MULTILINGUALISM IN ANCIENT CONTEXTS

Perspectives from
Ancient Near Eastern
and Early Christian
Contexts

EDITORS

Louis C. Jonker
Angelika Berlejung
Izak Cornelius

4

VISIBLE MULTILINGUALISM IN ANATOLIA AND THE LEVANT (1ST MILLENNIUM BCE)

Izak Cornelius
Stellenbosch

4.1 INTRODUCTION

Multilingualism refers not only to the use of different languages in the form of bilingual or trilingual inscriptions, but also to the media in which texts were transmitted, because *the medium is the message*.¹ Attention should be devoted to the materiality,² monumentality³ and material (visual) imagery of the inscription.⁴ Not only the *what* (the content), but the *how* (the object or text type) and the *where* (where it was placed or functioned) of multilingual inscriptions should be taken into account.⁵

Mandell and Smoak emphasise the “multimodality” of monumental inscriptions, which includes their visual and material dimensions.⁶ “Language was a part of their message, but not the whole message.”⁷ The context was also important: not only what the audience read, but where they viewed these texts – which also included the not so literate. These readers as observers and viewers saw *both* the object and the text, whereas modern scholars tend to separate them by devoting attention only to the text, and also outside of its original context. A photograph of the Tell Fekheriye bilingual (see Figure 4.13 and discussion below) has a caption “The Tell Fakhariya inscription”,⁸ which is quite correct, but it should be kept in mind that the inscription is on a *statue* – the medium or the object is just as important a part of its meaning. In an article on royal inscriptions in the Levant, Dobbs-Allsopp and Pioske focus on mixed-media artefacts and emphasise that iconographic considerations should also receive attention when working with inscriptional material.⁹

- 1 Marshall McLuhan, *The Medium is the Message* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1989). Note the pun on “massage” for “message”.
- 2 On the importance of materiality see Dan Hicks & Mary Beaudry, eds. *Oxford Handbook of Material Culture Studies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010). Also see Kathryn E. Piquett & Ruth D. Whitehouse, eds. *Writing as Material Practice: Substance, Surface and Medium* (London: Ubiquity Press, 2013) and the special issue of *MAARAV*, 23/1 (2019) *Communicating through the Material in the Ancient World*, eds. Emily Cole & Alice Mandell.
- 3 On this concept see James Osborne, ed. *Approaching Monumentality in Archaeology* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2014).
- 4 On the relation between text and image see Pascal Attinger, Antoine Cavigneaux, Catherine Mittermayer & Mirko Novák, eds. *Text and Image* (Leuven: Peeters, 2018).
- 5 See Angelika Berlejung in this volume with reference to Katherine McDonald, “Fragmentary Ancient Languages as ‘Bad Data’: Towards a Methodology for Investigating Multilingualism in Epigraphic Sources”, *Sociolinguistica: Internationales Jahrbuch für Soziolinguistik*, 31 (2017): 31–48.
- 6 Alice Mandell & Jeremy D. Smoak, “Reading Beyond Literacy, Writing beyond Epigraphy: Multimodality and the Monumental Inscriptions at Ekron and Tel Dan”, *MAARAV*, 22/1–2 (2018): 79–112. They cite important theoretical and other relevant literature.
- 7 Mandell and Smoak, “Reading Beyond Literacy”, 86.
- 8 K. Lawson Younger, *A Political History of the Arameans. From Their Origins to the End of Their Politics* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2016), Figure 4.5.
- 9 Frederick W. Dobbs-Allsopp & Daniel Pioske, “On the Appearance of Royal Inscriptions in

Three famous inscribed monuments illustrate the importance of the visual dimension and also seeing the inscriptions/texts as imagery:

- The stela of Hammurapi of Babylon (ca. 1750 BCE): it is famous because of the laws inscribed on it, but the monument as an object is just as important.¹⁰
- The stela of the Assyrian king Esarhaddon (ca. 670 BCE) from Zincirli: the message was primarily visual, the inscriptions were of secondary importance.¹¹
- The Bisitun monument of the Achaemenid ruler Darius I (ca. 520/519 BCE): it is a “textual image”, the “text is iconographic”.¹²

A variety of languages were used in western Asia and texts were written in different writing systems.¹³ There is no direct link between the language and the writing system or script.¹⁴ The same writing system could be used for different languages. In this contribution the emphasis will be on 1st millennium BCE southeast Anatolia/Turkey and northern Levant/Syria up to the 8th century BCE. The inscriptions are in Hieroglyphic Luwian, Phoenician, Akkadian and Aramaic. Hieroglyphic Luwian is an Indo-European language used in Anatolia from the 2nd millennium and in the northern Levant until the 8th century BCE. It used a writing system consisting of 500 pictorial signs, a combination of logographic and syllabic-phonographic signs indicating words/objects or sounds.¹⁵ Phoenician and Aramaic are west Semitic

Alphabetic Scripts in the Levant: An Exercise in ‘Historically Anchored Philology’”, *MAARAV*, 23/2 (2019): 389-442. The cited article includes various visual materials (including some discussed in this chapter). Note, however, that the statue in Figure 32 is not from Tell Halaf itself. The website of the Museum of Fine Arts only states “In Tell Halaf, in Syria, several statues of this type were found ...” (collections.mfa.org/objects/164760).

