

Over the Mountains and Far Away

Studies in Near Eastern history
and archaeology

presented to Mirjo Salvini on the occasion
of his 80th birthday

edited by

Pavel S. Avetisyan, Roberto Dan

and

Yervand H. Grekyan



ARCHAEOPRESS PUBLISHING LTD
Summertown Pavilion
18-24 Middle Way
Summertown
Oxford OX2 7LG
www.archaeopress.com

ISBN 978-1-78491-943-6
ISBN 978-1-78491-944-3 (e-Pdf)

© Archaeopress and authors 2019

Cover image: Mheri dur/Meher kapısı. General view of the 'Gate of Haldi' (9th century BC)



All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the copyright owners.

Printed in England by Oxuniprint, Oxford.

This book is available direct from Archaeopress or from our website www.archaeopress.com

Contents

Editorial	iv
Foreword	v
Bibliography	vi
Bisotūn, ‘Urartians’ and ‘Armenians’ of the Achaemenid Texts, and the Origins of the Exonyms <i>Armina</i> and <i>Arminiya</i> ..1 Gregory E. Areshian	
Human Images from the Eastern Urartian Periphery: Anthropomorphic Sculpture of Syunik on the Cusp of the 2nd and 1st Millennia BC	9
Hayk Avetisyan, Artak Gnuni, Gagik Sargsyan and Arsen Bobokhyan	
Cult-Places of Ancient Armenia: A Diachronic View and an Attempt of Classification	19
Pavel Avetisyan and Arsen Bobokhyan	
The Elamite Tablets from Armavir-Blur (Armenia): A Re-Examination	34
Miqayel Badalyan, Gian Pietro Basello and Roberto Dan	
Šiuini: The Urartian Sun god	46
Miqayel Badalyan	
Protective Clay Figurines in the Urartian Fortresses	58
Atilla Batmaz	
Mesopotamians and Mesopotamian Learning at Hattusa, Thirty Years On	65
Gary Beckman	
Too Many Horns in the Temple of the God Hadad of Aleppo at the Time of the Ebla Archives!	71
Maria Giovanna Biga	
The Roots of the Urartian Kingdom: The Growth of Social Complexity on the Armenian Plateau Between Ancient Bronze and Early Iron Ages	74
Raffaele Biscione	
Thoughts about the Audience-Hall of Naramsin at Tell Asmar-Ešnunna	90
Felix Blocher	
The Urartian God Quera and the Metamorphosis of the ‘Vishap’ Cult	98
Arsen Bobokhyan, Alessandra Gilibert and Pavol Hnila	
Laḫmu, ‘The Hairy One’, and the Puzzling Issue of Mythology in Middle Assyrian Glyptic Art	106
Dominik Bonatz	
The First Gilgamesh Conjectures About the Earliest Epic	114
Giorgio Buccellati	
Ayanis Fortress: Only a Military Fortress or More?	120
Altan Çilingiroğlu	
Granaries in Urartu and Neighboring States and the Monumentalization of Administrative Records	134
Birgit Christiansen	
Hasanlu, the Southern Caucasus and Early Urartu	144
Megan Cifarelli	
The King of the Rock Revisited: The Site of As-Sila (Tafila, Jordan) and the Inscription of Nabonidus of Babylon	157
Rocío Da Riva	
A New Painting Fragment from Erebuni and an Overview of Urartian Wall Paintings	171
Roberto Dan, Yeghis Keheyán, Nelli Hovhannisyán, Artur Petrosyan, Yelena Atoyants, Priscilla Vitolo and Boris Gasparyan	
New Observations Regarding the Urartian Inscription of the Tul-e Talesh Bracelet	187
Maryam Dara	
Nouvelles réflexions relatives à la fin du royaume d’Ourartou – la forteresse d’Erebuni vers la fin du VIII^e siècle av. J.-C.	191
Stéphane Deschamps, François Fichet de Clairfontaine and Mary Karapetyan	
Quand dieu aide les vainqueurs	203
Jean-Marie Durand	

The Relationship between State and Nomads in the Urartian Kingdom	207
Aylin Ü. Erdem	
Alcune considerazioni sulla posizione di Uršum e Haššum/Haššuwa: dal commercio paleo-assiro al regno di Ḫattušili I	212
Massimo Forlanini	
L'espressione (ANA) PANI NP nei colofoni ittiti	220
Rita Francia	
From Khazane Kapoussi/Hazine Kapsı to Anahkız: Rethinking a Place at Tušpa Citadel	231
Bülent Genç	
Some Remarks on Qulḫa	241
Levan Gordeziani	
The Problem of the Origin of the Urartian Scribal School	244
Yervand Grekyan	
The Cross Statue as a Symbol of Christianizing Armenia	263
Grigor Grigoryan	
Oshakan Tomb No. 25 Revisited	266
Michael Herles	
Urartian Envoys to Ashurbanipal's Court – Some Remarks on the Assyro - Urartian Relations in the First Half of the 7th Century BC	283
Krzysztof Hipp	
The 'City of Ḫaldi' in the Land of Uaza	292
Simon Hmayakyan	
Urartian Inscriptions at the Van Museum. A New Collection	296
Kenan Işık	
Towards the Reconstruction of the Hurro-Urartian Protolanguage	304
Margarit Khachikyan	
A New Rock-Cut Tomb in Van Fortress/Tushpa	307
Erkan Konyar	
Upper Euphrates Political Geography Reconsidered	312
Aram Kosyan	
The Urartian Rock-Cut Chamber at Yelpin / Armenia	317
Stephan Kroll	
Le terre di Urartu nella descrizione di Strabone	324
Gianfranco Maddoli	
The Armenian Patronymic Arcruni	331
Hrach Martirosyan	
Iron Age Luvian <i>tarrawann(i)</i>-	337
H. Craig Melchert	
An Echo of Assyria in Plutarch's Life of Alexander	346
Sarah C. Melville	
Lo strano caso del Sig. VITA+RA/I, scriba '4' alla corte ittita	354
Clelia Mora	
From Petroglyphs to Alphabet. A Brief Characterization of the Writing Culture of Pre-Christian Armenia	359
Artak Movsisyan	
New Iri-Sağrig Ration Distribution and Related Texts	371
David I. Owen	
Le melograne della basilica di Santa Cecilia in Trastevere	381
Neda Parmegiani	
On the Ethnic Origin of the Ruling Elite of Urartu	386
Armen Petrosyan	
Solak 1. Una fortezza urartea nella valle del Hrazdan, Armenia	391
Artur Petrosyan, Roberto Dan and Priscilla Vitolo	
Un piccolo frammento di una lunga storia: un cammello a Tell Barri/Kahat (Siria)	401
Raffaella Pierobon Benoit	

