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PART TWO

LUWIAN COMMUNITIES OF CENTRAL ANATOLIA
Recent publications of seals and seal-impressions have greatly contributed to the available evidence for the onomastics of Late Bronze Age Anatolia, especially at Boğazköy, ancient Hattusa.\textsuperscript{1} At the same time, several recent syntheses have pointed to a growing Luwian element in central Anatolian society from the period of Kültepe level Ib, still notable through the Old and Middle Hittite periods and attaining significant numerical dominance in the names of personages attested on cuneiform documents in the Hittite Empire period.\textsuperscript{2} Suffice it to say that the only securely Hittite language king’s name is Suppiluliuma, the rest being either Luwian, of unknown origin, or unassignable to the one language rather than the other. The following considerations pertain to some of the limitations on the use of material culled from seal-impressions as a contribution to this debate.

\section{Language and Writing}

Firstly we need to say something about how we identify the difference between Hittite and Luwian names. Some basic principles have been laid down by I. Yakubovich,\textsuperscript{3} which I broadly recapitulate here:

1) The name contains elements that show Luwian as opposed to Hittite sound changes, e.g. Hittite */ti/* > /zi/, not Luwian;
2) must be composed of lexical elements that are present in the one language but not the other: e.g. Hitt. \textit{ḫumant} - vs. Luw. \textit{puna} - “all”, Hitt. \textit{suppi} - vs. Luw. \textit{kumm(a)}i- “pure”\textsuperscript{4};
3) all grammatical elements must be able to be analysed as Luwian or Hittite rather than vice-versa: e.g. Hitt. -\textit{talla} - vs. Luw. -\textit{alli} -.

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{1} Herbordt 2005; Dinçol and Dinçol 2008.
\bibitem{2} Yakubovich 2010; van den Hout 2006.
\bibitem{3} Yakubovich 2010: 210–223.
\bibitem{4} Hawkins apud Herbordt 2005: 299.
\end{thebibliography}
How do we read a hieroglyphic name? In order to be able to read a name in the Anatolian hieroglyphic script, it is necessary that its individual parts be deciphered. Those individual parts may consist of logograms (or word-signs), syllabic elements (or signs for sounds), and phonetic complements, which are sound-signs attached to the word-signs. A writing can either be entirely phonetic, half-logographic, entirely logographic or logographic with a phonetic complement. A major problem with the seals, is that there are so many logographic writings, which could correspond to words in any language:

- **Logographic:** TONITRUS (storm-god) Hitt. Tarḫunna, Luw. Tarḫunda, Hurrian Teššub
- **Syllabic:** Hieroglyphic $i(a)\cdot r-a/i\cdot n-u$ (SBo 2:138, BoHa 19:152);
  - cf. cuneiform $i\cdot i-a\cdot ri\cdot nu$ (Noms 437)
- **Logographic with phonetic complement:** CERVUS-šti Kurunti(ya), CERVUS+$r+ia$,
  - Inanna 5
- **Half-Logographic:** á-zi/a-TONITRUS, Azatarḫunda 6

The route to decipherment leads via digraphic inscriptions, i.e. those that are written in both cuneiform and in Hieroglyphic. However, even an apparently digraphic inscription can be deceptive. The famous seal of Ispat washu from Tarsus, one of the earliest datable uses of hieroglyphic writing, has a cuneiform ring and a central area with hieroglyphs. 7 However, it is very unlikely that there is any relationship between the cuneiform ring and the centre. We know the words that correspond each of these hieroglyphic signs in Luwian, and they can only be related to the name written in cuneiform with the greatest of difficulty. It is perhaps best to say that in this one case, infuriatingly, we are left with a purely symbolic or indexical relationship between the cuneiform and the hieroglyphic. The cuneiform gives the name of a king, while the hieroglyphs yield the name of the supreme king of the gods. 8 In other cases the cuneiform may stand in an asymmetrical relationship to the hieroglyphic, or it may be difficult to see how the two relate to each other. This is particularly true of seals belonging to officials from central Anatolia. 9 It is less true of royal seals,

