

History & Philology

Towards the Identification of Luwian Hieroglyphs Denoting Fauna of Ancient Asia Minor

Nana Khazaradze*

* *Iv.Javakhishvili Institute of History and Ethnology, Tbilisi*

(Presented by Academy Member D. Muskhelishvili)

ABSTRACT. The comparison of data of the Hieroglyphic Luwian script with varied information preserved in Assyrian, Hittite cuneiform and Hieroglyphic Luwian texts leads to the conclusion that the fauna of Asia Minor is reflected in a quite adequate manner in Hieroglyphic Luwian, in spite of the fact that a great part of hieroglyphs bearing representations of animals is not identified so far. The study of Luwian hieroglyphs known to the present day shows that the creators of this script gave priority to those species of fauna (bull, horse, donkey, mule, sheep, pig, dog, lion, hare, deer) which played an especially significant role in the political military, socio-economic (farming, cattle-breeding, hunting, transport) and cultural (religious beliefs, myth, ritual) life of this major area of the Ancient East. © 2007 Bull. Georg. Natl. Acad. Sci.

Key words: *Hieroglyphic Luwian Script, Late Hittites, The Royal Inscriptions, Hittite Laws.*

Written monuments in the Hieroglyphic Luwian script, discovered at various sites of Asia Minor in the 19th-20th cc., along with Assyrian and Hittite cuneiform texts, are one of the important primary sources for the study of the history of the peoples of Ancient Asia Minor. Hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions provide significant information concerning natural conditions and resources of Asia Minor of the 2nd-1st millennia BC, as well as political, socio-economic and cultural processes going on there.

The Hieroglyphic Luwian script proper is equally valuable from the scholarly point of view.

The present study deals with Luwian hieroglyphs denoting fauna of Ancient Asia Minor. On the basis of the data available to date, the number of Luwian hieroglyphs containing representations of animals reaches 50. Some hieroglyphs denote a particular animal (“dog”, “horse”, “sheep”), others reflect both an animal (“donkey”, “deer”, “bull”) and syllables - constituent parts of words (ta₄, ḡy, kar, sḅ, u(wa), muwa, mu. i₄, li, etc.), which is clear from the examples below:














“lion”, Sumerogram UR.MAH-აჲ,
UR.MAH-იჲ uncertain pronunciation
(Laroche, N97; Meriggi, N88 a, b)



“dog”, logogram, pronunciation:
suwana – (Laroche, N98; Meriggi,
N112-113).

* Examples are cited according to lists compiled by E.Laroche and P.Meriggi (see E.Laroche, *Les hiéroglyphes hittites*, I, Paris, 1960; P.Meriggi, *Hieroglyphisch – Hethitisches Glossar*, Wiesbaden, 1962).

	“horse”, logogram”, pronunciation: asuwa – (Laroche, N99; Meriggi, N90 cf. N95).		I. “donkey”, logogram, pronunciation: tarkasna -, turlakalisa -. II. ta ₄ (Laroche, N100 _{1,2} ; Meriggi, N94-96).
	I. “(deity) deer”, logogram, pronunciation: Tuwat – II. rú (Laroche, N102 Sfr. 412; Meriggi, N94-96).		I. “(deity) deer (transliteration: “deer ₂ ”), logogram, pronunciation: Tuwat-> Ruwat-. II. rú III. kar (Laroche, N103; Meriggi, N118-120).
	sá (Laroche, N104; Meriggi, N98).		ma (Laroche, N110; Meriggi, N104).
	I. “bull”, logogram, pronunciation: wawa- or uwa-. II. logogram, pronunciation: usapata -, uncertain meaning III. u (wa) (Laroche, N105; Meriggi, N109).		“sheep”, logogram, pronunciation: hawa/i – (Laroche, N111; Meriggi, N107).
	Ligature of two signs, muwa -, mu -. (Laroche, N107: N105+ N391; Meriggi, N108).		“hare”, logogram and determinative pronunciation: tapa or tapar (Laroche, N116; Meriggi, N121).
	Logogram denoting the name of the city of Malatya, uncertain pronunciation (Laroche, N109; Meriggi, N111).		

Let us see how adequately Luwian hieroglyphs reflect the history of fauna of Asia Minor of the 2nd-1st millennia BC.