New Ways of Etymologizing Certain Fragments of the Cuneiform Inscription of Tanahat	418
Ashot Piliposyan	
A Note about an Ewer of Probable Anatolian Production, from One of the Tombs of the Assyrian Queens at Nimrud	426
Frances Pinnock	
Armenian Toponyms in the ‘Patria Quae Dicitur Parthia’ according to the Cosmographia of Ravennas Anonymus....	434
Daniel T. Potts	
Updates on Verbal Transitivity and Nominal Ellipsis in Hittite	438
Jaan Puhvel	
The Assyria-Urartu Relationship and the Political Role of Mercenaries	440
Julian Edgeworth Reade	
Zur Frage des Weiterlebens urartäischer Namen in achaimenidischer Zeit	457
Rüdiger Schmitt	
Auf der Suche nach einem Reichsgott für Urartu	465
Ursula Seidl	
Everyday Life in Trialeti (South Caucasus) in the Middle and the Second Half of the 2nd Millennium BC	476
Nino Shanshashvili and Goderdzi Narimanishvili	
A New Fragment of an Inscription of Rusa, Son of Argišti, from the susi Temple of Bastam, Iran	501
Marie-Claude Trémouille, Roberto Dan, Keomars Haji Mohammad and Ebrahim Bodaghi	
‘Excavating’ Looted Tombs at Pessinus (2011-2013)	511
Gocha R. Tsetskhladze	
The Bronze Stamp Seals of Marlik: Evidence of Bronze Age Links with Eastern Iran and Central Asia	525
Ali A. Vahdati and Amir Saed Mucheshi	
Beyt’a Mêzînê A Trace of the Qur’anic Influence on the Yezidi Oral Religious Tradition	532
Vardan Voskanian	
The Ethno-Cultural Diversity of Central Anatolian Early Iron Age Inhabitants	537
Jak Yakar	
The Mighty Weapon of Tarhunt	544
Ilya Yakubovich	
Illiterate Urartians: Writing and the Ayanis Outer Town	560
Paul Zimansky	

Iron Age Luvian *tarrawann(i)-*

H. Craig Melchert

University of California, Los Angeles

Abstract: The Iron Age Luvian word *tarwani-* has for at least forty years been widely interpreted as a title. Despite its connection to *tarwan(a)-* ‘justice’, its pattern of use has suggested a primary sense ‘ruler, prince’, rather than ‘judge’. However, Franco Pintore in 1979 presented cogent arguments that the word is in all Luvian contexts an epithet ‘just (one)’ in the sense of ‘upright, pious’ (matching Semitic *šdq*), parallel to ‘hero’. Reexamination of current evidence fully vindicates his analysis and suggests a reading *tarrawann(i)-*. While the new meaning and shape do not preclude the popular view that Greek *týrannos* ‘tyrant’, Ugaritic *srn* ‘prince’, and the Hebrew transposition *srnym* of Philistine princes or military leaders are borrowed from the Luvian, they do increase the semantic and formal problems in its supposed transmission.

Keywords: Luvian, *srn*, *srnym*, *šdq*, *tarwan(i)-*, *týrannos*

I am honored to take part in this tribute to Mirjo Salvini, who in addition to his foundational works advancing our understanding of Hurrian and Urartian has also addressed issues of language contact and promoted the study of other languages of Bronze and Iron Age Anatolia and Syria. It is in this spirit that I offer him as a sign of friendship and esteem the following reconsideration of a notorious Wanderwort.

Introduction

Identification of the Iron Age Luvian word spelled with or determined by the sign L 371 as a title of some sort dates from the earliest era of the decipherment of the Anatolian hieroglyphs—well before its correct phonetic reading had been essentially determined. Meriggi¹ tentatively ventures ‘Fürst’ and subsequently uses PRINCE for the logogram.² Gelb³ opts for ‘ruler’, while Forrer⁴ adopts ‘Herzog’ or ‘Heerführer’ according to context. See for further similar early interpretations the references assembled by Laroche.⁵

The first partial publications of the Luvian-Phoenician bilingual from Karatepe shed important new light on the word. Bossert⁶ is ambivalent about the connection of the title (or perhaps epithet ‘just’) with the possibly homonymous word for ‘justice’ (meaning assured by Phoenician *šdq*), but in their respective handbooks a decade later Laroche⁷ and Meriggi⁸ alike read both nouns as *tarwana-* and identify the abstract as ‘justice’. Laroche hesitantly renders the title as ‘juge’, while Meriggi leaves the choice open between ‘Richter’ and ‘Gerechter’, noting the collocation with the word for ‘servant’. It is important to note that Laroche, albeit with characteristic caution, also suggests a possible means of bridging the gap between ‘judge/justice’ and ‘ruler’ (or the like): ‘si le sens exact est ‘juge’, d’après *tarwana-* ‘justice’, comparer l’emploi politique de *sém. šdq*.’

