

Post Hittite Historiography in Asia Minor

A. Uchitel

I am fully aware that the use of the word “historiography” is controversial when applied to non-Greek historical writing. Nevertheless, bearing in mind the basic difference between the Greek concept of *historia*, as rational historical research, and other traditions, I believe that it is still possible to use the term “historiography” for at least such exclusively historical Near Eastern genres as the Babylonian Chronicles, and the Hittite and Assyrian royal annals.¹ After all, these compositions were written for no other reason than the recording of past events, without any visible practical aim.

Using the word in this broad sense, Hittite historiography is well known. In fact, the Hittite royal annals can be regarded as the earliest example of this genre anywhere in the world. Since there is an excellent survey of the Hittite historiography by Hoffner,² I do not need to elaborate. Two historical genres will be mentioned in the course of our discussion: royal annals and royal autobiographies. I would like to recall that what we call “royal annals”, the Hittites themselves called *pesnatar* — “manly deeds”. These were accounts of military campaigns, year by year, written in the first person, in the name of the king himself. In this respect they resemble rather the Roman genre of *res gestae* than that of *Annales*. Unlike the Assyrian annals, which developed from the building inscriptions and maintained this connection in the form of the so-called *Baubericht* — an account of the building activity of the king,

1 The problems of Ancient Near Eastern historiography are discussed in: *Histories and Historians of the Ancient Near East*, *Orientalia* 49 (1980), esp. J. W. Wevers, “Preface”, 137–9; A. K. Grayson, “Assyria and Babylonia,” 140–94; H. A. Hoffner, “The Hittites,” 283–332; and in *History, Historiography and Interpretation*, ed. H. Tadmor, M. Weinfeld, Jerusalem 1983).

2 Hoffner, *op. cit.* (n. 1 above).

written as a postscript, Hittite annals show no trace of an external purpose, other than the historical.³

Three series of such annals have survived in the Boğazköy archive: of Hattusili I from the Old Kingdom (17th cent. B.C.),⁴ of Tuthaliya II from the Middle Kingdom (dated by most scholars to the 15th cent. B.C.),⁵ and of Mursili II of the Empire period (13th cent. B.C.).⁶ Mursili II also wrote annals covering the reign of his father, Suppiluliuma I (these are the only annals written in the third person).⁷

Unlike the annals, royal autobiographies were written for a very clear practical purpose: these are royal edicts issued to legitimize a change of succession or a simple usurpation. They hardly belong to historiography proper, though they take the form of a historical narrative, describing the struggle for succession inside the royal family, from the point of view of the author, of course. For this reason these texts are rightly also called “apologies”.

There are three such texts in the Boğazköy archive: Testament of Hattusili I from the Old Kingdom,⁸ Proclamation of Telepinu from the Middle Kingdom,⁹ and apology of Hattusili III from the Empire.¹⁰

The question I would like to ask in this paper is — what happened to this historiographical tradition after the destruction of the Hittite Empire around

- 3 The Anitta inscription is sometimes regarded as a prototype of the royal annals, but the existence of the Akkadian version of the earliest annals of Hattusili I rather suggests some unknown Mesopotamian source. For the Anitta inscription see: E. Neu, *Der Anitta-Text* (Studien zu den Boğazköy Texten, Wiesbaden, hereafter-StBoT 18) 1974.
- 4 E. Laroche, *Catalogue de textes hittites* (Paris 1971, hereafter- CTH) 4; F. Imparati, C. Saporetti, “L’autobiografia di Hattusili I,” *Studi classici e orientali* 14 (1965) 40–85; H. G. Melchert, “Acts of Hattušili I,” *JNES* 37 (1978) 1–22.
- 5 CTH 142.
- 6 CTH 61, A. Côtze, *Die Annalen des Muršiliš* (Mitteilungen der Vordasiatisch-Ägyptisch Gesellschaft, Berlin, 38) 1933; J.-P. Grémois, “Les annales décennales de Mursili II (CTH 61,1),” *Hethitica* 9 (1988): 17–145.
- 7 CTH 40, H. G. Güterbock, “The Deeds of Suppiluliuma as Told by his Son, Muršili II,” *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 10 (1956) 41–68, 73–130.
- 8 CTH 5, F. Sommer, A. Falkenstein, *Die hethitisch-akkadische Bilingue des Hattušili I (Labarna II)*, Munich 1938.
- 9 CTH 19, I. Hoffman, *Der Erlass Telepinus*, Heidelberg 1984.
- 10 CTH 81, H. Otten, *Die Apologie Hattušiliš III* (StBoT 24), 1981.