---

7 Gelb 1956 n° 1. Cuneiform ring: $i\cdot i\cdot p[u-t]a\cdot ū$ lugal.gal dumu $p[a]\cdot ri\cdot ia\cdot wa\cdot at\cdot ri$. Hieroglyphic centre: BONUS, TONITRUS REX VITA. Further literature at Yakubovich 2010: 287–288. Read as $i\cdot i\cdot pu\cdot t[a]h\cdot ū$ at Mora 1987: 193.
8 Slightly differently Yakubovich 2010: 287.
9 See for example the debate on the cuneiform writing of the name Mizramuwa on SBo 2:80 and 81 in Hawkins, Morpurgo-Davies and Neumann 1973: 159; Carruba 1990.
where we usually have a clear correspondence between cuneiform and hieroglyphic, and of seals found on cuneiform tablets from northern Syria, particularly from Emar and Ugarit, although here too there are conspicuous exceptions, as we shall see below.

If there is no digraphic inscription our next best option is to try to identify the name on the seal with someone who we know as a historical personage from cuneiform documents. However, whoever works with seals is immediately struck by the lack of correspondence between names attested in seals and names attested in cuneiform documents. Out of 285 names registered in S. Herbordt’s corpus of princes’ and officials’ seals from Nişantepe only 18 could be identified with historical individuals known from witness lists on treaties, although not securely in all cases.10

Failing a direct historical equation, we may try to identify the hieroglyphic name with one that is otherwise attested in cuneiform, without necessarily being the same person. Here the scale of the problem becomes apparent. Out of at least 459 identifiable names on non-royal seals and seal-impressions found at Boğazköy, that means here names that do not use unidentified logograms or are otherwise broken, a full 269 of them are not found at all in cuneiform documents.11

2. Sarini and Tuwar(i)sarini

From a prosopographical perspective one is particularly struck by the repeated attestation of certain individuals on seals compared to their complete absence from the cuneiform record. One figure that is attested on seals from Boğazköy-Hattusa in the centre, Tarsus-Gözlüçale in the South and now from Oymaçağ-Ç-Nerik in the very North is the scribe Sarini.12 Clearly this was a very important person, but thus far unattested

---

10 Herbordt 2005: 78. She identifies 19 persons, but excludes one of them from being identical with a historical personage.  
11 This figure should be regarded as work in progress, as collation and decipherment are likely to increase the number of names that can be identified. Sources used were: Güterbock 1942 (SBo 2); Beran 1957 (Bo 3); Güterbock 1975 (Bo 5); Boehmer and Güterbock 1987 (BoHa 14); Herbordt 2005 (BoHa 19); Dinçol and Dinçol 2008 (BoHa 22). Up until Boehmer and Güterbock 1987 the readings were collated with J.D. Hawkins at Ankara Museum of Anatolian Civilisations in 2007. Thanks are due to then director Hikmet Denizli, now sadly deceased, and Dr R. Akdoğan.  
12 BoHa 19: 358; 359 (SCRIBA); 360 (signet, SCRIBA); 361 (SCRIBA, SOL+RA//DOMINUS?); 362 (SOL+[RA//DOMINUS(?)); the title SOL+RA//DOMINUS(?) has been supposed to be the equivalent of an unattested cuneiform *EN URU Arinna, “lord of Arinna” (Hawkins
in cuneiform sources. Another figure known to any seal aficionado is the name we usually transcribe as *Tuwarsa*. This character has no less than 21 fine looking seal-impressions at Boğazköy, including a signet ring. He is a scribe and once even a prince. All his seal-impressions are dated to the late period, most likely the 13th century, and they are all written phonetically.