Subsequently, Laroche’s very tentative suggestion has effectively become the standard analysis, with the connection of the title to the abstract duly acknowledged by using IUDEX to transliterate the former beside IUSTITIA for the latter,

despite consistent translation of the first as ‘ruler’.⁹ Meriggi’s alternative of an honorific epithet ‘the just one’ has been almost entirely forgotten. A notable exception is the paper by Franco Pintore,¹⁰ who argues for precisely a sense ‘just/the just one’, based on internal evidence from Luvian for an original adjective and on the sense of the Semitic root *šdq* in the Iron Age.¹¹ Pintore’s analysis has occasionally been acknowledged,¹² but the force of his arguments has unfortunately been ignored. While not all aspects of his analysis can be upheld after nearly four decades, an objective reassessment supports the validity of his principal claim: Luvian *tarrawann(i)-* referring to persons is fundamentally an adjective meaning ‘just, righteous, morally upstanding’ which becomes an honorific title ‘the just/upright one’ and has nothing directly to do with either judgment or ruling.

Evidence for Luvian *tarrawann(i)-* as an Adjective

tarrawann(i)- modifying SERVUS-*l(i)-* ‘servant’ and FEMINA-*nat(i)-* ‘wife’

There are several compelling examples in Iron Age Luvian that permit only an analysis of *tarrawann(i)-* as an adjectival modifier of a following noun. The first is cited by Pintore, who correctly terms it ‘una ricorrenza che non consente dubbi’:¹³

(1) KARKAMIŠ A17b,§1

[... (LITUUS)á(?)]-za-[t]i-wa/i+ra/i-sa DEUS-*nt-sa* *371-*ni-sa* SERVUS-*la/i-i-sa ka-ma-nt-si-sa* [...]DOMINUS-[...]sa[...]

⁹ See, e.g., Hawkins 1980: 140-141; 2000: *passim*.

¹⁰ Pintore 1979.

¹¹ I am deeply indebted to Norbert Oettinger for his renewed reference to Pintore’s study (pers. comm., 14 October 2013), without which I would never have been led to revisit the problem—despite my longstanding unease with the standard interpretation. I am also grateful to Dennis Pardee and Ilya Yakubovich respectively for invaluable help with the Semitic and Luvian aspects of the problem. The usual disclaimer applies, and I am solely responsible for all views not explicitly attributed.

¹² E.g., Hawkins 2000: 176, 193; Yakubovich 2002: 112, n. 53.

¹³ Pintore 1979: 477. I cite Iron Age Luvian texts according to the conventions established by Hawkins (2000), aside from updated readings of a few hieroglyphic signs, most notably L 172 as *lá/i* and L 319 as *la/i*, for which see Rieken and Yakubovich (2010), and for obvious reasons read non-committally *371 instead of IUDEX. To avoid endless repetition of multiple parentheses, I give the word as *tarrawann(i)-*, a reading that will be justified in the last section of the paper.

¹ Meriggi 1929: 205.

² Meriggi 1932: 18-19 and *passim*.

³ Gelb 1931: 10, 66.

⁴ Forrer 1932: 22.

⁵ Laroche 1960: 198.

⁶ Bossert 1949: 107.

⁷ Laroche 1960: 197-198.

⁸ Meriggi 1962: 124-125.

[...A]zatiwaras, __ servant of the god, [...] of Kamanis, Country Lord [...]

Hawkins¹⁴ translates ‘Ruler-Servant of god (?)’, but concedes that ‘the title is quite unusual’(!) and cites Pintore’s ‘giusto servitore’. In fact, such a title is manifestly incoherent, and by any unprejudiced reading a word occurring between a genitival modifier and a noun with which it agrees in case and number must be construed as an attributive adjective.¹⁵ This example is entirely parallel to the following cited by Bauer and analyzed as such by Hawkins¹⁶:

(2) ALEPPO 2, §1

EGO-mi-i 'ara/i-pa-sa (DEUS)TONITRUS-si |BONUS-mi-i-sa
SERVUS-la/i-sa

‘I am Arpas, Tarhunzas’s beloved servant.’

Further proof that *371-ni-sa occurring before SERVUS must be construed as an adjectival epithet comes from the following:¹⁷

(3) BULGARMADEN, §1

á-mu-wa/i-mi-i |TONITRUS-hu-na-(LITUUS)á-za-sá-’ |*371-ni-
sa|TONITRUS-hu-wa/i+ra/i-’*273-sa |(INFANS)ni-mu-wa/i-za-sá
|wa/i+ra/i-pa-la-wa/i-si-sa |REX-ti-sa |HEROS-ti-i-sá |*371-ni-sa
SERVUS-la/i-sa

‘I am Tarhunzas, the __ one, son of Tarhuwara...s, __ servant of King Warpalawas, the hero.’

The attempt by Hawkins¹⁸ to construe the second *371-ni-sa as a genitive, a title of Warpalawas (‘...servant of Warpalawas, the King, the Hero, the Ruler’) must be rejected. Other texts show that when the honorifics *371-ni-sa and HEROS are used together, *371-ni-sa always precedes HEROS. Compare:

(4) BOR, §1

(EGO...) |wa/i+ra/i-pa-la-wa/i-sa |tu-wa/i-na-wa/i-ni-sa(URBS)
|REX-ti-sa |*371-ni-sa |HEROS-li-i-sa-’ [...]x[... || ...] (INFANS)
ni-mu-wa/i-za-sa

‘[I...]am Warpalawas, King of Tuwana, the __ one, the hero, son of [...].’

