

# **The Luwians of Western Anatolia**

Their neighbours and predecessors

**Fred C. Woudhuizen**



ARCHAEOPRESS PUBLISHING LTD

Summertown Pavilion

18-24 Middle Way

Summertown

Oxford OX2 7LG

[www.archaeopress.com](http://www.archaeopress.com)

ISBN 978 1 78491 827 9

ISBN 978 1 78491 828 6 (e-Pdf)

© Archaeopress and Fred C. Woudhuizen 2018

Cover illustration: 'Tarkondemos' seal (Pope 1999: 139, Fig. 86)

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the copyright owners.

This book is available direct from Archaeopress or from our website [www.archaeopress.com](http://www.archaeopress.com)

# Contents

List of Figures .....	iii
List of Tables.....	iv
Preface .....	1
1. The Homeland of the Luwians .....	5
2. Geography of Western Anatolia.....	19
3. Origin of the Luwian Hieroglyphic Script .....	36
3.1 Introduction .....	36
3.2 Catalogue of the Middle Bronze Age Luwian Hieroglyphic Inscriptions.....	37
3.3 Middle Bronze Age Luwian Hieroglyphic Signary .....	39
3.4 In Search of the Cradle of the Luwian Hieroglyphic Script .....	41
3.5 Overview of Luwian Hieroglyphic Inscriptions from, or Attributable to, Assuwa/Arzawa/Mira-Kuwaliya, Seḫa-Appawiya, and Ḫapalla .....	46
Addendum.....	51
4. Luwian Hieroglyphic Evidence on the Great Kingdom of Assuwa .....	55
4.1 Introduction .....	55
4.2 Two Assuwian Royal Seals.....	56
4.3 An Assuwian Royal Seal from Thebes.....	59
4.4 On the Reading of the Luwian Hieroglyphic Legends of the Schimmel Rhyton .....	66
5. Western Anatolia under Hittite Rule .....	74
5.1 Introduction .....	74
5.2 The Sealing of Prince Maḫuiluwas .....	79
5.3 The Stone Inscription of <i>tuḫkanti</i> Urḫitesup .....	80
5.4 The Seal and Rock Relief of Tarku(ndimu)was.....	80
5.5 The Stone Inscription of Prince Maḫuittas.....	83
5.6 The Luwian Hieroglyphic Stele from Afyon .....	83
6. Western Anatolia in the Final Stage of Bronze Age.....	88
6.1 Introduction .....	88
6.2 The Rediscovered Luwian Hieroglyphic Inscriptions from Western Anatolia in Transliteration and Translation.....	91
7. Amenhotep III: Historical Background to his Aegean Policy .....	107
7.1 Introduction .....	107
7.2 KUB 26.91 & the Tawagalawas-letter .....	108
7.3 The Phaistos Disc .....	111
7.4 The Madduwattas-text.....	114
7.5 Conclusion.....	115
8. The Arzwan Language .....	117
8.1 Cuneiform Luwian .....	117
8.2 Luwian Hieroglyphic .....	121
9. The Language of the Trojans.....	123
9.1 Introduction .....	123
9.2 The Relevant Late Bronze Age Data .....	124
9.3 The Relevant Homeric Data .....	128

10. Evidence for an Old Indo-European Substrate in Western Anatolia.....	132
10.1 Late Bronze Age Hydronyms and Toponyms of Indo-European nature in Western Anatolia.....	132
10.2 On the Identity of the Indo-European Substrate in Western Anatolia .....	139
Bibliography .....	144
Index .....	165

