Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie

Begründet von
Johann Tischler

Herausgegeben von Detlev Groddek

Band 53

2021
Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

Fred C. Woudhuizen

Luwian Hieroglyphic Texts in Late Bronze Age Scribal Tradition

2021
Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

Die Abbildung auf der Umschlagrückseite bietet eine Nachzeichnung des hieroglyphenluwischen Siegels ZN 1769 der Skulpturensammlung, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden.

Cover illustration: “great prince”, Latmos 2001 & Beyköy 2, § 26 before 1989.
Design: Eberhard Zangger

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek
Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über https://dnb.de abrufbar.

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek
The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet at https://dnb.de.

For further information about our publishing program consult our website https://www.harrassowitz-verlag.de

© Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden 2021
This work, including all of its parts, is protected by copyright. Any use beyond the limits of copyright law without the permission of the publisher is forbidden and subject to penalty. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage and processing in electronic systems.
Printed on permanent/durable paper.
Printing and binding: Beltz Grafische Betriebe GmbH, Bad Langensalza
Printed in Germany

ISSN 1619-0874
ISBN 978-3-447-11531-5

CONTENTS

Introduction....7
List of abbreviations....12
Chart I: Synchronisms between the royal houses of Khatti, Karkamis, and Assuwa/Arzawa/Mira....13

Part I: The Texts
1. The legend of seal Borowski no. 26....17
2. The Ankara silver bowl (Ankara 2)....22
3. The Ankara bronze bowl (Ankara 3)....41
4. Dedication of temples by Talmisarrumas of Aleppo....44
5. The victory stele of *tuhkanti* Urkhitesup....49
6. The rock relief of Taşçı....51
7. A bowl and altar dedicated by the scribe Tapramis....55
8. The Lycian campaign of Tudkhaliyas IV....59
9. Offering regulations on the Emirgazi stone altars....77
10. The stone inscription from Karakuyu....94
11. Sauskaruntias' capture of Attarima....98
12. Pudukhepa's memorial at Fraktin....108
13. Suppiluliumas II's *pietas* towards his father....114
14. The deeds of Suppiluliumas II for one year....118
Excursus: On the date of the Südburg text: Suppiluliumas I or II?....130
1. Tarkhuntassa....136
2-3. Wiyanawanda and Lukka....137
15. The stele from Afyon....141
16. The orthostat from Torbalı....144
17. The rock inscription of Latmos (Suratkaya)....146
18. The stele of Anazitis from Çalapverdi....147
19. The spring precinct at Boğazköy erected by a king of Isuwa....149
20. Great king Kupantakuruntas III of Mira, Muksus, and the Sea Peoples event....152
20.1 Introduction....152
20.2 The Luwian hieroglyphic text from Beyköy....156
20.3 Significance of Beyköy 2....182
20.4 Arguments for and against authenticity....184
Excursus: Arguments for the authenticity of Beyköy 2....188
1. Introduction....188
2. Material in Mellaart's estate....189
3. The research history....190
4. The sequence of the blocks....193

5. The date of the drawing 194
6. Linguistic analysis 194
7. Comparing Beyköy 2 with the Sea Peoples inscriptions in Medinet Habu 202
8. Conclusions 204
21. Muksas' realm in the Troad 206
22. Walwamuwas' realm of Sekha 210
23. Sekha's Sekundogenitur 212
24. The recovery program of great king Aritesup of Khatti 214
25. Great king Khartapus of Tarkhuntassa's victory over the Phrygians and other deeds 227
Appendix: The recently discovered text from Türkmen-Karahöyük 234

Part II: Grammar & Vocabulary
1.System of (pro)nominal declension & verbal conjugation 241
2.Index 248

Concordance 267
Bibliography 285
Figures & Maps 311

INTRODUCTION

Of all the texts in Luwian hieroglyphic, the ones from the Bronze Age, or, to be more specific, in Late Bronze Age scribal tradition (which includes the earliest phase of the Early Iron Age), have received limited attention. If books on the topic may serve as an indication, I know of only three, Massimo Poetto's edition of the Yalburt text of 1993, David Hawkins' edition of the Südburg text of 1995 (which additionally treats the Emirgazi text), and my own attempt at presenting a collection of texts inscribed in rock or stone of 2004a.