In Emar there is a character called *İTuwarıša* attested as the important official *İ*iugula kalam.ma “overseer of the land” on a cuneiform document. An unpublished drawing of the official’s seal impression, kindly shown to me by Professors Tsukimoto and Singer, has something completely different to what one might expect if this was the seal of our *Tuwarsa* from Boğazköy. The hieroglyphic cannot be matched with the cuneiform and is currently unreadable. Nevertheless, it occasionally occurs that officials use other people’s seals, so we cannot discount the identity of cuneiform *İTuwa-ri-ša* from Emar and hieroglyphic *tu-wa-ri=ra/i-sà* from Boğazköy. Even if they are different people, the name is likely to be the same. In this case we might have to call him *Tuwarisa* instead of *Tuwarsa*, given that the cuneiform has indicated a sequence of sounds that the hieroglyphic cannot render unambiguously. The alternative is to postulate that the cuneiform writing is a mistaken rendering of a foreign name, a not implausible conclusion, but one that infringes against the basic methodological primacy of cuneiform spellings in the decipherment of hieroglyphic writings.

---

13 It should be noted, however, that Sarini’s seal-impressions are found on a bulla also stamped by Armapiya, who is probably known from the cuneiform record (Herbordt 2005: 177). J.N. Postgate points out to me the existence of a Sareni at Middle Assyrian Assur. The name may well be Hurrian (*šarri=ni*), but a Luwian derivation is not excluded. Ebeling 1939: 73.

14 SBo 2: 37, 38 (BONUS, SCRIBA), 39–41 (SCRIBA), 222 (signet, SCRIBA); Bo 3:16, 17; BoHa 19: 474–483 (SCRIBA, BONUS, SCRIBA), 484 (PITHOS, REX.FILIUS); 87/n (SCRIBA), 223/n, 370/n.

15 Hirayama 45 seal 1 (Tsukimoto 1992: 294). This is doubtless correctly transliterated as *İtu-wa-ri-ša* by the tablet’s editor, although the copy clearly has *İtu-wa-ri-it* (ibid. 306). The title *İ*iugula kalam.ma is equated with Hittite cuneiform EN KURT-TI, “country-lord”, and this in turn with hieroglyphic REGIO.DOMINUS at Singer 2011: 167 fn. 18. This plausible equation was not considered at Weeden 2011a: 215–218. Singer’s association with the official post or posts Hittite anduwasalli-*, Luwian pitauri-*, is less plausible, in my view, as Iron Age hieroglyphic has the title with phonetic complements REGIO(-ni/nî)-(ia)-(si) (-)DOMINUS(-ia)-(i-)sa, see Hawkins 2000: 96. Unfortunately, *Tuwar(isa) from Boğazköy does not bear this hieroglyphic title.*
In fact the only evidence for a reading *Tuwarsa is based on etymological considerations. The Luwian word *tuwarsanza, only attested in later hieroglyphic writing, means “vineyard”, and is supposed to be connected with Gk *θúrsos.16 Theoretically, this could either be as a cognate or as a loanword, although it is usually supposed to be a loan-word.17 While we do not know the Hittite word for vineyard, it is unlikely to have been identical, as an initial *dwo- or *two- would have been simplified in Hittite through loss of the -w-, and the sequence *CuRCV- would lead to Hittite CuRCV.18 Seen from a purely phonetic perspective, the most likely Hittite cognate to Luwian *tuwarsanza and Gk *θúrsos, should they belong together, would have to be GISKarša- “branch, shoot, leaf(?”). This is unlikely to have developed an associated meaning vineyard and is also probably attested in Hieroglyphic Luwian in the same form and meaning as it appears to have in Hittite, thus excluding an etymological connection with Luwian *tuwarsa-.19 If the reading of the “vineyard”-word is in fact *tuwarisanza, and the person is called *Tuwarisa, a connection with Greek *θúrsos as a cognate would have to be rejected.20 The possibility that it is a loanword into Greek would also need some reconsideration.21