## List of Figures

Fig. 1. Distribution of Luwian place-names in -ss- and -nd-.....	12
Fig. 2. Seal of Tarku(n)timuwas from Malia .....	15
Fig. 3. Cylinder seal from Klavdia .....	17
Fig. 4. Cylinder seal impression from Kourion.....	17
Fig. 5. Map of western Anatolia .....	32
Fig. 6. Geography of the Hittite empire.....	33
Fig. 7. Distribution of Middle Bronze Age Luwian hieroglyphic seals and sealings .....	42
Fig. 8. Sealing Tell-Atchana-Alalah no. 154.....	43
Fig. 9. Erlenmeyers' seal.....	43
Fig. 10. Seal Hogarth no. 154 .....	44
Fig. 11. Seal of king Piyamakuruntas of Assuwiya .....	51
Fig. 12. Stamp seal from Beycesultan.....	51
Fig. 13. The Luwian hieroglyphic titular expression of the Indilima seal compared to its closest cognate on seal # 271 from Malia. ....	53
Fig. 14. Stamp side of stamp-cylinder seals Louvre AO 20.138 (a) and Aydin (b) .....	57
Fig. 15. Impression of the cylinder side of stamp-cylinder seal Louvre AO 20.138.....	59
Fig. 16. Cyprian cylinder seal from Thebes .....	61
Fig. 17. Luwian hieroglyphic cylinder seal from Thebes .....	62
Fig. 18. Drawing of the scene on the Schimmel rhyton .....	67
Fig. 19. Baltimore seal.....	69
Fig. 20. Luwian hieroglyphic legend no. 1 with comparison from the Baltimore seal. ....	70
Fig. 21. Thus far enigmatic sign from the Luwian hieroglyphic legends with suggested equivalent of later date, LH 430 sa.....	70
Fig. 22. Luwian hieroglyphic legend no. 2 with comparison from Südburg § 3 .....	71
Fig. 23. Rock inscription of great prince <i>Kupaā</i> .....	78
Fig. 24. Sealing of prince Maṣṣuiliwas.....	79
Fig. 25. Stone inscription Beyköy 1 .....	81
Fig. 26. Seal of 'Tarkondemos'.....	81
Fig. 27. Rock relief at Karabel.....	82
Fig. 28. Stele from Afyon .....	84
Fig. 29. Beyköy 2 .....	102-103
Fig. 30. Edremit.....	104
Fig. 31. Yazılıtaş.....	105
Fig. 32. Beyköy 3-4 (A-B), Şahankaya (C), Dağardı 1 (D), Dağardı 2 (E-G). ....	106
Fig. 33. Throne-name of Amenhotep III. ....	107
Fig. 34. Cursive variant of the throne-name of Amenhotep III.....	107
Fig. 35. Scarab of queen Tiyi.....	108

## List of Tables

Table I. Place-names in <i>-ss-</i> and <i>-nd-</i> from Late Bronze Age Hittite cuneiform and Luwian hieroglyphic texts .....	6
Table II. Place-names in <i>-ss-</i> and <i>-nth-</i> or names related to such place-names from the Late Bronze Age Linear B texts.....	8
Table III. Place-names in <i>-ss-</i> and <i>-nd-</i> from Anatolia as recorded for sources from the Classical period .....	9-10
Table IV. Place-names in <i>-ss-</i> and <i>-nth-</i> from Greece as recorded for sources from the Classical period .....	12
Table V. Identification of place-names from cuneiform Hittite and Luwian hieroglyphic with a bearing on western Anatolia. ....	22-25
Table VI. Overview of the dating criteria for Middle Bronze Age Luwian hieroglyphic seals or sealings. ....	41
Table VII. Analysis of the legends of the Erlenmeyers' seal and seal Hogarth no. 154 from Henri Frankfort's First Syrian Group.....	44
Table VIII. Overview of Proto-Indo-European roots in Middle Bronze Age Luwian hieroglyphic.....	54
Table IX. Synchronisms between the dynasties of Ḫattusa, Arzawa, and Seḫa .....	86-87
Table X. Grammatical sketch of the cuneiform Luwian evidence on the Arzawan language.....	121
Table XI. Grammatical sketch of the Luwian hieroglyphic evidence on the Arzawan language.....	122
Table XII. Overview of western Anatolian hydronyms and toponyms of Indo-European nature.....	133
Table XIII: Overview of literary evidence for Pelasgians in western Anatolia according to Lochner-Hüttenbach's <i>Die Pelasger</i> of 1960. ....	140
Table XIV. Names based on a Proto-Indo-European root associated in the Greek sources with Pelasgians .....	141

## Preface

Just recently, in spring of 2016, Eberhard Zangger wrote a stimulating book on the Luwian civilization. He aptly calls this the missing link in the history of the Aegean Bronze Age. As it happens, namely, there are 340 major archaeological sites in western Anatolia, ‘very few of which have been excavated on a large scale—and virtually none of these were published in a western language.’ (Zangger 2016: 14).