- 10 Izak Cornelius, “Communicating Divine Order and Authority: The Stela of Hammurapi of Babylon”, in *Teaching Morality in Antiquity: Wisdom Texts, Oral Traditions, and Images/Morallehren in der Antike: Weisheitstexte, mündliche Traditionen, und Bilder*, ed. Takayoshi Oshima (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018), 219-32; also Mandell & Smoak, “Reading Beyond Literacy”, 86 n. 15.
- 11 Israel Ephal, “Esarhaddon Egypt and Shubria: Politics and Propaganda”, *Journal of Cuneiform Studies*, 57 (2005): 99-111, esp. 108.
- 12 Jennifer Finn, “GODS, KINGS, MEN: Trilingual Inscriptions and Symbolic Visualizations in the Achaemenid Empire”, *Ars Orientalis*, 41 (2011): 219-75, esp. 224.
- 13 Map I in Sebastian P. Brock & David G.K. Taylor, *The Hidden Pearl* (Roma: Trans World Film Italia, 2001); Wolfgang Röllig, “Sprachen und Schriften der Levante in Anatolien”, in *Die Außenwirkung des späthethitischen Kulturraumes: Gütertausch, Kulturkontakt, Kulturtransfer* (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2004), eds. Mirko Novak, Friedhelm Prayen & Anne-Maria Wittke, Abb. 1. For the languages used, see Röllig, “Sprachen und Schriften”; Ulrich Hübner & Herbert Niehr, eds. *Sprachen in Palästina im 2. und 1. Jahrtausend v. Chr.* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2017); Sebastian Fink, Martin Lange & Manfred Schretter, eds. *Mehrsprachigkeit. Vom Alten Orient bis zum Esperanto* (Münster: Zaphon, 2018) and now Rebecca Hasselbach-Andee, ed. *A Companion to Ancient Near Eastern Languages* (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2020), with Rebecca Hasselbach-Andee, “Multilingualism and Diglossia in the Ancient Near East”, 457-70.
- 14 See Berlejung in this volume.
- 15 See Annick Payne, *Hieroglyphic Luwian: An Introduction with Original Texts* (Wiesbaden:

languages using the (Phoenician) alphabet.¹⁶ Akkadian is an east Semitic language written in cuneiform script.¹⁷

An interesting case study for multilingualism in this region is Sam'al (Zincirli) in southern Turkey with inscriptions in Luwian, Phoenician, the local dialect called Sam'alian and finally Old Aramaic.¹⁸ But there are no bilingual texts from Zincirli. Multilingual – or more specifically bilingual and trilingual – inscriptions are known from other sites in southeastern Turkey and the northern Levant. These inscriptions from Karatepe, Çineköy, Ivriz, İncirli, Arslan Taş and Tell Fekheriye (map) will be examined with regard to their discovery and find contexts, description of the object, the language of the inscriptions, and the material imagery of the object with comparative material. As this contribution is not about texts per se, the texts will not receive attention and only a few examples of the differences between the texts in the form of citations will be given.¹⁹

FIGURE 4.1 Map of sites discussed

Harrassowitz, 2010) and *Iron Age Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012). See Payne, *Iron Age Hieroglyphic Luwian*, xii for map of inscriptions.

- 16 On these languages see Holger Gzella, *A Cultural History of Aramaic: From the Beginnings to the Advent of Islam*, Handbook of Oriental Studies 111 (Leiden: Brill, 2015); “Phoenician”, in *Languages from the World of the Bible*, ed. Holger Gzella (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011), 55-75. For a map of Phoenician and Aramaic inscriptions from the Levant and Anatolia, see Wolfgang Röllig, “Asia Minor as a Bridge between East and West: The Role of the Phoenicians and Aramaeans in the Transfer of Culture”, in *Greece between East and West: 10th–8th Centuries B.C.*, eds. Günter Kopcke & Isabella Tokumaru (Mainz: Von Zabern, 1992), figures 12 and 13; and Ilya Yakubovich, “Phoenician and Luwian in Early Iron Age Cilicia”, *Anatolian Studies*, 65 (2015), Figure 1.
- 17 See Bert Kouwenberg, “Akkadian in General”, in *Semitic Languages. An International Handbook*, ed. Stefan Weninger (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011), 330-40.
- 18 Herbert Niehr, “The Power of Language. Language Situation and Language Policy in Sam'al”, in *In Search for Aram and Israel: Politics, Culture, and Identity*, eds. Omer Sergi, Manfred Oeming & Izaak de Hulster (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2016), 305-33.
- 19 All translations follow the online version of William W. Hallo, ed. *Context of Scripture* (Leiden: Brill, 2011, abbreviated as COS) unless otherwise indicated. For other text editions and literature see references in COS.

4.2 KARATEPE

Karatepe (Turkish for “Black Rock”) or Aslan Taş (Turkish for “Lion Stone”), ancient Azatiwadaya/Azatiwataya, is on the Cilician plain of Anatolia (modern Turkey), between the Taurus and Amanus mountains, with the Mediterranean to the south.²⁰ It is a strategically situated hilltop fortress of ca. 5 ha near modern Kadirli on the west bank of the Ceyhan (Classical Pyramus) river with Domuztepe on the eastern side.²¹ The ruins were found by Bossert and Çambel in 1946 and excavated from 1947 onwards by Alkim and Bossert, later by Çambel.²² There are walls with two main gates, the North (lower) and the South (upper) Gates.²³ These are decorated with orthostats containing imagery and inscriptions,²⁴ made from basalt because they were intended to last a long time.²⁵ The better preserved North Gate has portal lions on the side guarding the entrance (1.69 x 1.33 m) and orthostat slabs with images in relief and inscriptions (Figures 4.2 and 4.3).