1200 B.C., and before the emergence of Greek historiography after 500 B.C., in this same Asia Minor.

The first step in this direction was made by Güterbock¹¹ in 1967, when he identified part of the cuneiform text KBo XII 38 as a Hittite translation of the Luwian hieroglyphic inscription Nişantaş. The Hittite text consists of two parts, both dealing with the conquest of Cyprus. The first text contains an account of the campaigns of Tuthaliya IV, probably originally inscribed upon his statue, and the second one is a piece from the annals of Suppiluliuma II himself, which was inscribed on the “Everlasting Peak” (*hekur ukturi*) — identified by Güterbock as Nişantaş. If this identification is correct, this would mean that, at least at the very end of the Empire period, royal annals could be written in the form of monumental inscription. Unfortunately, this does not help very much: the Nişantaş inscription is so damaged by erosion that it is illegible, apart from the first line containing the name, titles, and a genealogy of the author, sufficient for the identification of the Hittite translation, but not enough even to supply the Luwian correspondence either for *pesnatar* or *hekur ukturi*, both mentioned in KBo XII 36.

After the downfall of the Empire the hieroglyphic script was widely used by the rulers of the so-called Neo-Hittite kingdoms of South-Eastern Anatolia — North Syria for their monumental inscriptions. However, nothing comparable to the Hittite royal annals or other historical genres has been identified among them. Historical events are mentioned only occasionally in these mainly building and votive inscriptions. Apart from names, titles and genealogies very little historical information has been extracted from them, so that the main source for the history of the New-Hittite kingdoms themselves is still the Assyrian royal annals.

It should be taken into account, however, that the decipherment of the hieroglyphic script and the interpretation of the Luwian language was a very slow process. The decipherment of the script was actually completed only in 1973, when the reading of several frequently used signs changed dramatically.¹² Since then, several revealing new interpretations have been made by J.D. Hawkins, now the leading authority in the field.

Firstly, in 1980 Hawkins published in *Anatolian Studies* an inscription

- 11 H. G. Güterbock, “The Hittite conquest of Cyprus Reconsidered,” *JNES* 26 (1967) 139–56.
- 12 J. D. Hawkins, A. Morpurgo Davies, G. Neumann, “Hittite Hieroglyphs and Luwian: New Evidence for the Connection,” *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen* (Phil.-Hist. Klasse) 6, 1973.

from Tell-Ahmar 1 which he called “The Autobiography of Ariyahinas’s Son”.¹³ The name of the author has not survived in the text. He was a ruler of the kingdom which the Assyrians called Til-Barsip, and the Luwians Masuwari,¹⁴ and his inscription clearly belongs to the Hittite literary tradition of the royal autobiography. It is especially close to the autobiography of Hattusili III, since both texts were written for the same purpose — the justification of a usurpation. Like Hattusili, who justifies the dethronement of his nephew Urhi-Tešub by the divine intervention of the Hurrian goddess Šaušga, his personal deity, our author owes his victory to Celestial Tarhunt (the storm-god) to whom he promised to dedicate his enemy’s daughter as a hierodule.¹⁵ But, while Hattusili begins his story with his own childhood under the rule of his father Mursili, the author of Tell-Ahmar 1 describes a long struggle for succession over four generations beginning with his great-grandfather Hapatilas.¹⁶ It is interesting that during the whole period both the “usurpers” and the “legitimate” (from the point of view of the author) pretenders coexisted in the same city, and at one stage one of the “usurpers”, Hamiyatas, made the author “lord of his house” and made him “greater than his own brothers”,¹⁷ but later Hamiyatas’s son undermined his position and deprived him of his power.¹⁸ So we can understand that our author was the loyal subject of Hamiyatas, but revolted against his successor, and like Darius I much later, had to go back to his great-grandfather to establish his common ancestry with the former ruling dynasty.¹⁹

Thus, with the publication of this text the continuity of the genre of the royal autobiography well into the 9th century was securely established. Yet this is still not the royal annals. As already observed, the purpose of this text is by no means purely historiographical; it is a propagandistic document pursuing very practical aims.

