

E Luvia Lux

YOËL ARBEITMAN

Bronx, New York

For Gilbert-James Ayala
in celebration of 20 years of friendship.

The publication of the Karatepe Bilingual in 1948 provided a far greater possibility for our understanding of Hieroglyphic Luwian (HL) than was possible before. Both the length of connected text and, in particular, the fact that alongside the HL there was a Phoenician version, allowed penetration into the mysteries of this language with which investigators had struggled for many years. It was natural that during the early years of studying the text, the Phoenician was often used to understand the HL. However, in recent years, particularly since the 1973 publication of Hawkins', Morpurgo-Davies' and Neumann's monumental *Hittite Hieroglyphs and Luwian: New Evidence for the Connection*,¹ HL has come into its own, and more and more of the text is understood for itself—its meaning often diverging from the Phoenician. Now that we have in general a good understanding of the HL text, the time has come for Luwilogists to repay their Phoenician colleagues. I believe the HL text should not only be understood for itself; it can, on occasion, also contribute to a solution of some problems in our understanding the Phoenician text. I intend in this article to apply this premise to one small problem.² For HL the transliterations I employ are those of Hawkins/Morpurgo-Davies/Neumann; the normalizations are based on those presented in Prof. Morpurgo-Davies' seminar on the Karatepe Bilingual, conducted at the 1975 Linguistic Institute.

The problem I will deal with is the opening line of the text, the Phoenician version of which reads $\text{nk } \text{ztwd } \text{hbrk } \text{b'l } \text{'bd } \text{b'l}$. This line has usually been translated "I am ztwd , the blessed of Baal, the servant of Baal." However, the presence of a putative definite article before the first member of the construct state has caused no end of commentaries. Donner-Röllig³ comment: "Die Verwendung des Artikels in der Konstruktus-Verbindung ist auffällig. Ist hier כרבעל als Titel oder Eigenname und ה as Relativpronomen zu verstehen: 'der (auch) Gesegneter des Ba'al (heißt) . . .?'" Gordon⁴ seeks to give a justification of the

1 J. D. Hawkins, A. Morpurgo-Davies & G. Neumann, *Hittite Hieroglyphs and Luwian: New Evidence for the Connection*, Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaft in Göttingen Phil-hist. kl., Jahrgang 1973, Nr. 6 (Göttingen, 1973).

2 I thank Mr. Larry Kutler for turning my thoughts to this problem.

3 H. Donner & W. Röllig, *KAI*, II, 39.

4 C. H. Gordon, "Azitawadd's Phoenician Inscription," *JNES* 8 (1949), 112.

article, wherein he cites Biblical and Arabic parallels. The problem has led others, however, to view *hbrk* as another word. Rosenthal in a footnote to his translation in *ANET*³ says “perhaps ‘chief official (*habarakku*) of Baʿl,” and an entry for *hōrk* as “steward” is given by Tomback.⁶ Lipiński⁷ took up this interpretation of Rosenthal’s and, basing himself on Bossert, read the HL as meaning “. . . ‘man of my Sun’, i.e. of the king.” He reached the conclusion that “the Phoenician title has a slightly different meaning and designates Azitawada as ‘steward of Baal’, while the Luwian text qualifies him as ‘the steward’ or ‘the wizieer’ of the kings of Adana.”⁸ Lipiński himself recognized the problems of so construing the hieroglyph for the sun god. We may also note that there is more than a slight difference (from both the semantic and socio-religious points of view) between being the steward of the king or the steward of the god.

Let us turn our attention now to the HL text. Meriggi, the editor of the standard edition,⁹ translates the line “Io sono *Asi-tiwata*, uomo (illuminato dal) dio Sole, servo del dio *Tarhui*.” With the advances made since Meriggi’s edition, we are now able to give the following transliteration and normalization of this line:

EGO- <i>wa/i-mi á-za-ti-i-wa/i-tà-sá</i>	DEUS _{SOL} - <i>mi-sá</i>	CAPUT- <i>ti-i-sá</i>	DEUS _{TONITRUS} - <i>hu-ta-sa</i>	<i>mí-ta₄-sá</i> .
amu.wa.mi Azatiwatas	tiwatamis	zitis	Tarhuntas	mitas.
I (particles) Azatiwatas	“sunned”	man	of Tarhuntas	servant.

The problematic word is *tiwatamis* ‘sunned’. For a comprehensive discussion of older views on this word see Laroche’s summary.¹⁰ This adjective is actually a passive participle, formed by the suffix *-mis* from a denominative verb **tiwatawi* ‘make of Tiwaz’. Thus, this participle may be literally and clumsily translated into English as “made of Tiwaz, Tiwazified, Tiwazized.” Its actual function, though, is an adjective of appurtenance: “of Tiwaz.” Tiwaz was the Luwian sun god (etymologically cognate with Ζεύς, Iuppiter, etc.).

Now it has long been known that Cuneiform Luwian lacks a genitive and uses an adjective in *-ašši* in case accord with the nomen regens to indicate genitival relationship.¹¹ Stefanini has devoted an article¹² to this subject. This is precisely the use to which HL is

5 Apud *ANET*³, 653.

6 R. S. Tomback, *A Comparative Semitic Lexicon of the Phoenician and Punic Languages* (Missoula, 1978), 80. Tomback, it is interesting to note, also listed the passage under *brk* ‘to bless’, as a past participle (p. 56), with cross references in both listings.