- 20 See on the region Susanne Rutishauser, Stefan Erasmi, Ralph Rosenbauer & Ralf Buchbach, “SARchaeology – Detecting Palaeochannels Based on High Resolution Radar Data and Their Impact of Changes in the Settlement Pattern in Cilicia (Turkey)”, *Geosciences*, 7/109 (2017): Figure 3.
- 21 See the maps in Halet Çambel, *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions. Vol. II. Karatepe-Aslantaş* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1999), pls. 1-2; Halet Çambel & Asli Özyar, *Karatepe-Aslantaş. Azatiwataya. Die Bildwerke* (Mainz am Rhein: Von Zabern, 2003), Tafel 2-3; Asli Özyar, “Phoenicians and Greeks in Cilicia? Coining Elite Identity in Iron Age Anatolia”, in *From Assyria to Iberia. Art and Culture in the Iron Age*, eds. Joan Aruz & Michael Seymour (New York: MMA, 2016), Figure 1.
- 22 Çambel, *Corpus II*, 1-2; Çambel & Özyar, *Karatepe-Aslantaş*, 1-6. See the popular description in C.W. Ceram, *Narrow Pass, Black Mountain. The Discovery of the Hittite Empire* (London: Victor Gollancz / Sidgwick and Jackson, 1956), 213-46 and also Halet Çambel, “The Story of Karatepe-Aslantaş”, in *From Bogazköy to Karatepe: Hittitology and the Discovery of the Hittite World*, ed. Eric Jean (Istanbul: YKY, 2001), 22-143.
- 23 See the plans in Çambel, *Corpus II*, pls. 34; Çambel & Özyar, *Karatepe-Aslantaş*, Tafel 45; Özyar, “Phoenicians and Greeks”, Figure 2; Winfred Orthmann, “Karatepe B. Archäologisch”, in *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und vorderasiatischen Archäologie* V.5-6, ed. Dietz O. Edzard (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1980), 412-13. There is a model of the city with the walls and two main gates in the Karatepe Museum (<https://turkisharchaeonews.net/site/karatepe-aslantaş>).
- 24 Çambel & Özyar, *Karatepe-Aslantaş*, Tafel 6-11 and Beilage 1-5. See Ceram, *Narrow Pass*, pl. XLI to get an idea of the height. For an overview of the inscriptions and archaeology see J. David Hawkins & Winfred Orthmann, “Karatepe”, in *Reallexikon der Assyriologie*, 409-14 and Wolfgang Röllig, “‘Und ich baute starke Festungen an allen Enden auf den Grenzen...’ Zur Bedeutung der Inschriften und Reliefs vom Karatepe-Aslantaş”, in *Lag Troja in Kilikien? Der aktuelle Streit um Homers Ilias*, eds. Christoph Ulf & Robert Rollinger (Darmstadt: WBG, 2011), 115-33.
- 25 Ömür Harmanşah, “Upright Stones and Building Narratives. Formation of a Shared Architectural Practice in the Ancient Near East”, in *Ancient Near Eastern Art in Context. Studies in Honor of Irene J. Winter by Her Students*, eds. Jack Cheng & Marian H. Feldman (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 69-99 and *Cities and the Shaping of Memory in the Ancient Near East* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 153-88.

FIGURE 4.2 Karatepe Northern Gate

FIGURE 4.3 Karatepe Northern Gate with Phoenician (top) and Luwian (below) inscriptions

Gates as points of entry and exit for the people were important in these cities²⁶ and the inscriptions were purposely situated there for public display, literally “writing on the wall”;²⁷ they functioned as visual monuments. So, entering the Northern Gate there are inscriptions on opposite sides, on the left side Phoenician, on the right side Luwian (Figure 4.3). Is there a right-left symbolism inherent? Entry = Luwian = right side; Exit = Luwian = Left side?²⁸

26 Timothy P. Harrison, “Landscapes of Power: Neo-Hittite Citadels in Comparative Perspective”, in *Cities and Citadels in Turkey: From the Iron Age to the Seljuks*, eds. Scott Redford & Nina Ergin (Leuven: Peeters, 2013), 103; Natalie N. May, “Gates and Their Functions in Mesopotamia and Ancient Israel”, in *The Fabric of Cities. Aspects of Urbanism, Urban Topography and Society in Mesopotamia, Greece and Rome*, eds. Natalie N. May & Ulrike Steinert (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 77-121; Stefania Mazzoni, “The Gate and the City: Change and Continuity in Syro-Hittite Urban Ideology”, in *Die orientalische Stadt. Kontinuität, Wandel, Bruch*, ed. Gernot Wilhelm (Saarbrücken: SDV, 1997), 307-38; and Jared L. Miller, “The (City-) Gate and the Projection of Power”, in *Organisation, Repräsentation und Symbole von Macht in Alt Vorderasien*, ed. Gernot Wilhelm (Eisenbrauns: Winona Lake, 2012), 675-85.

27 Asli Özyar, “Writing on the Wall: Reviewing Sculpture and Inscription on the Gates of the Iron Age Citadel of Azatiwataya (Karatepe-Aslantaş)”, in *Cities and Citadels*, 115-37.

28 We simply do not know, and we can merely speculate. Psycholinguists would indicate that the right side is more dominant. However, if Phoenician is the primary text here (which is

The bilingual inscriptions from Karatepe are the longest Phoenician (62 lines) and Luwian (75 lines) inscriptions known, and have been dated to the beginning of the 7th century BCE.²⁹ The Phoenician texts on the Northern Gate running from right to left form a unit, but the Luwian ones are scattered.³⁰ The Northern Gate Phoenician inscriptions are carved on four orthostats and were added *after* the reliefs, even running onto one image and the base of the orthostat and ending on the body of the portal lion.³¹

The inscriptions are those of a certain Azatiwada (Phoenician)/Azatiwata (Luwian), not a king, but a vassal of Awariku, the King of Adana (ca. between 720 and 700 BCE), who built the fortress called Azatiwadaya/Azatiwataya.³² The two main gods referred to are the Luwian storm god Tarhunza and his counterpart the Phoenician-Levantine Ba'al.³³ The order of the words in the inscriptions is sometimes different: in the Luwian "horse, army, shield" and in the Phoenician "horse, shield, army".³⁴ In the curse at the end the Luwian mentions "the celestial Tarhunza, the celestial Sun, Ea, and moon and sun", but in the Phoenician it is "Ba'al Shamem and El, creator of the earth, Shemesh, the eternal and the sun and the moon".³⁵

There is no clear connection between the imagery and the inscriptions on the orthostat reliefs in the two gateways. The relief to the left of the Phoenician inscription shows horse riders,³⁶ but whether these are related to the text mentioning "horse upon

also debatable) it should be on the other side. Furthermore, in the other Karatepe gates the inscriptions are scattered and left/right does not work in the classification. This is a study in itself that cannot be done within the scope of this chapter.