3. Logographically Written Names with TONITRUS22

Given the phonetic writing in the Hieroglyphic script, our chances of establishing Tuwarsa/Tuwarisa as a Luwian name are far greater than in

---

16 Literature at Beekes 2010: 566.
17 An inherited sequence *-rs- would usually not be preserved in Greek (Beekes 2010: xxi §2a.15). However, one cannot exclude the possibility that the relative chronology of sound-changes may have allowed a limited preservation of *-rs-, for example in the Greek word tarsós, unless this too is a loanword (Beekes 2010: 1454).
20 At a guess one might entertain an etymological connection of *tuwarisa-/tuwarsanza (?) with Hitt. GIS*türi- “weapon, stick”, as a pair of substantivized Luwian derived adjectives; possibly “the person associated with the stick”, “the (place) associated with the stick”. For *türi- as “stick” see Kloekhorst 2008: 900. If so, *tuwarisa- would have to be derived from a full-grade variant of the root, as the word GIS*türi- “weapon or garden implement” is also attested in Cuneiform Luwian (Melchert 1993: 236; Kloekhorst loc. cit.). These speculative considerations do not have to exclude the further speculation mooted at Gordin 2010: 324 fn. 29 that Tuwar(i)sá may be the reading of the scribal name INU. GIS*KIRI. It is difficult to see how one might accommodate the Iron Age personal name at KARKAMIŠ A7j: tu-wa/i+ra/i-sà-sà (Hawkins 2000: 129).
21 Yakubovich 2010: 147 suggests that Greek *θúrsos and Luwian *tuwarsa- are both borrowed from a third source due to the anomaly in the initial stops.
cases where the name is written logographically, i.e. using signs to represent whole words rather than signs used to represent sounds. A logogram can essentially represent a word in any language. To illustrate the difficulties that can be experienced here, I use the group of names associated with the storm-god.


Hieroglyphic:

Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TONITRUS?-la</th>
<th>Tarhula?</th>
<th>SBo 2:114</th>
<th>Cf. Noms 1255 (Capp.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TONITRUS-ĩ-[a]</td>
<td>Tarhu(na)liya?</td>
<td>SBo 2:163</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONITRUS-BOS,</td>
<td>Tarhu(na)muwa</td>
<td>SBo 2:231, Bo 3:34, BoHa 22:314</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOS+MI-TONITRUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cf. Tarhumuwa, HKM 57 obv. 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONITRUS-ma-na[-wa/i]</td>
<td>Tarhu(na)-manawa?</td>
<td>BoHa 19:414</td>
<td>Noms 1259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONITRUS-FRATER2</td>
<td>Tarhu(na)nani</td>
<td>BoHa 19:410–412</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONITRUS-na(-su)</td>
<td>Tarhun(su)?</td>
<td>BoHa 22:5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONITRUS-ta-xmi</td>
<td>Tarhu(na)mi (?)</td>
<td>BoHa 19:413</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONITRUS-tā/PUGNUS?-mi</td>
<td></td>
<td>BoHa 22:177, 231, 274, 275, 277, 321, 322, 327, 276, 278, 279</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONITRUS-(tā?)-pi-ha-nu</td>
<td>Tarhu(na)pīhanu</td>
<td>BoHa 19:422</td>
<td>Noms 1276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONITRUS-(tā?)-pi-i(a)</td>
<td>Tarhu(na)pīya</td>
<td>SBo 2:23, 24, 141, 142, Bo 3:10; BoHa 19:418–420; 85/n?</td>
<td>Noms 1267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONITRUS-URBS-CER-VUS-ti</td>
<td>Tarhuntassa-Runtiya(?)</td>
<td>BoHa 19:421</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONITRUS(-tā?),URBS-ĩ</td>
<td>Tarhundassīlī(?)</td>
<td>BoHa 22:18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONITRUS-LEO2</td>
<td>Tarhu(na)walwi (?)</td>
<td>BoHa 22:142</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONITRUS-VITIS'/-i(a)?</td>
<td>Tarhu(na)wiya/</td>
<td>834/w</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tarhu(na)i(ya)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONITRUS-BONUS2</td>
<td>Tarhu(na)asu</td>
<td>SBo 2:116–121, 210; BoHa 22:71</td>
<td>Noms 1278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONITRUS-(tā?)-VIR.zi</td>
<td>Tarhu(na)ziṭī</td>
<td>SBo 2:69–71; BoHa 22:201, 242</td>
<td>Noms 1271, 1279</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23 Compiled from Laroche 1966 (Noms); Laroche 1981; Trémouille 2006.
Names using this storm-god element attested in cuneiform can take the forms (Hittite or Luwian) Tarḫu-, Tarḫun-, (Luwian) Tarḫunda- and (Hittite) Tarḫunna-, in addition to Hurrian Teššub. The logogram can theoretically represent a word in any language, so the logographic writing MAGNUS.TONITRUS can represent either Luwian Uratarḫunda, or the historically entirely different person Talmi-Teššub, where Teššub is the Hurrian and Tarḫunda is the Luwian form.

