The Organisation of the Hittite Military* (Heidelberg, 1992), *passim*; F. Pecchioli Daddi in G. Beckman et al., eds. *Hittite Studies in Honor of Harry A. Hoffner Jr.* (Winona Lake, 2003), 83-92.

[63] Güterbock & van den Hout, ib., 59.

bodyguards' (UGULA.10.*MEŠEDI*) who may finally dismiss the fretful guard. Is it a mere coincidence that the lower echelons bear Luwian designations?[64]) Other military terms built with the Luwian suffix *-alla/ī-* are *LÚtapariyalli-* 'commander' and *LÚkuwalanalla/i-*, 'soldier', both of them derived from well-known Luwian vocables. The latter is particularly important because it seems to be the only attested term for a single 'soldier' of rank and file.[65]) Last but not least, I would add here Luwian *upati-* a vocable whose attested history covers an entire millennium, from Old Assyrian *upatinnum* to Neo-Hittite *L. 274 ubatit-*.[66]) Without entering into the complex problems of interpretation and etymology, I tend to accept R. Beal's conclusion that it is some kind of military group or association capable of holding land.[67])

Besides the above terms intimately associated with military organization, browsing through the lists of Luwian vocables preserved in Hittite texts I came across several terms related to vehicles of transportation:[68]) GIŠ*haršandahit-* must be a part of the wagon,[69]) whereas *tiyarit-* could be the very reading of GIŠMAR.GÍD.DA 'wagon'.[70]) *māuwani(ya)-* is probably 'hitch as a four-span'.[71]) Significantly, this last term comes from the horse training instructions of Kikkuli, a text, which according to F. Starke, contains other Luwian clues and was probably composed in Kizzuwatna.[72]) To these vocables we may add Hieroglyphic Luwian *zalal-*, 'vehicle', and its cognates, including Hieroglyphic Luwian *zalalasa-*, the possible equivalent of cuneiform LÚ*KARTAPPU*.[73]) This small assemblage, surely not exhaustive, could indicate some Luwian expertise and influence in the domains of horse-breeding and chariotry.[74]) As noted above, the horse plays an important role also in Luwian religion.

Historical texts may provide the actual background for a Luwian connection to horses and chariotry. Besides massive numbers of infantry men, hundreds of horse teams with their charioteers were also transported from western Anatolia to Hatti. For example, Tudhaliya I reports in his annals that he brought from Aššuwa to Hattuša 10.000 foot soldiers and 600 teams of horses together with their chariot drivers.[75]) What did they do in Hatti? From administrative texts and letters we mainly hear about the resettlement and the employment of the deportees as agricultural work force,[76]) but I assume that many of the professional persons brought from the West continued to exercise their original occupations, including within the ranks of the army and the chariotry. In the Battle of Qadesh several western Anatolian units participated, both infantry and chariotry.[77]) The list of Hittite allies includes not only vassal kingdoms, who were obliged by treaties to send their auxiliary troops, but also some western Anatolian lands that were never truly subdued by the Hittites — Maša, Karkiša, Luka. I assume that these fighters were recruited into the Hittite armies, either as prisoners of war, or, more likely, as mercenaries. An incised drawing on a fragmentary Hittite bowl from Boğazköy may give us a clue what such a western Anatolian soldier might have looked like.[78])

In short, what I would like to put forward as a working hypothesis is the assumption that a considerable part of the Hittite army consisted of men originating from western Anatolia, perhaps serving, as in Egypt,[79]) in special combat units. Like their first millennium counterparts, these were probably fierce fighters whose martial abilities were greatly valued by their commanders. However, quite often throughout history mercenaries and foreign troops became a broken reed in times of distress and disarray and sometimes they even turned against their masters of yore.[80]) In his last article on the Hittites, Emil Forrer envisaged "a slave mutiny of the Luwian lower classes in Hatti."[81]) Although

---

[64]) For the Luwian suffix in *-alla/i-*, see N. Oettinger, *KZ* 99 (1986), 43-53; Melchert, *The Luwians*, 16; op.cit. (n. 50), §3.2.

[65]) Beal, op. cit., 35 f. Luwian *kuwalana-* is a recurring element in personal names, including Kuwalana-ziti, the Hittite messenger who brought to western Anatolia the new treaty tablet for Walmu king of Wiluša (KUB 19.55+ rev. 38'). For this diplomat, who was also active in Egypt, see Th. van den Hout, *Der Ulmitešub-Vertrag* (Wiesbaden, 1995), 91, n. 112.

[66]) For a comprehensive survey of the sources and the various interpretations, see Beal, op. cit., 539-549.