29 COS 2.21 and 2.31.

30 As indicated on plans for the Northern and Southern Gates: Çambel, *Corpus II*, pls. 52, 89. Phoenician texts indicated by Roman I-IV and Luwian ones by Arabic 1-12.

31 Çambel, *Corpus II*, pls. 5-19; Çambel & Özyar, *Karatepe-Aslantaş*, Tafel 41, 44-49 for details.

32 COS 2.21 and 2.31. See now J. David Hawkins, "Die zweisprachige Inschrift des Azatiwatas vom Karatepe", in *Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments. Neue Folge. Band 2: Staatsverträge, Herrscherinschriften und andere Dokumente zur politischen Geschichte*, eds. Bernd Janowski & Gernot Wilhelm (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2005), 156-59; and Payne, *Iron Age Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions*, 20-42. On Azatiwada see Herbert Niehr, "Azitawada", in *Encyclopaedic Dictionary of Phoenician Culture I: Historical Characters*, eds. Andrea Ercolani & Paolo Xella (Leuven: Peeters, 2018), 39.

33 COS 2.21: sections 1-3 and 2.31: i.1-3.

34 COS 2.21: sections 8 and 2.31: i.7-8.

35 COS 2.21: sections 73, 75 and 2.31: iii.18-19, iv.3.

36 Çambel & Özyar, *Karatepe-Aslantaş*, Tafel 44-45.

horse”³⁷ is unclear.³⁸ The material imagery has no clear pattern or logic and shows great variety.³⁹

A colossal statue of more than three metres high was found just inside the Upper or South Gate (Figure 4.4).⁴⁰

FIGURE 4.4 Karatepe: God on Bulls

FIGURE 4.5 Zincirli Statue

Royal monuments in the form of statues or stelae were often placed in prominent places such as city gates, as is known from Malatya and Zincirli.⁴¹ The Karatepe figure wears a cap, is dressed in a long garment with a sash and the hands held indeterminate

37 COS 2.21: sections 8 and 2.31: i.7.

38 Röllig, “Und ich baute”, 126 refers to the banquet scenes in relation to the statue (Çambel & Özyar, *Karatepe-Aslantaş*, Tafel 142-45).

39 For the imagery see Sanna Aro, “The Relief on the Slab NKL 2 at Karatepe-Azatiwataya: Neo-Assyrian Impact in Cilicia?” in *From Source to History: Studies on Ancient Near Eastern Worlds and Beyond*, eds. Salvatore Gaspa & Giovanni Battista Lanfranchi (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2014), 11-31; Çambel & Özyar, *Karatepe-Aslantaş*, 57-144 and Tafel 12ff.; Özyar, “Writing on the Wall”, 127-31; Winfried Orthmann, *Untersuchungen zur späthethitischen Kunst* (Bonn: Rudolf Habelt Verlag, 1971), 105-11, 488-97, Tafel 15-19; and Irene Winter, “On the Problems of Karatepe: The Reliefs and their Context”, in *On Art in the Ancient Near East Volume I: Of the First Millennium BCE*, ed. Irene Winter (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 467-524. The motifs of the better-preserved North Gate are summarised in Çambel & Özyar, *Karatepe-Aslantaş*, 33.

40 Çambel, *Corpus II*, 20-23, 62-68 (Röllig), pls. 32-51; and Çambel & Özyar, *Karatepe-Aslantaş*, 48 with Abb. 56, 114-15, 138 and Tafel 218-20.

41 David Ussishkin, “The Erection of Royal Monuments in City-Gates”, in *Anatolia and the Ancient Near East. Studies in Honor of Tahsin Özgüç*, eds. Kutlu Emre, Machteld J. Mellink & Barthel Hrouda (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1989), 485-96. On the importance of city gates, see the sources cited earlier.

objects.⁴² It stands on a socle with two bulls, which have been damaged.⁴³ Such twin bull pedestals are known from other sites, and some stelae have storm gods standing on bulls.⁴⁴ The bulls are held by a figure such as the one on a pedestal from Zincirli holding lions (Figure 4.5).⁴⁵ On the Karatepe statue there is a Phoenician inscription of 78 lines (four columns around the skirt of the statue, with one column on the bull socle).⁴⁶ As the curse shows, this is a statue of a god identified as Ba'al-KRNTYŠ.⁴⁷

It is difficult to determine which language was the most prominent one at Karatepe (Luwian or Phoenician?).⁴⁸ Phoenician is the only language used on the impressive statue which stood inside the gate, which might give some indication of its prominence. The Phoenician version was placed at the left of the North Gate entrance, “visually emphasizing that the text is one continuous narrative”, whereas the Luwian inscriptions are scattered all-over the place, “so that in order to read the text the athletic reader must run left and right and back and forth”.⁴⁹ However, even with the seemingly more ordered Phoenician text, one part is so low on the stones that one would have to bend or kneel down to read it. Maybe the inscriptions were not intended to be read in the literal sense of the word (as they were also intended to be of significance to the illiterate) but served as symbols of the power of the ruler and meant to impress as *visual monuments*.⁵⁰

42 Çambel & Özyar, *Karatepe-Aslantaş*, 115 see a staff in the right hand, Rölliğ, “Und ich baute”, 128 even a mace or thunderbolt which is speculation.

