

News & Notes

MEMBERS' MAGAZINE

ISSUE 234 | SUMMER 2017



THE
ORIENTAL
INSTITUTE
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

HITTITE ANATOLIA CORNUCOPIA OF CULTURES IN CONTACT

BY PETRA GOEDEGEBUURE



LANGUAGES OF 0 ANATOLIA

Anatolia (modern Turkey) is a cornucopia of cultures. It is one of the pivotal areas of the world, the place from where agriculture spread out over Europe, and the point of departure and final home of migrating peoples. Moving in from all directions we find, among others: Assyrians, Hittites (both displacing and merging with the indigenous Hattians), Mycenaeans, Phrygians, Phoenicians, Ionian Greeks, Cimmerians, Scythians, Urarteans, Persians, Armenians, Celtic Galatians, Romans, and Turks. It was the home of the Hittite, Byzantine, and Ottoman empires, and was part of the Persian, Seleucid, Armenian, Roman, and Seljuk empires. The Etruscans might very well have left Lydia in western Anatolia to settle in Italy, while the Lukka people, from Lycia, were part of the Sea Peoples moving east to the Levantine coast, and the Carians functioned as famous mercenaries in Egypt and the Persian empire. Anatolia is where Greek philosophy started, the Lydians minted the first coins, the *Iliad* takes place, and Indo-European languages were written down for the first time in history.

Multiple ethnicities not only followed each other in succession through the millennia: our earliest sources show that even within the borders of a single Anatolian (city-)state, different population groups could be found living together. At the end of the third millennium BC, the Assyrians established trading posts throughout Central Anatolia, with their main hub at Kültepe (Hittite Kaneš/Neša), near Kayseri. Although the tens of thousands of clay tablets from the private archives of the Assyrian merchants and the limited number of official documents from the indigenous Anatolian rulers were all written in Old Assyrian, the actors mentioned in these tablets clearly illustrate that Kaneš/Neša, the homeland of the Hittites, was also the home of people with Luwian, Hurrian, Syrian, Hattian, and, of course, Assyrian names.

The archives of the Hittite kingdom and later empire (ca. 1650–1180 BC) attest to a similarly diverse group of names and also to longer texts in these languages. Around the time of the collapse of the empire, the temple and palace archives of the Hittite capital Hattuša (modern Boğazköy or Boğazkale) still contained about 10,000 tablets (broken up into 30,000 fragments). Most of these tablets were written in Indo-European Hittite, with a respectable number written in its sister languages Luwian and Palaic, the (near)-isolates Hattian (the language of the indigenous Hattians), Hurrian and Sumerian, and Semitic Akkadian (fig. 1a). We also have an intriguing fragment with a dialect close to Hittite or Luwian. This fragment is large enough that we can recognize its language as Anatolian, but too small to further determine the relationship with the other Anatolian languages. Fortunately, for the decipherment of Hittite, Hattian, and Hurrian, the archives also contain bilingual texts, such as Akkadian-Hittite historical narratives and treaties, Hattian-Hittite mythology, and Hurrian-Hittite wisdom literature.

First-millennium BC Anatolia continued the tradition of multiple languages and multilingual texts. In Lycia we find the famous Xanthos trilingual with Lycian (related to Luwian), Greek, and Aramaic. Cilicia fortunately brought us the Phoenician-Luwian Karatepe inscriptions, which led to the final decipherment of Luwian, and Carian-Greek and Lydian-Greek bilinguals are found in west Anatolia (fig. 1b).

