ISMEO
ASSOCIAZIONE INTERNAZIONALE
DI STUDI SUL MEDITERRANEO E L'ORIENTE

SERIE ORIENTALE ROMA

FONDATA NEL 1950 DA GIUSEPPE TUCCI

DIRETTA DAL 1979 DA GHERARDO GNOLI

NUOVA SERIE

Vol. 33

R O M A
ISMEO
2022

Roberto Dan, Rita Francia, Marie-Claude Trémouille

Studia Hethitica, Hurritica et Urartaica

Vol. 1

Layout by Priscilla Vitolo

CONTENTS

VI

PREFACE

This volume marks the beginning of a new series within the frame of the Serie Orientale Roma, and it is dedicated to the study of the ancient civilizations that flourished between Asia Minor and the Armenian Highlands, the latter intended as the territories comprised among Eastern Turkey, modern Armenia and North-Western Iran. The Studia Hethitica, Hurritica et Urartaica *have been thought as a series of miscellaneous volumes, without a set periodicity, aimed at the study of different aspects of the Hittite, Hurrian and Urartian civilizations. The issues that this series intends to address are related to philology, linguistics, architecture, and material culture of the three civilizations, with a marked diachronic approach, and a special consideration for the analysis and study of the elements, presumed or substantial, of commonality among them. Despite chronological and territorial discrepancies, Hittites, Hurrians and Urartians are connected by a common thread, as is easily perceived by aspects related to the linguistic and iconographic sphere. The intent of the series is to dedicate a privileged space to the discussion of these relevant aspects, where to host contributions from established scholars, as well as from younger scholars, both Italian and international. To guarantee the scientific quality of the contributions, a specific scientific committee composed by some of the most relevant Italian scholars devoted to the considered civilizations has been set. The present volume contains twelve contributions. These include the publication of new epigraphic studies on Hittite inscriptions, the presentation of two unpublished Urartian cuneiform texts, researches on linguistics and philology, as well as works related to the analysis of ancient toponyms and, more in general, to problems of historical geography. There are also contributions relating to specific archaeological areas, and iconographic analyses. The work of the three editors is particularly deserving, and it is the result of years of collaboration, sharing of scientific paths and diversified professional experiences. In essence, this new series of miscellaneous volumes constitutes a new space for the presentation of research relating to the Hittite, Hurrian and Urartian civilizations, filling a relevant gap in the current panorama of scientific publishing, and ISMEO is glad to host it among its editorial series.*

ADRIANO V. ROSSI
President of ISMEO

FOREWORD

The new series beginning with this volume, entitled Studia Hethitica, Hurritica et Urartaica 1 (SHHU 1)*, was conceived as a place dedicated to a detailed study of historical, philological, and archaeological themes, connected directly and indirectly with the Hittite, Hurrian, and Urartian civilizations. This series of miscellaneous works will not have a stable periodicity, even if we will try to publish a volume every two years. The series is designed to give space both to established scholars, as well as to young scholars, both Italian and international. The idea of developing this series of publications was born from the discussions and comparisons that we had the opportunity to debate during a series of in-depth courses on the Urartian civilization, hosted within the Hittitology course at the Sapienza University of Rome. The continuous sharing of views and knowledge regarding the three civilizations, objects of the series, and the possibility of finding elements of contact and comparison, brought into being the development of the idea that sees the light today. The volume collects twelve contributions, ranging from historical geography to philology and from material culture to archaeology, with a diachronic perspective. This project, undoubtedly ambitious, a first space designed exclusively for the study and systematic comparison of the civilizations of Asia Minor and of the Armenian Highlands, would not have seen the light if it were not for the support of the ISMEO - The International Association for Mediterranean and Oriental Studies, and its president, Prof. Adriano Rossi, who allowed the inclusion of this and the following books within the prestigious Serie Orientale Roma (SOR), and for these reasons we sincerely thank. We also want to thank the scholars who agreed to be part of the scientific committee of the series, conferring prestige to this publication with their presence, their careful review and supervision. At the same time, we would like to thank Priscilla Vitolo for the excellent layout of the contributions.*

ROBERTO DAN, RITA FRANCIA, MARIE-CLAUDE TRÉMOUILLE

CONTRIBUTORS

Natalia Bolatti Guzzo
University of Naples Suor Orsola Benincasa

Annarita Stefania Bonfanti
PhD candidate at Pavia University/ISMEO

Roberto Dan
Tuscia University/ISMEO

Tommaso De Vincenzi
Sapienza University of Rome

Virna Fagiolo
PhD candidate at Roma Tre University/Sapienza University of Rome

Massimo Forlanini
Independent researcher

Rita Francia
Sapienza University of Rome/ISMEO

Federico Giusfredi
University of Verona

Kenan Işık
Independent researcher

Behrouz Khanmohammadi
PhD candidate at Bu-Ali Sina University; Administration of Cultural Heritage, Handicrafts and
Tourism of West Azerbaijan Province, Urmia, Iran

Massimiliano Marazzi
University of Naples Suor Orsola Benincasa

Valerio Pisaniello
University of Verona

Massimo Poetto
Emeritus, University of Bari

Marie-Claude Trémouille
ISMEO

FOREIGNERS AND FOREIGN NAMES
IN ANATOLIAN HIEROGLYPHS

FEDERICO GIUSFREDI, VALERIO PISANIELLO[1]

1. INTRODUCTION

The integration of foreign proper names into texts in Anatolian hieroglyphics and the Luwian language—the result, in its various historical declinations, of linguistic and cultural contacts—manifests itself in different ways in the distinct phases and diverse contexts of the 2nd and 1st millennia BCE.

Second millennium foreign proper names are usually found in glyptics, while royal inscriptions in this period are mostly relatively untouched by this phenomenon, due to the type of texts for which hieroglyphics were used (royal inscriptions, mainly of Hittite kings). In general, it is difficult to give a picture of the society or the sociolinguistics underlying the foreign anthroponomastic evidence in glyptics; it seems reasonable to conclude that the names seen on seals reflect the complex coexistence of different demographic components during the central and final centuries of the Hittite capital's history.[2] However, this does not imply that the existence of Hurrian or Luwian names should be taken to indicate the presence of social and linguistic minorities strictly corresponding to their languages of origin, given the centuries-long coexistence of different onomastic traditions found in mixed societies of every time and place.[3]

[2] On the presence of Hurrians in the Hittite capital, see Klengel 1999: 110-111; Yakubovich 2010: 276-277, with references to previous bibliography.

[3] Examples of mixed proper names within single cultures are found in different ages in various parts of the ancient Mediterranean. In the Near East there are cases where the phenomenon was undoubtedly caused by actual demographic change, e.g. in the recently studied spread of

The situation appears to have been more complex in the Iron Age, for which a greater number of texts of more varied kinds are known. Although the 1st millennium Luwian culture appears in some ways epigraphically closed, highly impermeable to the use of the Neo-Assyrian cuneiform script and open only to local Western Semitic epigraphic cultures (for example the bilingual Luwian-Phoenician texts from Cilicia and the use of Luwian names in Aramaic texts from Sam'al), recent studies have shown that this closure was primarily linked to the identity significance of the use of the Anatolian hieroglyphic writing system for monumental inscriptions. Two aspects in particular should be borne in mind, which are in conflict with the image of the Luwian-Syro-Anatolian hieroglyphic world as a closed epigraphic system. First, there is an evident opening to the Semitic world, not only in the demographically or culturally mixed societies of Cilicia and kingdoms such as Sam'al and Bit Adini, but also in the "Luwian" centres *par excellence* such as Karkemiš, where at the beginning of the 8th century the regent Yar(i)ris claimed to know the languages of Tayma (Aramaic?) and Tyre (Phoenician).[4] Furthermore, in the 1st millennium corpus the presence of loanwords and foreign terms has also been recognized in the common vocabulary, with varying degrees of morphological and phonological adaptation (Giusfredi 2012).[5] Although there may be debate over the interpretation of individual contact phenomena, it is undeniable that overall there was considerable permeability. It is therefore not surprising that a notable quantity of non-Luwian onomastic material is found in Iron Age texts; however, to date no study has been made of the phenomenon as a whole.[6] Names adapted from other languages are in any case of great interest, both from a historical perspective (because in some cases they may indicate the presence of foreigners among the populations of certain Syro-Anatolian city-states) and linguistically, since they may provide comparisons regarding the adaptation tendencies identified for the linguistic loan of common words. Whilst not making any claim to completeness, in this article we examine a representative sample of anthroponyms of foreign origin from the 2nd and 1st millennium BCE *corpora*. A taxonomy of their adaptation strategies is then proposed. Lastly, we make some observations regarding the presence of foreigners, with particular reference to the social and cultural demography of Iron Age Syrian-Hittite city-states.

Amorite personal names in the Old Babylonian period (Streck 2000). Other situations, such as the survival of Sumerian names, again in Middle Bronze Age Mesopotamia, depend upon cultural influence and traditions rather than being linked to speakers' linguistic identities (Stol 1991: 197-198, who also reveals the existence of names "translated" from Sumerian into Akkadian).

  [4] KARKEMIŠ A15b, cf. Hawkins 2000, 131.

  [5] Additional studies of loanwords and foreign terms have been conducted recently; these include a suggestion by Yakubovich (2016) that the term *ka-mara/i-* should be identified with the Akkadian *gammalu* (or *gammālu*), "camel." Several loanwords are recognized in the lexicon eDiAna (https://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary.php).

  [6] Bibliographical references are given below, in the sections dealing with individual names.

2. Foreign Anthroponyms in the Bronze Age

With regard to the 2nd millennium hieroglyphic corpus, the reliably foreign onomastic material mostly comes from the Hurrian language. Given the level of linguistic and cultural intermixing that occurred between the Hittite and Hurrian worlds in the capital Ḫattuša during the Late Bronze Age, together with the well-known occurrence of double personal names—certainly as far as members of the royal family were concerned—it should be borne in mind that officials who bore Hurrian names documented by hieroglyphic sources were not necessarily Hurrian, but rather members of a society that was demographically and linguistically complex.

2.1 *a₂-ki-i(a)*

Occurring on seal no. 2 in the Herbordt catalogue (2005), the name is a Hurrian hypocoristic, corresponding to Agi-Teššub (§2.2) or another theophoric name with *agi-* as its first member (Laroche 1966: 349; de Martino 2010: 134).

