CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

H. CRAIG MELCHERT

1. *Definition: who were the Luwians?*

The Luwians (re)enter history with the discovery in 1906 of the cuneiform archives of the ancient capital of the Hittite Empire, Hattusa (near the modern village of Boğazköy/Boğazkale, about ninety miles east of Ankara).[1] Several provisions of the Hittite Laws assure us that in the middle of the second millennium BCE there was in Asia Minor a land Luwiya (KUR *Lu-ú-i-ya*).[2] Paragraph five referring to the slaying of a Hittite merchant shows that Luwiya must have been contiguous to or at least very near the heartland of the Hittite kingdom in Hatti (the central Anatolian plateau encircled by the Halys River, the modern Kızıl Irmak).

Paragraphs §§19-21 of the Laws deal with the abduction of free persons from Hatti to Luwiya and slaves from Luwiya to Hatti. The penalty for a Luwian who abducts a free Hittite is forfeiture of his entire estate, while a Hittite who abducts a free Luwian pays only six persons. Conversely, theft of a slave belonging to a Hittite requires a penalty of 12 shekels of silver, while a Luwian slave-owner is entitled

[1] The gradual reemergence of the Luwians during the twentieth century is illustrated by the successive editions of the *Encyclopedia Britannica*. The eleventh edition of 1910 has an article on the Hittites by David W. Hogarth that already acknowledges the new discovery at Boğazköy. However, since the Hittite-language texts were deciphered by Bedřich Hrozný only during the First World War, Hogarth's article naturally can take no account of these, and there is no mention of the Luwians. The fourteenth edition of 1929-1941 has an article on the Hittites by none other than Hrozný himself that includes a section on "Lûish". Understandably, some aspects of his description are now outdated. The edition of 1962 finally brings a separate article on the Luwians by Hans G. Güterbock, an excellent treatment that retains its validity in all essentials to the present day.

[2] The most recent edition of the Laws is Hoffner 1997. Other important editions are those of Friedrich 1959 and Imparati 1964.

only to the return of his slave. This quite unequal treatment suggests that the Hittites viewed the Luwians as 'foreign', belonging to 'the other', not to their own social group. That Luwiya has a purely geographic sense (Klinger 1996 17[41]) is not credible. On the other hand, the very inclusion in the Laws of special provisions for cases involving Luwians (and not inhabitants of other countries) argues for a close relationship of some kind (cf. the remarks of Friedrich 1959 91, Güterbock 1961 67, and Hoffner 1997 180f).

Scholars such as Hrozný, Forrer, and Sommer did not hesitate to speak of 'peoples', but they were conscious of the difficulties in the use of this term. Today we are even more acutely aware of the fact that language and culture often do not correspond to ethnicity or 'nationhood'.[3] We thus refer merely to 'the Luwians'. Nevertheless, we are still obliged to give some idea of just what we mean by this term. One obvious possibility is that suggested by the references to the Hittite Laws cited above: the inhabitants of the land Luwiya.

This definition for 'Luwian' and 'Luwians' proves to be impractical, because we have a very imperfect idea of the location and extent of Luwiya. One reason for this is that there is no evidence that there was ever a unified Luwian state or polity—there are no kings of Luwiya or a capital city. The replacement of Luwiya by Arzawa in the Neo-Hittite copy of the Hittite Laws shows that Luwiya must have included a considerable portion of western Asia Minor (see Chapters Two and Three below). Nothing, however, suggests that Luwiya and Arzawa are coterminous. On the contrary, the presence of Luwian ritual texts in the Hittite archives originating in Kizzuwatna argues that Luwiya included portions of southern and southeastern Asia Minor. The distribution of Luwian hieroglyphic inscriptions tends to confirm that Luwian territory extended in a broad arc that ran from northwest to southeast to the west and south of the Halys River. However, we also have Luwian hieroglyphic inscriptions written by Hittite kings, including in Hattusa. Further such inscriptions are found in the 'Neo-Hittite' states of northern Syria following the fall of the Hittite Empire. It is far from clear just what conclusions we may draw about a 'Luwian' presence in a given area based merely on the appearance of Luwian hieroglyphic inscriptions. We

[3] For further problems in applying the concept 'people(s)' to ancient Anatolia see Starke (1997a 460 with n. 131).

must also, of course, allow for the possibility of population movements over time. In sum, the limits of 'Luwian' territory are ill defined.

The preceding paragraph already brought mention of Luwian texts. Despite our knowledge that language is not always a reliable criterion in identifying or defining an ethnic group or people, we have little else to go on (cf. the remark of Sommer 1947 30). With all due reserve we will here use 'Luwians' effectively to mean 'Luwian-speaking population groups'. And descriptions of their history, religion, and material culture will refer to those topics in areas where we have reason to suppose significant presence of Luwian speakers. Readers should bear in mind the obvious limitations of such a working definition and the fluid nature of the boundaries in all of these aspects of human societies. They should also not be surprised or disturbed that the contributors to this volume, to say nothing of other scholars, do not always arrive at the same conclusions on this point.