In the work last mentioned, I edited 10 texts entailing a total of 145 phrases. As opposed to this, the present monograph contains as much as 31 texts entailing a total of 233 phrases. This is a significant increase within a term of about one and a half a decade. Newly included are Borowski no. 26, Karakuyu, and Afyon, treated by me in 2013, Çalapverdi 3, which I discussed in 2014, Ankara 2, discussed by me in 2017a, Beyköy 1, Torbalı, and Latmos, included in my recent book on the western Luwians of 2018a, Taşçı and Ankara 3, which I treated in 2019a (Notes 1 and 2), and the Kastamonu or Kınık bowl, Boğazköy 1, 2, and 12, Kızıldağ 3, Burunkaya, and the most recently discovered (2019) Türkmen-Karahöyük. The criterium used is that the inscription entails one full phrase or more.

Most dramatically in terms of the number of phrases, however, has been the rediscovery of Luwian hieroglyphic texts from western Anatolia dating to the final stage of the Bronze Age by Eberhard Zangger in 2017 when searching for the so-called "Beyköy Text" in the Mellaart files. In doing so, he stumbled upon the drawings of 8 Luwian hieroglyphic texts, 4 of which are lengthy enough to be included here, among which features most prominently Beyköy 2 with as much as 50 phrases in sum. The shorter ones are reported to be from Edremit, Yazılıtaş, and Dağardı. All these texts are stated to have been first discovered in the latter half of the 19th century AD.

In the mean time, the presumed cuneiform "Beyköy Text", of which only a "translation" into English was found, has been exposed as a product of James Mellaart's imagination.[1] This being the case, one immediately wonders whether the Luwian hieroglyphic texts rediscovered in the Mellaart files are falsifications as well. Such a view may easily apply to the smaller texts, which mainly consist of enumerations of place-names. However, one runs into difficulties with this view in connection with the largest one, Beyköy 2. It is not so easy to falsify a Luwian hieroglyphic text of such length, let alone one from the Late Bronze Age. Given the fact that the text was presented at a conference in Ghent in 1989, the only available model for such an undertaking was the Emirgazi text, the contents of which, at that

1 Zangger 2018.

time, were not well understood and, more importantly, of an entirely different nature, entailing regulations for the use of the altar stones on which it is written.

It is often taken for granted that the contents of the texts in Late Bronze Age scribal tradition are difficult to grasp for the lack of grammatical features. Such a view is too pessimistic, an intimate study of these texts allows for the reconstruction of the paradigms of nominal and pronominal declension as well as verbal conjugation of the Luwian language dating to this early period (see Part II, Table III). It is true, though, that endings are summarily indicated in the texts from this period and that the function of a word in the phrase often needs to be reconstructed on the basis of the context. And precisely this phenomenon, the restricted use of endings, complicates the undertaking of the falsification of a Luwian hieroglyphic text in Late Bronze Age scribal tradition to a great deal.

Beyköy 2 fits exactly within the picture of Luwian hieroglyphic texts conducted in Late Bronze Age scribal tradition as it has been established since the 1990s, which means after its possible fabrication antedating 1989. This is the reason to include it, together with 3 of the smaller texts from the Mellaart files, in the present study, with the proviso that much attention will be paid to arguments pro and contra its authenticity. One observation stands out in this connection, namely that a text cannot be falsified on the basis of data not available to the falsifier at the time of his or her presumed activity. As noted by the late Annelies Kammenhuber in a letter dated September 14, 1989, the at that time unparalleled title *URA+HANTAWAT +**infans**^{m}* "great prince" occurs in Beyköy 2 (**Bk-2**, § 26), which served as an argument for her to expose the text as a falsification. Since then, the advance of research in the field has resulted into a dramatic change concerning the validity of this title as it has been discovered in a rock inscription at Latmos in the hinterland of classical Miletos published in 2001 (cover design).[2] It now turns out, therefore, that this title is not suspect but rather to be expected in Luwian hieroglyphic texts from western Anatolia dating to the latest phase of the Bronze Age.