With so many different languages attested in the same area and often in the same texts, we need to ask ourselves whether the local population was multilingual as well. If they were, how would we know this? A bilingual text in itself does not tell us anything about the language competence of the local population or even the scribe of a tablet. The scribe might simply be learning a foreign language, such as Akkadian or Sumerian. The epigraphic material could reflect the presence of several monolingual groups speaking different languages. But if people indeed controlled



a



b

Figure 1a-b. Map of the languages of Anatolia: (a) early second millennium BC and (b) first millennium BC

multiple languages, did their languages influence one another? And what does the presence of multilingualism tell us about the local socio-economic situation? If we find multiple languages in the same area, will we be able to establish who are indigenous and who are newcomers if the historical sources are silent on the topic? Regarding newcomers, are we dealing with immigrants or conquerors? The archaeology of Anatolia is notoriously problematic when it comes to recognizing ethnicities in material culture. If it were not for the Old Assyrian tablets, we would not have been able to recognize the presence of the Assyrian merchants of Kültepe/Kaneš.

Fortunately, there is a subfield of linguistics, namely contact linguistics that has the tools to answer at least some of these questions and gain insight into the ethnic and socio-economic stratification of ancient societies. But before we explore the multilingual situation of Anatolia, we need to turn to where all knowledge of ancient cultures starts: the script. In the case of Anatolia, the indigenous writing system is intricately connected with cultures in contact.

DECIPHERING THE ANATOLIAN HIEROGLYPHS

Cuneiform writing on clay became wildly popular among the governing elites of the ancient Near East. Although some societies, such as Egypt, only used cuneiform for their international correspondence, the Anatolians additionally adopted cuneiform for domestic use to write Hittite, Luwian, and Hattian. But they also developed their own hieroglyphic script for Luwian. The first inscriptions were observed by nineteenth-century travelers in Hama in Syria and in Boğazköy, and were believed to be Hittite, but because the writing had no connection to other scripts and it was the wrong language, the decipherment of the Anatolian hieroglyphs was slow. In the 1930s, a handful of scholars, which included the decipherer of Hittite, Bedřich Hrozný, and the Oriental Institute's Ignace Gelb, slowly battled on, but real progress could not be made until 1946, after the discovery of a

Phoenician–Luwian inscription in Karatepe (in Osmaniye Province, Turkey).

Currently, Hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions can be found in Anatolia and northern Syria, in circa ninety-five different locations. The inscriptions are attested during a respectable 800 years, from circa 1500 to 700 BC, far longer than its equally extinct sister languages Hittite (1650–1180 BC), Palaic (extinct by the sixteenth century BC?), Lycian (sixth–late fourth century BC), Lydian (eighth–third century BC), and Carian (sixth–third century BC) (for all these languages see Woodard 2008). It was in use by both the Hittite empire and its successors, the Neo-Hittite city-states of Anatolia and northern Syria, for commemorative and building inscriptions on living rock, statues, orthostats, and blocks (see for example the Südburg inscription in Hattuša, fig. 2). The archives of Hattuša also contain a large number of royal and non-royal stamp seals and sealings, often with the name and title in hieroglyphs in the center of the seal (fig. 3). Remarkably, letters of a commercial nature and economic documents listing the distribution of goods were found written on lead strips.

The Anatolian hieroglyphic writing system uses a combination of logograms (word signs) and syllabograms (syllable signs). Because the script is still very pictographic, we can sometimes deduct the concept behind a logogram by “reading” the picture. This is the case, for example, for EGO “I,” REX “king,” and DARE “to give” (in transliteration logograms are represented by Latin in caps; see table 1, left column). The sign EGO represents a person pointing at him- or herself, while the sign for REX is similar to the pointed crown worn only by kings (and gods), and the sign for DARE is a giving hand. Such signs were therefore among the first to be deciphered: A. H. Sayce already concluded in 1876 that EGO needed to be regarded “as expressive of the first personal pronoun” (1877, p. 24). But more often than not we do not know how a symbol came to stand for a concept, because we do not know what the symbol originally depicted (table 1, right column). Decoding such symbols was a joint effort over many decades and a major achievement, especially in the absence of bilingual narratives until 1946.



Figure 2. Südburg inscription of king Šuppiluliuma I or II, Ḫattuša/Boğazköy (photo courtesy Thalia Lysen)

Table 1. Anatolian Hieroglyphic logograms*

	EGO "I"		DEUS "deity"
	REX "king"		BONUS "good"
	DARE "to give"		DOMINUS "lord"

* I am very grateful to Annick Payne for her permission to use her hieroglyphic signs.