2.2 **a-ki-TEŠUB-pa*

(= Agi-Teššub): Hurrian theophoric name attested in *ki-TEŠUB-pa-'* (ALEPPO 1, 2) and *ki*-TONITRUS (seal stamp on tablet RS 19.78 = ᵐ*a-ki-*ᵈ10 in Akkadian text) (Laroche 1960: 229, no. 446). The first part of the name is the Hurrian verb *ag-* "to raise" (de Martino, Giorgieri 2008: 29-36); the name thus means "Teššub has raised" (cf. also the hypocoristic *a₂-ki-i(a)*, §2.1).

2.3 *a-sa-mu-ha-pa*

(= Ašmu-Ḫepa): Hurrian theophoric name attested on seal no. 11 of the Herbordt catalogue (2005). The meaning of the first part of the name, traceable to the root *ažm-*, is not clear (de Martino, Giorgieri 2008: 127).

2.4 *a₂-na-ni*

Hurrian hypocoristic name attested on several seals, also in the form *na-ni₃* on a seal from Alacahöyük (Hawkins 2005: 248-249), which probably does not constitute genuine apheresis, but was motivated by lack of space (Melchert 2019: 360, fn. 13). The element *anani* is found in various theophoric names and is explained as the imperative of the root *an=an-*, ultimately derived from *an-* "delight" (de Martino, Giorgieri 2008: 82-85).

2.5 *a-sa-mi-SARMA*

(= Ašmi-Šarruma): Hurrian theophoric name composed of an element derived from the root *ažm-*, of uncertain meaning, and the theonym Šarruma. The name is attested on seal no. 75 in the Herbordt catalogue (2005).

2.6 *a-sa-ma-ia

The name appears on the ANKARA Silver Bowl as *sa-ma-ia-'* (with the so-called *initial-a-final*) and seems to be a variant of the name *aš-mi-ya*, attested in a contract from Emar (Arnaud 1987: no. 11). It would therefore be a Hurrian hypocoristic name based on the root *ažm-* (cf. §2.5).

2.7 *i(a)-hi-li-i(a)*

(= Ehliya): hypocoristic of a theophoric name containing the imperative of the Hurrian verb *eġl-* "to save" as its first member, attested at Emar (Laroche 1981).

2.8 *i(a)-hala/i-SARMA*

Hieroglyphic rendering of the Hurrian name Ehli-Šarruma, attested on a seal from the Nişantepe archive (Bo 90/534, cf. Herbordt 2002: 55, no. 4). The name is composed of the imperative of the root *eġl-* "to save" plus the theonym Šarruma (= "Save, Sarruma!"). The person in question is probably the son of Ari-Šarruma, king of Išuwa.[7]

2.9 *i(a)-hala/i-TONITRUS*

Hieroglyphic writing of the Hurrian name Eḫli-Teššub (perhaps in the form with apocope and anaptyxis, Eḫel-Teššub), attested on seal no. 104 in the Herbordt catalogue (2005: 131). The first member of the name is the imperative of the Hurrian root *eġl-* "to save": the meaning of the name is thus "Save, Teššub!" (Giorgieri 2000: 288). It is doubtful that the sequence *ia-hi-la-ti-sa-pa-* in the inscription KARKAMIŠ A7 represents a rendering of this name (§3.2.2).

2.10 *i(a)-ni₃-TONITRUS*

Hieroglyphic writing of Ini-Teššub, an important king of Karkemiš in the 13th century BCE, occurring in several seal stamps on tablets from Emar, Ugarit and the Nişantepe archive.[8] It is a Hurrian theophoric name composed of the noun *ini*, *eni* "god" and the name of the Storm-god Teššub. It is possible that *i(a)+ra/i-TONITRUS* in the KARAHÖYÜK inscription represents a variant of this name with rhotacism (§2.13).

---

[7] Cf. Herbordt 2002: 57, with previous bibliography.

[8] On the seals of Ini-Teššub see especially d'Alfonso 2001, with additions by Herbordt 2002 on the Nişantepe seals. For non-hieroglyphic attestations of this name see also Laroche 1966: 79-80.

2.11 *i(a)-pari-SARMA*

Hieroglyphic rendering of the Hurrian theophoric name Evri-Šarruma (= "Šarruma is lord"), attested on seals nos. 133 and 134 of the Herbordt catalogue (2005).

2.12 *i(a)-pari-TONITRUS*

Attested on seal no. 135 in the Herbordt catalogue (2005), it is the hieroglyphic writing of the Hurrian name Evri-Teššub, composed of the Hurrian term *evri* "lord" and the theonym Teššub (= "Teššub is lord").

2.13 *i(a)+ra/i-TONITRUS*

(= Ir-Teššub? Ini-Teššub?): the name is attested in the KARAHÖYÜK inscription and belonged to a 12th century BCE ruler whose connections with members of the Karkemiš dynasty are unclear.[9] Although a Luwian reading of the name, Yarri-Tarhunta, cannot be entirely ruled out, it seems more likely that it is a theophoric name of Hurrian origin based on the name of the Storm-god Teššub. With regard to the first member, a plausible interpretation would be /ir/, given that the name Ir-Teššub is known from both Hittite texts and those from Alalakh, although identifying the exact Hurrian root poses some problems. Hittite texts include [m]*ir*-[d]10-*ub*, [m]DU-[d]10-*ub*, and [m]SUM-[d]10-*ub* (Laroche 1966: 221; Hawkins 1988: 105, no. 38) as variants of the name, although these are not easily reconcilable, since the correspondence between the logograms DU and SUM and the phonetic reading *ir* would be unusual.[10] The best solution suggested so far is perhaps that of Miller (2007: 131), according to which the logogram SUM represents the Hurrian verb *ar(i)*- "to give," while DU should be read as GUB, corresponding to Hittite *ar*- "to stay," used by Hittite scribes instead of Hurrian *ar(i)*-. Ir-Teššub (or Er-Teššub) is thus a variant of the name Ari-Teššub, the meaning of which is "Teššub gave (it)" or "Give, Teššub!"[11] More recently, though, Simon (2013) has suggested that *i(a)+ra/i-TONITRUS* may represent a rhotacised variant of the name Ini-Teššub (§2.10),[12] indicated as "king of the land of Hatti" in the annals of the Assyrian king Tiglat-Pileser I (*c.* 1100 BCE).[13] Both hypotheses are plausible, and, based on the evidence currently available, it is impossible to choose between them.

---

[9] According to Bryce (2012: 85-87), this could be one of the sons and successors of Ku(n)zi-Teššub, but there is no direct evidence of such kinship.

[10] Theoretically, the sign IR could also be interpreted as a logogram, but the attestations from Alalakh, where the use of logograms in personal names seems to be limited to a few theonyms, suggest that it may be phonetic in nature (cf. Hawkins 1988: 105, no. 38). Furthermore, the Luwian *i(a)+ra/i-TONITRUS* might represent additional evidence in favour of a phonetic understanding of IR, as long as this interpretation of it is correct.

[11] On the structure of these names cf. Giorgieri 2000: 285-286.

[12] On rhotacism in Luwian, see above all Melchert 2003b: 179-182; Rieken, Yakubovich 2010.

[13] RIMA 2, A.0.87.3, 26-28; A.0.87.4, 28-30.

2.14 *ku-ti*-TONITRUS

(= Ku(n)ti-Teššub): the name *ku-ti*-TONITRUS is attested in five seal stamps on a tablet that probably comes from Meskene/Emar (ASJ 14, 307 46), whose cuneiform text gives the equivalent ᵐ*ku-un-ti*-ᵈ10(-*ub*) and ᵐ*ku-un-ti*-ᵈIŠKUR (Hawkins 1988: 99, no. 1; 2000: 574; Poetto 2004).[14] This is a theophoric name of Hurrian origin; the meaning of the first part is unknown, but probably derived from the well-known Hurrian root *kund*- (Richter 2012: 224). The fact that on this tablet Kunti-Teššub is indicated as son of Talmi-Teššub, king of Karkemiš, led to the initial supposition that the name Kunti-Teššub was a variant of Ku(n)zi-Teššub (§2.15), mentioned as son of Talmi-Teššub in seal stamps on the *bullae* of LIDAR. This is possible, but assumes that the Hurrian roots *kund*- and *kuz*- (or *kunz*-, if Kuzi-Teššub is to be understood as a variant of Kunzi-Teššub) are both variants of one another, which seems quite unlikely.[15] A possible hypocoristic of this name is *ku-ti-i*(*a*) (§2.16).

2.15 *ku-zi/a-TEŠUB-pa*

(= Ku(n)zi-Teššub): this name identifies a 2ⁿᵈ millennium BCE king of Karkemiš, son of king Talmi-Teššub (§2.29), occurring in the hieroglyphic legend of a seal stamp on the *bullae* of LIDAR as *ku-zi/a-TEŠUB-pa* and in inscriptions from İSPEKÇÜR, GÜRUN and KÖTÜKALE as *ku-zi*-TONITRUS. It is a theophoric name, the second part of which is Teššub, the Hurrian name of the Storm-god. This suggests a Hurrian interpretation of the first component, *kuzi*-, which however is not entirely clear. The cuneiform legend of the seal stamp on the LIDAR *bullae*, where the name is written ᵐ*ku-zi*-ᵈ*te-šub*, seems to confirm the form /kuzi/, but in KBo 43.51, 11' ᵐ*ku-un-zi*-ᵈ10-*ub* is found, which is perhaps a variant of the same name,[16] the first member of which is derived from the Hurrian verb root *kunz*- "to kneel."[17] If instead Kuzi-Teššub should be explained as a different name from Kunzi-Teššub, the base of the first element might be the Hurrian verb root *kuz*- "to hold back," as Hawkins suggests (2000: 575).[18] The hypothesis that the name is a variant of Ku(n)ti-Teššub should be probably excluded (§2.14).

---

[14] The name is perhaps also present in the letter Emar 267, 1.

[15] Cf. Hawkins 1988: 99, no. 1, Hawkins 2000: 575 and Poetto 2004: 514 (who considers Kunti-Teššub to be the brother of Kuzi-Teššub).