2. *Sources*

Our knowledge of the Luwians derives from a number of sources, of quite variable size, quality and value:

(1) Direct references to the land of Luwiya and its inhabitants. These are limited to §§5, 19-21, and 23 of the Hittite Laws as cited above. In addition, Carruba (1992 254ff) has argued persuasively that the term *nuwa'um* of the Old Assyrian texts from Kanesh (see Edzard 1989 107ff) also refers to the Luwians. This identification is important in establishing the presence of Luwians in south central Anatolia already at the start of the second millennium.

(2) Appearance of Luwian personal names in Old Assyrian texts from Kanesh and elsewhere from the 20th-18th centuries BCE (see Tischler 1995 with extensive bibliography), in Hittite texts from Hattusa and elsewhere from the 16th to the 13th centuries (see Laroche 1966 and 1981a),[4] in Assyrian texts from the 9th to

[4] For personal names in Hittite texts published since Laroche (1981a) see the web-based 'Répertoire d'onomastique' of Marie-Claude Trémouille at www.orient.uni-wuerzburg/hetonom/.

7th centuries,[5] and in Greek texts from Anatolia of the first millennium (see Zgusta 1964).

(3) Mention of place-names associated with both Luwian texts and with bearers of Luwian personal names (it is important to stress that we have no assurance in most cases that the place-names *themselves* are linguistically Luwian!). For place-names in Hittite texts see Del Monte and Tischler (1978) and in Greek sources Zgusta (1984).[6]

(4) Luwian-language texts. For the details of this evidence see Chapter Four.

3. *Dating and Chronology*

Both the absolute dating and relative chronology of persons and events in the Ancient Near East are matters of considerable controversy. For two recent discussions of the problem see Cryer (1995) with extensive bibliography and Bryce (1998 408-415). The dates used in this work tend to adhere to what are termed the 'Middle' or 'Low' chronologies. One may compare, for example, the dates given for Hittite kings in Bryce (1998 xiii-xiv) and Klengel (1999 392-393) with those of Starke (2002). The differences tend to be significant only for the Old Hittite kingdom. They thus have little impact on most of the issues treated here. Likewise, while the existence or non-existence of certain Hittite kings obviously is of importance for Hittite history, Luwian history as we now know it is relatively unaffected by such discrepancies. Readers should note merely that the kings listed by Starke as Hattusili II and Tudhaliya III are the same as Hattusili III and Tudhaliya IV given by Bryce and Klengel.

---

[5] The most accessible recent survey of this material is found in the respective 'Historical Context' passages in Hawkins (2000).

[6] A few relevant personal and place-names also are found in other sources, such as texts from Ugarit (Ras Shamra), Egypt and the Old Testament. For a recent survey of the biblical material see Cancik (2002a), with a discussion of why these references are labeled 'Hittite'. Readers should know that identification of the place-name Que (= HLuwian /Kawa/) in First Kings 10.28f and Second Chronicles 1.16-17 dates only to the end of the nineteenth century. They will not find it in the King James Version or other older translations. One should also be prepared to find various alternative spellings such as Kue, Qöe or Coa.

4. *Geography*

Readers cannot be expected to follow descriptions of Luwian history, prehistory and other topics without some guide to the many place-names cited. They should be aware, however, that the maps offered here (Maps 2 and 3, pp. 37 and 94) are fully as much a matter of interpretation as the rest of the contents. The location of the hundreds of place-names attested in our ancient texts is a matter of intense debate and ongoing investigation. For various reasons there is fairly widespread agreement regarding most of the place-names cited in this work from northern Syria and southeastern Anatolia. If one compares these sites on the maps in works such as MacQueen (1986), Bryce (1998), Klengel (1999) and Starke (2002), one will find few discrepancies. Even here, however, one must be prepared to find dissenting opinions (cf. the new proposal of Casabonne 2002 regarding Kummani and Lawazantiya, following Trémouille).

Given the focus of the present work, it has seemed prudent to limit identifications for central Anatolia to a few that are a matter of broad consensus and to avoid explicit claims about more controversial cases (cf. the discussion regarding Kussara and Sana(h)witta below in Chapter Two, p. 22). For western Anatolia, however, choices had to be made, and some justification for them is called for. It would be rash to speak yet of a consensus, but a comparison of Map 2 presented here with those of Hawkins (1998b 31) and Starke (2002 303ff) vis-à-vis those of older works such as Garstang-Gurney (1959) and Forlanini-Marazzi (1986) shows that considerable progress has been made.