Likewise in MARAŞ 14, §1¹⁹ and NIĞDE 2.²⁰ In view of the incontrovertible examples (1) and (3), one must follow Pintore²¹ in analyzing all examples of *371-ni-sa SERVUS as a

collocation.²² This is certainly the most natural analysis of the following:

(5) EĞRİKÖY, §3

(B) ... -[F]RATER-la-i-sa |('LIGNUM')su-ka-la-sa ‘CRUS’-ta
|(*371)tara/i-wa/i-ni-i-sa (A) SERVUS-la/i-sa

‘[]-atalais (personal name) the vizier stood, the/a __ servant.’

As we shall see momentarily, the overall structure of the text also calls for the same construal of the following in principle ambiguous example.

(6) BOYBEYPINARI 1, §4

(PES)u-pa-tá-pa-wa/i-tà-’á-za-mi-i-sá PURUS.FONS.MI *371-ni-
sa SERVUS-lá/i-sa

‘While Azamis, __ servant of Suppiluliumas, furnished them.’

As cogently argued by Pintore,²³ the alternate reading ‘Azamis, the ruler Suppiluliumas’s servant’,²⁴ which takes *371-ni-sa as a title of Suppiluliumas, is made highly suspect by the distribution of the other instances of *371-ni-sa in the same text:

(7) BOYBEYPINARI 1, §1

[z]a-wa/i (THRONUS)i-sà-tara/i-tá-za za-ha MENSA-za mu'pa-
na-mu-wa/i-ti-sa PURUS.FONS.MI-sa *371-ni-sa FEMINA-na-ti-
sa PONERE- wa/i-ha

‘This throne and this table I, Panamuwatis, __ wife of Suppiluliuma, put in place.’

(8) BOYBEYPINARI 2, §1

za-wa/i á-lá/i-na DEUS.AVIS mu-u'pa-na-mu-wa/i-ti-sa PURUS.
FONS.MI *371-ni-sá FEMINA-na-ti-sa 'HÁ+LI-sa || [...]sá
(SOLIUM)i-sà-nu-wa/i-ha

‘This Lady Kubaba I, Panamuwatis, __ wife of Suppiluliumas, [mothe]r of Hattusilis, seated.’²⁵

This inscription, commissioned by Panamuwatis, wife of Suppiluliumas, refers to her husband (likely a king of Kummuh, as per Hawkins²⁶) no less than eight times. In the other four instances where he is mentioned in the role of her husband he is consistently referred to as ‘my lord’, but with no title of office. Likewise, he is given no title of office in BOYBEYPINARI 1, §11, in connection with the two scribes who carved the inscription. As per Pintore, it is paradoxical and hardly credible that he would receive the alleged title ‘ruler’ only in the three contexts of (6)–(8) where *371-ni-sa/sá may be equally or more naturally construed with the noun that follows it. *371-ni-sa is not only an epithet of ‘servant’ in (6), but also of ‘wife’ in (7) and (8).

²² This also applies to the structurally ambiguous example in MALPINAR, §1, not known to Pintore.

²³ Pintore 1979: 478, note 18.

²⁴ Hawkins 2000: 234.

²⁵ For á-lá/i- with Kubaba as a title ‘lady’ see Hutter (2016), revising the analysis of Rieken and Yakubovich (2010: 203), to whom we owe the new reading of the word.

²⁶ Hawkins 2000: 336.

¹⁴ Hawkins 2000: 176.

¹⁵ For the order of genitive+attributive adjective+head noun see the treatment by Bauer (2014: 232-233). Since the word for ‘god’ *massan(i)-* is an *n*-stem, and true *i*-stem appellatives are vanishingly rare (if existent) in Iron Age Luvian, DEUS-*ni-sa* is more likely nom. sg. comm. /*massani:s/* of a genitival adjective agreeing with SERVUS-*la/i-sa* than a nominal genitive /*massanis/*, but this does not affect the argument.

¹⁶ Hawkins 2000: 236.

¹⁷ Cf. Pintore 1979: 477, note 17.

¹⁸ Hawkins 2000: 522.

¹⁹ Hawkins 2000: 265.

²⁰ Hawkins 2000: 527.

²¹ Pintore 1979: 477, note 17.

tarrawann(i)- modifying REX-t(i)- ‘king’ (and REGIO DOMINUS?)

*371-*ni-sa* is also used not only as an honorific title accompanying the title of office ‘king’ (see example (4) above, BOR, §1), but also directly as an epithet of ‘king’.²⁷ Whether it also serves as an epithet of REGIO DOMINUS ‘country lord’ is more arguable, in part because even to the present day the role played by the holder of the latter title remains far from clear.²⁸ However, there can be no doubt that REX-t(i)-(/xantawat(i)-/) ‘king’ was a well-defined concept no less in the Iron Age than in the Bronze Age, and it is difficult to see what sense a collocation ‘ruler, king’ or ‘ruler-king’ could have. A ‘king’ was by definition a ruler, and *371-*ni-sa* was as much an honorific as an adjectival epithet as it was as an accompanying title:

(9) AKSARAY, §9

wa/i-na á-mu ki-ya-ki-ya-ya *371-*ni* REX-ti(-)x pil| (front)-[ya-t]á

‘He gave it to me, Kiyakiyas, the/a __ king.’

(10) MALPINAR, §2

(a) a-wa/i á-[m]i-i DOMINUS-*ni-i* HÁ+LI-i *371-*ni-i* REX-ti-i |... (b?) ... ‘SCALPRUM’-wa/i FLAMMAE(?) -x-tà-ti-i ku-ma-ha(URBS) <x>-wa/i-*ni-sá-ha*

‘And for my lord Hattusilis, the/a __ king, I _ed ...in the city Kumaha.’