[16] The name is also perhaps present in KUB 23.29, 11 (but the reading ᵐ*ku-zi*-ᵈ10-*up* is rather uncertain) and 13 ([…-*z*]*i*-ᵈ10-*ub*), KUB 21.7 iii 12' ([…-*u*]*n-zi*-ᵈ10-*ub*), KBo 10.7+ iv 14-16 ([…]x-*zi-it-te-eš-šu-u-pa*) and KuSa I/1 10 obv. 9' ([…-*z*]*i*-ᵈ10-*ub*).

[17] Cf. Salvini 1991: 179, no. 24. For this root see also Richter 2012: 223-224.

[18] For this root cf. Richter 2012: 229.

2.16 *ku-ti-i(a)*

Name attested on a late-Imperial period seal of unknown provenance, published by Poetto (2004), who interpreted it as Ku(n)tiya, hypocoristic of Ku(n)ti-Teššub (§2.14).

2.17 *pa-ti-si-na*

Name of a scribe attested in the inscription BOĞAZKÖY 8 (Poetto 1987), interpreted by Hawkins (2005: 268) as Bentešina and composed of two Hurrian terms, *penti-* "just" and *šena-* "brother."

2.18 *pi-ti-SARMA*

Attested on a number of seals (Herbordt 2005), it is a Hurrian theophoric name, whose first part *pi-ti-* should probably be interpreted as *penti* "just" (= "Šarruma is just") (Hawkins 2005: 268).

2.19 *pi-ti-TEŠUB-pa*

Theophoric name, probably to be understood as Benti-Teššub, "Teššub is just" (cf. §2.18).

2.20 *pu-hi-si-ni*

Attested on two seals in the hieroglyphic forms *pu-ha-si-na* and *pu-hi-si-ni* (Gonnet 1992), it is the rendering of the Hurrian name *Puhi-šeni*, well-known at Nuzi (Gelb, Purves, MacRae 1943: 116-117), composed of *puhi-*, meaning unknown (unlikely to be a loan of the Akkadian *puhu* "substitute"), and *šena-* "brother."

2.21 *pu-tu-ha-pa*

Name of the queen Puduḫepa, wife of Ḫattušili III, attested in hieroglyphic writing on a number of seals and in the FRAKTIN inscription. It is a Hurrian name, meaning "Ḫepat bore (her)."[19]

2.22 *sa₃-mi-ka-tal*

Name of a scribe attested on three potsherds from Tell Fray (Archi 1980). The name is composed of the theonym Šimegi and Hurrian *adal* "strong" (= "Šimegi is strong").

---

[19] On the structure and meaning of this name cf. Giorgieri 2000: 287.

2.23 *sa₃-ta₃-tu-ha-pa*

(= Šadanduḫepa): name of the first wife of Tuthaliya III, found on two *bullae* from Maşat (Dinçol et al. 1993: 91-92). In the first part of this theophoric name the Hurrian root *šad-* "to give back, replace" may be recognized (de Martino 2010: 133).

2.24 *sa₃+US-ka-si-na*

Rendering of the Hurrian name Šaušgašena, attested on a seal in the Ipek collection (van den Hout, Akdoğan 2013: 44). The name appears to be composed of the theonym Šaušga and the Hurrian term *šena* "brother" (= "Šaušga is (my) brother"). The sequence *sa₃[+US-ka]-si-na* has recently also been restored by Peker (2018) on a seal from Kayalıpınar (Kp 15/157).

2.25 *si-ti-*TONITRUS

Likely hieroglyphic writing of the name Šinti-Teššub (cf. Šintip-Teššub at Nuzi; Gelb, Purves, MacRae 1943: 135), of which the first element has not been reliably identified (it is unlikely to be *šind-*, root of the numeral "7"). The name is attested on seal no. 385 in the Herbordt catalogue (2005).

2.26 *ta₂-ki-*SARMA

Rendering of the Hurrian name Tagi-Šarruma, found on several seals from Nişantepe and Ugarit, belonging to an individual identified by his titles as a prince (REX.FILIUS) and head of the scribes (MAGNUS.SCRIBA; Herbordt 2002: 57). The name is composed of *tagi* "luminous, radiant" (Richter 2012: 428-429) and the theonym Šarruma (= "Šarruma is radiant").

2.27 *ta₃ʔ-ki-TEŠUB-pa*

Theophoric name of likely Hurrian origin attested on seal no. 404 in the Herbordt catalogue (2005). The hieroglyph <ta₃> would seem to exclude the possibility that the first member is *tagi* "luminous" (cf. e.g. §2.26).

2.28 *tal-mi-*SARMA

(= Talmi-Šarruma): name of a king attested in the inscription ALEPPO 1, son of Telipinu, first Hittite king of Aleppo. The first member of this Hurrian theophoric name is *talmi-* "great" (= "Šarruma is great").

2.29 *tal-mi-TEŠUB-pa-*

(= Talmi-Teššub): name of a 2ⁿᵈ millennium BCE king of Karkemiš, father of king Kuzi-Teššub (§2.15), attested on a seal stamp on the *bullae* of LIDAR, with legend in hieroglyphic and cuneiform. The name, a theophoric of Hurrian

origin, is composed of *talmi-* "great" (Richter 2012: 432-435) plus the theonym Teššub.[20] The meaning of this name is thus "Teššub is great."

2.30 *ta$_x$-nu-ha-pa*

Name of a Hittite queen, probably wife of Muršili II, attested on a number of seals from the reign of this and subsequent kings (Muwattalli II and Muršili III/Urḫi-Teššub).[21] It is a Hurrian name meaning "Ḫepat made her."[22]

2.31 *ta$_3$-tu-ha-pa-'*

Name of the author of the inscription of EĞRIKÖY, unfortunately too fragmentary to be dated (Hawkins 2000: 495-496). This is a well-known Hurrian name, Taduḫepa (although written with the sign <ta$_3$>, suggesting that it was instead Daduḫepa), whose meaning is "Ḫepat loved (her)."[23] The same name (written *ta$_x$-tu-ha-pa*) also identifies the second wife of king Tuthaliya III, present on a cruciform seal from Boğazköy (Dinçol et al. 1993).

2.32 *ti-ha-TEŠUB-pa*

Theophoric name of Hurrian origin that occurs on various seals, including the one stamped on a tablet found at Ras Shamra/Ugarit (RS 17.137), the cuneiform text of which reads ᵐ*ti/te-ḫi-*ᵈIŠKUR (= Teḫi-Teššub). The first part of the name is a form of the verb *teġ-* "to raise"; the meaning is therefore "Teššub raised (him)" (Giorgieri 2000: 286).

2.33 *ti-li-SARMA*

(= Tili-Šarruma): theophoric name attested on various seals (Hawkins 2005: 275). The meaning of the element *tili-* is unclear; it is usually distinguished from the root *til-* "to knock down, trample" (Richter 2012: 459).

2.34 *ti-li-[…]*

(= Tili-[Teššub]): the fragmentary name *ti-li-[…]* is found on the hieroglyphic seal stamp on tablet RS 17.137 from Ugarit, whose cuneiform text contains the name ᵐ*ti-li-*ᵈIŠKUR (cf. §2.33).

---

[20] For other occurrences of this name cf. Laroche 1966: 172.

[21] Cf. SBo I, nos. 42-44. For a wide-ranging discussion of the question of Danuḫepa's identity see van den Hout 1998: 44-53.

[22] See Richter 2012: 436-438 for the Hurrian root *tan-*.

[23] For the Hurrian root *tad-* cf. Richter 2012: 451-453. On the structure of the name see Giorgieri 2000: 287 and de Martino 2010: 133.

2.35 *ur-hi₂-TEŠUB-pa*

Hurrian name of the king Muršili III, attested on a number of seals. The first part of this theophoric name is the Hurrian noun *urġi* "certainty" (= "Teššub is (my/his) certainty") (Giorgieri 2000: 290).

3. IRON AGE ANTHROPONYMS

The situation in the 1ˢᵗ millennium BCE is markedly different with respect to the Late Bronze Age. First of all, the onomastic material comes from a wide and diversified area, including Southeast Anatolia and North-Central Syria, and exhibits a real mix of Anatolian and Semitic elements; the former are perhaps restricted to the *élite* in many instances. In this case these mixed personal names definitely mirror demographic diversification, the result of the presence of North-Western Semitic elements throughout the Levant, and contacts with the Mesopotamian world. The status of the few names that are instead of Hurrian origin should be interpreted as Luwian from an emic perspective, since they appear to be the legacy of a Luwian-Hittite onomastic tradition dating to the final stages of the 2ⁿᵈ millennium BCE.

3.1 Semitic Names

3.1.1 *a-mu-*

Son of *Walinaya*, referred to on the stele of CEKKE, §17 (Hawkins 2000: 146). The father's name could be Anatolian (although the sequence °*a-ya-* coincides with the Semitic adjectival ending seen for example in §3.1.6). The son's name, in Luwian, seems to coincide with the first person pronoun, which would be extremely unusual and improbable from a typological perspective. If it is Semitic, the name could be a kinship term frequently employed in Amorite onomastics (*H/ʿammu-* "uncle").

3.1.2 *ara/i-pa-*

It is the name of the official, priest or leader who dictated the inscription ALEPPO 2 §1, §25. The name of this figure, who declares himself a worshipper of the god Tarhunta and the moon deity of Harran, could be Anatolian and be linked to the word family that according to Puhvel is connected to the adjective *arpa-* "unfortunate (*vel sim.*)" (HED A, s.v. *arp-*). Links with the rare anthroponyms from Greek inscriptions in Asia collected together by Zgusta (1964: 88)—Αρβησσις, Αρβησσις, Αρβασις, whose origin is in any case unclear—remain uncertain. However, the name *a-ra/i-pa-* could be Semitic and coincide

with *Araba'u*, attested as an anthroponym e.g. in ABL 273, rev. 2, ABL 1244 rev. 7, etc.[24]

3.1.3 *ha-mi-ya-ta* and *ha-mi-ya*

The first anthroponym, Hamiyata, is variously attested in the Aleppo and Tell Ahmar area.[25] Giusfredi (2012) has proposed *'ammi-Addu* ("Adad is the paternal uncle"). Younger (2016: 142) suggests the more convincing reading *'ammi-yaṭa'* ("the paternal uncle saved"), which would explain the missing notation of the voiced dental consonant with TA$_3$ in the hieroglyphic rendering of the name Adad. Its relation or possible identification with the second anthroponym, Hamiya—attested only in the schematic shorthand context of a piece of lead strip: KULULU lead strip 1 (line 6)—remains uncertain. Given the nature of this find, it is possible that the name is a hypocoristic version of the previous one.