7 E. Lipiński, “From Karatepe to Pyrgi,” *Rivista di studi fenici* 2 (1974), 46.

8 Lipiński also states that “No word corresponds to this *bʿl* in the parallel Luwian inscription since . . . ‘my Sun’ cannot be considered as an equivalent to ‘Baal’.” This unhappy conclusion, forced on Lipiński by his acceptance of Bossert’s erroneous understanding of the HL phrase, is obviated by the new analysis provided below. Lipiński does render us very useful information in telling us that *hbrk* ‘chief steward’ is not a *hapax* in Phoenician, but rather a *dis* (occurring also in a Punic inscription from Sardinia: *Rp[y]š hbrk bn Šdq* [not noted by Tomback]). Lipiński’s further adduction of the problematic מַבְרַךְ of Gen. 41:43, however, remains open to question in spite of the worthy case which he builds for its connection with this same Akkadian word.

9 P. Meriggi, *Manuale di eteo geroglifico*, Parte II: Testi—1ª serie (Rome, 1976), 73.

10 E. Laroche, *Les hiéroglyphes hittites* (Paris, 1960), 101.

11 E. Laroche, *Dictionnaire de la langue louvite* (Paris, 1959), 136.

12 R. Stefanini, “Il genitivo aggettivale nelle lingue anatoliche,” *Studi in onore di Piero Meriggi* (= *Athenaeum*, nouva serie, 47 [1969]).

putting the participle/adjective in *-mis* here. What is of great interest for this line is that it is an inherited Indo-European use to employ, in a sentence with more than one genitival relationship, variation of 1) an adjective of appurtenance and 2) a genitive. Watkins¹³ gives several Greek and Slavic examples of this process. We will content ourselves with his Old Church Slavonic example which precisely parallels our HL line: *silojq xristovojq i arxangela rafaila* “by the power of Christ (adj.) and the archangel Raphael (gen.),” literally “by the Christic power and (the power) of the archangel Raphael.”

We are now in a position to correctly interpret the HL line: “I am Azatiwatas, Tiwaz’ (adj.) man and Tarhuntas’ (gen.) servant.” The word *zitis* ‘man’ is well known from Cuneiform Luvian onomastics in the sense of ‘devotee of’, for example, *Arma-zitis* ‘Devotee of the Moon’.¹⁴ We even have evidence of the name *Tiwata-zitis* ‘Devotee of the Sun’.¹⁵ Thus we see that the HL line is composed of two statements in parallelism:

devotee of Tiwaz || servant of Tarhuntas.

Since the name Azatiwatas means “lover [worshipper] of Tiwaz,”¹⁶ the phrase or title *tiwatamis zitis* is almost a (pleonastic) gloss on the steward’s name.

If we can use the HL to interpret the Phoenician, we would like to see in the first part of the Phoenician line a phrase meaning “devotee of Baal” parallel to *ʿbd bʿl* in the second part of the phrase. Even though the Phoenician (showing more monotheistic tendencies than the HL) names the same god in both parts of the line, it is a word such as ‘devotee, servant’ rather than a word meaning ‘blessed’ that we should expect in part one. The Akkadian *abarakku*¹⁷ ‘steward, manager’ seems to fit exceedingly well both the sense and the letters present.

13 C. Watkins, “Remarks on the Genitive,” in *To Honor Roman Jakobson* (The Hague, 1967), 2195.

14 Laroche, *Dictionnaire*, 116.

15 *Ibid.*, 128.

16 Cf. the place name *gt trgn̄ds* “Winepress of Tarḥund-asa (i.e., Lover of Tarḥundas)” at Ugarit, where the “lover” word occurs at the end of the compound (Gordon, *UT Glossary*, no. 2609). The third consonant in the name of this god, which is customarily transcribed *h* in the HL syllabary and *ḥ* in cuneiform, was (as shown by the Ugaritic writing) a voiced velar spirant /ɣ/. The Ugaritic transcription also shows that the second of the signs transcribed *t* in the HL writing of this god’s name was a /d/. However, the first of the signs transcribed *t* in the HL writing of “Azatiwatas” is also etymologically a /d/, but is nevertheless rendered by a *t* in the Phoenician transcription.

17 Akk. *abarakku* bears the same relation to Ph. *hbrk* as Akk. *ekallu* does to Heb. *ḥēkal*. Just as Akk. *ekallu*, a loan word from Sum. *ē-gal*, enters Ug. as *hkl*, Heb. as *ḥēkal*, and Arab. as *ḥaikal*, so too Akk. *abarakku*, a loan word from Sum. AGRIG (W. von Soden, *AHw.*, 3-4) enters Ph. as *hbrk*. On the problem of the initial *h-* in the West Semitic *h-k-l* vs. Akk. *ekallu*, D. O. Edzard has offered some illumination with his comment on the word’s origin: “Sum. *hai-kal*, later *e-gal* . . .”; “The Early Dynastic Period,” in J. Bottéro et al., eds., *The Near East: The Early Civilizations* (New York, 1967), 73. Thus, it is possible that both *hkl* and *hbrk* preserve a Sum. unvoiced glottal continuant /h/ at the beginning of these words, even though the sound wasn’t represented in Akk. cuneiform. For a similar view see S. A. Kaufman, *The Akkadian Influences on Aramaic*, AS 19 (Chicago, 1974), 27, n. 75.