

Luwian Identities

Culture, Language and Religion Between
Anatolia and the Aegean

Edited by

Alice Mouton
Ian Rutherford
Ilya Yakubovich



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2013

© 2013 Koninklijke Brill NV ISBN 978-90-04-25279-0

CONTENTS

Introduction	1
<i>Alice Mouton, Ian Rutherford and Ilya Yakubovich</i>	

PART ONE

PRESENT STATE OF THE LUWIAN STUDIES

Luwians versus Hittites	25
<i>J. David Hawkins</i>	
Peoples and Maps—Nomenclature and Definitions	41
<i>Stephen Durnford</i>	

PART TWO

LUWIAN COMMUNITIES OF CENTRAL ANATOLIA

Names on Seals, Names in Texts. Who Were These People?	73
<i>Mark Weeden</i>	
Anatolian Names in <i>-wiya</i> and the Structure of Empire	
Luwian Onomastics	87
<i>Ilya Yakubovich</i>	
Luwian Words in Hittite Festivals	125
<i>Susanne Görke</i>	
<i>CTH 767.7</i> —The Birth Ritual of Pittei: Its Occasion and the	
Use of Luwianisms	135
<i>Mary R. Bachvarova</i>	
‘Luwian’ Religious Texts in the Archives of Hattuša	159
<i>Daliah Bawanypeck</i>	

The Luwian Cult of the Goddess Huwassanna vs. Her Position in the “Hittite State Cult”	177
<i>Manfred Hutter</i>	

PART THREE

LUWIAN CULTURE IN SOUTH-EASTERN ANATOLIA

A Luwian Shrine? The Stele Building at Kilise Tepe	193
<i>Nicholas Postgate and Adam Stone</i>	
A New Luwian Rock Inscription from Kahramanmaraş	215
<i>Meltem Doğan-Alparslan and Metin Alparslan</i>	
Carchemish Before and After 1200 BC	233
<i>Sanna Aro</i>	

PART FOUR

LUWIAN AND LUWIC GROUPS OF WESTERN ANATOLIA

James Mellaart and the Luwians: A Culture-(Pre)history	279
<i>Christoph Bachhuber</i>	
The Cultural Development of Western Anatolia in the Third and Second Millennia BC and its Relationship with Migration Theories	305
<i>Deniz Sari</i>	
Luwian Religion, a Research Project: The Case of “Hittite” Augury ...	329
<i>Alice Mouton and Ian Rutherford</i>	
Hieroglyphic Inscriptions of Western Anatolia: Long Arm of the Empire or Vernacular Tradition(s)?	345
<i>Rostislav Oreshko</i>	
Greek (and our) Views on the Karians	421
<i>Alexander Herda</i>	

PART FIVE

CULTURAL CONTACTS BETWEEN LUWIAN
OR LUWIC GROUPS AND THE AEGEAN

Divine Things: The Ivories from the Artemision and the Luwian Identity of Ephesos	509
<i>Alan M. Greaves</i>	
Iyarri at the Interface: The Origins of Ares	543
<i>Alexander Millington</i>	
Singers of Lazpa: Reconstructing Identities on Bronze Age Lesbos	567
<i>Annette Teffeteller</i>	
Index	591

PART TWO

LUWIAN COMMUNITIES OF CENTRAL ANATOLIA

NAMES ON SEALS, NAMES IN TEXTS.
WHO WERE THESE PEOPLE?

Mark Weeden

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.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.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.

1. 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,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. *ḫumant-* vs. Luw. *puna-* “all”, Hitt. *suppi-* vs. Luw. *kumm(a)i-* “pure”;⁴
- 3) all grammatical elements must be able to be analysed as Luwian or Hittite rather than vice-versa: e.g. Hitt. *-talla-* vs. Luw. *-alli-*.

¹ Herboldt 2005; Dinçol and Dinçol 2008.

² Yakubovich 2010; van den Hout 2006.

³ Yakubovich 2010: 210–223.

⁴ Hawkins apud Herboldt 2005: 299.

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)+ra/i-nú-u* (SBo 2:138, BoHa 19:152);

cf. cuneiform ¹*i-ia-ri-nu* (*Noms* 437)

Logographic with phonetic complement: CERVUS-*tiKurunti(ya)*, CERVUS+*ra/i, Innara*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 Ispuṭaḫsu 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,

⁵ Hawkins apud Herbordt 2005: 290.