3.1.4 *ha-pi+ra/i-*

Attested on a piece of lead strip from KULULU (lead strip 1, §3), this name is associated with that of a certain *Nu-* (perhaps a *Lallname* or a hypocoristic), without there being any explicit relationship between the two (although they participate in the same barley registration/allocation/consignment, and might belong to the same household). This person comes from Tuna, or more precisely (in one occurrence) from "Upper Tuna," SUPER+*RA/I-sa tu-na-sa*(URBS), probably a centre in Anatolia (which may have been the site of Kululu itself).[26] This provenance makes the name particularly interesting due to its evident assonance with the term *habiru*, which starting from the Middle and Late Bronze Age referred to nomads (largely from the area of Syria) who from the time of the Mittani hegemony onwards seem to have become integrated into settlements in Hurrian-Amorite Syria. It should be made clear that although the name *Habiri*(*ya*) does in fact derive from the Semitic denomination *habiru*, this does not imply that the person who bore it was of Semitic origin, since the anthroponym could have been an old form in use in "Hurrianized" Late Bronze Age Syria, where Luwian was an adstrate language from the 15th/16th century BCE, if not earlier. Mention should also be made of the name Hapiri, documented in the Maşat corpus (HKM 48 obv. 3, 5), which Hoffner (2009: 182) also links to the same Semitic origin outlined above.

---

[24] Both *Ar$_2$-ba-ia* (ABL 273 rev. 2) and *Ar-ba-a*(-*a*) (ABL 1108 rev. 15, 1244 rev. 7) are attested in duplicate or parallel texts, indicating that they are alternative writings of a single name.

[25] For the various attestations and the difficulties associated with reconstructing this family, cf. Hawkins 2000: 224-225.

[26] Weeden 2010: 44; cf. the observations of Hawkins 2000: 425.

3.1.5 *ka-mara/i-*

According to Yakubovich (2016: 87) the noun *ka-mara/i-* attested in the letters of ASSUR constitutes a loanword based on the Akkadian *gammalu* (or *gammālu*), meaning "camel." The hypothesis appears solid both formally and from a historical perspective, which offers the possibility of analysing the anthroponym *Kamari-* present on the stele of CEKKE §17. It seems unlikely that this name should be interpreted as a primitive name, and thus identical to the word for the animal, but rather more plausible that it is a form contracted from the genitival adjective *kamari*(*ya*)- "of the camel > camel driver" (Giusfredi 2020a).

3.1.6 ni_x-*nu-wa/i-ya-*

As suggested by Giusfredi (2020b), this name, attested in KARKEMIŠ A11b+c §2, seems unlikely to have belonged to the Luwian leader of a rebel group in Karkemiš, as has been suggested in the past (Hawkins 2000: 78-81, 104), but rather to a generic adversary. Although the historical interpretation of the text still poses problems, the most convincing formal correspondence is with Assyrian *Ninuāyu*. It may be compared with the anthroponyms $CRUS_2$-nu_2-*wa/i* and $CRUS_2$-nu_2-*wa/i$_3$* in the *corpus* of seals from Nişantepe (Hawkins 2005: nos. 281-286, 287-289), although the initial phonetic of these remains uncertain.

3.1.7 *pa+ra/i-ki-pa-*

The rendering of the name Bar-Rākib on the king's ring presents no unexpected or problematic characteristics. However, the apparent *a* stem makes little sense, so *pa+ra/i-ki-pa-sa* should instead be considered a genitival adjective. This is not typical of Luwian seals, but is rather a calque on Semitic forms with the preposition *l* followed by a personal name, attested in other seals from Bar-Rākib: *lbrrkb bn pnmw* (attested three times, in seals B8, B9 and B10; see also Tropper 1993: 152).

3.2 Names of Hurrian Origin

3.2.1 *ara/i-ya-hi-na-* and *ha-pa-ti-la*

Names of two rulers of the same dynasty referred to in TELL AHMAR 1, §1. Although Tell Ahmar—with its double denomination of Bit Adini and Masuwara/i (a Semitic name, plus one of Anatolian aspect)—should probably be considered one of the towns with mixed Luwian-Aramaic demography in the style of Sam'al/Yadiya, the name Ariyahina is certainly not Semitic, and it is not easy to parse as Luwian. The link with *Hapatila* makes a Hurrian attribution attractive, because it might hide a tie with Habadili, a Luwian derivative of the

Hurrian name Hebat (derivation from the Luwian *ḫabadi-* "river" would seem less likely), or even the entirely Hurrian sequence Hebat-tilla (Dalley 2000: 80). A Hurrian reading of Ariyahina would however remain problematic: although anthroponyms with *Ari-* are not uncommon in the 2nd millennium corpus (de Martino, Giorgieri 2008: 97-101), the second part of the name would still be obscure.

3.2.2 *ia-hi-la-ti-sa-pa-*

This name is attested in the inscription KARKAMIŠ A7, next to the image of the individual, indicated in the text as one of Kamani's brothers. The component *-ti-sa-pa-*, which may probably be interpreted as /tispa/, corresponds to the Hurrian name of the Storm-god, Teššub (cf. -TONITRUS-*pa* in the name *ma-li-i*-TONITRUS-*pa-*, §3.2.4). This would suggest a Hurrian origin also for the first part of the name, *ia-hi-la-*, which however is not attested elsewhere, unless *ia-hi-la-ti-sa-pa-* is to be explained as a variant of the name Eḫli-Teššub/Eḫel-Teššub (§2.9).[27] In this case we should imagine a secondary breaking of /e/ into /ja/, attested perhaps in the loanword ("*464")*sa-ri+i-ia-si-* (ANCOZ 4), probably "eunuch," from the Akkadian *ša rēši* (but cf. Giusfredi 2012: 157 for a different explanation).

3.2.3 *i-si-ka+ra/i-ti-sa-pa-*

Name of one of Kamani's brothers in the inscription KARKAMIŠ A7, a theophoric name composed of the name Teššub, in the form /tispa/ (§3.2.2), and the element *i-si-ka+ra/i-*, of uncertain interpretation. It might be connected with the Hurrian term *eš-kar-ri* (KUB 27.38 iv 9), *iš-ga-ri* (KUB 32.52 iii 14'), of unknown meaning.

3.2.4 *ma-li-i*-TONITRUS-*pa-*

Name of one of Kamani's brothers in the KARKAMIŠ A7 inscription. It is a theophoric containing the name of the Storm-god which, on the basis of the phonetic complementation, is to be identified with Hurrian Teššub, probably to be read /tispa/ as in the names *ia-hi-la-ti-sa-pa-* (§3.2.2), *i-si-ka+ra/i-ti-sa-pa-* (§3.2.3) and *tara/i-ni₂-ti-sa-pa-* (§3.2.5), which occur in the same inscription. The first part *ma-li-i-* is thus presumably of Hurrian origin, although its interpretation remains uncertain.

3.2.5 *tara/i-ni₂-ti-sa-pa-*

Name of one of Kamani's brothers in the inscription KARKAMIŠ A7, composed of the Hurrian theonym /tispa/, e.g. Teššub (§3.2.2). A Hurrian origin for the first part of this name, *tara/i-ni₂-*, is plausible, although its interpretation

---

[27] According to Hawkins (2000: 129), this hypothesis should probably be discarded.

is problematic: it could be connected to the Hurrian term *tari* "fire" (cf. *tarinni*, of unknown meaning; Richter 2012: 444-445) or maybe derive from the putative root *tarn-*, not yet attested with certainty (Görke 2010: 137).

4. Uncertain Anthroponyms

In this section we consider a series of anthroponyms that do not appear to be Luwian and thus might plausibly have a different (albeit obscure) linguistic origin. Absent from this list of uncertain forms are what are known as *Lallnamen*, phonologically simple names such as *La-*, *Nu-*, *Ni-*, *Taia-*, etc. The category is well represented in the texts on lead strips from KULULU. Since in these cases it is basically impossible to identify a language of origin (although more than probable that some are diminutives of real names), they have not been included in this inventory.

4.1 *a₂-wa/i+ra/i-ku-* and *wa/i+ra/i-i-ka-*

The two names Awariku- and Wra(i)ka- from KARATEPE 1 (Hu. §2 // [Ho. §2]) and ÇİNEKÖY (§§1, 2), initially considered variants of a single name, are now treated (Simon 2017a) as different names. Neither of the two appears to be Luwian. Greek links have been hypothesized for both, including Εὐαρχός for the former, and Ῥοῖκός and Ῥάκιος (mythical father of Mopsus and king of Caria, with implications for those who wish to imagine that a Greek dynasty existed in Iron Age Cilicia) for the latter. Hurrian hypotheses have also been advanced (Lemaire 1997), but seem to have little basis.[28] Simon (2017a) proposes a Luwian origin. Overall, the origin of the two names, in any case not strictly Luwian, remains obscure. In this regard, it is worth noting that Pirozzi and Pisaniello (2016) proposed the reading of the ethnonym *vrekes*, indicating the Phrygians, in the Phrygian tablet from the Persepolis Fortification Archive: if their proposed analysis were correct, the form could underlie the variant *wa/i+ra/i-i-ka-* at least.

4.2 *ha-ni-*

Attested twice in the same strip from KULULU (lead strip 1, §4, §9). Formal analysis poses difficulties. Although comparable Anatolian roots exist (*hann(a)-* "contend legally," or *hanna-*, "grandmother"), neither seems to be a good candidate for derivation. Comparable names are not known among 2ⁿᵈ millennium documents from Cappadocia (the name 'Ania,[29] already attested in the Old Assyrian period, is female), and a Semitic origin is unlikely overall.

---

[28] As noted by Simon (2017a), the attempt to see the Hurrian component *evri-* "lord" in the first part of the name Awariku- is unconvincing.

[29] CCT V, 14b, 22; VAT 13528, 37.