It will take at least a century to excavate at least some of the tells in western Anatolia, if not longer. So the prospects for this ‘missing link’ to become as profoundly prospected archaeologically as the Aegean in the west and central Anatolia and the Levant in the east are rather grim on the short term.

This state of affairs, however, should not discourage us from studying the culture of the Luwians of western Anatolia during the Bronze Age and collecting the relevant data presently at hand. In fact, this is precisely what Zangger aimed to do in his book and aims to put on a more solid basis with his foundation *Luwian Studies* (see esp. its website).

The interest in the Luwians as an object of study next to and apart from the Hittites is already growing for some time. A pioneer in this respect is Jacques Freu with his monograph entitled *Luwija* of 1980. However, Luwian studies becomes of age, so to say, with *The Luwians*, edited by Craig Melchert, of 2003 and the publication of the papers to the conference in Reading on *Luwian Identities*, edited by Alice Mouton, Ian Rutherford, and Ilya Yakubovich, in 2013.

The habitat of the Luwians is not confined to western Anatolia, but included the later Hittite provinces of Tarḫuntassa (Konya basin), Kizzuwatna (Cilician plain), and the island of Cyprus in the east. In the west, it extended to the Aegean islands, up to and including Crete, and regions in southern Greece. In the present book, however, after an introductory chapter on the extent of the homeland, I will focus on the Luwians of western Anatolia because the reconstruction of their Bronze Age history up to this moment is a *desideratum*.

In my opinion, especially with the help of data from epigraphy and linguistics, the history of western Anatolia during the Bronze Age can be reconstructed in its bare outlines. Of fundamental importance to such an endeavor is the reconstruction of its geography. We cannot reach the stage of historical reconstruction before we know where the various places and countries named in cuneiform Hittite and Luwian hieroglyphic texts are situated. Therefore I first address the question of the geography of western Anatolia before I set out to discuss the relevant Luwian hieroglyphic and cuneiform Hittite texts.

Since I finalised the first draft of this book in July 2016, our knowledge of the geography of especially northwestern Anatolia has improved dramatically. It so happens, namely, that in the meantime Eberhard Zangger acquired the files on the so-called ‘Beyköy

Text' from the inheritance of James Mellaart (Zangger 2017: 309). In these files there were, next to the translation of the cuneiform Beyköy Text, drawings of Luwian hieroglyphic inscriptions discovered at Beyköy and some other sites in northwestern Anatolia between 1854 and 1878. One of these Luwian hieroglyphic inscriptions, Beyköy 2, actually is, with its 50 phrases, the longest Late Bronze Age text known to date and as such highly informative on the Arzawan language (Zangger & Woudhuizen 2018). Among the remaining Luwian hieroglyphic texts, the one from Edremit, which only entails 4 phrases, records numerous toponyms from the Troad, whereas those from Yazılıtaş and Dağardı consist almost exclusively of place-names from the realm of Seḫa. Owing to this discovery, then, the formerly almost blank region of northwestern Anatolia can be filled in with toponyms primarily known from Greek sources.

The joy about this sensational find is somewhat hampered, however, since the foremost specialist in Luwian hieroglyphic, David Hawkins, considers it forged. Hawkins' successor Mark Weeden informed me on September 29, 2017 in personal communication, that Beyköy 2 as well as the smaller fragments are merely the product of the lively imagination of James Mellaart, who falsified them apparently out of resentment of his critics and in order to give a surge to his otherwise ruined career. Weeden presented me with the copies of these inscriptions as they were in David Hawkins' possession since 1989. The proposed scenario, however, is highly unlikely if we realise that Mellaart was not a specialist in Luwian hieroglyphic and, in view of the attempts at interpretation of the inscriptions also present in his files, had only limited understanding of their contents. I believe that no one, not even Hawkins himself, could falsify a Luwian hieroglyphic text of the length of Beyköy 2.