If Beyköy 2 is a genuine text, as I maintain, it constitutes the most important find in the field of Luwian hieroglyphics since the discovery of the Karatepe text in 1946. It is incredibly detailed about the period of the upheavals of the Sea Peoples, *c*. 1180-1170 BC—a period about which we are otherwise little informed, to say the least. It shows that the great king of Mira at the time, Kupantakuruntas III, thanks to the naval expedition all the way to Askalon and Gaza in the southern Levant of his vassal, great prince Muksas of Wilusa, profited most of the downfall of the Hittite Empire *c*. 1190 BC and occupied the former Hittite province of the Lower Land as well as coastal sites along the southern coast of Asia Minor in order to secure his contacts with the outposts in the southern Levant.[3]

---

2 Peschlow-Bindokat & Herbordt 2001: 373, Abb. 7a.

3 Zangger & Woudhuizen 2018; Woudhuizen & Zangger 2018.

Beyköy 2 is also of importance for the discussion on the reading of Luwian hieroglyphic, and this is probably the reason that Hawkins, who was familiar with this text since the Ghent meeting of 1989, has deliberately withhold it from his colleagues. In 1973, Hawkins, together with Anna Morpurgo-Davies and Günter Neumann introduced the so-called "new reading". According to this new reading, the pair of signs *376 and *377,[4] formerly read as *i* and *ī*, exclusively render the values *zi* (during the Late Bronze Age also *za*) and *za*, respectively. As a consequence, the pair of signs *209 and *210, formerly read as *a* and *ā*, are supposed to render the values *i* and *ya*, respectively, because otherwise the vowel *i* happens to be absent in the syllabary, "a basically improbable assumption".[5] In the Beyköy text, however, *376 is demonstrably used for the expression of the value of the "old reading" *i*:

(1) *ma-sa-hù+*376-ti* (**Bk-2**, §§ 1, 5) = Hit. *Mashuittas*
376-ku-wa-na* (Bk-2**, § 50) = Hit. *Ikkuwaniya* (mod. Konya)

as well as that of the "new reading" *zi* or *za*:

(2) *mi-*376+r(i)* (**Bk-2**, § 28) = Hit. *Mizri* (mod. Egypt)
*ka-*376* (**Bk-2**, § 28) = *Kaza* (mod. Gaza)

Now, since the early 1980s I have argued that the "new reading", notwithstanding the fact that it is generally accepted by the colleagues in the field, in its present form is untenable.[6] At first, I argued to stick to the "old reading" altogether, but since 2004 I acknowledged the then available bilingual evidence for the reading of *376 as *zi* (or also *za*) and *377 as *za*. However, I did so with the notable distinction that these "new readings" are not the exclusive values of these signs, but that in other instances the "old readings" still apply, in other words that the signs *376 and *377 are subject to *polyphony* as paralleled for other signs from the syllabary.[7] I subsequently elaborated this line of approach in the extended version of my *Selected Luwian Hieroglyphic Texts* of 2011, in which I presented an overview of the bilingual evidence for on the one hand the "new reading" of *376 and *377 as *zi* and *za* and on the other hand their "old reading" as *i* and *ī*, respectively.[8]

One thing stands out as certain in this discussion: that the weakest link in the argument of the protagonists of the "new reading" is formed by the consequence of reading *376 and *377 exclusively as *zi* and *za*, namely that *209 and *210 must

4 Numbering of the signs according to Laroche 1960.
5 Hawkins, Morpurgo-Davies & Neumann 1973: 155.
6 Woudhuizen 1984-5a: 104-113.
7 Woudhuizen 2004a: 8; 167-170; Woudhuizen 2004b: 8-11.
8 Woudhuizen 2011: 89-98.

be read as *i* and *ya*. As I have demonstrated conclusively in my recent overview of all available data, there can be no doubt that *209 renders the value *a*.[9] As a consequence, the "new reading" must be wrong in the assumption that *376 and *377 exclusively render the values *zi* and *za* otherwise a sign for *i* being absent in the syllabary. *Ergo*: these signs must be considered polyphonic, being used for the expression of both "old reading" *i* and *ī and* "new reading" *zi* and *za*.[10] In this manner, then, we arrive at the correct reading of these two pairs of signs, most adequately addressed as "adjusted old reading".