(11) BOROWSKI 3, §1

EGO-wa/i-mi-i¹ha-mi-ya-ta-sa |*3[71]-wa/i-*ni-i-sa* |REX-ti-sa |ma-su-wa/i+ra/i-za-sa(URBS) ...

‘I am Hamiyatas, the/a __ king, Masuwarean [...].’

In the three preceding examples *371-*ni-* is certainly an adjectival epithet qualifying ‘king’. Its status in examples like the following is more delicate:

(12) TELL AHMAR 6, §1

EGO-wa/i-mi-i¹ha-mi-ya-ta-sa |*371-*ni-sa* |ma-su-wa/i+ra/i-za-«sa»(URBS) |REX-ti-i-sa

‘I am Hamiyatas, the __ Masuwarean King/the __ one, Masuwarean King.’

Should we read *371-*ni-sa* here as the first of two attributive adjectives and thus again an epithet of ‘king’? Or is it the honorific title, followed by ‘Masuwarean King’ in apposition? Example (4) above, in which Warpalawas calls himself first ‘King of Tuwana’ and only then ‘the __ one, the hero’ suggests the first interpretation. However, the order of constituents in example (13) involving ‘country lord’ would suggest rather the second option in (14):

(13) KARKAMIŠ A12, §1

EGO-wa/i-mi-i¹ka-tú-wa/i-sa |“*371”-*ni-i-sa* DEUS-*ni-ti* (LITUUS) á-za-mi-sa kar-k[a]-m[i-si-za-sa(URBS) REGIO] DOMINUS[...]

‘I am Katuwas, the __ one, favored by the gods, Country Lord of Carchemish...’

(14) KARKAMIŠ A2+3, § 1

EGO ‘ka-tu-wa/i-sa |“*371”-sa kar-ka-mi-si-za-sa(REGIO) REGIO DOMINUS-ya-sa ‘su-hi-si-sa |REGIO-*ni* DOMINUS-ya-i-sa |(INFANS)ni-mu-wa/i-za-sa

‘I am Katuwas, the __ Country Lord of Carchemish/the __ one, Country Lord of Carchemish, son of Suhis, Country Lord.’

It ultimately matters little how we construe examples like (12) or (14). We have ample evidence that *371-*ni-* functions as an adjectival epithet of at least three socially defined roles: servant, wife, and king. It is also undeniable that it comes to serve as a free-standing honorific title ‘the __ one’ for at least kings and ‘country lords’, like (sometimes alongside) ‘hero’, as in examples (3) and (4) above.²⁹ In the absence of unambiguous examples of the type †*371-*ni-sa* REGIO DOMINUS-*sa*, we cannot be sure whether it ever served as an adjectival epithet of ‘country lord’.³⁰

tarrawann(i)- modifying (INFANS)nimuwiza- ‘son’?

Pintore (1979: 479) claims that *tarrawann(i)-* also appears as an epithet of a fourth social role, namely ‘son’. However, this interpretation seems to rely too heavily on the existence of *bn ʔdq* ‘just/legitimate son’ in West Semitic. All the putative occurrences of this collocation stand in ambiguous sequences like the following:³¹

(15) KARKAMIŠ A14b, §1

[E]GO-mi á-sa-tú-[wa/i-la/i]-ma-[za]-sa [...?] || [k]ar-ka-mi-sa-zi-a-sa(REGIO) |REGIO DOMINUS-i-a-sa ‘su-hi-si |*371-*ni-sa* || |(INFANS)ni-mu-wa/i-zi-a-sa

‘I am Astuwalamanzas, [...?], Country Lord of Carchemish, __ son of Suhis/son of Suhis, the __.’

The same ambiguity applies in MARAŞ 4, § 1 (second occurrence), KARKAMIŠ A4b, § 6, and TELL AHMAR 1, §1. However, one example suggests that all instances should probably be analyzed as containing the honorific title standing in apposition to the preceding name,³² not as an adjective modifying the following ‘son’:

²⁹ This reading is certain also in KARKAMIŠ A11b+c, §1, KARKAMIŠ A15b, KARKAMIŠ A31+fragments A30b1-3, §7, MARAŞ 14, §1, and NIĞDE 2. It also seems the more likely possibility in KARKAMIŠ A6, § 1.
³⁰ For reasons given above, the examples MARAŞ 1, § 1 a and MARAŞ 4, § 1 with ‘king’ are ambiguous (*contra* Pintore 1979: 483), as are KARKAMIŠ A11a, § 1, CEKKE, § 6a, KELEKLİ, § 1, and KARKAMIŠ N1, §7 (Dinçol *et al.* 2014) with ‘country lord’, and ANDAVAL, § 1 (‘lord’ of a city).

³¹ One might object that the same is true of the occurrences of *371-*ni-sa* FEMINA-*na-ti-sa*, but, as argued above regarding examples (7) and (8), the overall diction of BOYBEYPINARI 1 and 2 argues for a collocation ‘the __ wife’.

³² Strictly speaking, given the doubtful status of *i*-stem appellatives in Iron Age Luvian (compare note 3 above), *371-*ni/ni-sa/sá* in these examples likely represents nom. sg. comm. /tarrawanni:s/

²⁷ The very limited data available to him misled Pintore (1979: 483-486) to regard the collocation as isolated in Iron Age Luvian and the result of a contamination of two competing notions of political power. The more extensive current evidence allows us to discard this characterization.

²⁸ See Dinçol *et al.* 2014: 150-151, with reference to Hawkins 1995a.