[67]) Ib. 548. For the question of etymology, see H.C. Melchert, "A Luwian Dedication," in J.H.W. Penney, ed. *Indo-European Perspectives. Studies in Honour of Anna Morpurgo Davies* (Oxford, 2004), 370-379; I. Yakubovich, "Carian Monument," in N. Kazanskij, ed. *Festschrift Leonard Georgijevich Gercenberg* (Saint Petersburg, 2005). I wish to thank Ilya Yakubovich for these references and for putting at my disposal preprints of his forthcoming articles.

[68]) I found only a couple of terms related to military equipment: *putalli(ya)-* 'to gird'; *kurudawant-* 'wearing a helmet(?)''. Cf. also *gurta-* 'citadel'.

[69]) F. Starke, *Untersuchung* (op.cit., n. 36), 174.

[70]) But cf. Starke, ib., 218-220 ('Spindel').

[71]) But cf. Starke, *Ausbildung und Training von Streitwagenpferden* (Wiesbaden, 1995), 44, n. 105.

[72]) Starke, ib. 122 f.

[73]) Starke, *Untersuchung* (op.cit., n. 36), 337-340 (with refs.).

[74]) It is interesting to note another semantic field which is abundantly represented in the list of Luwianisms preserved in Hittite texts — the elaborate terminology of (dis)obedience and rebellion, so typical for Hittite relations with western Anatolia: *harpanuwant-* 'rebellious', (\)*tarpanallašša-* 'become rebellious', *kappilalli-* 'hostile', *maršašša/i-* 'treacherous', (\)*kupiyati- kup-* 'hatch a plot', *appalā(i)-* 'entrap, deceive', *zammura/i-* 'insult, slander', *tumantiya-* 'obedience', etc. Also related to subjugation is *arkammalla/i-* 'make tribute bearing', for which see now Singer, op.cit. (n. 18).

[75]) Lit. "the lords of the reins" (LÚ.MEŠ *išmeriyaš* BELŪ*HI.A*). KUB 23.11/12 iii 34 f.; O. Carruba, *SMEA* 18 (1977), 160 f.; R. Beal, *Organisation* (op. cit., n. 62), 153 f.; T. Bryce, *The Kingdom of the Hittites* (Oxford, 1998), 135. Probably similar numbers were also brought from Arzawa but the passage (ii 11 f.) is damaged. The number of chariots brought by Muršili II from Arzawa must have been even greater, but the exact figures are not indicated.

[76]) See S. Heinhold-Krahmer, *Arzawa* (Heidelberg, 1977), 144 f.; H.A. Hoffner, "The Treatment and Long-Term Use of Persons Captured in Battle according to the Maşat Texts," in K.A. Yener & H.A. Hoffner Jr., eds. *Hittite Archaeology and History. Papers in Memory of Hans G. Güterbock* (Winona Lake, 2002), 61-72.

[77]) A. Gardiner, *The Kadesh Inscriptions of Ramesses II* (Oxford, 1975), 8, 57 f.

[78]) K. Bittel, "Tonschale mit Ritzzeichnung von Boğazköy," *Revue Archéologique* 1976, 9-14. After analyzing the various elements of the warrior's equipment Bittel concluded (p. 14): "Die namentlich beim Helm spürbaren westlichen Bezüge könnten darauf zurückzuführen sein, dass sich der Zeichner an Vorbilder aus dem kleinasiatischen Westen oder Südwesten gehalten hat, aus Bereichen, in denen sich Anatolisches und Aegaeisches berührten.''

[79]) For the Sherden and other foreign troops in the Egyptian army, see, e.g., A. Kadry, *Officers and Officials in the New Kingdom* (Budapest, 1982), 173-181; O. Loretz & J. Kahl in M. Yon et al., eds. *Le pays d'Ougarit autour de 1200 av. J.-C.* (Paris, 1995), 125-140. For a possible etymological connection (which remains to be proven) between the Šerdani and the Hittite term *šardiya-* , 'allied-troops', see Singer in op.cit. (n. 11), 604, n. 45.

[80]) As did the Philistines in Canaan to their Egyptian masters. See I. Singer, *Tel Aviv* 12 (1985), 109 ff.

[81]) "Der Untergang des Hatti-Reiches," *Ugaritica* 6 (1969), 222: "… ein Sklavenaufstand der luvischen Unterschicht des Hatti-Landes…".

such a scenario might be overly dramatized, it does not take one too much imagination to conceive of the final disintegration of the Hittite army and state as following along ethno-cultural fault lines, besides other feuds and rifts.[82] It should again be stressed that these tentative reflections on the Luwians in the Late Hittite society must be further explored and corroborated by using all possible means of investigation.[83]

In conclusion, the editor and the contributors of this excellent volume should be congratulated for erecting a durable monument for the Luwians, one of the most important yet elusive peoples of the ancient Near East.

————————