Though almost all syllabograms and quite a few logograms have received a value by now, there still remains work to be done. Theo van den Hout, Ilya Yakubovich (PhD 2008, University of Chicago), and I are continuing the Oriental Institute's tradition of deciphering Anatolian hieroglyphs that was started here by Ignace Gelb and Hans Güterbock. Our work illustrates how even an improved reading of a sign may have major consequences for our understanding of text and history alike.

The logogram was already known to represent HORREUM "granary," believed to be a building, but its appearance as a determinative for the word *mariyaninzi* in *kwi=pa=wa* *mariyaninzi abha maki(sa)ha* (§11, KARATEPE bilingual) did not make much sense. The provisional translation "thus I broke up the proud" was based on the equally problematic Phoenician version, completely disconnecting the passage from any agricultural setting. Theo van den Hout (2010) was able to clarify the sentence when he realized that the logogram actually represents the top view of a subterranean granary (fig. 4) and could be connected with storing the crops of *mariyana*-fields, attested in Hittite. When he also saw that the Luwian verb *maki-* was related to English *much*, the sentence could finally be understood as "Indeed (= *kwipa*), I accumulated (= *maki(sa)ha*) the *mariyana*-field crops (= *mariyaninzi*) in great quantities (= *abha*)" and connected with the preceding and following discourse in an ABA'B' pattern (KARATEPE §§7–12):

- A "I filled the Paharean granaries,
- B and I made horse upon horse, and I made army upon army, and I made shield upon shield, all by Tarhunzas and the gods.
- A' Indeed, I **accumulated the *mariyana*-field crops** in great quantities,
- B' while I removed out of the land the evils that were in the land"

Recently, I established the syllabic value for the bird sign (AVIS) as *wa* (Goedegebuure forthcoming). The word for "bird" is *wattai-*, so clearly the Anatolians derived the value *wa* acrophonically from *wattai-*. Hittitologists had always assumed that the syllabic value for this sign was *zi*, only attested twice, and that it was derived from another type of bird, the *zinzapu*, perhaps a dove. Unfortunately, this did not lead to any acceptable readings for the four words in which syllabic AVIS occurred. With my alternative proposal, however, these words were given new meanings and shown to be related to known words in Hittite and Cuneiform Luwian (table 2).

Table 2. Six New Hieroglyphic Luwian Words

<i>New Reading and Meaning</i>	<i>Old Meaning</i>	<i>Related Words</i>
(DEUS) <i>wati-</i> "mountain"	unknown	Cuneiform Luwian <i>watti-</i> "idem"
(DEUS) <i>wataniya-</i> "sacred holding"	"day"	Cuneiform Luwian <i>wataniya-</i> "of the land"
<i>wala-</i> "to remove, erase"	"idem"	Hittite <i>wallanu-</i> "idem"
<i>was-</i> "to lead here"	"smash"	Hieroglyphic Luwian <i>usa-</i> "to lead here"
(DEUS) <i>hapada(n)ti-</i> "riverland"	unknown	Hieroglyphic Luwian <i>hapadi-</i> "idem"
<i>haparinuwa-</i> "to deliver"	unknown	Hittite <i>hap(pa)riya-</i> "idem"

As a corollary of reading (DEUS)AVIS-*ti-* as *wati-* "mountain" in a list of divine names, I could also show that the word (DEUS)*30-*da-ti-* in the same text represented *hapada(n)ti-* "divine riverland," suggesting that *30 () should be read as *hapa*. This in turn led to a contextually acceptable reading of "*30"(-)*ri+i-nu-wali-* in yet another text as *haparinuwa-* "to deliver." How fundamentally the sense of a text can change with new readings becomes clear when we compare the old interpretation of the passage with "*30"(-)*ri+i-nu-wali-* with the new one (KARKAMIŠ A12 §11–13):

Old: I went to him (i.e., a deity) (as) a living sacrifice. I went to him for skill and protection ("shield") [and] profit ("selling"). And it before him I caused to...(Hawkins 2000, p. 114)

Improved: I carried blood offerings to him, and I also carried (my) craft and (my) shield as gifts to him. I **delivered** them (lit. it) in front of him.