(16) MARAŞ 1, §1e

'TONITRUS.HALPA-pa-CERVUS₂-ti-ya-si-sà |(*371)tara/i-wa/i-ni-sá || (INFANS)na-wa/i-sa

'...great-great-grandson of Halparuntiyas, the __ one...'

It seems very unlikely that *tarrawann(i)s* here forms a collocation with 'great-great-grandson'. Furthermore, in the uniquely elaborate genealogy of MARAŞ 1³³ the names of three other forebears are accompanied by honorifics (twice 'hero' and once 'brave'). It is thus to be expected that Halparuntiyas would also receive that of *tarrawannis*. Although one cannot regard the evidence as compelling, the following example points in the same direction:

(17) MARAŞ 4, §1

EGO-wa/i-mi-i 'TONITRUS.HALPA-pa-CERVUS₂-ti-ya-sa |(*371)tara/i-wa/i-ni-sa |ku+ra/i-ku-ma-wa/i-ni-i-sa(URBS) |REX-ti-sa 'mu-wa/i-ta-la/i/u-i-si-sà |(*371)tara/i-wa/i-ni-sá |(INFANS)ni-mu-wa/i-i-za-sa

'I am Halparuntiyas, the __ King of Gurgum/the __ one, King of Gurgum, son of Muwattallis, the __ one.'

Whether we read the first (*371)tara/i-wa/i-ni-sa as an adjectival epithet or the honorific title, it would be surprising if Halparuntiyas, having already styled himself *tarrawannis* once, insisted that he is also a 'tarrawannis son'. It seems more probable that he gives his father the same honorific. In sum, while a collocation 'tarrawann(i)- son' cannot be definitively excluded, one must regard the evidence for it as very weak.

tarrawann(i)- modifying CAPUT-t(i)- 'man, person'

Pintore³⁴ also argues correctly that *tarrawann(i)-* serves as an adjective modifying CAPUT-t(i)- (/t^si:d(i)-/) 'man' in the generic sense of 'person', entirely parallel to other such expressions where the noun serves merely to support the adjective, which carries the entire semantic weight of the expression. He aptly cites POST(-ra/i)- CAPUT-ti- 'inferior man', the generic value of which is clearest in ALEPPO 6, §11,³⁵ where it is contrasted with 'king', 'king's son', 'country lord', and 'river-country lord'.³⁶ One may also directly compare the frequent characterization of someone as (DEUS)SOL-mi-(CAPUT-ti-) = /tiwadama/i-/ (/t^si:d(i)-/) '(man) of the Sun-god', that is, a devotee of the deity and recipient of his favor.³⁷

(18) KULULU 2, §1

|EGO-mi 'pa-nu-ni-i-sa |(DEUS)SOL-wa/i-tà-mi||-i-sa CAPUT-ti-sá

'I am Panunis, a man of the Sun(-god).'

(19) KULULU 4, §1

of a genitival adjective 'of the __ one', not a nominal genitive /tarrawannis/.

³³ See Hawkins 2000: 262-263.

³⁴ Pintore 1979: 479.

³⁵ Hawkins 2011: 44-45.

³⁶ There is no basis whatsoever for assigning the meaning 'prince' to CAPUT-ti- in this expression, which is definitively excluded in ALEPPO 6, where it stands in direct contrast to 'king's son/prince'.

³⁷ For /tiwadama/i-/ as an appurtenance adjective 'belonging to the Sun(-god)', not a verbal participle see Arbeitman (1980) and Melchert (2014: 208-209).

EGO-wa/i-mi ru-wa/i-sa₄*371-ni-sa á-sá-ha SOL-wa/i+ra/i-mi-sa₈

'I was Ruwas, the __ one—one who belongs to the Sun(-god).'

The direct parallel of the first instance with the second, where the noun is omitted, shows that the latter is the inessential generic 'man, person'. There is no justification for the interpretation as 'prince'.³⁸

One may therefore interpret the following examples with *tarrawann(i)-* in entirely parallel fashion:

(20) BABYLON 1, §1

|EGO-wa/i-mi-i 'la-PRAE-VIR²/la²-sa|(*371)tara/i-wa/i-ni-sa |CAPUT-ti-i-sa

'I am Lap(a)rizidis², a __ person.'

(21) KARKAMIŞ A18a, l.1

EGO-mi 'pi²-sa-mi-tá-sa tara/i-wa/i-ni

'I am Pisamitas, a __ one.'

As properly emphasized by Pintore,³⁹ the entire text of BABYLON 1 is consistent with the author being a wealthy and pious devotee of the Storm-god of Aleppo—nothing in it supports the assumption that he held a position of political power. The nature of KARKAMIŞ A18a⁴⁰ also suggests a private document. Neither 'Ruler-Prince' nor 'homme juge' makes much sense for the former.⁴¹ While a reading of tara/i-wa/i-ni in the latter (with omission of the nominative singular ending) as the honorific title cannot be entirely excluded, it seems very odd that a high office holder would have used it alone without his administrative title. Thus an epithet parallel to that in (20) seems more likely.

tarrawann(i)- modifying other nouns

We have nearly completed our survey of *tarrawann(i)-* in its function as an epithet or honorific title (for discussion of the abstract see the next section).⁴² The example in KARKAMIŞ A7, §14⁴³ remains unclear, due to uncertainty whether it refers to the depicted woman or the infant she is holding and to the opacity of the accompanying hapax (*357+RA/I')za+ra/i-za-mi-sa. Some examples are in contexts too fragmentary to be of use: KARKAMIŞ A19, frag. no. 2 and A27, frag. ee and frag. ff 2; ÇİFTLİK §22; and IZGIN 1, §14. There are, however, at least two more examples of *tarrawann(i)-* as an attributive adjective:

(22) KULULU 3, §§1-2

³⁸ Contra Hawkins 2000: 488. The same applies to KARKAMIŞ A 21, §2 and KULULU 5, §3, contra Hawkins 2000: 160 and 485, who correctly interprets all other instances as 'Sun-blessed man/person': KARATEPE 1, §1; KARKAMIŞ A5a, §1, A18h. The adjective also occurs alone as an epithet at BOYBEYPINARI 2, §5.