⁶ Hawkins apud Herbordt 2005: 251.

⁷ Gelb 1956 no. 1. Cuneiform ring: ¹riš-p[u-t]a-šu luḡal.gal dumu p[a]-ri-ia-wa-at-ri. Hieroglyphic centre: BONUS₂ TONITRUS REX VITA. Further literature at Yakubovich 2010: 287–288. Read as ¹iš-pu-t[a]ḫ-šu 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)SA

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-Gözlükale in the South and now from Oymağaç-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/I DOMINUS?); 362 (SOL[+RA/I] DOMINUS?); the title SOL+RA/I DOMINUS(?) has been supposed to be the equivalent of an unattested cuneiform *EN^{URU} *Arinna*, "lord of Arinna" (Hawkins

in cuneiform sources.¹³ 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.¹⁴

In Emar there is a character called ¹*Tuwariša* attested as the important official ^{lu}ugula kalam.ma “overseer of the land” on a cuneiform document.¹⁵ 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 ¹*Tu-wa-ri-ša* from Emar and hieroglyphic *tu-wa/i+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.

apud Herbordt 2005: 309). OyB 05/1 (SCRIBA) www.nerik.de, Czichon, Flender and Klinger 2006 Abb. 6; Gelb 1956:254, no. 65a, plate 404, 408.

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 (BONUS₂ SCRIBA), 39–41 (SCRIBA), 222 (signet, SCRIBA); Bo 3:16, 17; BoHa 19: 474–483 (SCRIBA, BONUS₂ 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 ¹*tu-wa-ri-ša* by the tablet’s editor, although the copy clearly has ¹*tu-wa-ri-it* (ibid. 306). The title ^{lu}ugula kalam.ma is equated with Hittite cuneiform EN KUR-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 *anduwassalli-*, Luwian *pitauri-*, is less plausible, in my view, as Iron Age hieroglyphic has the title with phonetic complements REGIO(-*ni/ni*)-(ia)-(si) (-)DOMINUS(-ia)-(i)-sa, see Hawkins 2000: 96. Unfortunately, *Tuwar(i)sa* 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 *thúrsos*.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 *thúrsos*, should they belong together, would have to be ^{GIS}*tarša-* “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 *thúrsos* 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).

¹⁸ Kloekhorst 2007; 2008: 29, 372, 486, 907.

¹⁹ *tara/i-sa-zi* SULTANHAN 6 §24 (Hawkins 2000: 470).

²⁰ At a guess one might entertain an etymological connection of **tuwarisa-/tuwarisanza* (?) with Hitt. ^{GIS}*tūri-* “weapon, stick”, as a pair of substantivized Luwian derived adjectives; possibly “the person associated with the stick”, “the (place) associated with the stick”. For *tūri-* 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)*tūri-* “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)sa* may be the reading of the scribal name ¹NU.^{GIS}KIRI₆. It is difficult to see how one might accommodate the Iron Age personal name at KARKAMIŠ A7j: ¹*tu-wa/i+ra/i-sà-i-sá* (Hawkins 2000: 129).

²¹ Yakubovich 2010: 147 suggests that Greek *thúrsos* and Luwian **tuwarsa-* are both borrowed from a third source due to the anomaly in the initial stops.

²² See Hawkins apud Herboldt 2005: 295.

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.

Cuneiform:²³*Tarhuan, Tarhula* (Capp.), *Tarhu(n)miya, Tarhumimma, Tarhumuwa, Tarhunani, Tarhunaniya, Tarhunnaradu, Tarhundaradu, Tarhundaziti, Tarhuni, Tarhundapiya, Tarhunpihanu, Tarhunu* (Capp.), *Tarhuntissa, Tarhunzili, Tarhuwa, Tarhuwasu, Tarhuziti, ^{D10}-manawa, ^{D10}-pihanu, ^{D10}-pihaya, ^{D10}-zalma, Asdu-^{D10}, Ku(n)zi-^{D10}-up, Lissa-^{D10}, Manapa-^{D10}, Musisipa-^{D10}, Pihā-^{D10}, Sapala-^{D10}, ^fSarra-^{D10}, Tapala-^{D10}, Ura-^{D10}, DU-^{D10}, ìR-^{D10}, ^{D30}-^{D10}, ^{D10}-ti/TI*

Hieroglyphic:

Table 1.