Sometimes syllabograms receive new values, with major consequences. Ilya Yakubovich and Elisabeth Rieken (2010) suggest



Figure 3a–b. Stamp seals with hieroglyphs, (a) OIM A43134 and (b) OIM A12728

reading the sign ta_4 as *la* or *li* (conventionally written as *la/i*). This is not very relevant for a word like *a-ta₄-ma-za > a-la/i-ma-za* “name,” but when the geographical name *pa-ta₄-sa-ti-na / wa-li-ta₄-sa-ti-na* = Paddasatina/Waddasatina changes into *pa-la/i-sà-ti-na / wa-li-lali-sà-ti-na* = Palistin/Walistin, the Luwian world suddenly becomes connected with the Philistines of the Bible and the *plst* of the Sea Peoples, at least in name. Inscriptions mentioning the Neo-Hittite kingdom of Palistin/Walistin have been found in Arsuz, Tell Ta’yinat — on display in the Syro-Anatolian gallery of the Oriental Institute Museum (fig. 5) — Aleppo, and near Hama (fig. 6). The inscriptions date to the eleventh–ninth centuries BC and point to an important kingdom of respectable size. The similarity in names between Palistin and the biblical Philistines is hardly a coincidence, and further research to clarify the relationship is needed.

ORIGIN OF THE ANATOLIAN HIEROGLYPHS

One of the more lively discussions in Hittitology deals with when the Anatolian hieroglyphs developed into a full-fledged writing system, who created the system and where, what was the purpose, and on what material. For decades the prevailing view was that the hieroglyphs were developed by Luwians, for Luwian, and in Luwian lands. This, as we will see, needs to be replaced with a very different view: “the Anatolian hieroglyphic script was developed in Hattusa, in the mixed Hittite and Luvian environment” (Yakubovich 2008, p. 28).

Yakubovich has convincingly shown how the Anatolian hieroglyphs received their values not only from Luwian but also from Hittite. This was quite an unexpected finding and has consequences for when the Hittites started to use the hieroglyphs not simply as a symbolic system on seals and ceramics, but as a true writing system. Yakubovich, like others before him, followed a

relatively simple procedure by reversing the acrophonic principle. Turning around the principle of assigning values to symbols based on the word behind a symbol, Yakubovich assigned words to the value behind a symbol. In a few cases this had already been done successfully, and as expected, the word that provided the value for the syllabogram was Luwian. For example, the logogram for the word “seal” (table 3), SIGILLUM, also has the syllabic value */sa/*. The word meaning “seal” that provided that syllable was Luwian *sasanza*, not Hittite *šiyatar*. There are also a few symbols with identifiable concepts for which the syllabic value is known, but where the Luwian word could not have been the source for the syllabic value. This is the case, for example, for CAPERE “to take.” When not used as a logogram, we read it as */dal/*, but the Luwian word that should have provided the value is *la(la)*- “to take.” Because we cannot be certain that the word familiar to the modern reader was also the one that provided the value for a sign, there could still exist a synonym that has not yet been discovered or preserved. However, Yakubovich’s brilliant and elegant move was to realize that the value *da* was derived from Hittite *da*- “to take”! (table 4).

