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

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

Hawkins (1995, esp. 54ff) sees the text as an account of military conquests and building activities of Suppiluliuma II. There can be no doubt about the latter, but I see not an iota of evidence for military activity in the SÜDBURG text. Hawkins (1995: 28, 40) bases his interpretation in large part on an alleged parallel with the YALJURU inscription of Tuthaliya IV, which certainly does recount that king's campaign in Lydia (see Hawkins 1995: 68ff for translation and commentary, and Zoro 1993 for a full edition of this text). The YALJURU text predictably uses well-known Luvian equivalents of the corresponding Hittite terms in the royal annals: /ufb(a)/- 'strike' (= CLuvian nup(a)-ii, Lycian nub(h)-i) matching Hittite *waš- /mum(a)-i/- + reflexive -a/-u 'conquer' (= CLuvian) matching Hittite turb- plus reflexive -a/-e, and the logographically written DELERE 'destroy' (for which see Melchert 1988: 34ff) matching Hittite hana(i)-e/-e.

If Suppiluliuma II in SÜDBURG is describing military action(s), it is extremely peculiar—for me, simply not credible—that he uses not a single one of the established Luvian terms, all of which are used by his own father in his inscription scarcely
a generation earlier, Hawkins would have us believe that Suppiluliuma II uses instead one expression (putatively INFRA š-ka) which is attested nowhere else in Luwian and another (PUGNUS.PUGNUS) whose other attestations are without exception non-military in sense.

As Hawkins himself ably summarizes in an appendix (1995: 118f.), the Luwian verb PUGNUS.PUGNUS is in several of its occurrences an intransitive verb, for which the contexts suggest a meaning 'live, endure, stay', a sense that also fits SÜDBURG, as we shall see below. I cite here only the greeting formula of the ASSUR letters (1/B6, §2): [a-na-unùrša/i] PUGNUS.PUGNUS-ni 'You shall stay well'. In the one example of a transitive PUGNUS.PUGNUS whose context is reasonably clear, there is no evidence at all for any military sense (SULTANHAN, §54-44): ša-ulêš [REL-tä | REL-ta] ša LOCUS-ta-zu PUGNUS.PUGNUS-tä | ša-liš-tä [NEG-] 'HUVXA ša-ha ša-ulêš-ta 'Whoever PP-ed this place, no one nuwa-ed it' Hawkins attempts to make capital out of the presence of /nuwu-i/- in the next sentence, but note the significant absence of the reflexive particle. In Hitite, ša-ša only means 'conquer' when accompanied by -ša (see Friedrich 1952: 213), and likewise /nuwu-i/- is accompanied by reflexive ša-mi in the meaning 'overcome, conquer' in all of its occurrences in YALBURG. Given that the verb /nuwu-i/- is denominalative from /nuwa/- 'strength, might', I suggest for the simplex verb a sense 'strengthen, make strong'. In any case, Hawkins himself concedes that the context of SULTANHAN, which concerns the reestablishment of a vineyard for the god TAHUNTAS, gives no support for a military sense in either /nuwa-i/- or the transitive verb PUGNUS.PUGNUS.

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

Hawkins's interpretation INFRA š-ka with preverb plus verb also leads to serious syntactic problems. In three of seven instances, this produces either a syntactically linked verbs or (assuming omission of a sentence connective) verbs with no expressed subject or object. While the latter is not totally impossible, it would be highly unusual in Hitite or Luwian phraseology. The awkwardness and artificielly of such an assumption is manifest in Hawkins's own translation (clauses §58, 12, and 15, p. 23).
Finally, while it is quite plausible in general linguistic terms to attribute a sense 'sub-ject, sub-road' to a combination with a preverb 'kata/ down', sound method demands that we give most weight to the evidence immediately at hand, that of the languages of the author of the text: Hittite and Luvian. Supphililuma II is writing in a well-developed analitical tradition, and all available evidence suggests that the use of Luvian instead of Hittite does not affect this tradition. In Tifthyal, IV's YALBURT text, for example, we find the Luvian versions of the well-known topoi of the deity "running before" the king (12, §4) and of women and children of a cis kernel before the king (15, §1). Cf. KUB XIV 15-17; 46-47; and iv 288. Gött. 1932: 56-57, 70-71). We therefore have every right to expect that INFRA (that is, 'katat') saks would conform to known Hittite analitical usage. To our knowledge, there simply is no Hittite expression for anything like 'sub-ject, subject' using the preverb kata. I therefore conclude that Hawkins's assertion that the SÜDBURG inscription refers to military conquest is without foundation. As always, it is far easier to argue against an interpretation than to provide a persuasive alternative, and I make no claim to a full understanding of the text. I do believe that the general thrust of the last half is reasonably clear. I cite this portion in full for reference, with my readings (to which one should compare Hawkins 1995: 22-23):