TONITRUS?- <i>la</i>	<i>Tarhula?</i>	SBo 2:114	Cf. <i>Noms</i> 1255 (Capp.)
TONITRUS- <i>lî-i</i> [(<i>a</i>)]	<i>Tarhu(nda)lîya?</i>	SBo 2:163	
TONITRUS-BOS, BOS+MI-TONITRUS	<i>Tarhu(nda)muwa</i>	SBo 2:231, Bo 3:34, BoHa 22:314	cf. <i>Tarhumuwa</i> , HKM 57 obv. 15
TONITRUS- <i>ma-na</i> [- <i>wa/i</i>]	<i>Tarhu(nda)-manawa?</i>	BoHa 19:414	<i>Noms</i> 1259
TONITRUS-FRATER ₂	<i>Tarhu(nda)nani</i>	BoHa 19:410–412	<i>Noms</i> 1261
TONITRUS- <i>na</i> '(- <i>su</i>)	<i>Tarhuna(su)?</i>	BoHa 22:5	
TONITRUS- <i>ta_x-mi</i>	<i>Tarhu(nda)mi (?)</i>	BoHa 19:413	
TONITRUS- <i>tâ</i> /PUGNUS?- <i>mi</i>		BoHa 22:177, 231, 274, 275, 277, 321, 322, 327, 276, 278, 279	
TONITRUS-(^f <i>tâ?</i>)- <i>pi- ha-nu</i>	<i>Tarhu(nda)pihanu</i>	BoHa 19:422	<i>Noms</i> 1276
TONITRUS(- <i>tâ</i>)- <i>pi-i(a)</i>	<i>Tarhu(nda)piya</i>	SBo 2:23, 24, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145; Bo. 3:10; BoHa 19:418–420; 85/n?	<i>Noms</i> 1267
TONITRUS.URBS-CER- VUS- <i>ti</i>	<i>Tarhuntassa-Runtiya(?)</i>	BoHa 19:421	
TONITRUS(- <i>tâ?</i>).URBS- <i>lî</i>	<i>Tarhundassili(?)</i>	BoHa 22:18	
TONITRUS-LEO ₂	<i>Tarhu(nda)walwi (?)</i>	BoHa 22:142	
TONITRUS-VITIS ² - <i>i(a)?</i>	<i>Tarhu(nda)wiya/ Tarhu(nd)i(ya)?</i>	834/w	
TONITRUS-BONUS ₂	<i>Tarhu(ndaw)asu</i>	SBo 2:116–121, 210; BoHa 22:71	<i>Noms</i> 1278
TONITRUS(- <i>tâ</i>)-VIR- <i>zi</i>	<i>Tarhu(nda)ziti</i>	SBo 2:69–71; BoHa 22:201, 242	<i>Noms</i> 1271, 1279

²³ Compiled from Laroche 1966 (*Noms*); Laroche 1981; Trémouille 2006.

Table 1. (*cont.*)

TONITRUS-tà/MANUS	<i>Tarhunda(?)</i>	BoHa 22:29	
TONITRUS.REX		Bo 5:30, 31	
MAGNUS-TONITRUS	<i>Uratarhunda</i>	SBo 2:55	<i>Noms</i> 1441
TONITRUS-L. 419	<i>Urhiteššub</i>	BoHa 19:504–508	<i>Noms</i> 1443
TONITRUS?-li-li		Bo 5:10	
zi/a-wa/i-TONITRUS	<i>Zawatarhunda?</i>	BoHa 19:531–532	
ASINUS-TONITRUS?		SBo 2:214	
á-ha-TONITRUS	<i>Ahatarhunda?</i>	BoHa 19:1	
á-na*-TONITRUS	<i>Anatarhunda?</i>	BoHa 22:107	
LUNA-TONITRUS	<i>Armatarhunda?</i>	SBo 2:22; BoHa 22:163B	
á-zi/a-TONITRUS	<i>Azatarhunda?</i>	SBo 2:146–147; BoHa 19:82–87; BoHa 22:214	
i(a)-HALA-TONITRUS	<i>Ehliteššub</i>	BoHa 19:104	<i>Noms</i> 225
i(a)-pari-TONITRUS	<i>Evriteššub</i>	BoHa 19:135	
TONITRUS.HALPA-CER-VUS ₂₋₃	<i>Halparuntiya</i>	BoHa 19:108–110	
TONITRUS.HALPA-AVIS	<i>Halpasulupti?</i>	BoHa 19:111	<i>Noms</i> 256
TONITRUS.HALPA-VIR.zi	<i>Halpaziti</i>	SBo 2:56–58; BoHa 19:112; 76/22	<i>Noms</i> 259
i(a)-ni-TONITRUS	<i>Initeššub</i>	BoHa 19:150–151	
la? mi TONITRUS x		BoHa 19:200	
pi-ha-TONITRUS	<i>Pihatarhu(nda)</i>	BoHa 19:305–307	<i>Noms</i> 971
si-ti-TONITRUS	<i>Šintiteššub?</i>	BoHa 19:385	