Table 3. Symbols with Values Based on Luwian





Symbol	Meaning	Value	Luwian	Hittite
	SIGILLUM “seal”	<i>/sa/</i>	<i>sasanza</i>	<i>šiyatar</i>
	BONUS “good”	<i>/wa/</i>	<i>wasu</i>	<i>assu</i>

Table 4. Symbols with Values Based on Hittite

Symbol	Meaning	Value	Luwian	Hittite
	INFRA “down”	<i>/ka/</i>	<i>zanta</i>	<i>katta</i>
	CAPERE “take”	<i>/da/</i>	<i>la(la)</i>	<i>da-</i>

The consequences of Yakubovich’s insights are far reaching. The origin of the Anatolian hieroglyphs should no longer be sought in the periphery of the Hittite kingdom, in the Arzawa lands in the west or Kizzuwatna in the southeast, but in a Luwian–Hittite bilingual environment. Yakubovich convincingly argues that this environment can only have been the Hittite core land around the capital.

BILINGUALISM AMONG THE HITTITES AND LUWIANS

In order to investigate the socio-linguistic situation of an area where speakers of different languages are in close contact, one does not, in fact, need bilingual texts. Bilingual texts only show that the languages were spoken at the same time: it does not prove that people themselves were bilingual. Perhaps counter-intuitively, we need monolingual texts, ideally of all languages spoken in an area, to investigate whether the monolingual texts show interference from another language.

When one thinks of language contact, the first thing that comes to mind is the borrowing of foreign content words in one’s



Figure 4. Subterranean granaries in Büyükkaya (Hattuša/Boğazköy). After Seeher 1997, fig. 3

native language. But that is only one type of interference. The other type, called substratum influence, occurs when speakers acquire another language and impose sound patterns, syntax, and sometimes morphology on the acquired language. One can for example think of the pronunciation of American English by Italian or Jewish immigrants. Foreign content words hardly appear in the case of substratum influence, but mainly occur in the borrowing situation. Phonological (sounds), syntactic (word order), and morphological influence (forms) mainly occur in the substratum situation and only appear in the borrowing situation after heavy lexical borrowing. Hittite and the few Luwian monolingual texts can therefore tell us about the type of interference and ultimately about the socio-political situation that caused the interference.

The presence of a Luwian-speaking population in the core land was known already in the early days of Hittitology, after the Plague Prayers and the Ten-Year and Extensive Annals of Muršili II (1321–1295 BC) were edited in the mid-1930s. Muršili recalls how the — in his eyes unlawful — acts of his father Šuppiluliuma I led to the start of an epidemic that raged through the core of the empire for decades. No one was spared. Both Šuppiluliuma and his heir Arnuwanda II died from the plague, Šuppiluliuma in 1322 BC, and Arnuwanda in 1321 BC, leaving only the teenager Muršili available for the throne. In the early years of his reign, Muršili had to prove his worth as a young king, and part of the battle ground was west Anatolia, in the rebellious lands of Arzawa. After his successful campaigns there, Muršili deported a large part of the Luwian-speaking population and repopulated the severely hit center. We do not only know this from the historical sources, but we also see this reflected in the language. Theo van den Hout (2007) analyzed the occurrence of Luwian loanwords in thirteenth-century Hittite texts and concluded that the population in the heart of the empire was mainly Luwian speaking, not Hittite, while the court and nobility were bilingual in Hittite and Luwian, with Hittite as the official language of the state.

But Hittite–Luwian bilingualism must also have existed in the population in the Old Hittite period (1650–1400 BC), long before the mass deportations during the reign of Mursili II that saw the replacement of the Hittite vernacular with Luwian. Luwian grammar started to influence Hittite in the Old Hittite period, gaining momentum in Middle Hittite. Table 5 shows how the Old Hittite plural pronouns were originally different from

the Luwian pronouns, but how by late Middle Hittite the old forms had been replaced with new forms from Luwian (with some minor changes):

Table 5. Pronouns in Old, late Middle Hittite, and Luwian

	<i>Old Hittite</i>	<i>Late Middle Hittite</i>	<i>Luwian</i>
nom.pl.common	-e	-at	-ata
acc.pl.common	-us	-as	-as
nom.-acc.pl.neuter	-e	-at	-ata

It ended with the total structural convergence of Hittite and Luwian toward the end of the empire. By that time, every Hittite clause could be turned into a Luwian clause by simply replacing the Hittite words with Luwian words. For this type of grammatical interference to happen, there must have been a substantial number of native speakers of Luwian in the Old Hittite period that must also have been able to speak Hittite in order to influence Hittite to the extent that it did.