Evidence of the treaty of Tudhaliya IV with Kurunta (see Otten 1988) confirms that the land of Tarhuntassa stretched as far west as Parha (Perge) and the Cestros River. The YALBURT hieroglyphic inscription shows that the second-millennium Lukka lands were centered on classical Lycia (see Poetto 1993 75ff). These localizations effectively fill the southernmost quadrant of western Anatolia, precluding the location there of other disputed territories. The demonstration by Hawkins (1998b) that the land of Mira extended to the west central coast also almost inexorably forces other pieces of the interlocking puzzle to fall into place (cf. also Starke 1997a 450ff). The *relative* positions of Wilusa, Appawiya, the Seha River Land,

Arzawa-Mira, and Kuwaliya are reasonably assured.[7] Likewise it no longer seems possible to deny the long proposed identifications of Apasa with Ephesos and Millawanda with Miletos.

One remaining topic of disagreement concerns the Astarpa and Siyanta Rivers, the lands of Hapalla and Walma, and the precise extent of Pedassa and the 'Lower Land' that lie to their east. These are interlocking issues, and a decision in one case tends to determine the rest. The picture presented in Map 2 here essentially follows that of Hawkins (1998b). He identifies the Astarpa with the modern Akar Çay (thus already Garstang-Gurney 1959 86). Starke (2002 304ff) equates the Astarpa with the upper course of the Maeander. Hawkins further suggests the modern Seydi or Porsuk, upper tributaries of the Sangarios, as the Siyanta (the former is chosen here). Starke and others (e.g. Garstang-Gurney 1959 91f) identify the Siyanta rather with the Banaz Çay, a tributary of the Maeander. For reasons cited by Hawkins, the alternative identifications seem to displace the two rivers too far to the south and west.

There is a consensus that the northern limit of Walma is near the site of classical Holmi, southeast of modern Afyon. Pedassa must lie to the west of the Salt Lake (see Hawkins 1998b 22). On the other hand, in the treaty of Tudhaliya IV with Kurunta, the western border of Tarhuntassa formed by the Cestros River is continued directly by Walma and then Pedassa. There seems no problem in assuming that Pedassa stretched in a north-south direction so as to fulfill both these requirements. The southward extension of Walma is harder to determine (cf. the different solutions of Garstang-Gurney 1959 x and Starke 2002 306). The matter is left open here.

Hawkins (1998b 14) places Hapalla in inner Pisidia, a position that puts it near Kuwaliya and also open both to attack from the Lower Land as generally defined (see KUB 19.22,4ff on the attack of the Hittite general Hannutti) and to incursions by Madduwatta from the Siyanta River Land (*Madd.* §§19-20). Starke (2002 304ff) locates Hapalla significantly farther north, east of the Seha River Land

[7] The placement of Wilusa in the northwest argues for a similar location of the associated Tarwisa (KUB 23.11 ii 19) and the long suggested connection with the name of Troy (see further Starke 1997a 455 and Bryce in this volume, p. 68). On the problem of the additional name Tarwiza (*tara/i-wa/i-zi/a*) see Hawkins (1997 17ff).

(similarly Garstang-Gurney 1959 97ff). Not coincidentally he extends the area of the Lower Land to the northwest (to west of the Salt Lake).[8]

Also problematic is the position of the land of Karkisa/Karkiya. It is tentatively put here on Map 2 in the vicinity of classical Caria, with Peschlow-Bindokat (2002) and others. Starke (2002 304) places Karkisa in the far northwest, east of Wilusa, based on the association of Karkisa with the Land of Assuwa, which he connects with classical Assos (see Starke 1997a 456 and also Garstang-Gurney 1959 105ff). However, one can equally well connect Assuwa with the name Asia (Bossert 1946 et al.), whose original localization is in west central Asia Minor (see Georgacas 1971 27f).[9] It is thus by no means clear that Assuwa was restricted to the northwest (cf. Bryce in this volume, p. 74).[10] Hawkins (1998b 29) weighs the alternatives and leaves the issue open. A definitive answer is not yet possible. Localization of the Land of Masa remains even more difficult. Starke (2002 304ff) opts for a northern location in the area of classical Bithynia, but the current evidence is conflicting: see Hawkins (1998b 29f) for discussion and references.

---

[8] If one accepts Hawkins' location of Hapalla as adopted in Map 2, its absence among the lands bordering Tarhuntassa is surprising, since it would lie between Walma and Tarhuntassa. However, Hapalla is last attested in the reign of Muwattalli (treaty with Alaksandu). It may thus have no longer existed as a discrete entity by the time of the treaty with Kurunta.

[9] See *Iliad* 2.461: Ἀσίῳ ἐν λειμῶνι Καϋστρίου ἀμφὶ ῥέεθρα 'in the Asian meadow along the streams of the Cayster'.

[10] *Linguistically*, all three terms are likely related, in a chain **Assa-* > *Assuwa-* (cf. *Zalpa/Zalpuwa, Ahhiya/Ahhiyawa*) > **Asswiya-* '(land) of Assuwa' (attested in the Mycenaean personal name *a-si-wi-jo*). For the last step see Starke (1997a 458). His supposed base **Assu-* for *Assuwa-* (1997a 456) is pure invention. The base is surely non-Indo-European.