$58$ MONS, IDEXI: QUINQUE *416-wall-nil $A$ INFRA-ka PUGNUS.PUGNUS
$59$ PURUS, FONS-nil MAGNUS, REX *416-wall-nil $A + $INFRA-ka
MONS, IDEXI: QUINQUE X
$510$ CAPUT, VIR, MONS, IDEXI: QUINQUE zis-la-ku PUGNUS.PUGNUS
$511$ TONTRUS, URBIS, REGIO *416-wall-nil $A + $INFRA-ka
PUGNUS.PUGNUS
$512$ pur-nil-k AVUS, *506-nil NEG-wall-nil REL-il-ku *507
$513$ PURUS, FONS-nil MAGNUS, REX *416-nil-nil $A + $INFRA-ka CAPUT, VIR,
TONTRUS, URBIS, REGIO $A + $INFRA-ka ARHA CAPIRE
$514$ ta-NEG, URBIS AEDIFICAR-F
$515$ TONTRUS, URBIS x-nil-nil-nil URBIS, INFRA, *122 URBIS *137-la-ku
DEUS-nil-nil DARE-nil
$516$ zis-la-nil INFRA, zis-nil

For the last sequence "(I) in that year built here a Divine Earth-Road" (that is, $4$ KASKAL, KUR, a man-made entrance to the underworld), I merely refer to the

1. Nor, to my knowledge, is kata used in any other established Hittite expression for military activity or conquest. The single exception is in the Annals of Muršili (Kii 112 iv 39-40): nek- $4$ (shijin) $300$ (Dukkammara) zilgi-pa: kata-dhatu; 'I took down Atipa and Dukkammans in battle' (Kii 112 iv 4 iv 12). The detailed description in the latter of the city as being in a high and mountainous locale (iv 58) makes it likely that this special expression reflects the special topography involved in the actual. Hittite does also have an expression kata damatt - 'arrest', but in its use to describe military action from Old through Middle to Neo-Hittite, it occurs consistently without kata in the sense 'prey hard'.
convincing analysis of Hawkins (1995: 44–45). The sense of the immediately preceding sentence is also clear, thanks to the presumptive interpretation of *$137-values (as) final
haraa/‘offering, ritual’ (in CLavian mi$al$) by van de Houw (1995: 562–63, following E. Master): “I gave (the city) Tarhunta$la, (the city) X, and (the city) Y to the gods as an offering.” I wish to stress the full significance of this statement. By dedicating the capital Tarhunta$la and two other cities to the gods, Suppiluliuma thereby makes these cities taboo and off-limits to humans, in effect currying them. Such a pious
ishment is well-known from the Annals of Mursili see KUB XIX 37 ii 15–19 on the fate of Timmuthala, where the motivation and ramifications of the act are spelled out quite explicitly. The significance was clear to Götze (1923: 234), who compares also KUB XIX 15 i 16 on the similar fate of Pulpissa and KUB VII 60 ii 17.2

Hawkins (1995: 35–36) finds no convincing interpretation for CAPUT/VIR. I would follow Otten (1989: 335–36) in seeing merely the equivalent of Hitite LU. The logogram CAPUT is ambiguous in Hitite, standing for both barmak$- ‘head’ and for rati$- ‘person, man’. The function of VIR here is to mark clearly the latter reading (in lieu of a phonetic complement -$). However, since the use of the expression LU $101X ‘man of X’ as a title (‘prince/ruler of X’) is attested only for Old Hitite (Kenyon) and Kozak 1982: 97; Neu 1974: 36), I believe we must take the phrase as a plural, the equivalent of the standard Hitite LU.MES$101X ‘men/people of X’ so frequent in the annals.3 In the SÜDBURG text cited above, we have in parallel fashion the mention first of a mountain ($58) and then its inhabitants ($101, followed by mention of the land Tarhunta$la ($11) and then its inhabitants ($15).

Whatever the meaning of (*$16-wed$)-A INFRA-ha turns out to be the subject of §13 is surely Suppiluliuma, and the object is the people of Tarhunta$la.” (1) Suppiluliuma, the Great King, . . . took a very people of the land of Tarhunta$la.” Not only is depriving a people a well-established practice of Hitite kings (during the Empire and thereafter), but such an action also makes a logical preliminary to the dedication of the capital Tarhunta$la and other cities to the god in §15 (see again Götze 1923: 234, as cited above).