Deciding which of the Hittite or Luwian forms is being used in any particular name is very difficult in Hieroglyphic. Usually we assume that the use of a writing with a phonetic complement eg. TONITRUS-tá must indicate the Luwian form.24 However, as unpalatable as it may sound, Empire period Luwian knows several writings that provide phonetic complements which apply not to the last syllable of a word, but to the first.25 The only

---

relevant available evidence from phonetic cuneiform writings is ambiguous. Tarḫu- is used in the name Tarḫuziti (Noms 1279) and Tarḫundaziti is also attested in a phonetic spelling (Noms 1271). The only writings of the name Tarḫundapiya (Noms 1267) in cuneiform which use phonetic complements do suggest that the Luwian form Tarḫunda was usual in this name: D10-ta-SUM-ia. However, it cannot be excluded that the tá in TONITRUS-tá- refers to the /Ta-/ of Tarḫu-, Tarḫunda- or Tarḫunna-, rather than to the /-ta-/ of Tarḫunda-, although the relatively few examples of initial phonetic complementation point the balance of probability in favour of a final syllable reference. The occurrence of a name written solely Tarhunna/ Tarhunza (i.e. TONITRUS-tá/tá), without occurring in composition with another noun, might lead us to suppose, on the contrary, that the final element refers to the initial syllable, but the only published examples of this phenomenon are of doubtful interpretation.26

Among the Storm-god names in Hieroglyphic the one that is complemented with -na-, if this is in fact the correct reading, is almost certainly Hittite: *Tarhunna(ssu).27 Here it is unclear if the su-element belongs to the name or is a logogram meaning “goodness”. This is frequently a problem. If it does belong to the name we have the Hittite *Tarhunnassu, unattested, “beloved by Tarḫunnna”, otherwise simply Tarhounda.28 A Luwian correspondent to *Tarhunnassu might be something like *Tarhundawasu. The name written TONITRUS-BONUS₂ could be Tarhuwas(su) (Hittite or Luwian), *Tarhundawasu (Luwian), *Tarhunnassu (Hittite) or possibly even a mixed Hittite-Luwian form *Tarhoundassu.29

Moving by way of digression over to Kaman-Kalehöyük some 100 km to the south-west of Hattusa, we also find a character whose name is written as TONITRUS-L. 318. The sign L. 318 is usually rendered as a logogram for Teššub, due to its occurrence in the writing of the divine name Teššub as L. 318-pa. Recent evidence from the Nişantepe royal seals suggests that this is in fact a syllabic value TAS(U), given the fact that the same sign is used to write the name Tašmi-Šarri on a seal of Tudhiya IV.30 Whether this