³⁹ Pintore 1979: 479, note 29.

⁴⁰ See the description by Hawkins 2000: 193-194.

⁴¹ See Hawkins 2000: 393 with references to Meriggi and Laroche.

⁴² The very atypical example in TELL TAYINAT 2, frag.1b will be discussed in the second half of this paper. In the word IUDEX-li-i (sic!) in TELL TAYINAT 1, frag. 2, l. 3 the sign surely has a phonetic value t(a/i), despite the absence of the stroke indicating RA/I (see Hawkins 2000: 366-367, whose confusing reference to sign *273 instead of *277 is a lapsus, compounded by Giusfredi 2009: 140, n. 3).

⁴³ For which see Hawkins 2000: 129 with references.

§ 1 EGO *i-la²-li-sa₄* *371-*ni-sa₄* || |SCRIBA-|[*a-sa₄*]
 § 2 |*wa/i-ta* |*á-mí-ri+i* || IUSTITIA-*na-ri+i-i* |*á-m*[*t* ... || ...
]-*na²* x-*mi-ha*

'I am Ilalis the __ scribe, and on account of my 'justice' I _ed...'

Pintore⁴⁴ concedes that a reading of *371-*ni-sa₄* as an adjective is most natural, but objects that no equivalent expression for a scribe is attested either in Akkadian or West Semitic and thus opts for *tarrawannis* as the honorific title. However, his argument arbitrarily excludes the possibility that Iron Age Luvian extended application of an epithet used for other social roles to that of a scribe. Since Pintore himself admits that the office of a scribe was often not that of a mere engraver, but a position of considerable responsibility, I see not the slightest reason to doubt that a scribe might receive the same complimentary epithet as a servant, wife, or king. Furthermore, as we shall discuss in more depth below, it is crucial to note that the characterization of Ilalis as *tarrawannis* is *immediately* followed by a sentence asserting that he achieved something through or because of this quality.

Also demanding construal of *tarrawann(i)-* as an adjective is a recently published example unknown to Pintore:

(23) ŞARAGA, §3

*371-*ni-sa* '*á-lá/i-mu-sá* (DEUS)*sá-ta* ('BOS')*u-wa/i-na á-ni-i-a>-ta*

'The __ Alamus *a*-ed a bull for Sanda.'

I follow for the syntax the analysis of Sasseville and Yakubovich,⁴⁵ revising the first reading of the passage by Poetto.⁴⁶ Sasseville and Yakubovich interpret *371-*ni-sa* as 'ruler', and likewise Poetto as a title 'il *governante*'. However, as a title *371-*ni-sa* stands without exception *after* personal names,⁴⁷ just like all other titles: see the treatment by Bauer.⁴⁸ The religious context also supports the reading as an adjectival epithet (see further below).

In sum, while use of *tarrawann(i)-* as an adjective to modify 'son' is very doubtful and to modify 'country lord' is uncertain, its collocation with 'servant', 'king', and at least one personal name is assured beyond all doubt. It is also highly probable that it appears as an adjective characterizing 'wife', 'scribe', and generic 'man, person'.

⁴⁴ Pintore 1979: 489.

⁴⁵ Sasseville and Yakubovich 2016: 33.

⁴⁶ Poetto 2010: 296-297.

⁴⁷ The one alleged exception (Bauer 2014: 198) must be that in ŞARAGA, §3, since the title appears nowhere else before a personal name. Since Bauer follows the standard view that *371-*ni-* is only a title 'ruler', she does not even consider that it could be an attributive adjective.

⁴⁸ Bauer 2014: 297-302. The titles FILIUS/INFANS 'son', FEMINA 'wife', SERVUS 'servant', and DOMINUS 'lord' also occur before names, but only under very precise conditions. Bauer's formulation of these (2014: 298-299) is seriously flawed, forcing her to conclude wrongly that DOMINUS behaves differently from the others. However, the true conditioning for these titles being preposed is when they are modified by a pronominal possessive adjective, mostly 'my', but occasionally 'your' or 'his'. This conditioning factor accounts for all preposed instances of 'son', 'wife', and 'servant' and for eighteen of nineteen of 'lord' (human or divine). The one exception, KARATEPE 3, §1, occurs in an isolated inscription whose relationship to others is far from assured (cf. Hawkins 2000: 70), and we cannot be certain that it represents the beginning of the text.

Further Luvian-internal evidence against *tarrawann(i)-* 'ruler'

Pintore⁴⁹ presents two telling arguments against the analysis of *tarrawann(i)-* as 'ruler'. First, if the word referred to a function, a position of political power and administration, it is singularly peculiar that it *never* is qualified by an ethnicon or geographical qualifier.⁵⁰ Other Iron Age Luvian terms that do express the role of a ruler or administrator are regularly so characterized, as is to be expected. Examples with 'king' and 'country lord' have been amply illustrated in citations given above. Second, Iron Age Luvian curse formulas also routinely cite as potential violators putatively envious or inimical kings and country lords (and in SULTANHAN, §48 a *tabariyall(i)-* 'governor'). Never, however, is a *tarrawann(i)-* or 'hero' cited as a violator, strongly suggesting that *tarrawann(i)-*, like hero, is an honorific title referring to a positive quality that would be incongruous in a negative context.