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

²⁴ Hawkins apud Herbordt 2005: 295.

²⁵ VIR.ZI/A = *ziti*; MONS.TU = *tudhaliya*; *277.LA = *labarna*. Hawkins 1995: 111.

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/tà*), 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 *Tarḫunna*”, otherwise simply *Tarhunna*.²⁸ A Luwian correspondent to **Tarhunnassu* might be something like **Tarhundawasu*. The name written TONITRUS-BONUS₂ could be *Tarhuwas(s)u* (Hittite or Luwian), **Tarhundawasu* (Luwian), **Tarhunnassu* (Hittite) or possibly even a mixed Hittite-Luwian form **Tarhundassu*.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 Tudhaliya 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: ^l*tar-ḫu-wa-šu* KBo 32.1 rev. 5, 9, 11 (Middle Script).

³⁰ See Herbordt *et al.* 2011: 101–102. For another such hybrid name see perhaps ^l*tar-ḫu-na-ŠEŠ-iš* for *Tarhunananiš*, unless this is to be read ^l*tar-ḫu-na*ŠEŠ-*iš*, 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(nda)-dassu*, meaning “*Tarhu(nda)*-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.³¹ 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*.³² 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.³³

The complex of names represented by the antler or stag includes the probably Luwian *Kuruntiya* or *Runtiya*, as opposed to the clearly Hittite *Innara*.³⁴ 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.

³² BoHa 19: 76–77. Hawkins apud Herbordt 2005: 251.

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, “Maeonian”, 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.

³⁴ BoHa 19: 137–140; Hawkins apud Herbordt 2005: 290; Yakubovich 2010: 80 fn. 5; Weeden 2011a: 263–268.

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 ASINUS_{2(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. ^{GIŠ}*zupparu/i-*, “torch”, which has been suggested to be a borrowing from Akkadian *dipāru*.⁴⁰ As a Luwian correspondent the

Table 2.

<i>Tarkasnali</i>	ASINUS _{2A} - <i>li</i>	BoHa 19:423
<i>Tarkasnatali</i>	ASINUS _{2A} - <i>tâ-li</i>	BoHa 19:428–439; BoHa 22:320
<i>Tarkasnatala</i>	ASINUS _{2A} - <i>tâ-la-a</i>	BoHa 19:425
<i>Tarkasnatalana</i>	ASINUS _{2A} - <i>tâ-la-na</i>	BoHa 19:426–427
<i>Tarkasnatakalana?</i>	ASINUS _{2A} - <i>tâ-ka-la-na?</i>	BoHa 19:424
<i>Tarkasna</i> X.LEO	ASINUS ₂ + <i>a?</i> X.LEO	BoHa 19:441

³⁵ SBo 2: 74; BoHa 19: 136; Hawkins apud Herbordt 2005: 256.

³⁶ BoHa 19: 114; Hawkins apud Herbordt 2005: 254.

³⁷ Hawkins apud Herbordt 2005: 295–296.

³⁸ Melchert 2005: 456.

³⁹ Yakubovich 2010: 257 fn. 65.

⁴⁰ BoHa 19: 535. Laroche 1966: 340; Otten 1971: 6; Hawkins apud Herbordt 2005: 279.