43 So, it is not a lion statue as originally supposed and from which the name of the site Aslantaş (“lion stone”) derives.

44 Guy Bunnens, *A New Luwian Stele and the Cult of the Storm-God at Til-Barsib-Masuware* (Leuven: Peeters, 2006), 44-45 for the bull motif. For double bull pedestals see Silvia Schroer, *Die Ikonographie Palästinas/Israels und der Alte Orient. Eine Religionsgeschichte in Bildern. Band 4* (Basel: Schwabe Verlag, 2019), Abb. 1317 (Carchemish) and Francois Thureau-Dangin, Georges Augustin Barrois, Georges Dossin & Maurice Dunand, *Arslan-Tash* (Paris: Geuthner, 1931), pl. II:3. For stelae with storm gods on bulls see Bunnens, *A New Luwian Stele*, figs. 56-57, 71, 73, 78, 117-22 and Schroer, *Ikonographie*, 364 with Abb. 1313.

45 Izak Cornelius, “The Material Imagery of the Sam'al (Zincirli) Monuments and 'Aramaean Identity'”, *Welt des Orients* 49/2 (2019): 199-200, Figure 12 and Schroer, *Ikonographie*, Abb. 1327.

46 Çambel, *Corpus II*, 21.

47 Çambel & Özyar, *Karatepe-Aslantaş*, 114 and Rölliğ in Çambel, *Corpus II*, 67: lines 19-20. The Gate inscription states that Azatiwada built the city and settled in it Ba'al-KRNTYŠ (COS 2.31: ii.17-19). For the name, see Philip Schmitz, “Phoenician KRNTYŠ, Archaic Greek *KOPYNHTHPIOΣ, and the Storm God of Aleppo”, *KUSATU*, 11 (2009): 119-60 and K. Lawson Younger, “The Deity Kur(ra) in the First Millennium Sources”, *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions*, 9 (2009): 13-16.

48 Yakubovich, “Phoenician and Luwian” argues that the Phoenician inscription was the primary one, see esp. 48.

49 Özyar, “Phoenicians and Greeks”, 140.

50 Compare Özyar, “Writing on the Wall”, 132-33.

4.3 ÇINEKÖY, IVRIZ, AND ARSLAN TAŞ

4.3.1 Çineköy

Southwest of Karatepe, 30 km south of Adana, is Çineköy, where a statue was found during building operations in 1997. It is a human figure of limestone (1.9 m) standing on a base of basalt (95 cm), depicting a wagon or chariot with two wheels pulled by a pair of bulls (Figure 4.6). It is now in the Adana museum. The human figure has long hair and a curly beard, wearing a long dress with a tasselled shawl, and a round cap with horns of divinity and holding unidentified objects.⁵¹ The image can be compared to storm gods mounting chariots on reliefs from Aleppo and Malatya (Figure 4.7),⁵² but as a statue it is a unique find.

FIGURE 4.6 Çineköy Statue

FIGURE 4.7 Storm God and Chariot (Malatya)

51 On the style as “Assyrianized”, see Aro, “The Relief”, 24 and Dirk Wicke, “Assyrian or Assyrianized. Reflections on the Impact of Assyrian Art in Southern Anatolia”, in *Mesopotamia in the Ancient World. Impact, Continuities, Parallels*, eds. Robert Rollinger & Erik van Dongen (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2015), 583-86.

52 Bunnens, *A New Luwian Stele*, figs. 100, 102 = Schroer, *Ikonographie*, Abb. 1310-11.

There is a Luwian text of 12 lines under the animals, on the back of the cart and partly on the base. A Phoenician text of 18 partly damaged lines appears on the front between the bulls; this might indicate the prominence of Phoenician above Luwian.⁵³

Only one example of the Luwian and the Phoenician texts is given. The Luwian mentions “Warika Muksa’s grandson, king of Hiyawa, Tarhunza’s servant”. The Phoenician has “offspring of Mopsos, king of the Danunians, blessed by Ba‘al”.⁵⁴ Warika/Urikki (Awariku of Karatepe) is known from the Assyrian texts of Tiglath-Pileser III and Sargon II (738–710 BCE) and these inscriptions are dated earlier than the ones from Karatepe.⁵⁵

4.3.2 Ivriz

FIGURE 4.8 Ivriz Stela

FIGURE 4.9 Ivriz Rock Relief

53 COS 4.15-16 and Payne, *Iron Age Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions*, 42-44. See the studies by Giovanni B. Lanfranchi, “The Luwian-Phoenician Bilingual of Çineköy and the Annexation of Cilicia to the Assyrian Empire”, in *Von Sumer bis Homer. Festschrift für Manfred Schretter*, ed. Robert Rollinger (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2005), 481-96; “A Happy Son of the King of Assyria: Warikas and the Çineköy Bilingual (Cilicia)”, in *Of God(s), Trees, Kings, and Scholars*, 127-50; and Yakubovich, “Phoenician and Luwian”, esp. Table 1 and 41-44, 48 who argues for the prominence of the Phoenician inscription.

54 COS 4.15: sections 1 and 4.16: 1-3.

55 COS 4.15.

Leaving the anti-Taurus, one enters the region called Tabal.⁵⁶ A white limestone stela with relief (height ca. 2.3 m with the top part lost; Eregli Museum A 1991) was found at Ivriz in 1986.⁵⁷ It shows the lower part of a figure and inscriptions that are partly preserved (Figure 4.8). Between the legs, on the upper right edge and on the back is a Luwian inscription. On the left narrow side, the back and the narrow right side is a Phoenician one. The Luwian text must still be published, but the Phoenician was published by Röllig.⁵⁸ The text mentions a “Warbalawa king of Tyana” for which the image was made by his son and is dated in the time of the Assyrian kings Tiglath Pileser III and Sargon II (744–705 BCE).