4.3 *hi-li*-CERVUS

(= Hiliruntiya?): this name, recorded thus in the *Annotated Corpus of Luwian Texts* by Yakubovich, is based on the reading by Bossert (1955), who identified it with the ruler of Malatya recorded in Urartian sources as [m]*hi-la-ru-a-da* (*c*. 780-760 BCE).[30] The only alleged attestation of this name is in the KÖTÜKALE inscription, at the beginning of the second line, clearly determined by DEUS[31] and followed by the genealogy and epithets of this person, said to be the "grandson/descendent of Kuzi-Teššub(?), the great king, […] son of PUGNUS-mili, lord of the land of the city of Malizi."[32] It should however be noted that (1) the first line of the inscription consists of a list of deities, some of which have not been reliably identified,[33] (2) the same textual structure, with a list of gods at the beginning, and the same genealogy, are also found in the better preserved inscription of GÜRÜN, whose author is identified by the single logogram CERVUS (= Runtiya).[34] It therefore seems preferable to follow the interpretation by Hawkins (2000: 300) and divide the sequence (DEUS)*hi[?]-li*-CERVUS. (DEUS)*hi[?]-li* (cautiously transliterated by Hawkins as (DEUS)x x) would thus close the list of deities with which the text starts, while the logogram CERVUS would identify the inscription's author, the same as GÜRÜN.

4.4 *ku+ra/i-ti-*

Following Simon (2017b), the name Kurti-, found in texts from the area of Hisarcık and Bozca (HISARCIK 1, §§1-2, 5; BOHÇA §2), as well as on a strip from KULULU (lead strip 1, §§4, 9), might be Phrygian and derive from the toponym Gordion. Less compelling is the observation that the Assyrian name Gurdî could not have been transmitted to Akkadian from Luwian, due to the initial consonants in this language becoming voiceless (Simon 2017b: 115). The fact that Luwian eliminated the voicing of initial consonants and therefore could not render them graphically in hieroglyphs does not mean that a foreign name written with a sign for a voiceless sound was not pronounced, in speech, using a voiced one.

---

[30] Cf. CTU A 8-3 ii 6 (Argišti I), A 9-1 obv. 22, 28 (Sarduri II), A 9-4, 2 (Sarduri II).

[31] Although partially damaged, the signs DEUS and *li* are clearly visible in the photographs published by Hawkins (2000: pl. 139), while the identification of the second sign with *hi*, less evident in the pictures, is plausible based on the handcopy (pl. 140). However, the possible presence of this name also at the beginning of line 5, in the genitive case (x-x-CERVUS-*sa₅*, cf. ACLT), is not supported by the traces of the first two signs.

[32] ⌜*ku-zi*-TONITRUS-*sa₅*⌝(?) MAGNUS.REX |IN[FANS].NEP[OS … || PUGNUS-*mi-li* |INFANS.*NI MAₓ.LIₓ.ZI*(URBS) REGIO.DOMINUS.

[33] (MAGNUS.DEUS)… (DEUS)… (DEUS)TONITRUS[?] (DEUS)*sa₃* (DEUS)CAELUM[?] (DEUS)*142. For a review of the various proposed readings and interpretations of these theonyms, see Hawkins 2000: 300.

[34] (MAGNUS.DEUS)TONITRUS (MAGNUS.DEUS)*hi-pa-tu₂* (MAGNUS.DEUS)*SARMA* CERVUS *ku-zi*-TONITRUS-*sa₅*||MAGNUS.REX |INFANS.*NI*.NEPOS HEROS *kar-ka-mi-i-si-sa₅*(URBS) PUGNUS-*mi-li* |(INFANS)[*ni*]||-*mu-wa/i-za MAₓ.LIₓ.ZI*(URBS) REGIO.DOMINUS.

4.5 *mu-ka-sa*

The name *Muksa* (present in KARATEPE 1 Hu. §21/Ho. §21 and Hu. §58 / Ho. §58; ÇİNEKÖY §1) has been associated in the literature with that of the Greek mythological figure Mopsus, a seer aligned with the Trojans in the Homeric saga, and son (in some versions of the myth) of the mythical king of Caria Ῥάκιος (see above, 4.1).[35] If this identification is correct, the alternation between variants with /p/ and /k/ might be due to an original labiovelar consonant; identification of the name Mopsus with the Mycenaean MO-QO-SO attested at Knossos and Pylos (KN X 1497 and PY Sa 774) would support this.[36] However, the two variants, Mopsus and *muksa-*, must both have survived, given that the labial form appears in the Phoenician text in the bilingual KARATEPE 1 inscription, whereas the Luwian version contains the form with a velar consonant,[37] a circumstance that remains difficult to explain. If the name was that of a historical king, it is difficult to imagine that it survived in two variants, but less problematic to suppose the existence of traditional variants for a mythological character. To these (by now familiar) considerations concerning the Greek evidence (which may have preceded or followed diffusion into Anatolia) may be added the attestation of the name *Muksos* at Tumulus MM of Gordion (Liebhart, Brixhe 2009). Although the authors' position is substantially in favour of a Greek derivation, if the name (whatever its origin) had links with the Phrygian sphere, the hypothesis of a Phrygian reading of the anthroponyms *a₂-wa/i+ra/i-ku-* and *wa/i+ra/i-i-ka* (§4.1) would acquire a certain merit.

4.6 *pa-pi* and *pa-pi-ta₃-ti*

Notwithstanding their very simple forms, in which they resemble *Lallnamen*, the names *Papi-* (CEKKE §17) and *Papidati-* (KARKAMIŠ A4a §2), the first perhaps a hypocoristic version of the second, are included in this review due to the existence of an Anatolian kinship term *papa-* "father," Palaic equivalent of the Hittite *atta-* and Luwian *tadi-*. If this analysis is correct, the names in question are relics of a language that disappeared in the Bronze Age, incidentally preserved in the Luwian tradition.

---

[35] This identification has often been suggested, first by Alt 1948; for an overview see Gander 2012: 297.

[36] Following Gander (2012: 301-302), it may be noted that the name Mopsus does not seem to be demonstrably Greek. Thus the influx of the loss of the labiovelar may have been indirect, secondary and limited to just part of the tradition.

[37] On the complex question of the alternation between consonants, see the study of Oettinger (2008), which also examines the supposed precursor represented by the form Mukšu in cuneiform Hittite (in the letter of Madduwatta; cf. Forlanini 1996: 14; Tekoğlu, Lemaire 2000: 983-985 for the connection between the Bronze Age name and the occurrences in ÇİNEKÖY), and the excellent overview and discussion in López-Ruiz (2009: 492).

4.7 *sa-hwa/i-*

This name is found only in the inscription of ŞIRZI (§1) and designates the father of its author, *ru-ti-CERVUS$_3$-*ia*- (= Runtiya).[38] This figure may probably be identified with ᵐ*šá-hu-*, indicated in Urartian sources as the father of Hilaruada, king of Malatya (§4.3). The name might thus be Sahui or Sahu,[39] of uncertain etymology, although a Luwian origin is possible (cf. Luwian *šahu*(*i*)-, of uncertain meaning).[40]

4.8 *sa$_5$-ka+ra/i-*

Name of a king of Karkemiš (*c.* 870-848 BCE),[41] a probable ancestor of Kamani, recently attested in fragment KH.15.O.690,[42] which completes the upper part of the inscription KARKAMIŠ A31+. The name was previously known from Assyrian sources of the period of Assurnasirpal II and Salmanassar III,[43] which provide the readings ᵐ*sa-an-ga-ra*, ᵐ*sa-ga-ra*, ᵐ*sa-an-gar* and ᵐ*sa-an-ga-ar*. The origin of the name is unknown.

4.9 *si-ka-ra+a-*

This name occurs in the inscription KARKAMIŠ A7 and belongs to one of Kamani's brothers. Its interpretation and origin are uncertain, but there may perhaps be a connection with the Hurrian root *šeg=ar-*, of unknown meaning, which is attested in the name Šegar-Teššub (cf. Schwemer 2001: 470).[44] The form of the name and date of the inscription (late 9ᵗʰ-early 8ᵗʰ century BCE) exclude the identification of this individual with the king of Karkemiš Sangara (*c.* 870-848 BCE),[45] known from Assyrian sources and recently also attested in hieroglyphic (§4.8).

---

[38] The first sign in this name, now correctly identified as *ru* after close examination of the original (Dillo 2013: 338-339), was initially taken to be *417 (*su*, *sa$_x$*). The interpretation of the name as Runtiya is perhaps preferable to Runtiruntiya, proposed by Dillo 2013 (cf. Simon 2014: 152, no. 1).

[39] The use of the hieroglyphic sign *hwa/i* does not necessarily constitute evidence in favour of the first hypothesis: cf. *hwa/i-zi/a-i(a)* for Huzziya in the seal Bo 90/560 and the verb *hwa/i-hwa/i-sa$_3$-* "to run, march," written *hu-ha-sa$_3$-* in TELL AHMAR 6.

[40] Known only in KBo 29.37, 3 (nom. pl. *ša-hu-i-zi*), but possible base of *šahuihuiššuwal*(*i*)-, *šahuidāla-*, and *:šahuidara-*, all of uncertain meaning (cf. CLL: 184).

[41] Cf. Bryce 2012: 93.

[42] Cf. Peker 2016: 47 and Marchetti, Peker 2018: 95-96.

[43] RIMA 2, A.0.101.1 iii 65; A.0.101.80; A.0.101.90; RIMA 3, A.0.102.1, 55', 67'; A.0.102.2, i 43, 53, ii 19, 27, 82; A.0.102.6 ii 55, 69; A.0.102.8, 30', 35'; A.0.102.10 ii 46, 52; A.0.102.14, 85; A.0.102.16, 67', 72'; A.0.102.70.

[44] See also Watson 2010, who connects to the same root the term *šekaru* (and *šekaruhhu*), the name of a metal container attested at Nuzi and perhaps Ugarit (*šgr*, *škr*), and maybe also the personal name *ṯqrn*.

[45] Cf. Hawkins 2000: 129.