The desire to declare Beyköy 2 a forgery may rest in the fact that the inscription does not fit in the framework of Hawkins' readings. These were introduced in 1973 and are currently generally applied in the field of Luwian hieroglyphics. Since 1931 and until Hawkins' introduction of the new reading, the sign LH 376 was interpreted as expressing the value *i*, – one of only three vowels in Luwian. Hawkins then proposed that it should be read as the expression of the value *zi* – and every scholar in the small field of Luwian studies followed him. I, for one, challenged this interpretation, arguing that sign LH 376 is indeed polyphonic and thus can be used as expressing both the values *i* and *zi* (Woudhuizen 2004c: 11). There are indeed 24 cases certified by bilingual evidence for the *zi*-reading, but also 18 cases, also with bilingual evidence, for the *i*-reading (latest count, cf. Woudhuizen 2011: 92-97). Thus, a 'readjusted old reading' of sign LH 376 would be called for.

As it happens, in Beyköy 2, sign LH 376 is used twice for the expression of the value *i*, in the name of a great king of Mira, *ma-sa-hù+i-ti* (§§ 1, 5), corresponding to Hittite cuneiform *Mashuittas*, and the place-name *i-ku-wa-na* (§ 50), corresponding to Hittite cuneiform *Ikkuwaniya* 'Konya'. Only once is sign LH 376 in Beyköy 2 used for the expression of the value *zi*, in the country name *mi-zi+r(i)* (§ 28), corresponding to Hittite cuneiform *Mizri* 'Egypt'.

It is inconceivable that Mellaart based his forgery in the 1980s on a theory about the reading of Luwian hieroglyphic that would appear over twenty years later! Far more likely, Beyköy 2 and the other texts are indeed genuine. In that case, they provide us with further evidence that the new reading and current paradigm in the study of Luwian hieroglyphics is flawed and needs to be adjusted.

What is more, Hawkins proposal to read sign LH 376 exclusively as the expression of the value *zi* reduced the number of available vowels from three to only two. He therefore suggested that sign LH 209 should now be read as the expression of the value *i*. The Beyköy 2 inscription, however, contains the Luwian word for 'sea', of which we know from Hittite cuneiform texts, that is *aruna*. It is spelled correctly in the document, but when transcribed using Hawkins' system, it would read *ʔiruna* – which is evidently incorrect.

The study of cuneiform Luwian is also of relevance, as the so-called songs from Istanuwa presumably bear direct testimony of the language of Ḫapalla, one of the Arzawa lands. The town of Istanuwa, namely, is directly associated with Saḫiriya or the Sangarios river, and therefore likely to be situated within the bend of this river. Now, within this bend the Arzawa land Ḫapalla happens to be situated. Accordingly, it may reasonably be inferred that the songs of Istanuwa are conducted in the Arzawan language.

For our understanding of the history of the Luwians of western Anatolia, even in its bare outlines as aimed at here, it is also helpful to distinguish their neighbours. An unknown fraction of the inhabitants of the Troad in northwest Anatolia was presumably of a stock different from the Luwians. They spoke another language, closely related to Thracian and Phrygian. Furthermore, the Luwians of western Anatolia were in contact with the Hittites of the central Anatolian plateau in the east and with the Mycenaean Greeks in the west.

Finally, it should be realised that the Luwians, like most other Indo-European peoples, were not indigenous in their Anatolian habitat but entered this at some point in the Bronze Age. Accordingly, they were preceded by earlier inhabitants of the region, called a substrate population. From the relevant hydronymic and toponymic evidence, then, it can positively be deduced, at least in my opinion, that among the substrate populations of western Anatolia there were speakers of an Old Indo-European tongue well-known in the Classical sources by the ethnonym Pelasgians.

It is to be hoped that this book will serve as a worthy tool in the development of Luwian studies into a discipline in its own right and in the ongoing process to turn the civilization of the Luwians of western Anatolia from a 'missing link' into a 'link' between cultures of the Hittites in the east and the Mycenaean Greeks in the west.