Although only the lower part has survived, the image can be reconstructed. The stela was found 75 m upstream from a famous large rock relief monument (Figure 4.9).⁵⁹ The relief with the main figure (4.2 m high) depicts a king identified by the Luwian inscription as Warpalawa of Tuwana (dated ca. 740–705 BCE) worshipping the god Tarhunza (larger figure on the left). The god is holding ears of grain or barley and a bunch of grapes, with more grapes on his belt and holding a sickle.⁶⁰ Anatolian texts refer to the god of grain and wine.⁶¹ On the bilingual broken stela the lower part is similar, showing a figure with a short dress with the hem-volute, muscular legs and the boots with upturned toes and part of the barley that the figure is holding. This is another example of a storm god, but in this case, he is the bringer of the harvest to make bread and wine.

4.3.3 İncirli

At İncirli, northeast of Zincirli, a stela of basalt was found by Elizabeth Carter in 1993, exposed to the elements and therefore badly weathered⁶² (Figure 4.10). The

56 Sanna Aro, “Tabal”, in *Reallexikon der Assyriologie* 13/5-6 (2012): 388-91.

57 Belkis Dinçol, “New Archaeological and Epigraphical Finds from Ivriz: A Preliminary Report”, *Tel Aviv* 21 (1994): 117-28; Horst Ehringhaus, *Das Ende, das ein Anfang war: Felsreliefs und Felsinschriften der luwischen Staaten Kleinasien vom 12. bis 8./7. Jahrhundert v.Chr.* (Mainz: Von Zabern, 2014), Abb. 59; Hawkins, *Corpus I*, 526, pl. 300 and Röllig, “Asia Minor as a Bridge”, 98, and “Die phönizische Inschrift der Reliefstele von Ivriz, Türkei”, in *Ritual, Religion and Reason. Studies in the Ancient World in Honour of Paolo Xella*, eds. Oswald Loretz et al. (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2013), 311-20.

58 Röllig, “Die phönizische Inschrift”.

59 See Dinçol, “New Archaeological and Epigraphical Finds”, Figure 2 for the findspots. Ehringhaus, *Das Ende*, 48, and Hawkins, *Corpus I*: 517, Pls. 292-95.

60 Mustafa Şahin, “Neue Beobachtungen zum Felsreliefs von Ivriz/Konya. Nicht in den Krieg, sondern zur Ernte: der Gott mit der Sichel”, *Anatolian Studies* 49 (1999): 165-76.

61 Mark Weeden, “The Good God, the Wine-god and the Storm-god of the Vineyard”, *Welt des Orients* 48/2 (2018): 330-56.

62 Lynn S. Dodd, “Squeezing Blood from a Stone: The Archaeological Context of the İncirli Inscription”, in *Puzzling Out the Past. Studies in Northwest Semitic Languages and Literatures*

figure in the relief (set in a niche) is in Assyrian style and is holding a staff and a lotus flower.⁶³ Dodd compares it with the figure on the orthostat of King Kulamuwa from Zincirli, also holding a lotus flower, with the oldest Phoenician inscription known (Figure 4.11).⁶⁴

FIGURE 4.10 Incirli Stela

FIGURE 4.11 Kulamuwa Orthostat

The inscriptions (hardly legible) are in Luwian on the top right next to the relief and two lines in Assyrian cuneiform below the Luwian and on the right side. Below these, and on all sides, there are Phoenician inscriptions.⁶⁵ The presence of Luwian, Assyrian, and Phoenician make this a trilingual monument. The inscription is by a King Warikkus/Warika/Awariku/Urikki (also known from Çineköy and Karatepe) and mark land given to him by the Assyrian King Tiglath-Pileser III, dated 8th century BCE. Later in Byzantine times it was reused as a border marker by incising an inscription in Greek.⁶⁶

in Honor of Bruce Zuckerman, eds. Marilyn J. Lundberg et al. (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 213-30; Stephen A. Kaufman, "The Phoenician Inscription of the Incirli Trilingual", *MAARAV* 14/2 (2007): 7-26.

63 Dodd, "Squeezing Blood from a Stone", Figure 3; and Dobbs-Allsopp & Pioske, "Royal Inscriptions", 413-16.

64 Dodd, "Squeezing Blood from a Stone", Figure 4.

65 Kaufman, "The Phoenician Inscription", with plates.

66 *Ibid.*, pl. XI.

4.3.4 Arslan Taş

Arslan Taş (“the stone lion”,⁶⁷ ancient Ḥadattu) is 30 km east of the Euphrates in northern Syria and 6 km from the Turkish border. Here at the East Gate and West Gate stood pairs of monumental basalt portal lions (socle length ca. 3.84 m) (Figure 4.12).⁶⁸

FIGURE 4.12 Arslan Taş Lion

On the West Gate lions, there are inscriptions in Assyrian and Aramaic, and on the East Gate lion there are inscriptions in three languages: nine lines Aramaic, nine lines Assyrian and, surprisingly for a site so far to the east under Assyrian influence, four lines Luwian. The texts are building inscriptions for the city of Ninurta-bēlu-ušur/Inurta-bēl-ušur and the provincial governor of Kār-Shalmaneser and dated to around 780 BCE.⁶⁹

67 The modern name derives from the lion imagery found there. Cf. Pauline Albenda, “The Gateway and Portal Stone Reliefs from Arslan Tash”, *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, 271 (1988): 5 and Hannes D. Galter, “Die Torlöwen von Arslan Tash”, *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, 97 (2007): 193.