4.10 *ta-i-ta-*

This name is attested in the inscriptions of MEHARDE, SHEIZAR, and ALEPPO 6 (in the last of these as *ta₂-i-ta₂*-), and designates a king of P/Walas(a)tin of uncertain date. According to Steitler (2010: 94-95), Taita is a Hurrian name, composed of *tahhe* "man" and the unclear element *-ta*, also found in Nuzi onomastics. On this basis, Steitler suggests the identification of Taita with Toi (*TʿY*), king of Ḥamath in 2Sam 8, whose name comes from the Hebrew **Tāʿy*, interpreted as an abbreviation of the Hurrian name *Tahhe=ta*. The main obstacle to this interpretation (apart from the obscure nature of the element *-ta*), is the unexpected lack of Hurrian /h/ in the hieroglyphic adaptation of the name, where we would expect **ta-hi-ta-* instead (see below). According to Hawkins (2011: 52), the name Taita may be compared with Tette, the name of the ruler of Nuhašše contemporary with Šuppiluliuma I, whose origin is however uncertain (but presumably Hurrian). More recently, Čech (2015) has proposed that Taita might be the Luwian rendering of the (etymologically obscure) name David, for which Čech cautiously suggests an Indo-European origin (perhaps from **deh₂*- "to assign," **dʰeh₁* "to place" or **dʰeh₁* "to suck").[46]

5. OBSERVATIONS ON ADAPTATION STRATEGIES OF FOREIGN NAMES

On the basis of the *corpus* of names collected here, some observations may be made about the linguistic and graphic adaptation strategies used for foreign names in Anatolian hieroglyphics. For the purposes of this analysis, only features which are not directly attributable to the structural characteristics of hieroglyphic writing—which is notoriously less precise than cuneiform for the representation of sounds—are considered relevant. In particular, Anatolian hieroglyphics do not denote (at least not systematically and unambiguously) the vowel and consonant length, and mostly resorts to quiescent vowels in order to represent consonant clusters (e.g. <C(V)-CV> for /CCV/) and consonants in syllabic coda, except for /n/, which is generally not written. In addition, this writing is not able to express the contrast between voiceless and voiced consonants, with the sole exception of the sign <ta₃>, specially designed for transcribing /da/.

These aspects often constitute an obstacle to a full evaluation of the hieroglyphic rendering of foreign names, which is further complicated when the models themselves are attested in different variants (for example, it is impossible to establish whether a spelling such as *i(a)-hala/i*-TONITRUS is a transcription

---

[46] However, the argument is rather confused; to explain the correspondence with David, Čech has to resort on one hand to the *Lex Eichner* of Proto-Anatolian, on the other hand to the loss of digamma in post-Mycenaean Greek (which only affected some dialects).

of the Hurrian name Eḫli-Teššub or its variant Eḫel-Teššub, with apocope and anaptyxis in the first member).

5.1 Names of Hurrian Origin

With respect to Hurrian names, the main problem—apart from those regarding the hieroglyphic writing system listed above—concerns our imperfect knowledge of the language, which at times makes it difficult to precisely reconstruct the original Hurrian form that represented the model for the hieroglyphic adaptation. For this reason, the observations made below mainly concern graphematic, rather than phonological, correspondences. Furthermore, although this paper focusses on anthroponyms, an analysis of the adaptation strategies employed for Hurrian personal names cannot ignore the data regarding theonyms, which are often components of personal names.

As far as the consonant system is concerned, there are no particular difficulties in Anatolian hieroglyphic rendering (except, of course, for those mentioned previously due to the characteristics of this writing system). Here we point out only two facts: 1) the Hurrian consonants that are transcribed in cuneiform as <ḫ> and <ḫḫ> are invariably rendered by <h> in hieroglyphics (e.g. *i(a)-hala/i-* for *ehli-*/*ehel-*); 2) the labiodental fricatives /f/ and /v/, for which the Boğazköy cuneiform employs the signs for the series <p>, <b> and <w> (as well as combinations of <wa> + *mater lectionis* such as <wa$_a$>, <we$_e$>, etc.), seem to be consistently expressed by <p> (e.g. *i(a)-pari-* for *evri-*), except for cases of simplification before <u>, such as in the theonym *sa$_3$+US-ka-*, as is seen also in cuneiform, where *ša-uš-ga-* is found alongside ᵈ*ša-**wu$_u$**-uš-ga-*, °*-ša-**mu**-uš-ga*/*qa-*, and ᵈ*IŠTAR-**pu**-uš-ga*.

With regard to vowels, a principal difficulty is the adaptation of the vowel /e/, which is absent from the phonemic inventory of Luwian. Data collected show fluctuation between <a> and <i>, with the prevalence of the latter. In the case of adaptation of the name of the goddess Hepat, it is possible that there was a chronological distribution. In cuneiform, this name is always written °*-hé-pa-* in theophoric names and ᵈ*hé-pát* (very rarely ᵈ*hé-pa*) as a theonym (showing *-u*-stem when followed by Hittite case endings).[47] In Imperial period hieroglyphic inscriptions, mostly on seals, theophoric names such as Ašmu-Hepa, Pudu-Hepa, Dadu-Hepa, etc. are consistently rendered as °*-**ha**-pa*, and the goddess' name at YAZILIKAYA is similarly ***ha**-pa-tu*.[48] Conversely, in later

---

[47] Cf. van Gessel 1998: 119.

[48] It may be noted that the rendering with *a* is closer to the original form of the goddess's name, clearly visible in the Eblaite ᵈ*ha-(l)a-ba-du* "She of Aleppo" (cf. Archi 1994). However, in view of the regular use of <hé> in Hittite cuneiform texts (or very rarely <he/hi>), it is probable that the hieroglyphic rendering with <ha> is simply a matter of adaptation and has nothing to do with the original model.

inscriptions we find adaptations with <i> for the theonym, already ***hi*-*pa*-*tu*₂** in the inscriptions of GÜRÜN (probably late 12th century) and DARENDE (perhaps 11th-10th century), and then, in the 1st millennium, ***hi*-*pu*-*ta*** (ANCOZ 1, ANCOZ 9, ÇIFTLIK, KULULU 5, TELL AHMAR 6), apparently with metathesis of vowels.[49]

An analogous variation between <a> and <i> in the rendering of Hurrian /e/ may perhaps be seen in the alternation between ***pi*-*ti*-°** and ***pa*-*ti*-°** for the transcription of Hurrian *f/penti-* "just" (cf. *pa-ti-si-na*, *pi-ti-SARMA* and *pi-ti-TEŠUB-pa*),[50] for which, though, the variant *f/panti-* is also attested.

However, the alternation between *pu-**ha**-si-na* and *pu-**hi**-si-ni* (= *Puhi-šeni*) does not seem to be associated with the rendering of an original /e/, and might instead be merely an apparent variation: either *pu-**hi**-še-*(*en*)*-ni* and *pu-**ha**-še-ni* are found at Nuzi (although the latter form might be a mistake made by a Middle-Assyrian scribe, cf. Gelb, Purves, MacRae 1943: 246), and *pu-uh-še-en-ni* occurs at Nippur, which makes it possible to explain the hieroglyphic form *pu-ha-si-na* as *pu-h*(*a*)*-si-na*.

The rendering *ti-**ha**-TEŠUB-pa* is less clear with respect to its cuneiform equivalent ᵐ*ti/te-**hi**-*ᵈIŠKUR (= Tehi(t)-Teššub), as also *sa-ma-i(a)-'* for the hypocoristic Ašmiya and ***sa***₃*-mi-ka-tal* for Šimeg(i)-adal. However, in some cases the variation might already have been present in the Hurrian model (consider e.g. the name Ir-Teššub, if it is actually a variant of Ar(i)-Teššub). Only in the name ***ia*-*hi*-*la*-*ti*-*sa*-*pa*** (KARKAMIŠ A7) we find breaking of Hurrian /e/ into Luwian /ja/, if the identification with the Hurrian name Ehel-Teššub is correct.

The names *ia-hi-la-ti-sa-pa*, *i-si-ka+ra/i-ti-sa-pa-* and *tara/i-ni*₂*-ti-sa-pa-*, all found in the inscription KARKAMIŠ A7 (9th-8th century), attest the only entirely syllabic writing of the theonym Teššub in 1st millennium hieroglyphic known to date, °*-ti-sa-pa*, generally explained as /-tispa/ (cf. the ACLT).[51] Apart from the adaptation of Hurrian /e/ with <i>, which, as mentioned, is a well documented strategy, it is also noteworthy the syncope of /u/ or, alternatively, its rendering with <a>, if indeed °*-ti-sa-pa* should actually be explained as /-tis(s)apa/ (consider also the Urartian Teišeba). In cuneiform sources the name always contains /u/, and also in some hieroglyphic inscriptions (cf. the gen. *ti-su-pi* at YAZILIKAYA and FORTIS-*su-pa-* in TELL AHMAR 1, dated to the 10th–9th century BCE). The form °*-ti-sa-pa* might thus represent a later local variant (perhaps close to the Urartian form) or point to the weakening or syncope of the vowel /u/ in the theonym, when occurring as the second member of theophoric names.[52]

---

[49] For an analogous rendering of Akkadian /ē/ with <i> see also the theonyms *i-ia-* for *Ēa* and perhaps *i-ta*₃*-* for *Ēl* (with a flap [ɾ]), discussed in Giusfredi 2012: 164.

[50] Cf. also the fragmentary name of the scribe on the ANKARA Silver Bowl, *pi*ˀ*-t*[*i*ˀ]*-*[…].

[51] However, see also LITUUS+*ta-sa-pa*-CERVUS-*wa/i-ti-i-sa* in the inscription KARKA-MIŠ A6, perhaps to be explained as a compound /tasparuntiya-/ "of Teššub and Runtiya" (cf. Hawkins 2000: 125).

Two names illustrate the so-called *initial-a-final* phenomenon, well-known in Luwian: *ki-TEŠUB-pa-'* = Agi-Teššub (ALEPPO 1) and *sa-ma-i(a)-'* = Aš-miya (ANKARA Silver Bowl). A genuine apheresis is attested by *ki-TONITRUS* = (A)gi-Teššub, while the case of *na-ni₃* = (A)nani in a seal from Alacahöyük is probably explained by the limited space available on the surface of the seal.