Significant reports regarding the fauna of Ancient Asia Minor are furnished by the text of the so-called “Cappadocia tablets”, dated to the beginning of the 2nd millennium BC, in which one often finds lexemes and expressions: “bull”, “cow”, “donkey”, “black donkey”, “donkey saddle”, “black donkey with its harness”, “goat”, “sheep”, “horse” [Khazaradze, 1978, 102-103]. Some documents deal with cattle and small livestock, the road tax price for livestock, e.g. donkey etc.

The existence in the Assyrian economic documents of terms denoting posts, such as: rabi alpâtîm (“chief drover of bulls”, rabi sîsi (“chief stable-keeper”), rabi rçîm (“chief of shepherds”), sarrîdum (“drover of donkeys”), is also very noteworthy [Cuneiform Texts from Kultepe, 1968, 220].

Significant information concerning the question of my present interest is found in Articles 57-90 from Tablet I of “the Hittite Laws” drafted as early as the period of the Old Hittite Kingdom (1656-1500 BC), which lists quite scrupulously the punishments provided for by the law for the damage caused to the owner of cattle and small livestock in different situations. In this written source of primary importance, the following animals are

mentioned: “bull”, “yearling”, “two-year-old bull”, “three-year-old bull”, “bull”, “plow ox”, “cow”, “pregnant cow”, “horse”, “stallion”, “draft horse”, “mare”, “sheep”, “goat”, “lamb”, “mule”, “donkey”, “pig”, “pregnant pig”, “dog”, “guard dog”, “sheepdog”, “hound”, “wolf”, etc.

Thus, § 57 of “the Hittite Laws” reads: “If anyone steals a bull – if it is a weanling, it is not a bull; if it is a yearling, it is not a bull; if it is a two-year-old, that is a bull – they would formerly give 30 bulls. Now 9 (the thief of the bull) shall give 15 bulls – 5 two-year-olds, 5 yearlings and 5 weanlings and he shall pledge his estate as security” [Friedrich, 1959, 168; Giordadze, 1965, 87; Imparati, 1964, 164]. Under the Hittite laws, thieves of a stallion and a ram were also punished (“If anyone steals a stallion – if it is a weanling, it is not a stallion; if it is a yearling, it is not a stallion; if it is a two-year-old, that is a stallion – they would formerly give 30 horses. Now (the thief) shall give 15 horses – 5 two-year-olds, 5 yearlings (and) 5 weanlings and he shall pledge his estate as security”; “If anyone steals a breeding ram, they would formerly give 30 sheep. Now (the thief) shall give 15 sheep – 5 ewes, 5 rams, 5 lambs and he shall pledge his estate as security”).

Several articles of the Hittite laws (§ 60, 61, 62) are devoted to persons finding and misappropriating cattle and small livestock: “If anyone finds a bull and removes

the brand (of its owner), and if [its] owner [traces it out], he shall give 7 bulls – 2 two-year-olds, 3 yearlings (and) two weanlings and he shall pledge his estate as security”. Under the law, the same compensation must have been made by persons finding and misappropriating a stallion and a ram.

The verdict of the Hittite laws for the thieves of a plow ox and a draft horse is the following: “If anyone steals a plow ox, they would formerly give 15 oxen. Now he shall give 10 oxen – 3 two-year-olds, 3 yearlings (and) 4 weanlings and he shall pledge his estate as security”. The same is provided for by the law for the thief of a draft horse (“If anyone steals a draft horse, the compensation is exactly the same for it”).

Other, equally significant reports are found in “the Hittite Laws” in connection with the question of my present interest. In this legislative document “sheep”, “ram”, “lamb”, “trained billy-goat”, “trained mountain sheep” are mentioned, which provides noteworthy information for the reconstruction of the general image of fauna of Asia Minor of the 2nd-1st millennia BC (“If anyone steals a ewe or a ram, they would formerly give 12 sheep. Now he shall give 6 sheep – 2 ewes, 2 rams (and) 2 lambs and he shall pledge his estate as security”; “If anyone steals a trained (?) billy-goat, if a tame wild goat, if a trained mountain sheep, the compensation is exactly the same, as for a goat”).

In “the Hittite Laws” one finds “cow” and “pregnant cow” as well (“If anyone steals a cow, they would formerly give 12 [(head of) cattle]. Now he shall give 6 [(head of) cattle] – 2 two-year-olds, two yearlings (and) 2 weanlings and he shall pledge his estate as security”; “If anyone strikes a pregnant cow and causes it to miscarry, he [shall give] 2 shekels of silver).