---

26 Hawkins apud Herbordt 2005: 286.
27 Dinçol and Dinçol 2008: 19.
28 The unprovenanced biconvex seal Hogarth 1920 no.311 has TONITRUS-na, with the -na written over to the left edge, and TONITRUS-BONUS₂ on the other side (Mora 1987: 142, who also sees a +ra/i, thus TONITRUS-su+ra/i). See also the seal from Hama with the woman’s name TONITRUS-na (Mora 1987: 178).
29 Trémouille 2006 records the name Tarhuwasu, with only one -s-, which may indicate a Luwian form: tar-hu-wa-su KBo 32.1 rev. 5, 9, 11 (Middle Script).
30 See Herbordt et al. 2011: 101–102. For another such hybrid name see perhaps *tar-hu-na-ŠEŠ-ıš for Tarhunananis, unless this is to be read *tar-hu-na-ŠEŠ-ıš, at KBo 32.198 obv. 6.
is ultimately a rebus for whatever the object was supposed to represent, possibly an axe, is not certain. The name of Teššub is thus not written TEŠŠUB-pa but TAS(U)-pa. Returning to our name from Kaman-Kalehöyük, this interpretation of the grapheme gives us a name TONITRUS-TAS(U). This may yield Tarhu(nd)-dassu, meaning “Tarhu(nd)-strong”, a bit like Hanti-dassu, “very strong” or Suppi-tassu, “pure-strong”, which should be Hittite, or it may give us the hybrid name *Tarhund-assu, which is now attested in the writing D10-ta-aš-šu. The latter is more likely.

4. Hittite Names in the Boğazköy Corpus

Using caveats such as these when determining the linguistic origin of a name, where this has precious little to do with the named person’s genetic background, and thus relying on phonetic elements to guide us, let us consider which names can be identified as Hittite among the Boğazköy seal-impressions. It is more economical to take the Hittite names, as these are by far the least. The name *Tarhunna(ssu) has already been discussed.

Atta, spelled á-tá, should be the Hittite word for “father”, as opposed to Luwian tati-, spelled tá-ti. However, the Hittite word was apparently used in Luwic circles relatively early, as the (hybrid?) name Madduwatta, sweet father, beside the wholly Luwian Maddunani, “sweet brother” may indicate.

The complex of names represented by the antler or stag includes the probably Luwian Kuruntiya or Runtiya, as opposed to the clearly Hittite Innara. Here the Hittite name, meaning “strength”, is complemented by Luwian annari- which is attested both as a hieroglyphic name and as a proper noun in cuneiform with a similar meaning. So stag or antler + phonetic complement -ra/i is Innara, whereas +ti is Runtiya. The cuneiform

---

31 Corti 2007: 114–115. I. Yakubovich points out to me that dassu-, if it is part of the name, would have to be Hittite not Luwian if the etymological connection to Latin densus is correct.
33 To treat these names as Luwian in origin implies not accepting the argument of van den Hout 2003 to the effect that Maddunani is an ethnonym, “Maenonian”, with the Lydian phonetic change /y/ > /d/. Admittedly, maddu- does mean “wine” in Luwian when attested as a substantive (Starke 1990: 191; Hawkins and Morpurgo-Davies 1986: 282; Melchert 1993: 144f.). Supporters of a Luwian interpretation of Maddunani and Madduwatta would need to assume that the meaning “wine” is a substantivised use of the adjective “sweet”, as per Starke 1990: 191 fn. 624. The older meaning may have been preserved in composition. See also Zehnder 2010: 194; Gordin 2008: 136 fn. 398; Yakubovich 2010: 91–92, with fn. 18.
record also gives us a name Hassuwas-Innara, literally "the stag-god, or protective deity of the king", where the Hittite word for king, hassu-", is also used, as opposed to the Luwian hantawati-. This corresponds to Hieroglyphic REX.CERVUS-ra/i.35

Remaining with kings we also have the name Hassuili written REX-li. It is unlikely that this refers to *Hantawatili, which is not attested, but rather it should correspond to cuneiform Hassuili (Noms 326), using the Hittite word hassu- "king".36