- 13 J. D. Hawkins, “The ‘Autobiography of Ariyahinas’s Son’: an Edition of the Hieroglyphic Luwian stelaē Tell Ahmar 1 and Aleppo 2,” *Anatolian Studies* (hereafter = *Anat.St.*) 30 (1980) 139–56.
- 14 J. D. Hawkins, “The Hittite Name of Til Barsip: Evidence from a New Hieroglyphic Fragment from Tell Ahmar,” *Anat.St.* 33 (1983) 131–6.
- 15 Tell ahmar 1, §21–29’, Hawkins, *Anat.St.* 30 (1980) 141–2; commentary: 151.
- 16 Tell ahmar 1, §7–20, Hawkins, *loc. cit.*, commentary: 154–5.
- 17 Tell Ahmar 1, §15–16, *ibid.*
- 18 Tell Ahmar 1, §18–20, *ibid.*
- 19 E. J. Brinckman, H. Tadmor, “Darius I, Pseudo-Smerdis, and the Magi,” *Athenaeum* 56 (1978) 239.

Nevertheless, I believe, the existence of royal annals among the Luwian hieroglyphic inscriptions will soon be evident with the publication of the forthcoming new corpus of Luwian hieroglyphic inscriptions by Hawkins²⁰ where his new interpretation of the Topada inscription is expected to appear.²¹

This inscription is probably one of the most difficult in the Luwian hieroglyphic corpus. It is written in a special “Tabalian” variant of the hieroglyphic script, very different from the better known Carchemishan monumental style.²²

The author of Topada was Wasu-Sarmas — the Great King of Tabal who was removed from power by Tiglath-Pileser III in 730 B.C.,²³ so that it can be safely dated in the second half of the 8th century B.C. It is clear now that this triumphal inscription is written in a style very similar to that of the Hittite royal annals. It deals with the three years’ war before the city of Parzuta²⁴ against a coalition of seven kings and in alliance with three other kings.²⁵ Two of these are identified as the authors of other hieroglyphic inscriptions: Warpalawas of Tuwana (the author of the Bor inscription)²⁶ and Kiyakiyas of Šinuhtu (the author of the Aksaray

20 Announced in: A. Morpurgo Davies, J. D. Hawkins, “The Late Hieroglyphic Luwian Corpus: Some New Lexical Recognitions,” *Hethitica* 8 (1987) 269–70.

21 The following treatment of Topada is based upon Hawkins’s copy, transliteration and translation of this inscription, kindly made available by him to his students during his Luwian class at SOAS in 1984/5.

22 J. D. Hawkins, “Some Historical Problems of the Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions,” *Anat.St.* 29 (1979) 164.

23 *Ibid.* p. 163, note 71.

24 Topada §3: wa/i-mu pa + ra/i-zu²-ta_x(URBS) 7 REX-ti-sa POST(+ RA/I?)-zi/a FRONS-lá/i/u-zi/a-ha x[...?](-) || sa-ta_x — “against me in Parzuta there were seven kings of lesser and greater rank”; §19–20: à-mi-sa-há-wa/i_x-tú-ta_x REX + RA/I-sa₇ EQUUS-sa₆ FRONS-ti-ia-si_x-sa FRONS-ti-sa₇ ANNUS 2-zi “TERRA”-REL + RA/I à-ta_x ta-x(URBS) *274(-)sa-ta_x wa/i_x-tù-’ ANNUS tara/i-zi TERRA-REL + RA/I ta-x(URBS) à-ta CRUS + SCALA(?) -ta_x — “my royal horse, the first of the first (*hantiyasis hantis*) for two years in the land of X was smiting (*hatalisata*) for him. For three years he stood in the land of the city X”.

25 Topada §4: wa/i-mu tara/i-zi/a REX-ti-zi/a CUM-ni wa/i_x-sa₇-ta_x wa/i_x + ra/i-pa-la_x-wa/i-sa₁ ki_x-ia-ki_x-ia-sa₄-ha ru-wa/i_x-ta_x-sa-ha *92 — “three kings were good with me: Warpalawas, Kiyakiyas and Ruwatas the charioteer”.

26 P. Meriggi, *Manuele de eteo geroglifico*, (Roma 1967) II, 2, No. 10.

inscription;²⁷ the third one — Ruwatas “the charioteer”²⁸ — is otherwise unknown.

Several characteristic expressions of the Hittite royal annals can be found in this text, such as: “gods ran before me”,²⁹ or “kings of greater and lesser rank”.³⁰ The standard sentences about the burning of cities and the deportation of populations also appear.³¹

Wasu-Sarmas was probably the last of the “Neo-Hittite” rulers who claimed descent from the ruling dynasty of the Hittite Empire.³² Such a family connection would make the survival of the Hittite annalistic tradition only to be expected. Like the Nişantaş inscription (or for that matter its Hittite translation), which contains only one section from the annals of Suppiluliuma II dealing with the conquest of Cyprus, Topada is likely to be a section from the annals dealing with the war at Parzuta. But we may assume that this king of Tabal at least wrote his annals, which have not survived.