Six articles of “the Hittite Laws” (§ 81-86) deal with thieves of “pig”, “pregnant pig”, “yard pig”, “pig fattened on wheat” and “piglet” (“If anyone steals a pig (fattened) on wheat, they would formerly give 1 mina of silver. Now he shall give 12 shekels of silver and he shall pledge his estate as security”; “If anyone steals a pregnant pig, he [shall give] 6 shekels of si[lver] and shall count the piglets as well, (for every) two piglets he shall give (1) measuring jug of wheat [and he shall pledge his estate as security”; “If anyone strikes a pregnant pig and it dies, [the compensation] is exactly [the same]”; “If anyone weans and steals a piglet, he shall give [...measuring jugs of wheat]”; “If a pig [goes] into a grain-heap, a field, (or) a garden, and the owner of the [gra]in-heap, field, (or) garden strikes it and it dies, he shall give it back to its owner. But if he does not give it (back), he shall become a thief”).

Only one representation of dog is recorded in the Hieroglyphic Luwian script (see above). Hittite laws furnish more ample information in this regard. Three varieties of dogs are known in them: “sheepdog”, “hound”

and guard dog”. As becomes clear from the respective articles (§ 87-89), the heaviest fine was imposed on the killer of a sheepdog (“If anyone strikes a sheepdog and it dies, he shall give 20 shekels of silver and he shall pledge his estate as security”; “If anyone strikes a hound and it dies, he shall give 12 shekels of silver and he shall pledge his estate as security”; “If anyone strikes a guard dog and it dies, he shall give one shekel of silver”).

Fauna of Ancient Asia Minor is reflected in Hittite-Hittite myths and literary written sources as well. In this respect, the Telipinu myth claims attention, which relates the beliefs of the Hittites about the so-called “vanishing” deities. According to the myth, the “withdrawal” and “anger” of the deity Telipinu had grave consequences: “Mist seized the windows. Smoke seized the house. In the hearth the logs were stifled. At the altars the gods were stifled. In the sheepfold the sheep were stifled. In the cow barn the cows were stifled. The ewe rejected her lamb. The cow rejected her calf... barley and wheat do not ripen. Cows, sheep, and humans do not get pregnant. And those who are already pregnant cannot give birth... The mountains and the trees dried up; and the foliage does not come out. The meadows dried”.

In this myth a special role is assigned to the sheep fleece. In the final part of the myth, dealing with the “return” of Telipinu, the sheep fleece appears as the symbol of the restoration of life: “There is the evergreen tree Eia in front of Telipinu. On this tree the sheep fleece is hanging, it is the pledge of the fertility of sheep, abundance of grains, abundance of animals, abundance of wine; that of longevity and breeding, it augurs the life, growth, abundance and fatness of sheep; then Telipinu will present the sheep fleece to the king and confer benefits on him”.

Interesting information is also found in A, B and C copies of Anitta text, the first of which is dated to the 16th c. BC, whereas B and C - to the period of the New Hittite Kingdom. Lines 53-63 of this text run as follows: “and I (Anitta – N.Kh.) blessed and [cursed (?)...] On the same day [I brought to my city] Neḫa [two lions, 70 boars (?), 1 wild boar (?)], 120 wild animals, whether [leopards, lions, deer], ibexes, or [. . .]” [Giorgadze, 1965,87]. Some authors think that in this Hittite text hunting is implied, whereas according to others, the text deals with Anitta’s initiative to create a zoological park in Neḫa [Tatishvili, 2001, 106; Alp, 1963, 377; Gøtterbock, 1938,141].

The nomenclature of animals is recorded in other Hittite written sources as well. Interesting information in this regard is found in hymns and prayers of Hittite kings too. Thus, in the prayer and hymn of Mursilis II to the Sun-goddess of Arinna one reads: “What is this that you, deities, have done? You have let loose the plague (in the interior of the land) and the land of Hatti

has been sorely, greatly oppressed by the plague. There is now constant dying! As a result, no one can offer you bread and wine as sacrifice...no one can give you sacrificial animals – bull and sheep – from cattle stalls (and) sheepfolds. Shepherds of bulls and sheep also died, they left cattle stalls and sheepfolds. Due to this, deities [will remain] without bread, wine and sacrificial animals”. The prayer of Muwatallis, the second king of the Hittites, to the Weather-god ^DU pihahьль-альи (beginning of the 13th c. BC) contains the following lines: “You, deity of sun from heaven, my lord, you make the law for man, dog (and) pig, wild animals every day” [Tatishvili, 2000, 101, 106].