A minor detail concerns the interpretation of the two oblique strokes at the lower side which distinguish *210 and *377 from *209 and *376. In connection with the vowels, this expresses length: *a* (*209) becomes *ā* (*210) and *i* (*376) becomes *ī* (*377). In line with this observation, when the sibilant value applies *377 should preferably be transliterated as *zā*.[11]

Until recently, the addition of oblique strokes were considered as the hallmark of texts conducted in Early Iron Age scribal tradition. It so happens, however, that this device to distinguish *210 and *377 from *209 and *376 is already used in Beyköy 2, which dates from the latest phase of the Bronze Age. That this device indeed was already introduced during the Bronze Age has been proved by Willemijn Waal, who discovered an instance of *377 on a Hittite tablet.[12] In light of the Beyköy 2 evidence, the addition of the double bars at the lower side of *377 appears to be a typically Arzawan innovation. Note in this connection that the earliest text in Early Iron Age scribal tradition from North Syria, Aleppo 6, dating from the latter half of the 11th century BC, is somewhat idiosyncratic in having the oblique strokes represented by a horizontally placed *450 *à*—a combination (*zi*+*à*) more suitable for writing *zā* than *ī*.

Other criteria for the distinction of the Late Bronze Age scribal tradition are:[13]

(2) As we have already noted, in texts conducted in Late Bronze Age scribal tradition the polyphonic *376 *i*, *zi* is used for the expression of *za* as well.

(3) In texts conducted in Late Bronze Age scribal tradition *209, 1-3 and 6, a variant of *209 *a* with four nudges or additional strokes at the top, occurs in exactly the same position as the later *210 *ā* of the Early Iron Age scribal tradition and is accordingly transliterated in this work as *ā*.

(4) The distinction of *na*$_4$ from *nā*$_4$ by two oblique strokes is, in line with the pairs *209-210 and *376-377, introduced after the demise of the Late Bronze Age scribal tradition.

---

9 Woudhuizen 2019a: Note 4.

10 Woudhuizen 2019a: Note 3.

11 Woudhuizen 2011: 98.

12 Waal 2017: 304-305, Fig. 7.

13 Cf. Woudhuizen 2011: 102-106.

(5) In texts conducted in Late Bronze Age scribal tradition the sign *386, 1 usually designated as "crampon" is used to express male gender (transliteration ^{m}). As opposed to this, in texts conducted in Early Iron Age scribal tradition this sign is used—apart from its continued use in its original function in the determinative *45 ***infans***^{m}—as a word-divider.

(6) In texts conducted in Late Bronze Age scribal tradition the sign for the relative pronoun, *329, still renders the original value *KWA,* whereas in those conducted in Early Iron Age scribal tradition it is used for lenited *HWA*.

(7) Contrary to the procedures of the Early Iron Age scribal tradition, in texts conducted in Late Bronze Age scribal tradition the N(m/f) sg. ending *-sa* and A(m/f) sg. ending *-na* are in the main not indicated in the realm of the noun. The exceptional cases in which these endings are written in texts conducted in Late Bronze Age scribal tradition are given in Part II, chapter 1.

(8) Contrary to the procedures of the Early Iron Age scribal tradition, in texts conducted in Late Bronze Age scribal tradition the N-A(n) sg. ending *-ī* is not indicated in both the realm of the noun and the pronoun. In principle, the same verdict applies to the N-A(n) ending in *-sa*, but in the exceptional cases this is written it happens to be used for the expression of the plural.

(9) In texts conducted in Late Bronze Age scribal tradition the G sg. ending in *-sa* is also used for the expression of the pl.

For an overview of how the transliteration applied in this book relates to current *communis opinio* as established at the conference held at Procida (Marazzi 1998), see the concordance. Note in this connection that the "adjusted old reading" as adhered to in this work also implies that all the adjustments to accommodate the new reading, like *214 *ná* becoming *ní*, *411 *nà* becoming *ni*, and *174 *sá* becoming *si*, and the assumption of interchange between the vowels *a* and *i* for the signs *439 *wa* becoming *wa/i*, *165 *wá* becoming *wà/ì*, *166 *wà* becoming *wá/í*, and *134 *ara* becoming *ara/i*, need to be redressed.

Acknowledgement: my thanks are due to Eberhard Zangger for sharing his rediscovery of the Luwian hieroglyphic texts from the Mellaart files with me. The subsequent cooperation resulted into two joined papers, Zangger & Woudhuizen 2018 and Woudhuizen & Zangger 2018, from which I heavily drew in the discussion of Beyköy 2 as presented in this book.

Fred C. Woudhuizen
Heiloo, March 2020