68 Hannes D. Galter, “Militärgrenze und Euphrathandel. Der sozio-ökonomische Hintergrund der Trilinguen von Arslan Tash”, in *Commerce and Monetary Systems in the Ancient World: Means of Transmission and Cultural Interaction*, ed. Robert Rollinger (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2004), 444-60; “Der Himmel über Hadattu. Das religiöse Umfeld der Inschriften von Arslan Tash”, in *Offizielle Religion, lokale Kulte und individuelle Religiosität*, eds. Manfred Hutter & Sylvia Hutter-Braunsar (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2004), 173-88 and “Die Torlöwen von Arslan Tash”, 193-211. According to the website *Hittite Monuments*: “In early 1980s the north side lion of the east gate was moved to Aleppo Museum. Around the same years south side lions of both the east and west gates were erected in a park in the city of Raqqa with reconstructed parts. During the Syrian civil war in 2015 both of the lions in Raqqa were bulldozed into pieces. A few smaller parts of these and other fragmentary lions were in Aleppo and Raqqa Museums.” Online at <https://www.hittitemonuments.com/arslantas2/> (Accessed 30 September 2020).

69 COS 4.25; Hawkins, *Corpus I*, 246-48 with pls. 103-105 and Wolfgang Röllig, “Inscriben des Ninurta-bēlu-ušur, Statthalters von Kār-Salmānu-ašared. Teil 1”, in *Of God(s), Trees, Kings, and*

4.4 TELL FEKHERIYE

Last but not least, our attention moves on to Tell Fekheriye, opposite Tell Halaf on the banks of the Habur river in Northern Syria, close to the Turkish border.⁷⁰ Here a 2 m high standing statue of grey basalt (now kept in the museum in Damascus) was found by a farmer in February 1979, so the archaeological context is lost (Figure 4.13).⁷¹ The figure has long wavy curly hair reaching down to the shoulders and a wavy curly beard. The eyes are hollow orbits, and the inlays are gone.⁷² There is no crown, no insignia, and no jewellery. The gesture is that of clasping hands (the left hand supporting the right one) at waist level. The figure wears a plain short-sleeved tunic reaching to the ankles and a shawl draped over the left shoulder and tucked in at the waist, with fringes on the tunic and shawl edges. The statue has aligned feet and wears sandals with clear shoelaces.⁷³

Everything about the statue looks Assyrian and it has been compared with other Assyrian statues also clasping hands.⁷⁴ It is not a royal or divine statue, but that of a commoner.⁷⁵ On the front of the statue is a 38-line cuneiform Assyrian inscription set

Scholars: Neo-Assyrian and Related Studies in Honour of Simo Parpola, eds. Mikko Luukko, Saana Svärd & Raija Mattila (Helsinki: Finnish Oriental Society, 2009), 265-78. See also Martien Dillo, "The Unpublished Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscription ARSLANTAŞ 2", *NABU*, (2016/1): 27-30 (No. 17).

- 70 The literature on this monument is enormous, starting with the publication of the statue and its inscriptions by Ali Abou-Assaf, Pierre Bordreuil & Alan R. Millard, *La statue de Tell Fekheriye et son inscription bilingue assyro-araméenne* (Paris: Recherche sur les Civilisations, 1982); see more recently Gzella, *A Cultural History of Aramaic*, 63-67; Jan Dušek & Jana Mynářová, "Tell Fekheriye Inscription", in *The Process of Authority*, eds. Jan Dušek & Jan Roskovec (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2016), 9-39; Dobbs-Allsopp & Pioske, "On the Appearance of Royal Inscriptions", 391-406; and Izak Cornelius, "Tell Halaf", in *Das Wissenschaftliche Bibellexikon im Internet* (www.wiblex.de, 2020), eds. Michaela Bauks & Klaus Koenen, 3.
- 71 For a description of the statue itself see Ali Abou-Assaf, "Die Statue des HDYS'Y, König von Guzana", *MDOG* 113 (1981): 3-22 and Agnes Spycket, "La statue bilingue de Tell Fekheriyé", *Revue d'Assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale* 79/1 (1985): 67-68.
- 72 As is known from the Tell Halaf statues, especially the human-headed scorpions as noted by Spycket, "La statue", 68 = Anton Moortgat, *Tell Halaf. Dritter Band: Die Bildwerke* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1955), Tafel 141, 144.
- 73 Abou-Assaf, Bordreuil & Millard, *La statue*, pl. III and Abou Assaf, "Die Statue", Abb. 4. Spycket, "La statue", 68 compared these with the shoes of the figures on the reliefs from Arslan Tash (Thureau-Dangin, Arslan Tash, pls. VII-IX, 1). For comparisons of the costume see Abou Assaf, "Die Statue", 9 and Spycket, "La statue", 67.
- 74 Abou Assaf, "Die Statue", 8-9; Dobbs-Allsopp & Pioske, "On the Appearance of Royal Inscriptions", figures 2, 5; Hartmut Kühne, "Interaction of Aramaeans and Assyrians on the Lower Khabur", *Syria*, 86 (2009): 48-49, Figure 3 and Winter, "North Syrian Ivories and Tell Halaf Reliefs: The Impact of Luxury Goods upon 'Major' Arts", in *On Art in the Ancient Near East*, 386-87.
- 75 Like the one published by Arlette Roobaert, "A Neo-Assyrian Statue from Til Barsib", *Iraq*, 58 (1996): 79-87.

vertically which creates the idea that it is an Assyrian monument, but at the back are 23 lines in Aramaic in an archaic Phoenician alphabet set horizontally with dots as word separators. The Assyrian text is in the foremost position, the Aramaic relegated to the back.⁷⁶

FIGURE 4.13 Tell Fekheriye Statue

76 For translations see *COS* 2.34 and Dušek & Mynářová, Tell Fekheriye Inscription, 12-14.

The first lines in Assyrian identify the monument as dedicated to the god Adad with all his titles and attributes. The Aramaic adds that it is an image or representation of Hadad-yithi which was set up before Hadad of Sikan. In part B in the Assyrian section, it is described as a statue of Adad-iti, as in the Aramaic, statue of Hadad-yithi. Both the Assyrian and Aramaic state that the statue was set up before Adad/Hadad. According to the Assyrian, Adad-iti is *Governor* of the city of Guzanu and of Sikanu. In the Aramaic he is called *King*.