Thus, we have seen that at least two Hittite historical genres, royal autobiographies and royal annals, survived the destruction of the Hittite Empire and their after life among Luwian hieroglyphic inscriptions can be proved. However, with the Assyrian conquest of the Neo-Hittite kingdoms of Eastern Anatolia hieroglyphic monuments ceased to appear by the end of the 8th century. The Luwian speaking population continued of course to live in Asia Minor, but our written sources shift westward, and they come this time from Lycia.

- 27 M. Kalaç, “Ein Steinbruchstück mit Luwischen Hieroglyphen in Aksaray bei Niğde,” *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung* (Kuhn Zeitschrift) 92 (1978) 119. Both names are identified by Hawkins in *Anat. St.* 29 (1979) 166.
- 28 “Charioteer” is written ideographically as *92. The phonetic reading is probably *zalala*, according to Assur letter d, §9.
- 29 Topada §17: *wa/i-mu-ta_x á-mi-sa_x DOMINUS-ni-sa (DEUS)TONITRUS-zi/a-sa_x (DEUS)SARMA-sa_x (DEUS)*198-sa₆ (DEUS)BOS.*206.PANIS-sa_x-ha PRAE-na *179-ia-ta_x — “my lord Tarhunzas, Sarmas, X and Y ran before me (*piran hwiya*nta).”*
- 30 Topada §3, *aparinzi hantilinz*i which corresponds to Hittite *appezzi hantezzi*, J. D. Hawkins, “The Negatives in Hieroglyphic Luwian,” *Anat.St.* 25 (1975) 150.
- 31 Topada §14–15: *wa/i_x-ta_x URBS + MI.AEDIFICIUM-ta_x-na FLAMMAE(?)(-)la_x-há-nú-wa/i-ta_x *274-ia-pa-wa/i FILIA-zi/a FILIUS-sa (“PES”)u-pa-ta_x — “he burned the city and he brought daughters (and) sons to (his) domain (*upati*)”.*
- 32 J. D. Hawkins, “Kuzi-Tešub and the “Great Kings” of Karkamiš,” *Anat.St.* 38 (1988) 99–108.

It has been shown by Houwink ten Cate³³ that the two Lycian languages — Lycian A and Lycian B, which the Lycians themselves called respectively *tr̄m̄mili* and *trujeli*, constitute a direct continuation of the Luwian languages. With progress in the study of Luwian hieroglyphics this has become more evident.

Although the Lycian script never posed any serious problem of decipherment, being a local variant of the Greek alphabet, progress in the interpretation of the Lycian languages has been even slower than in the case of the Luwian languages. The main obstacle is the scarcity of the sources. Almost all Lycian inscriptions are short and uniform funeral inscriptions. Only one outstanding monument, which presents by far the longest Lycian inscription, deserves special consideration.

This is the so-called Xanthos Monument. The inscription is not a funeral one in the strict sense, though the monument constitutes part of a family funerary complex of Lycian dynasts of the Persian period.³⁴ The inscription is written in three languages, but it cannot be called “trilingual” since the three texts do not repeat each other. The first text, written in Lycian A or *tr̄m̄mili*, is historical in nature and describes the military events of the years 429–410 B.C. in Lycia, partly known from Thucydides.³⁵ It is followed by a short Greek epigram,³⁶ while the third text, written in Lycian B or *trujeli* (an archaic Lycian dialect closely related to Luwian), is a long poem commemorating the military events already described in dry prose in the first text.³⁷

The name of the monument can be recognized in the fourth line of the Greek epigram:

33 P. H. J. Houwink ten Cate, *The Luwian Population Groups of Lycia and Cilicia Aspera during the Hellenistic Period*, Leiden 1961.