It is crucial to emphasize that this contact between Hittite and Luwian started in the Old Hittite period but not earlier. That is, early in or shortly before the Old Hittite period, Luwian speakers and Hittite speakers were not sharing the same geographic area in large numbers, but at a certain point they suddenly were. Even though people with Luwian names were present in Kültepe/Kaneš in the Old Assyrian period, and Luwian loanwords are attested in the Assyrian documents, there were not enough speakers of Luwian at the time to influence Hittite. If there had been, the changes in Hittite would have happened much earlier. So where did the Luwians suddenly come from?

We have no evidence for large-scale migrations of Luwians into Central Anatolia, home of the Hattians, in the early second millennium, but we do have evidence for the Hittitization of the area. Discounting the short-lived conquest of Central Anatolia by King Anitta in the Old Assyrian period, lasting unification of Central Anatolia took place under the first known Old Hittite kings Labarna and Hattušili I. Hattušili made Hattuša, once the cursed foe of Anitta, his capital, moving the center of his kingdom from south of the Kızıl Irmak River to the north. Although Hittites may have entered the area with Anitta, we only expect



Figure 5. Tell Ta'yinat inscription with the name *wa/i-la/i-sà-ti-ni-* (Walistin-). D. 00915 OIM A27861d-h

larger numbers to have settled there with the consolidation of the kingdom by Labarna and Ḫattušili I.

Hittitologists always assumed that the Hittites encountered only the Hattians. While taking over control, they fully assimilated to Hattian culture to such an extent that much of their Indo-European heritage was lost. The Hittites even minimized the role of the pantheon of their homeland Kaneš/Neša in favor of the pantheon of the Hattians, and the language of the cult was Hattian, not Hittite. But what is most interesting is that we also find *Luwian* cult recitations for Hattian deities. Furthermore, indigenous myths written in Hittite show a mixture of Hattian and Luwian motifs, not only Hattian, and, last but not least, the royal names of the Old Hittite kingdom are Hattian and Luwian, while Hittite names are absent: Tudḫaliya, Pafḫtelmaḫ, Ḫattušili, Muršili, Taḫurwaili, Ḫuzziya, and Telipinu are Hattian, Ḫantili is either Hattian or Luwian, and Zidanta and Muwatalli are Luwian.

Cultural evidence shows that the Hittites therefore indeed also encountered Luwians in the core land. That the Luwian population was large enough to account for the observed grammatical influence of Luwian on Hittite can, rather surprisingly, be supported by language contact phenomena in Hattian. I argue that the Luwians must have been bilingual in Hattian and Luwian (Goedegebuure 2008). Using purely linguistic arguments, I could show that Hattian grammar, not the lexicon, was heavily influenced by either Luwian or Hittite to the point of typological disruption. As mentioned above, grammatical influence occurs when a language is a substratum to another language. The substratum language is usually either spoken by a very large group of immigrants, or when the substratum group is conquered by outsiders. Of the logical options, (1) Luwians migrating *en masse* and merging with indigenous Hattian society, (2) indigenous Luwians conquered by arriving Hattians, (3) Hittites migrating *en masse* and merging with indigenous Hattian society, and (4) indigenous Hittites conquered by arriving Hattians, only option



Figure 6. The Neo-Hittite state of Palistin, with the findspots of inscriptions mentioning Palistin/Walistin

(1) explains the changes in Hattian, the later changes in Hittite caused by Luwian, and the merger of Hattian–Luwian culture visible in the Old Hittite documents.

Languages and cultures in contact can have a profound impact on any society. The Hittitologists of the Oriental Institute have shown how contact between Luwians and Hattians in prehistory led to changes in Hattian and to the heterogeneous culture of the Hittites, how historical contact between Luwian and Hittite led to change in Hittite and eventually the death of Hittite, and how Luwian and Hittite provided the Anatolian hieroglyphs with their sound values no earlier than the Old Hittite period.