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 *Runtiya*-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*, *Hassuwas-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 *Anamuwa*, possibly to be read as *á-mu-na*—suggestion J.D. Hawkins), *á-na-CERVUS₂* (*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-ni-BOS* (*Ananimuwa*, BoHa 19: 18), *á-na-ni-LEO* (*Ananiwalwi* BoHa 19: 19), *á-na+ra/i* (*Annari* 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 *āna-*, 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-zi/a* (BoHa 19: 24–25), *á-na-tà-li* (BoHa 22: 189), *á-na-zi/a+ra/i* (BoHa 22: 263), *á-na-ni-zi/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.PLX*, which could be Hittite using the second element *-salli* “great” (BoHa 22: 300g–h; Dinçol and Dinçol 2008: 61, interpreted as Hurrian after Hurrian women’s names in *-salli*) might in fact better be read as *ka-ni-sa-t[u]* *VIR.SUPER.MAG[NUS]*. See also *ká-ni-sa-tu* *SUPER.MAGNUS.VIR* on BoHa 14: 192. The name is of unclear analysis. The name *Hilamati* (*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-Şapinuwa. The seal is found in multiple impressions on around 32 clay objects, mostly bottle stoppers.⁴⁶ 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-*za*. 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.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Beekes, R.S.P., 2010. *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*, Boston – Leiden.
- Beran, Th. et al., 1957. *Bogazköy 3. Funde aus den Grabungen 1952–1955*, Abhandlungen der deutschen Orientalgesellschaft 2, Berlin.
- Boehmer, R.M. and Güterbock, H.G., 1987. *Glyptik aus dem Stadtgebiet von Boğazköy. Grabungskampagnen 1931–1939, 1952–1978*, Boğazköy-Ḫattuša 14/2, Berlin.
- Carruba, O., 1990. "The Name of the Scribe", *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 42, 243–251.
- Corti, C., 2007. "The so-called 'Theogony' or 'Kingship in Heaven'", *Studi micenei ed egeo-anatolici* 49, 109–121.
- Czichon, R.M., Flender, M. and Klinger, J., 2006. "Interdisziplinäre Geländebegehung im Gebiet von Oymaağac-Vezirköprü/Provinz Samsun", *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orientalgesellschaft* 138, 157–197.

⁴⁶ The seal will be published by the author in collaboration with Professor Aygül Süel.

- Dinçol, A.M. and Dinçol, B., 2008. *Die Prinzen- und Beamtensiegel aus der Oberstadt von Boğazköy-Hattuša vom 16. Jahrhundert bis zum Ende der Grossreichszeit*, Boğazköy-Hattuša 22, Mainz.
- Ebeling, E., 1939. *Die Eigennamen der mittellassyrischen Rechts- und Geschäftsurkunden*, Leipzig.
- Gelb, I.J., 1956. "Hittite Hieroglyphic Seals", in: H. Goldman (ed.), *Excavations at Gözli Kule, Tarsus 2. From the Neolithic through the Bronze Age*, Princeton, 242–254.
- Gordin, Sh., 2008. *Scribal Families of Hattuša in the 13th Century BCE*, M.A. Dissertation, Tel Aviv University.
- , 2010. "A Scriptorium of Mahhu(z)zi, MAGNUS.SCRIBA in the reign of Tudhaliya IV", in: Süel, A. (ed.), *VII. Uluslararası Hititoloji Kongresi Bildirileri, Çorum 25–31 Ağustos 2008—Acts of the VIIth International Congress of Hittitology, Çorum, August 25–31, 2008*, Ankara, 319–340.
- Güterbock, H.-G., 1942. *Siegel aus Boğazköy 2. Teil: Die Königssiegel von 1939 und die übrigen Hieroglyphensiegel*, Archiv für Orientforschung Beiheft 2, Berlin.
- , et al., 1975. *Boğazköy V. Funde aus den Grabungen 1970 und 1971. Ausgrabungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft und des Deutschen Archäologischen Institutes*, Abhandlungen der deutschen Orientgesellschaft 18, Berlin.
- Harðarson, J.A., 1987. "Das uridg. Wort für 'Frau'", *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 48, 115–137.
- Hawkins, J.D., 1995. *The Hieroglyphic Inscription of the Sacred Pool Complex at Hattusa. With an Archaeological Introduction by Peter Neve*, Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten Beiheft 3, Wiesbaden.
- , 2000. *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luvian Inscriptions, Volume. I: Inscriptions of the Iron Age*, Berlin.
- Hawkins, J.D. and Morpurgo-Davies, A., 1986. "Studies in Hieroglyphic Luvian", in: Hoffner, H.A. and Beckman, G.M. (eds), *Kaniššuar. A Tribute to Hans G. Güterbock on his seventy-fifth Birthday, May 27, 1983*, Assyriological Studies 23, Chicago, 69–81.
- Hawkins, J.D., Morpurgo Davies, A. and Neumann, G., 1973. "Hittite Hieroglyphs and Luvian. New Evidence for the Connection", *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. I. Philologisch-Historische Klasse* 1973/6, 143–197.
- Hawkins, J.D. and Weeden, M., 2011. "The Hieroglyphic Rock Inscription of Malkaya. A New Look", *Anatolian Archaeological Studies* 17, 241–249.
- Herbordt, S., 2005. *Die Prinzen- und Beamtensiegel der hethitischen Grossreichszeit auf Tonbullens aus dem Nišantepe-Archiv in Hattusa—mit Kommentaren zu den Siegelinschriften und Hieroglyphen von J. David Hawkins*, Boğazköy-Hattuša 19, Mainz.
- Herbordt, S., Bawanypeck, D., Hawkins, J.D., 2011. *Die Siegel der Grosskönige und Grossköniginnen auf Tonbullens aus dem Nišantepe-Archiv in Hattusa*, Boğazköy-Hattuša 23, Darmstadt-Mainz.
- Hogarth, D.G., 1920. *Hittite Seals*. Oxford.
- Hout, Th. van den, 2003. "Maenonien and Maddunašša: zur Frühgeschichte des Lydischen", in: M. Giorgieri et al. (eds), *Licia e Lidia prima dell'ellenizzazione: atti del Convegno internazionale (Roma, 11–12 ottobre 1999)*, Rome, 301–310.
- , 2006. "Institutions, Vernaculars, Publics: The Case of Second-Millennium Anatolia", in: S.L. Sanders (ed.), *Margins of Writing, Origins of Cultures*, Chicago, 217–256.
- Kloekhorst, A., 2007. "The Hittite Syllabification of PIE *CuR and *KUR", in: D. Groddek and M. Zorman (eds), *Tabula Hethaeorum, Hethitologische Beiträge Silvin Košak zum 65. Geburtstag*, Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie 25, 455–457.
- , 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*, Leiden.
- Laroche, E., 1966. *Les noms des Hittites*, Études linguistiques 4, Paris.
- , 1981. "Les noms des Hittites: Supplément", *Hethitica* 4, 3–58.
- Melchert, H.C., 1993. *Cuneiform Luvian Lexicon*, Lexica Anatolica 2, Chapel Hill.
- , 2005. "The Problem of Luvian Influence on Hittite", in: G. Meiser and O. Hackstein (eds), *Sprachkontakt und Sprachwandel. Akten der XI. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, 17.–23. September 2000, Halle an der Saale*, Wiesbaden, 445–459.