Animals are mentioned in different contexts in texts reflecting the Hittite building rituals connected with the erection of a palace and a temple. As it turns out, when a king decided to build a palace in any city, the builder, who set off to fell trees on the mountain, received from the palace one bull, three sheep, 3 jugs of wine, 1 jug of *marnuwa*, 10 loaves of bread, 20 round cakes and 50 biscuits. At the second stage of the construction, when the foundation of the palace was laid, one bull, one cow and 10 sheep were driven out from the palace to be offered as sacrifice. The bull was offered to the Weather-god, the cow - to the Sun-goddess of Arinna, and sheep - to other deities (one to each). When a new hearth was placed for a new house, 1 pot of lard, 1 pot of honey, 1 cheese, 1 first stomach, white and black wool, 1 jar of sweet milk, 1 jar of barley malt, shelled walnuts, raisins, almonds (?), ^{ab} *Bunitar*, ox skin and salt were taken from the palace and were placed in the hearth [Tatishvili, 2001, 81-83]. It also becomes clear from Hittite texts relating to building that when a temple was renewed, on the first day *kupti* (a vessel to be sacrificed) was stuck in the foundation, in which 1 lamb, 1 goat kid, 3 ducks, 30 thin loaves of bread, 1 loaf of *tarna mulati* bread, 2 small cheeses were placed, and on the second day the ritual pit was filled with 1 lamb, 1 duck, 30 thin loaves of bread and up to 18 hot loaves of bread baked from various grains [Tatishvili, 1988, 114-115].

Hittite building rituals also contain noteworthy references concerning the placement of miniature representations of animals (lion, bull) linked with various deities (Storm-god, Sun-goddess of Arinna) in the foundation of a temple or a house (e.g. “...on 4 cornerstones too, everywhere, on each cornerstone, he also puts 4 stands. 1 golden lion, (weighing) shekel; 2 pairs of iron bulls joined with a silver yoke, each bull weighing 1 shekel. There are plinths under them. Two bulls are standing on one plinth, and there are two bulls on the other plinth too” [Tatishvili, 1983, 126].

Significant information concerning the question of my present interest is found in Hieroglyphic Luwian and Assyrian cuneiform inscriptions of the first half of the 1st millennium BC as well.

“Bulls” and “sheep” are often mentioned in Hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions in connection with performance of different sacrificial rituals [Khazaradze, 1978, 103]. According to one inscription discovered at Kululu (Kululu I), a vassal of King Tuwati of Tabal, some Ruwa, who built a palace at the site of ruined houses, in token of worship of deity Tarhunt, constructed *artali* (prayer house?) in his name and offered bulls and sheep from year to year” [Meriggi, 1967, 50-51].

A Hieroglyphic Luwian inscription from Sultanhani, quite difficult to interpret, informs us that a servant of Wasusarmas (King Wassurma of Tabal known from Assyrian written sources) laid out a vineyard with the aid of deity Tarhunt. “By the grace of the deity” the vineyard grew well. In token of gratitude, the servant of Wasusarmas vowed to offer as a sacrifice from 3 to 9 sheep annually [Khazaradze, 2001, 60]. In Hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions discovered at present-day Kululu, Bopzha, Topada and Sultanhani (former territory of Tabal), “horse”, “stable”, “cavalry” are mentioned [Meriggi, 1967, 116-122; Khazaradze, 2001, 61]. Sheep and bulls are repeatedly mentioned in Hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions of economic character executed on lead strips [Hawkins, 1987, 135].

Along with the above-mentioned, Assyrian cuneiform written sources, dated to the 1st millennium BC, also contain noteworthy information. King Tiglath-pileser III of Assyria records that he led 2000 horses away from Tabal. According to Ashurbanipal, the Tabalians brought “big horses” to Assyria as tribute [Luckenbill, 1926-1927, I, №82, 781, 911] and as Sargon II (722-705 BC) records, he captured 1000 war chariots harnessed with horses in the country of Tabal [Luckenbill, 1926-1927, II, №24, 25, 55] etc.

Thus, the comparison of data of the Hieroglyphic Luwian script with varied information preserved in Assyrian, Hittite cuneiform and Hieroglyphic Luwian texts leads to the conclusion that the fauna of Asia Minor is reflected in a quite adequate manner in Hieroglyphic Luwian, in spite of the fact that a great part of hieroglyphs bearing representations of animals is not identified so far. The study of Luwian hieroglyphs known to the present day shows that the creators of this script gave priority to those species of fauna (bull, horse, donkey, mule, sheep, pig, dog, lion, hare, deer), which played an especially significant role in the political (military science), socio-economic (farming, cattle-breeding, hunting, transport) and cultural (religious beliefs, myth, ritual) life of this major area of the Ancient East.