There are some doubts as to the phonetic realisation of the signs ASINUS2(A), particularly as to whether they correspond to Hittite/Luwian tarkasna-, "donkey".37 However, with these doubts firmly in mind, the alleged names Tarkasnatala and Tarkasnatalana, may use the Hittite suffix -(a)t(t)alla-, which has been convincingly explained as a Hittite reanalysis of forms using the Luwian derivational suffix in -alla/i-.38 This latter is preserved in cuneiform Tarkasnalli, the name of a king of Hapalla (Noms 1283), which is perhaps also attested in Hieroglyphic. In the second case -atala- has had another suffix added to it, -na-, which is again undetermined. The next form, however, Tarkasnatak(a)lana, appears even stranger. One might think of the possible Luwian suffix -(u)k(a)la-, found in the word for "great-grandson", hamsuk(a)la-, although strictly speaking this does not have to be Luwian.39

The name Zupari has also been supposed to be Hittite. It is alleged to correspond to Hitt. G18zupparu/i-, "torch", which has been suggested to be a borrowing from Akkadian dipāru.40 As a Luwian correspondent the

Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>ASINUS2(A)</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tarkasnali</td>
<td>ASINUS2A-li</td>
<td>BoHa 19:423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarkasnatali</td>
<td>ASINUS2A-ta-li</td>
<td>BoHa 19:428–439; BoHa 22:320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarkasnatala</td>
<td>ASINUS2A-ta-la-a</td>
<td>BoHa 19:425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarkasnatalana</td>
<td>ASINUS2A-ta-la-na</td>
<td>BoHa 19:426–427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarkasna X.LEO</td>
<td>ASINUS2A+ta X.LEO</td>
<td>BoHa 19:441</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35 SBo 2: 74; BoHa 19: 136; Hawkins apud Herfordt 2005: 256.
39 Yakubovich 2010: 257 fn. 65.
name Tupari, which would be the same word without the typically Hittite assibilation, has been offered.\(^{41}\) However, the element Tupa-, whatever it may mean, fits into its own group of suffixed and compound forms in names. We have Tupaziti (Bo 3:21), Tupari (BoHa 19:467), Tupana (SBo 2:27).\(^{42}\) Without a clearly Luwian lexical correspondent to \(^{(GIŠ)}\)zupparu/i- it is not clear that this is a peculiarly Hittite word, just as it is neither very likely that \(^{(GIŠ)}\)zupparu/i- is a direct borrowing from Akkadian dipāru.\(^{43}\)

With forty-five typically Luwian -ziti names, fifteen Runiya-names, twenty-four muwa-names and other clearly Luwian lexical elements, the Luwian names clearly outweigh the Hittite ones almost to the point of the Hittite being negligible.\(^{44}\) There are only seven possible cases of Hittite names:\(^{45}\) Atta, *Tarhunnassu, *Tarkasnatala, *Tarkasnatalana, Innara, Hassuwass-Innara, Hassuili. Two of these are doubtful: *Tarkasnatalana due to unclear derivation and Tarhunnassu due to reading, although Tarhunna would also be Hittite. *Tarkasnatala, whether the reading of the initial logogram

\(^{41}\) Hawkins apud Herbordt 2005: 276.