Finally, the phenomenon of rhotacism is (perhaps) seen just in *i(a)+**ra/i**-*TONITRUS (KARAHÖYÜK), if one agrees with Simon (2013) that the writing refers to the name Ini-Teššub, rather than Ir-Teššub.

5.2 Names of Semitic origin

In addition to the points examined in Giusfredi (2012, a study which also includes divine names), which seem to indicate tendencies valid for single names rather than general rules, it may be noted that there is a fairly consistent treatment of the initial *'a*, rendered with <ha> in the names *Habiriya-* and *Hamiyata-*, whereas the name *Ammu-*, if linked to the kinship term *'ammu-*, constitutes an exception. Not much can be said about the opposition between voiceless and voiced consonants within a word, since the original dental consonant corresponding to the sign <ta> in *Hamiyata* is uncertain. If it were voiced, from the theonym *Addu*, the non-use of the sign <ta₃>, which specifically indicates the voiced form, would be surprising (as pointed out in Giusfredi 2012). On the other hand, the lack of notation of initial voiced consonants is not problematic and conveys no information, not because these are neutralised in Luwian, but simply because of the lack of graphemic alternatives for their representation.

Also present is some clearly unsystematic evidence of alternation between /l/ and /r/, for example in the name *Kamari(ya)-* and the Semitic loanword *kamara/i-* from which it derives, where the /r/ in Luwian forms corresponds to /l/ in Semitic. In any case, this alternation is not pertinent to the specific difficulties of adaptation, but depends on a wider and well—albeit sparsely—attested phenomenon found in Luwian.

Overall, the adaptation framework indicates a pattern of prevalent correspondences, which should not be considered mandatory. There is no reason why—apart from the consequences of (a) phonetic laws within individual languages and (b) rigid and homogeneous scribal schools that established obligatory rules—a model for analysis should take these correspondences to be mandatory.

---

[52] Curiously, in the hieroglyphic rendering of some Mesopotamian theonyms the opposite phenomenon is sometimes observed, namely the presence of *u* where it would not be expected; consider the cases of *ta-**mu**-ki-na-* = Damkina and *ma-**ru**-ti-ka-* = Marduk discussed in Giusfredi 2012: 164 (for the latter, though, it should be noted that the model might have been ᵈAMAR.UTU). The matter deserves further investigation, also in consideration of similar phenomena in cuneiform (see for example the alternation between ᵈ*mu-uš-ni* and ᵈ*mu-šu-ni*).

6. Conclusion

Although the foreign personal names rendered in Anatolian hieroglyphic during the Bronze Age reflect the spread of Hurrian culture within Hatti but can tell us very little about the linguistic identity of those who bore the individual names, it seems clear that in the demographically and culturally diverse and complex Iron Age society the evidence acquires a different meaning.

The panorama discussed above shows that the quantity of anthroponyms that are not (or do not appear to be) Luwian is quite substantial, and seems in fact to reflect a demographic context in communication with the surrounding civilizations of the ancient Near East. Apparently Semitic personal names appear not only in areas such as Cilicia and the kingdoms of Sam'al (Zincirli) and Masuwari (Tell Ahmar), where the Phoenician and Aramaic presence is well recorded in written sources and referable to well-known documented and historical phenomena (or, when these are not completely clear such as in 8th and 7th century BCE Cilicia, at least evident from the study of the sources). Even in kingdoms in which the penetration or co-presence of non-Luwian cultures is not immediately evident, such as Karkemiš, onomastics suggests the presence of non-Anatolian components. In any case, this scenario is only apparently in conflict with the relative resistance of the Neo-Hittite epigraphic culture towards cuneiform and alphabetic traditions. In reality, this resistance may be seen as the consequence of the use of writing as the main vehicle of identity, far more recognizable and far more defensible than the fluid linguistic code for preserving an identity distinct from the Semitic dynasties of the Aramaic states and Phoenician kingdoms, and above all from the cuneiform *koinè*, which in this era involved the relevant areas of Neo-Assyrian Mesopotamia, as well as the Urartian sphere.

Although the picture of a Syro-Anatolian world characterized by a demographic mix only partially reflected by the sources may be confirmed, it must be noted that—even in the most optimistic analysis—the onomastic evidence reveals certain limits when applied to historical reconstruction. It constitutes important data only when combined with independent considerations and historical, archaeological, or documentary evidence. Proper names, in fact, are extremely conservative and can be perpetuated within traditions on the basis of inputs and acquisitions of linguistic material much older than the ages in question. In Iron Age Luwian documents this distinction is significant with regard to Hurrian onomastic: the entry of Hurrian material must clearly have occurred in the Late Bronze Age, and the names were then preserved as part of the tradition, becoming in fact culturally Luwian (for instance Hapatila/Hebat-Tilla, a member of the same lineage as Ariyahina, whose name could be both Luwian and Hurrian).

But although the Aramaic and Phoenician names of the Iron Age are certainly foreign (or foreigners') names, and Hurrian names are certainly relics of previous centuries, as synchronously Luwian as those of Anatolian linguistic genealogy,

there are cases in which a definite historical analysis is not possible. Consider for example the name *Habiri-*, which is of Semitic origin, a foreign name which explicitly indicated foreign ancestry. It is attested in the Bronze Age in Hatti and could therefore have entered Luwian as a traditional name; however, it could also be a Semitic name, since the term *habiru* is also well-known in Ugaritic.

Without of course denying the important methodological distinction between a foreign name and a name that was *originally* foreign but entered the onomastic inventory of a given tradition, it may be concluded that the presence of synchronously non-Luwian onomastic material would seem indicative of a higher degree of cultural and demographic penetration than might be imagined on the basis of the epigraphic conservatism of Iron Age Syro-Hittite kingdoms. But this would certainly not be unexpected, given the great fluidity of the Levant and Southern Anatolia after the political changes of the 12th century BCE.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

CCT = Cuneiform Texts from Cappadocian Tablets in the British Museum.

VAT = Inventory number of the texts of the Vorderasiatische Abteilung der Staatlichen Museen in Berlin.

ABL = Harper, R.F. (1892-1914) *Assyrian and Babylonian Letters Belonging to the Kouyunjik Collection of the British Museum*. Chicago.

Alt, A. (1948) Die geschichtliche Bedeutung der neuen phönikischen Inschriften aus Kilikien. *Forschung und Fortschritte*, 24, 121-124.

Archi, A. (1980) Materiale epigrafico ittita da Tell Fray. *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici*, 22, 31-32.

Archi, A. (1994) Studies on the Pantheon of Ebla. *Orientalia*, N.S., 63, 249-252.

Arnaud, D. (1987) La Syrie du moyen-Euphrate sous le protectorat hittite: contrats de droit privé. *Aula Orientalis*, 5, 211-241.

Balza, M.E., P. Cotticelli-Kurras, L. d'Alfonso, M. Giorgieri, F. Giusfredi, A. Rizza, eds. (2020) *Città e parole, argilla e pietra. Studi offerti a Clelia Mora da allievi, colleghi e amici*. Biblioteca di Athenaeum, 65. Bari.

Bolatti Guzzo, N., P. Taracha, eds. (2019) *"And I Knew Twelve Languages", A Tribute to Massimo Poetto on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday*. Warsaw.

Bossert, H.Th. (1955) Die hieroglyphen-hethitische Inschrift von Kötükale. *Le Muséon*, 68, 61-91.

Bryce, T.R. (2012) *The World of the Neo-Hittite Kingdoms. A Political and Military History*. Oxford.

Bunnens, G., ed. (2000) *Essays on Syria in the Iron Age*. Leuven.

Čech, P. (2015) What if Goliath were David? Taita, King of the Palistineans. In Oeming, Sláma: 63-73.

Charpin, D., F. Joannès, eds. (1992) *La circulation des biens, des personnes et des idées dans le proche-orient ancien. Actes de la XXXVIIIe Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale (Paris, 8-10 juillet 1991)*. Paris.

Collins, B.J., M.R. Bachvarova, I.C. Rutherford, eds. (2008) *Anatolian Interfaces. Hittites, Greeks and their Neighbours. Proceedings of an International Conference on Cross-Cultural Interaction, September 17-19, 2004, Emory University, Atlanta, GA*. Oxford.

Cotticelli Kurras, P., M. Giorgieri, C. Mora, A. Rizza, F. Giusfredi, eds. (2012) *Interferenze linguistiche e contatti culturali in Anatolia tra II e I millennio a.C. Studi in onore di Onofrio Carruba in occasione del suo 80° compleanno*. Studia Mediterranea, 24. Genova.

CTU = Salvini, M. (2008) *Corpus dei Testi Urartei. Le iscrizioni su pietra e roccia*. Vols. I-III. Documenta Asiana, VIII. Roma.

d'Alfonso, L. (2001) Further Studies on the Ini-Tešub sealing. Part II: A Prosopographic Approach. *Altorientalische Forschungen*, 28, 2, 267-275.

Dalley, S. (2000) Shamshi-ilu, Language and Power in the Western Assyrian Empire. In Bunnens: 79-88.

de Martino, S. (2010) Nomi di persona hurriti nella prima età imperiale ittita. *Orientalia*, N.S., 79, 2, 130-139.

de Martino, S., M. Giorgieri (2008) *Literatur zum Hurritischen Lexikon (LHL). Band 1, A*. Firenze.

Dill, U., Ch. Walde, eds (2009) *Antike Mythen. Medien, Transformationen, Konstruktionen*. Berlin-New York.

Dillo, M. (2013) The Name of the Author of ŞIRZI: A Text Collation. *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, 70, 3-4, 332-360.

Dinçol, A.M., B. Dinçol, J.D. Hawkins, G. Wilhelm (1993) The 'Cruciform Seal' from Boğazköy-Hattusa. *Istanbuler Mitteilungen*, 43, 87-106.

Feliu, L., J. Llop, A. Millet Albà, J. Sanmartín, eds. (2013) *Time and History in the Ancient Near East. Proceedings of the 56th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale at Barcelona, 26-30 July 2010*. Winona Lake.

Forlanini, M. (1996) Awariku, un nom dynastique dans le mythe et l'histoire. *Hethitica*, 13, 13-15.

Gander, M. (2012) Ahhiyawa – Hiyawa – Que: Gibt es Evidenz für die Anwesenheit von Griechen in Kilikien am Übergang von der Bronze- zur Eisenzeit? *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici*, 54, 281-309.