ისტორია და ფილოლოგია

ძველი მცირეაზიური ცხოველთა სამყაროს ამსახველი ლუვიური ეროგლიფების იდენტიფიცირებისათვის

ნ. ხაზარაძე*

* ი.ჯავახიშვილის ისტორიისა და ეთნოლოგიის ინსტიტუტი

(წარმოდგენილია აკადემიკოს დ. მუსხელიშვილის მიერ)

იეროგლიფურ-ლუვიური დამწერლობის მონაცემების შედარებას ასურულ, ხეთურ ლურსმულ და ეროგლიფურ-ლუვიურ ტექსტებში შემონახულ მრავალფეროვან ინფორმაციასთან, ავტორი იმ დასკვნამდე მიჰყავს, რომ იეროგლიფურ-ლუვიურ დამწერლობაში მცირეაზიური ცხოველთა სამყარო საკმაოდ ადეკვატურადაა ასახული, მიუხედავად იმისა, რომ ცხოველთა გამოსახულებიანი იეროგლიფების დიდი ნაწილი იდენტიფიცირებული არ არის. ავტორის მიერ ჩატარებული კვლევა-ძიების შედეგად აღმოჩნდა, რომ ამ დამწერლობის შემქმნელები პრიორიტეტულ მნიშვნელობას მცირეაზიურ ცხოველთა სამყაროს იმ სახეობებს (ხარი, ცხენი, ვირი, ჯორი, ცხვარი, ღორი, ძაღლი, ლომი, კურდღელი, ირემი) ანიჭებდნენ, რომლებიც ძველი აღმოსავლეთის ამ უმსხვილესი რეგიონის პოლიტიკურ (სამხედრო საქმე), სოციალურ-ეკონომიკურ (მიწათმოქმედება, მესაქონლეობა, მონადირეობა, ტრანსპორტი) და კულტურულ (რელიგიური რწმენა-წარმოდგენები, მითი, რიტუალი) ცხოვრებაში განსაკუთრებულად მნიშვნელოვან როლს თამაშობდნენ.

REFERENCES

- S. Alp (1963), *J. Belleten*, 27 (107), Ankara.
- Cuneiform Texts from Kultepe in Collections of the USSR (Letters and Documents of the Trade Association in Asia Minor of the 19th c. BC). Autographical copies, transcription, translation, introduction, comments and glossary by N.B. Yankovskaya (1968) edit. I. M. Diakonoff, Moscow (Russian).
- J. Friedrich (1959), *Die hethitischen Gesetze*, Leiden.
- G.G. Giorgadze (1965), *Anitta Text and Some Questions of the Early History of the Hittites*, *Vestnik Drevnei Istorii*, I. (Russian).
- H.G. Götterbock (1938), *J. Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie* 44, Berlin-Leipzig.
- J.D. Hawkins (1987), *J. Anatolian Studies* 37.
- F. Imparati (1964), *Le leggi Hittite*, Roma.
- N. Khazaradze (1978), *Ethnic and Political Entities of Eastern Asia Minor in the First Half of the 1st millennium BC*, [Aghmosavlet mcire aziis etnik'uri da politik'uri gaertianebebi dzv. ts. I atasc'leulis p'irvel nakhevarshi]. Tbilisi (Georgian).
- N. Khazaradze (2001), *J. Materials for the Ethnography of Georgia*, XXIV, Tbilisi (Georgian).
- D. Luckenbill (1926-1927), *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia*, I-II, Chicago.
- P. Meriggi (1967), *Di Eteo Geroglifico, Parte II, Testi – I-a Serie*, Roma.
- I. Tatishvili (1983), *J. Matsne (Series of History, Archaeology, Ethnography and Art)*, Tbilisi, I. (Georgian).
- I. Tatishvili (1988), *Hittian-Hittite Building Rituals [Khatu-kheturi samsheneblo rit'ualebi]*, Thesis, Tbilisi (Georgian).
- I. Tatishvili (2000), *J. Language and Culture I*, Tbilisi (Georgian).
- I. Tatishvili (2001), *The Hittite Religion [Kheturi religia]* (Georgian).

Received September, 2007