- Mora, C., 1987. *La glittica anatolica del II millennio A.C.: Classificazione tipologica. Vol 1: I sigilli a iscrizione geroglifica*, Studia Mediterranea 6, Pavia.
- Otten, H., 1971. *Materialien zum hethitischen Lexikon*, Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 15, Wiesbaden.
- Schwemer, D., 2006. "Lehnbeziehungen zwischen dem Hethitischen und dem Akkadischen", *Archiv für Orientforschung* 51, 220–234.
- Singer, I., 2011. "The Historical Context of Two Tell Nebi Mend/Qadeš Letters", *Kaskal* 8, 161–175.
- Starke, F., 1990. *Untersuchungen zur Stammbildung des keilschrift-luwischen Nomens*, Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 31, Wiesbaden.
- Taş, İ. and Weeden, M., 2010. "A Stele of Prince Anaziti in the Yozgat Museum", *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 130.3, 349–359.
- Trémouille, M.-Cl., 2006. *Répertoire onomastique*. Istituto di Studi sulle Civiltà dell'Egeo e del Vicino Oriente – CNR. www.hethiter.net.
- Tsukimoto, A., 1992. "Akkadian Tablets in the Hirayama Collection (III)", *Acta Sumerologica Japan* 14, 289–310.
- Weeden, M., 2011a. *Hittite Logograms and Hittite Scholarship*, Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 54, Wiesbaden.
- , 2011b. "Hittite Scribal Schools outside of Hattusa?", *Altorientalische Forschungen* 38/1, 116–134.
- Weitenberg, J.J.S., 1984. *Die hethitischen u-Stämme*, Amsterdam.
- Yakubovich, I., 2010. *Sociolinguistics of the Luvian Language*, Leiden – Boston.
- Zehnder, Th., 2010. *Die hethitischen Frauennamen. Katalog und Interpretation*, Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie 29, Wiesbaden.