The intervening sentence §14 seems to say “(1) built (up the city) Tana.” Hawkins (1995: 42) tentatively suggests identification with Atawa (with non-writing or genuine aphaeresis of the initial A), but expresses misgivings due to the fact that Atawa was surely never a part of the land of Tarhunta$la. The mention of building (up) another city in the midst of discussion of Tarhunta$la seems a non sequitur in any


3. Neu admits the exceptional occurrence of the older usage in Neo-Hittite compositions, citing LU 14127-piya as in KBo III 3 ii 714. The term ‘ruler, prince’ does not seem strictly necessary for this passage, but LU KUR.196 after in SUB XXI 1 i 12 (as LUGAL in KUB XXI 5 iii 26) is the company of three other ‘kings’ seem clear enough. Such a reading is excluded for SÜDBURG by the first occurrence in §5 not quoted above: CAPUT/VIR. HATTU (REGO) *430 ‘the people of all the lands of Hattu’. Suppiluliuma II would not have referred to himself as LU KUR.KUR.MES 196-HATTU.
case. I venture as a solution to this that we should understand Adamu as the place (or one of the places) to which Suppiluliuma transplanted the people of Tarhuntalia. Explicit expression of the resettlement was considered unnecessary in the context. We know that the Hittite kings used forced movement of peoples for multiple purposes. By deporting the people of Tarhuntalia and making the capital off-limits to human habitation, Suppiluliuma seriously weakened chances of a rebellion. At the same time, he used the transplantees to reinforce his control over another border area.

The sense of clauses §§8–12 is obscured by the unidentified logogram for the verb in §§9 and the quite legible but not yet interpretable sign *506, which appears to be the verb in §12 (on the letter, see Hawkins 1995: 43). I tentatively suggest, however, that these lines contain the stated pretext for Suppiluliuma's very severe punishment of Tarhuntalia, which had, after all, enjoyed a very special status not that long before. In fact, I believe that the entire mention of the unidentified mountain in §§8–10 is merely to serve as a contrasting example to Tarhuntalia, the real topic of the second half of the text.

Note that sentences §§8 and §§11 are entirely parallel. The mountain and Tarhuntalia start out on an equal footing. The introduction of name and title in §9 strongly suggest a change of subject. Since the name of the mountain is the only noun phrase in §§8, and we have no reason to suppose some other third party, the verb PUGNUS/PUGNUS is likely to be intransitive. The meaning 'live, abide, stay' suggested by other occurrences would thus also fit here, whatever the sense of the mysterious *416-wa-li-ši A-1INFRA-ka. The crucial point is that the action of Suppiluliuma in §9 in regard to the mountain must have been benign, because in §10 "The people of Mt. X also thereafter stayed there." For a parallel for such merciful treatment compare the Annals of Murshili KUB XIX 37 iii 40, 46, where the Hittite expression is wesit eerapu 'And they remained (there'). Note the striking parallelism of the Hittite and Luvian, which feel no need for a local adverb, unlike modern English or German (compare Gitten 1932: 177, who likewise supplies 'don't').

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

4. Hawkins very tentatively reads the verb as DARE 'give', but the orientation of the sign is the opposite of the clear DARE in §§5, and the shape is also different. There is also obviously no indirect object available. Based on the comparable Hittite passages, we would expect an equivalent of Hitt. kadili, -i: semi-conservative 'give (to)'; (see Götte 1932: 176–77 and KUB XIX 37 iii 40, 46). The vague shape of the logogram in §9 in SÜDBURG makes this hypothesis untenable.

5. Contra Hawkins, I read sign 319 as syllabic -šid 'and, also', not as HATT. Hawkins concludes (1995: 25) that the latter reading causes problems of interpretation but argues against the phonetic value on the grounds that such a use is otherwise unattested in the Empire period. But he notes that phonetic -šid does occur in the KARAGIN/RAZIDAM inscriptions, which he himself has argued date to a period immediately following the end of the Empire. His objection thus carries no weight, since nothing precludes the innovation being a few decades rather than previously thought. The sense 'also, even' for onkel, 'he fits well here and elsewhere' in SÜDBURG.
looks like a ladle) as standing here for the value /bud/ (compare with Hoffner apud Hawkins Hitt. Jnl. 'draw (liquid)'). The combination AVUS *s06-sa is thus 'grandfather(s) and grandmother(s). Unfortunately, we cannot determine with certainty whether this phrase is subject or object, much less the meaning of the verb behind *s07. The expression NEG REL-it-ta could also be either a case form (dative singular) or adverbial. Hawkins takes "grandfathers and grandmothers" as the subject, and I cannot exclude this.

I find it more likely, however, that the land of Tarhuntassa is the subject, as in the preceding sentence, and that it is being charged with some crime or delict against the ancestor. Given the presence of the negation, I would look for the meaning of the verb in the realm of 'honor, worship, sacrifice to'. The (Tarhuntassa) did not formerly at all honor the grandfathers and grandmothers. "The seriousness of the crime may involve more than mere impiety. As is well-known, when King Muwatalli moved the Hittite capital to Tarhuntassa, he took with him the gods and the dead (Aphrodis: of Hatnissi, ii 52, Otten 1985: 14). As Hawkins (1905: 42) points out, Uluhi-Tushu is reported to have brought the gods back to Hattusa, but no mention is made of the dead (Götz 1930: 46, text B 11-12), who may thus have remained in Tarhuntassa. Impiety towards the dead would thus have involved Suppiluliuma's own royal ancestors, making the crime a very serious offense indeed.

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