Gelb, I.J., P.M. Purves, A.A. MacRae (1943) *Nuzi Personal Names*. Oriental Institute Publications, 57. Chicago.

Giorgieri, M. (2000) L'onomastica hurrita. *La Parola del Passato*, 55, 278-295.

Giusfredi, F. (2012) Note sui prestiti accadici e urartei in luvio-geroglifico di età del Ferro. In Cotticelli Kurras et al.: 153-171.

Giusfredi, F. (2020a) Assyrian Camels and Luwian Officials. *Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires*, 2020/1, 24, 53-56.

Giusfredi, F. (2020b) Questa città dei miei antenati era di Ninuāyu. In Balza et al. (2020): 265-275.

Gonnet, H. (1992) Un cas d'adaptation de l'écriture hiéroglyphique louvite à la langue hourrite. In Charpin, Joannès: 267-269.

Görke, S. (2010) *Das Ritual der Aštu (CTH 490). Rekonstruktion und Tradition eines hurritisch-hethitischen Rituals aus Boğazköy/Ḫattuša*. Culture and History of the Ancient Near East, 40. Leiden-Boston.

Groddek, D., S. Rößle, eds. (2004) *Šarnikzel. Hethitologische Studien zum Gedenken an Emil Orgetorix Forrer (19.02.1894-10.01.1986)*. Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie, 10. Dresden.

Hawkins, J.D. (1988) Kuzi-Tešub and the "Great Kings" of Karkamiš. *Anatolian Studies*, 38, 99-108.

Hawkins, J.D. (2000) *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions. Inscriptions of the Iron Age*. Vol. I. Studies in Indo-European Language and Culture, new series, 8. Berlin-New York.

Hawkins, J.D. (2005) Commentaries on the Readings. In Herbordt 2005: 248-313.

Hawkins, J.D. (2011) The Inscriptions of the Aleppo Temple. *Anatolian Studies*, 61, 35-54.

Herbordt, S. (2002) Hittite Seals and Sealings from the Nişantepe Archive, Boğazköy: A Prosopographical Study. In Yener, Hoffner Jr., Dhesi: 53-60.

Herbordt, S. (2005) *Die Prinzen- und Beamtensiegel der hethitischen Grossreichszeit auf Tonbullen aus dem Nişantepe-Archiv in Hattusa*. Boğazköy-Ḫattuša 19. Mainz am Rhein.

HKM = Alp, S. (1991) Hethitische Briefe aus Maşat-Höyük. Ankara.

Hoffner, H.A. (2009) *Letters from the Hittite Kingdom*. Writings from the Ancient World, 15. Atlanta.

Klengel, H. (1999) *Geschichte des hethitischen Reiches*. Handbuch der Orientalistik, 1/34. Leiden-Boston.

KBo = *Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköy* (1916-). Leipzig-Berlin.

KUB = *Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköy* (1921-1990). Berlin.

Laroche, E. (1960) *Les hiéroglyphs hittites. Première partie. L'écriture*. Paris.

Laroche, E. (1966) *Le noms des Hittites*. Études Linguistiques, 4. Paris.

Laroche, E. (1981) Les hiéroglyphes de Meskene-Emar et le style "syrohittite". *Akkadica*, 22, 5-14.

Lemaire, A. (1997) Sceau phénicien de la région de Karaman (Turquie). *Epigraphica Anatolica*, 29, 123-126.

Liebhart, R.F., C. Brixhe (2009) The recently discovered inscriptions from Tumulus MM at Gordion. A preliminary report. *Kadmos*, 48, 141-156.

López-Ruiz, C. (2009) Mopsos and Cultural Exchange between Greeks and Locals in Cilicia. In Dill, Walde: 382-396.

Marchetti, N., H. Peker (2018) The Stele of Kubaba by Kamani and the Kings of Karkemish in the 9th Century BC. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie*, 108, 1, 81-99.

Melchert, H.C., ed. (2003a) *The Luwians*. Handbook of Oriental Studies, I, 68. Leiden-Boston.

Melchert, H.C. (2003b) Language. In Melchert (2003a): 170-210.

Melchert, H.C. (2019) The Anatolian Hieroglyphic Signs L 41, L 172 and L 319 = L 416. In Bolatti Guzzo, Taracha: 356-377.

Miller, J. (2007) Mursili II's Dictate to Tuppi-Teššub's Syrian Antagonists. *Kaskal*, 4, 121-152.

Oeming, M., P. Sláma, eds. (2015) *A King like All the Nations? Kingdoms of Israel and Judah in the Bible and History*. Beiträge zum Verstehen der Bibel, 28. Münster.

Oettinger, N. (2008) The Seer Mopsos (Muksas) as a Historical Figure. In Collins, Bachvarova, Rutherford: 63-66.

Peker, H. (2016) *Texts from Karkemish I. Luwian Hieroglyphic Inscriptions from the 2011-2015 Excavations*. OrientLab, Series Maior, 1. Bologna.

Peker, H. (2018) Notes on Anatolian Hieroglyphic Materials 1 (Şarhöyük, Kayalıpınar). *Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires*, 2018/2, 49, 79-80.

Pirozzi, F., V. Pisaniello (2016) Frigi a Persepoli? Note sulla tavoletta frigia nell'archivio della Fortificazione. Paper presented at the 2nd International Workshop *Contactos culturales y lingüísticos en el Irán aqueménida, "Todos los caminos conducen a Susa"*, Complutense University of Madrid, 3 June 2016. Unpublished.

Poetto, M. (1987) L'iscrizione luvio-geroglifica HATTUSA VIII. *Oriens Antiquus*, 26, 187-189.

Poetto, M. (2004) Un "nuovo" antroponimo currico in geroglifico anatolico. In Groddek, Rößle: 513-519.

Richter, Th. (2012) *Bibliographisches Glossar des Hurritischen*. Wiesbaden.

Rieken, E., I. Yakubovich (2010) The New Values of Luwian Signs L 319 and L 172. In Singer: 199-219.

RIMA 2 = Grayson, A.K. (1991) *Assyrian Rulers of the Early First Millennium BC, Vol. I (1114-859 BC)*. Toronto.

RIMA 3 = Grayson, A.K. (1996) *Assyrian Rulers of the Early First Millennium BC, Vol. II (858-745 BC)*. Toronto.

Salvini, M. (1991) Note su alcuni nomi di persona hurriti. *Studi epigrafici e lessicali*, 8, 175-180.

SBo I = Güterbock, H.G. (1967) *Siegel aus Boğazköy. Erster Teil. Die Königssiegel der Grabungen bis 1938*. Osnabrück.

Schwemer, D. (2001) *Die Wettergottgestalten Mesopotamiens und Nordsyriens im Zeitalter der Keilschriftkulturen. Materialien und Studien nach den schriftlichen Quellen*. Wiesbaden.

Simon, Zs. (2013) Wer war Großkönig I(a)+ra/i-TONITRUS der KARAHÖYÜK-Inschrift? In Feliu, Llop, Millet Albà, Sanmartín: 823-832.

Simon, Zs. (2014) What Was Built in the Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscription of ŞIRZI? *Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires*, 2014/4, 96, 151-152.

Simon, Zs. (2017a) Der luwische Name Awarikus. *Beiträge zur Namenforschung*, 52, 115-122.

Simon, Zs. (2017b) Kurtis: A Phrygian Name in the Neo-Hittite World. *News from the Lands of the Hittites*, 1, 113-118.

Singer, I., ed. (2010) ipamati kistamati pari tumatimis. *Luwian and Hittite Studies Presented to J. David Hawkins on the Occasion of his 70th Birthday*. Tel Aviv.

Steitler, Ch. (2010) The Biblical King Toi of Ḥamath and the Late Hittite State 'P/Walas(a)tin'. *Biblische Notizen*, N.F., 146, 81-99.

Stol, M. (1991) Old Babylonian Personal Names. *Studi epigrafici e linguistici*, 8, 191-212.

Streck, M.P. (2000) *Das amurritische Onomastikon der altbabylonischen Zeit. Band 1: Die Amurriter. Die onomastische Forschung. Orthographie und Phonologie. Nominalmorphologie*. Alter Orient und Altes Testament, 271/1. Münster.

Tekoğlu, R., A. Lemaire (2000) La bilingue royale louvito-phénicienne de Çineköy. *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, 961-1006.

Tropper, J. (1993) *Die Inschriften von Zincirli. Neue Edition und vergleichende Grammatik des phönizischen, sam'alischen und aramäischen Textkorpus*. Münster.

van den Hout, Th.P.J. (1998) *The Purity of Kingship. An Edition of CTH 569 and Related Hittite Oracle Inquiries of Tutḫaliya IV*. Documenta et Monumenta Orientis Antiqui, 25. Leiden-Boston-Köln.

van den Hout, Th.P.J., R. Akdoğan (2013) Zwei weitere Beamtensiegel aus Boğazköy. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie*, 103, 1, 43-44.

van Gessel, B.H.L. (1998) *Onomasticon of the Hittite Pantheon*. Part I. Handbuch der Orientalistik, Abt. I, 33. Leiden-New York-Köln.

Watson, W.G.E. (2010) Cross-cultural Containers. *Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires*, 2010/2, 42, 49-50.

Weeden, M. (2010) Tuwati and Wasusarma: Imitating the Behaviour of Assyria. *Iraq*, 72 [In Honour of the Seventieth Birthday of Professor David Hawkins], 39-62.

Yakubovich, I. (2010) *Sociolinguistics of the Luvian Language*. Brill's Studies in Indo-European Languages & Linguistics. Leiden-Boston.

Yakubovich, I. (2016) Some Transitive Motion Verbs and Related Lexemes in Late Luwian. *Indogermanische Forschungen*, 121, 69-92.

Yener, K.A., H.A. Hoffner Jr., S. Dhesi, eds. (2002) *Recent Developments in Hittite Archaeology and History. Papers in Memory of Hans G. Güterbock*. Winona Lake.

Younger, K.L. (2016) *A Political History of the Arameans. From their Origins to the End of their Polities*. Archaeology and Biblical Studies, 13. Atlanta.

Zgusta, L. (1964) *Kleinasiatische Personennamen*. Prague.