The statue bears two inscriptions in two different writing systems and languages (imperial Assyrian and local Aramaic), which seem to suggest that they were written for two different audiences with two slightly altered messages.

4.5 CONCLUSIONS

Multilingual inscriptions occur in 1st millennium Anatolia and the Levant on stone monuments in the mediums of orthostat reliefs, statues, and stelae reliefs. The inscriptions on these monuments are bilingual as well as trilingual. The key points are summarised below.

What was the relationship or connection between inscription and object/image?

1. **Karatepe:** There is no clear relationship between the material imagery and the inscriptions in the gateways. The Phoenician inscription of the statue describes it as “the statue of this god” and identified as Ba‘al-KRNTYŠ.
2. **Çineköy:** The Luwian inscription states that the author of the inscription was the servant of Tarhunza who helped him. In the Phoenician inscription he is blessed by Ba‘al and Ba‘al-Kr is asked for help.⁷⁷ Both are storm gods, and a god is represented by the statue on the chariot drawn by bulls.
3. **Ivriz:** The inscription identifies the king, but not the god that has been partly depicted. In this case the similar larger rock relief from close by leaves no doubt that it is the god Tarhunza.
4. **İncirli:** The inscription identifies the king in the image.
5. **Arslan Taş:** The bilingual (Assyrian and Aramaic) and trilingual (Assyrian, Aramaic and Luwian) inscriptions are on portal lions who protected the city. The inscriptions refer to the gates and perhaps the lions as well.
6. **Tell Fekheriye:** In this case, the connection between the statue and the inscription is more direct. The inscription clearly states that it is a statue of the governor or king which was set up in the presence of the god Adad/Hadad.

77 See Younger, “The Deity Kur(ra)”, 1-23.

These inscriptions indicate that the people living in southeastern Anatolia and the northern Levant were multilingual, although the matter is much more complex. There are various complex reasons why different writing systems and languages were used:

- Luwian, the old script and language of the region continued its use by locals, but was also used as a matter of prestige;
- Phoenician was used for more practical purposes such as trade,⁷⁸ but also as a matter of prestige;⁷⁹
- Aramaic was the new *lingua franca*, especially in the Assyrian empire; and⁸⁰
- Assyrian was the language of the empire that conquered these regions.

The use of these different languages was perhaps intended for different audiences: Luwians, Phoenicians, Assyrians, Aramaeans, but it must be kept in mind that language is never a clear indicator of identity.

It is important to note that these inscriptions were not only read, but also *viewed* as visual monuments and seen as material imagery. These make them clear examples of *visual multilingualism*.

References for Figures

Figure 4.1 Map drawn by Liani Swanepoel.

Figures 4.2, 4.4, 4.6, 4.8, 4.9, 4.10 Photographs with thanks to Tayfun Bilgin (see <http://www.hittitemonuments.com>).

Figure 4.3 Adapted from Çambel & Asli Özyar, *Karatepe-Aslantaş*, Beilage 4, with thanks to Asli Özyar.

Figures 4.5, 4.7 Drawings from Schroer, *Ikönographie*, Abb. 1327 and 1311 with thanks to Silvia Schroer.

Figure 4.11 Adapted from Felix von Luschan, *Ausgrabungen in Sendschirli IV* (Berlin: Reimer, 1911), Figure 273.

Figure 4.12 Photograph with thanks to Hannes Galter.

Figure 4.13 Available at: <https://vici.org/image.php?id=14085> (Accessed 11 February 2021) (CCO / No Rights Reserved: <https://creativecommons.org/public-domain/zero/1.0/>).

78 Herbert Niehr, “Phönizier in Kleinasien”, in *Frühgeschichte der Mittelmeerkulturen. Historisch-archäologisches Handbuch* (Stuttgart: Metzler, 2015), ed. Anne-Maria Wittke, 646.

79 The same was true at Zincirli, see Niehr, “The Power of Language”, 313.

80 See Berlejung.

Summary of Material

<div><p>Karatepe orthostats</p> <p>lion + other images</p><p>bilingual: Phoenician / Luwian</p></div>		
<div><p>Karatepe statue</p> <p>god on bulls (Ba'al)</p><p>monolingual: Phoenician</p></div>	<div><p>Çineköy statue</p> <p>god on bull-chariot (Ba'al/Tarhunza)</p><p>bilingual: Phoenician / Luwian</p></div>	<div><p>Ivriz stela</p> <p>grain god Tarhunza</p><p>bilingual: Luwian / Phoenician</p></div>
<div><p>İncirli stela</p> <p>king</p><p>trilingual: Luwian / Phoenician / Assyrian</p></div>	<div><p>Arslan Taş statues</p> <p>lions</p><p>bilingual: Assyrian / Aramaic trilingual: Luwian / Assyrian / Phoenician</p></div>	<div><p>Fekheriye statue</p> <p>governor/king</p><p>bilingual: Assyrian / Aramaic</p></div>