34 *Tituli Asiae Minoris I: Tituli Lyciae*, ed. E. Kalinka, Vienna, 1901, No. 44, pp. 30–48. A historical analysis can be found in: D. Asheri, *Fra ellenismo e iranismo: studi sulla società e cultura di Xanthos nella età achemenide*, (Bologna 1983) 60–61, 85–97, 157; T. R. Bryce, “Political Unity in Lycia during the ‘Dynastic’ Period,” *JNES* 42 (1963) 31–42; *Idem*, “A Ruling Dynasty in Lycia,” *Klio* 64 (1982) 329–38; W. A. P. Childs, “The Authorship of the Inscribed Pillar of Xanthos,” 29 (1979) 97–102; *Idem*, “Lycian Relations with Persians and Greeks in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries Re-examined,” *Anat. St.* 31 (1981) 55–80; A. M. Кондратов, В. В. Шеворошкин, *Когда молчат письма*, (Moscow 1970) с. 156–167.

35 Thuc. 2.69; 8.5, 19, 28, 54.

36 Translated in Asheri, *op. cit.* (n. 34 above) 167–8.

37 Partly translated in И. И. Иванов, *Луна, упавшая с неба* (Moscow 1977) с. 248–9.

[νικέ]ων καὶ πολέμου μνημα τόδε ἀθάνατον — “immortal monument of victories and war”.³⁸

This expression has a striking resemblance to the name of the Nişantas inscription — *hekur ukturi* — “Everlasting Peak”, which was the starting point of our discussion. Another indication of the purpose of this text is found in the Lycian B poem where two key words are frequently repeated: *waxsa* — “glory”, and *slama* — “to make everlasting”.³⁹ Several other expressions in this text go back to the Hittite literary tradition, for example, “to threaten with war” — literally “to send enmity” where the Hittite verb *hatrai* appears as the Lycian *qidri*.⁴⁰

The most interesting of the three is the Lycian A text which can justly be called the *res gestae* of the Lycian dynast Kherēi — the author of the text.⁴¹ However, one important change occurred as compared with Hittite and Luwian annals: this text is written in the third person, not in the first. Among other things it mentions several details omitted by Thucydides in his account of the same events: the rebellion of the city of Tlos (Lycian Tlawa) under the leadership of Waxsse-pddimi against the central Lycian authority⁴² which took place simultaneously with the revolt of the Persian Amorges (Lycian Humρχχα) against Tissaphernes (Lycian Zisaprñna or Kizzaprñna).⁴³ The name of Trbbñimi, the Lycian who overcame the Athenian Melesandros (Lycian Milasãñtra) is also mentioned on the Xanthos Monument.⁴⁴

If we try now to summarize the evidence accumulated up to this point, it does not look very impressive: three Luwian hieroglyphic inscriptions⁴⁵ and one Lycian in eight centuries!

38 For another possible reading of the first word: [ἐργ]ων — “of exploits”, see Asheri, *op. cit.* (n. 34 above) 161–8.

39 *Tituli Asiae Minoris* (hereafter = TAM) I 44 c 40, 43, 44, 48, 50, 59, d 30, 31, 56; Кондратов, Шеворошкин, *op. cit.* (n. 34 above) c. 165, 192.

40 TAM I 44 c 58–59; Кондратов, Шеворошкин, *op. cit.* (n. 34 above) c. 164.

41 Childs, *Anat.St.* 31 (1981) 68.

42 TAM I 44 a 47–49: *xerēi qastte terñ tlahñ erbbedi ... xerēi tebete [t]erñ se waxsse-pddimi* — “Kherei punished the army of Tlos with a defeat ... Kherei defeated the army and Waxhsse-pddimi”; Кондратов, Шеворошкин, *op. cit.* (n. 34 above) c. 160, 165.

43 TAM I 44 a 55, c 1, 11, 14, 15.

44 TAM 44 a 44–45: *trbbēnimi tebete terñ se milasãñtrā* — “Trbbenimi defeated the army and Melesandros”; Кондратов, Шеворошкин, *op. cit.* (n. 34 above) c. 165.

45 When this paper had already been written a new Luwian hieroglyphic historical

It is also possible, that historical inscriptions similar to those of the Xanthos Monument were written west of Lycian in neighbouring Caria. The Carian language is even less understood than Lycian. In the light of one of the latest attempts at its decipherment by Shevoroshkin, the so-called Caunos stele can be tentatively identified as “historical”.⁴⁶ This would add one more inscription, but not a very helpful one since it is completely unintelligible.

It should be taken into account, however, that only the monumental inscriptions survived from the post-Hittite cultures of Asia Minor, since after the destruction of the Empire the cuneiform script went out of use, and with it the use of clay tablets as writing material. Luwians probably used wooden tablets, which are frequently mentioned in Hittite cuneiform texts,⁴⁷ but of course have not survived. Only two small archives of letters from Assur⁴⁸ and of economic documents from Kululu⁴⁹ written on lead-strips can give us some insight into the nature of this kind of text.