\(^{42}\) A similar range of forms is exhibited by the names which use the element á-na-: á-na-a (Anna, BoHa 19: 12–13) á-na-VIR.zi (Anaziti BoHa 19: 26, Taş and Weeden 2010), á-na-TONITRUS (Anatarhunda, BoHa 22: 107, reading J.D. Hawkins, read á-si-na Dinçol and Dinçol 2008: 34–35) á-na-mu-tà (SBo 2: 89), á-na-BOS (SBo 2: 176, 201 Anamuwua, possibly to be read as á-mu-na—suggestion J.D. Hawkins), á-na-CERVUS, (Anaruntiya, BoHa 22: 166), *507-á-na (certainly to be read Ana-507, BoHa 19: 91–93), á-na-ni (Anani BoHa 19: 14–17), á-na-BOS (Ananimuwa, BoHa 19: 18), á-na-ni-le (Ananimuwa, BoHa 19: 19), á-na-ri/i (Ananni Luw. lexical correspondent to Hitt. innara-, BoHa 19: 22–23). Thus, parallel to Tupaziti, Tupari, and Tupana we have a composition form Ana-, a derived noun in -ri-, and a derived noun in -ni-. Rather than an association with Hittite anna- “mother” (“presumably unconnected” Hawkins apud Herbordt 2005: 248), I would speculate that this element has something to do with the Luwian noun anña-, of unknown meaning (Melchert 1993: 12). A meaning “action, deed” would be appropriate in the names and for annari- “strength”, but is not secure. Further á-na-names: á-na-zì/a (BoHa 19: 24–25), á-na-tà-li (BoHa 22: 189), á-na-zì/a+ra/i (BoHa 22: 263), á-na-nì-zì/a (BoHa 19: 20–21).

\(^{43}\) Weitenberg 1984: 258; Schwemer 2006: 225 fn. 48. One might expect dipāru to give a Hittite *sipparu/i-. A Hurrian intermediary might be expected, but the word is thus far not attested in Hurrian (Otten 1971: 6).

\(^{44}\) These are only counted from among the 459 thus far credibly deciphered and unbroken names on seals from Boğazköy. There are many more which we cannot yet or will never be able to read completely, but which contain these elements.

\(^{45}\) The putative name *Kattasalli, ka-tà-sa-l[i] with title VIR.PI.LX, which could be Hittite using the second element -salli “great” (BoHa 22: 300g–h; Dinçol and Dinçol 2008: 61, interpreted as Hittura when Hurrian women’s names in -salli) might in fact better be read as ka-nì-sa-t[u] VIR.SUPER.MAG[NUS]. See also kà-nì-sa-tu SUPER.MAGNUS.VIR on BoHa 14: 192. The name is of unclear analysis. The name Hilamatti (PORTA-MI-ti, BoHa 22: 154, Dinçol and Dinçol 2008: 40) is not demonstrably Hittite, in that it is not clear that the Luwian word would not have been identical. On an i-mutating declension for hilammatti/a-, “courtyard attendant”, see Weeden 2011b: 128 fn. 75.
ASINUS$_2^{(A)}$ is correct or not, is likely to bear a suffix that has been identified as Hittite as opposed to Luwian. The most convincing examples of Hittite names among the seals from Boğazköy are thus either related to a god’s name, Innara and Tarhunna, or to the word for king, hassu-. This may fit the picture of a numerically dominant speech community, Luwian, with retention of prestige-words in names that echo the language of a dwindling ruling class. “King” is certainly prestigious, but the various donkey-related names do not have to be, although kings themselves also had names such as Luwian Tarkasnalli. One must remember, however, that the unknowns and unassignables are in the largest number.

To round this overview off with a further digression, let us consider another name, this time on a seal from Ortaköy-Šapinuwa. The seal is found in multiple impressions on around 32 clay objects, mostly bottle stoppers. It reads REL-a-zi/a and David Hawkins has suggested that this may in fact be a writing of the Hittite word for “woman”, thus Mrs Woman, which is attested in Luwian as wanatti-, wana-. The Hittite word for “woman” is always written logographically in cuneiform, with the nominative being written MUNUS-2a. Both most recent attempts to reconstruct what the underlying Hittite may have been, i.e. those of Harðarson (1987) and of Kloekhorst (2008: 501–550), have arrived at the same form for the nominative singular, although by different methods: *kwanz. It would appear that this is exactly what we have here, although written in Hieroglyphic. This would seem to be the regular Hittite as opposed to Luwian word for “woman”. It is not clear that any particular status attached to it.
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46 The seal will be published by the author in collaboration with Professor Aygül Süel.
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