REFERENCES

- Goedegebuure, Petra (2008). "Central Anatolian Languages and Language Communities in the Colony Period: A Luwian-Hattian Symbiosis and the Independent Hittites." In *Anatolia and the Jazira during the Old Assyrian Period*, edited by J. G. Dercksen, pp. 137–80. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten.
- (forthcoming). "The Hieroglyphic Luwian Signs *128 (AVIS 'bird') = *wa* and *30 = *HAPA*." In *Acts of the IXth International Congress of Hittitology 2014*.
- Hawkins, J. David (2000). *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions, Volume I: Inscriptions of the Iron Age*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Rieken, Elisabeth, and Ilya Yakubovich (2010). "The New Values of Luwian Signs L 319 and L 172." In *ipamati kistamati pari tumatimis: Luwian and Hittite Studies Presented to J. David Hawkins on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday*, edited by Itamar Singer, pp. 199–219. Tel Aviv: Institute of Archaeology, Tel Aviv University.
- Sayce, A. H. (1877). "The Hamathite Inscriptions." *Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archaeology* 5: 22–32.
- Seeher, Jürgen. (1997). "Die Ausgrabungen in Boğazköy-Ḫattuša 1996." *Archäologischer Anzeiger* 1997: 317–41.
- Van den Hout, Theo (2007). "Institutions, Vernaculars, Publics: The Case of Second-Millennium Anatolia." In *Margins of Writing, Origins of Cultures* (second edition), edited by Seth Sanders, pp. 221–62. Oriental Institute Seminars 2. Chicago: The Oriental Institute.
- (2010). "The Hieroglyphic Signs L 255 and 256 and Once Again Karatepe XI." In *ipamati kistamati pari tumatimis: Luwian and Hittite Studies Presented to J. David Hawkins on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday*, edited by Itamar Singer, pp. 234–43. Tel Aviv: Institute of Archaeology, Tel Aviv University.
- Woodard, Roger D. (ed.) (2008). *The Ancient Languages of Asia Minor*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yakubovich, Ilya (2008). "Hittite-Luwian Bilingualism and the Origin of Anatolian Hieroglyphs." *Acta Linguistica Petropolitana* IV(1): 9–36.



THE
ORIENTAL
INSTITUTE

The University of Chicago
1155 East 58th Street
Chicago, Illinois 60637
oi.uchicago.edu

UCHICAGOArts

INFORMATION

MEMBERSHIP

YOUR PARTNERSHIP MATTERS!

The Oriental Institute depends upon members of all levels to support the learning and enrichment programs that make our Institute an important — and free — international resource.

As a member, you'll find many unique ways to get closer to the ancient Near East — including free admission to the Museum and Research Archives, invitations to special events, discounts on programs and tours, and discounts at the Institute gift shop.

\$50 ANNUAL / \$40 SENIOR (65+) INDIVIDUAL
\$75 ANNUAL / \$65 SENIOR (65+) FAMILY

HOW TO JOIN OR RENEW

ONLINE: oi.uchicago.edu/getinvolved

BY PHONE: 773.702.9513

ON SITE: at the Suq Gift Shop

GENERAL ADMISSION

FREE

ADULTS

\$10 suggested donation

CHILDREN 12 OR UNDER

\$5 suggested donation

MUSEUM & GIFT SHOP HOURS

Closed Monday

Sun-Tue, Thu-Sat: 10am-5pm

Wed: 10am-8pm

THE MUSEUM IS CLOSED

January 1

July 4

Thanksgiving Day

December 25

ACCESSIBILITY

The Museum is fully wheelchair and stroller accessible. The University Avenue west entrance is accessible by ramp and electronic doors.

PARKING

FREE parking half a block south of the Museum on University Avenue, after 4pm daily and all day on Saturday and Sunday.

GROUP VISITS

For information about group visits, please go to:

oi.uchicago.edu/museum/tours