Later, Lycians, Carians and Lydians — like their Greek neighbours — used papyrus and parchment.⁵⁰ All these peoples were decidedly unluckier than either the Hittites or the Greeks. They did not write on such really “everlasting” material as clay, which has preserved virtually the whole Hittite literature, nor did they produce any independent literary tradition that might have survived during the Middle Ages, so that their literature has perished forever.

It is the more remarkable that among our fragmentary and occasional pieces of evidence a historiographical tradition can be traced from the 13th

inscription of the Empire period was discovered at Südburg in Boğazköy (J. D. Hawkins, personal communication).

46 B. V. Шеворошкин, *Исследования по дешифровке карийских надписей* (Moscow 1965) с. 312, Кондратов, Шеворошкин, *op. cit.* (n. 34 above) с. 175.

47 H. G. Güterbock, “Das Siegel bei den Hethitern,” in *Symbolae Koschaker* (Leiden 1939) 36. I. Singer has recently argued that these wooden tablets (GIŠ.HUR) were inscribed with cuneiforms, see his *The Hittite KI.LAM Festival* (StBoT 27) (1983) 40.

48 Meriggi, *op. cit.* (n. 26 above) II, 1 No 34–40.

49 J. D. Hawkins, “The Kululu Lead Strips: Economic Documents in Hieroglyphic Luwian,” *Anat.St.* 37 (1987) 135–62.

50 Although three clay tablets inscribed with the so-called “para-Carian” script have been found: P. Meriggi, “Zu neuen ‘para-karischen’ Schrift,” *Kadmos* 5 (1966) 61–102.

up to the end of the 5th century B.C. Three important principles of the Hittite tradition survived during the whole period under consideration:

1. The concept of history as contemporary or recent, recording events of the present or previous reign, not of the remote legendary past. It is especially interesting that this latter tradition also existed in Hittite literature. For example, the story of the city of Zalpa begins with the mythological account of the foundation of the city — the famous myth about the queen of Kaniš and her thirty sons — and proceeds until its conquest by the Hittites.⁵¹ Nothing of this sort can be identified among later post-Hittite inscriptions.
2. The concept of history as primarily military history. Unlike the royal autobiographies which concentrate upon the struggle for succession inside the royal family, the royal annals, both the Hittite and the Luwian and Lycian equivalents hardly mention any non-military events.
3. The purpose of writing — commemorating the “manly deeds” of the present ruler for the sake of his “everlasting glory”. Though the propagandistic element is present, it is much less central in the annals than in the autobiographies, where the historical narrative serves practical needs.

As can be seen, all these three points are not entirely foreign to the Greek idea of history. Greeks distinguished between *historia* as research into relatively recent events verifiable by cross-examination of the evidence, and *archaeologia* as the work of an antiquarian assembling legendary traditions about an unverifiable remote past.⁵² Greek historians saw as the proper subject of their research primarily accounts of great wars.⁵³ And finally, Herodotus formulated the purpose of his writing in the famous introductory sentence:

μήτε ἔργα μεγάλα τε καὶ θαυμαστά ... ἀκλεᾶ γένηται

The question which may be asked but not answered at the present stage of our knowledge is whether there is any connection between the emergence of Greek *historia* in the early 5th century B.C. and the indigenous Anatolian historiographical tradition going back to the Hittite period.

Both the earliest Greek historians — Hecataeus of Miletus and Herodotus of Halicarnassus — were natives of Caria. Herodotus's own father was Carian, and his name *Λυξσε* can be identified in Carian inscriptions.⁵⁴ But

51 H. Otten, *Eine althethitische Erzählung um die Stadt Zalpa* (StBoT 17), 1973.

52 Dion. Hal. *Th.* 5–6.

53 Lucianus, *Hist. Conscr.* 2.

54 Кондратов, Шеворошкин, *op. cit.* (n. 34 above) с. 188.

there is no indication that Herodotus knew the Carian language,⁵⁵ let alone was familiar with Carian or any other Anatolian literary tradition.

But there is still a possibility that the existence of an indigenous Anatolian historical literature was known to the first Greek historians. This hypothesis would not undermine the basic novelty of the Greek concept of *historia*, but would make its appearance in Greek Asia Minor less sudden and more predictable.

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

55 Hdt. 1. 172. His refusal to judge whether the Carian language is related to Caunian or “vice versa” is ambiguous.