What Pintore fails to do is to present the positive evidence for *tarrawann(i)-* as expressing a quality and not an administrative function: its close textual association with the abstract (IUSTITIA)*tarrawann(i)-*, whose basic sense 'justice, righteousness' is assured by the Phoenician equivalent *šdq* in KARATEPE 1, §XVIII. In texts from Carchemish it is a virtual topos that individuals are favored by the gods due to their 'justice, righteousness':

(24) KARKAMIŞ A11a, §7

**a-wa/i-mu* **a-mi-i-sa* DOMINUS-*na-ni* || (DEUS)TONITRUS-*sa* (DEUS)*kar-hu-ha-sa* (DEUS)*ku+AVIS-pa-sa-ha* **a-mi-ya-ti* | IUSTITIA'-*na-ti* (LITUUS)*á-za-tá*

'And my lord Tarhunzas, Karhuhas, and Kubaba favored me because of my justice/righteousness.'

See also KARKAMIŞ A6, §2, A11a, §4, KARKAMIŞ A11b+c, §9, and surely A12, §10. The notion is, however, by no means confined to Carchemish. Compare:

(25) AKSARAY, §5

wa/i-ta á-mi-ya-ti |(IUSTITIA)*tara/i*||-*wa/i-na-ti* (DEUS)TONITRUS-*hu-ti-i tara/i-ma-za-ha* DEUS-*ni-za* |*za-ti* BONUS-*si-ya-za-ha*

'Because of my justice/righteousness I was *dear* to Tarhunt and all the gods here.'

See also SHEIZAR, §2 and BULGARMADEN, §6. What is crucial for our purposes is that having this quality is directly associated in several instances with the characterization of the individual as *tarrawann(i)-*. Example (25) is directly followed by: 'And great kings and kings all admired this city. And who gives this position to me? Tarhunzas gave it to no one, but

⁴⁹ Pintore 1979: 480.

⁵⁰ One might object that *tabarna-*, a title of the Hittite king, likewise is never qualified by any adjective. This, however, merely reflects that it too is an honorific, like its pendant for the queen, *tawananna-*, in origin *'the mighty/powerful one' (Melchert 2003: 19, with references, *contra* Yakubovich 2002: 103). Per Hawkins (1995b: 111), sign *371 is the Iron Age continuant of sign *277 used to write the title *labarna* (but note the arguments against by Oreshko 2016: 246). In any case, the fact that words related to *tabarna-* in Iron Age Luvian continue to appear with initial /*tabar-*/ formally precludes any connection between the two honorifics (cf. Hawkins 1995b: 112, note 26).

to me, Kiyakiyas, the *tarrawann(i)*- king, he gave it.⁵¹ The last clause is example (9) cited earlier. It could hardly be clearer that the adjective *tarrawann(i)*- expresses the same positive quality as the homophonous noun. It is because Kiyakiyas is a person of this character that he is made king. We have already cited KULULU 3, §§1–2 as example (22) above, where again the epithet *tarrawann(i)*- is directly linked to the quality *tarrawann(i)*- by which the author achieved something. The same direct association also is clear in the one instance of the verb *tarrawannaza*- derived from *tarrawann(i)*-:

(26) MARAŞ 1, §§6–7

|wa/i-mu-ta |LIS+la/i/u-si-sá (DEUS)[SOL²]-ti-t²-sá |i-mara/i-si-ha¹ (DEUS)ru-ti-ya-sá¹ |(*371)tara/i-wa/i-na-za-ta¹

|wa/i-mu¹ |('IUSTITIA')tara/i-wa/i-na+ra/i |ha-pa(-)x(-)ha-la-i-ta

'[The Sun-g]od² of the Lawsuit and Runtiyas of the open country made me *tarrawann(i)*-, and because of/through my justice/righteousness they h_{ed} me ...'

The standard translation of the first clause as 'made me ruler',⁵² puts the cart before the horse. As we have seen, it is rather as a result of having the quality of *tarrawann(i)*- that gods grant individuals high office and other blessings. Hawkins's interpretation would only be possible if the clauses were reversed. The attested order makes sense only if the verb means 'made me (to have the quality of) *tarrawann(i)*-. What Halparuntiyas gained from this is expressed by the unclear predicate of the second clause.

The internal evidence of the Iron Age Luvian texts fully confirms Pintore's contention that *tarrawann(i)*- referring directly to persons is an adjective (only secondarily substantivized as an honorific title) meaning to have the quality of the noun *tarrawann(i)*- 'justice, righteousness', thus 'just, righteous'. To define more closely just what 'just, righteous' means, we must with him turn to the West Semitic evidence for the root *šdq*.

The Meaning of West Semitic *šdq*

The evidence presented by Pintore⁵³ for the meaning of the West Semitic root *šdq* is fatal to the attempt to interpret the Luvian title *tarrawann(i)*- as 'judge'. I must underscore that in typological terms Laroche's comparison⁵⁴ with Semitic *špt* is entirely in order. Not only in peripheral Akkadian,⁵⁵ but also in Hebrew,⁵⁶ reflexes of this root refer to both civil administration and the dispensing of justice.⁵⁷ The lack of direct evidence for the latter role for the *tarrawann(i)*- (duly noted by Giusfredi⁵⁸) is not a compelling counterargument. The decidedly non-administrative nature of our Iron Age Luvian texts means that such absence may easily be due to chance. Some readers will have noticed the reference in example (26) from MARAŞ 1 to a deity 'of the lawsuit'.

The difficulty with such an account of Luvian *tarrawann(i)*-⁵⁹ is that the Phoenician equivalent of the abstract in KARATEPE 1, §XVIII is *šdq*, not a reflex of *špt*. The latter root is attested in the sense 'judge, to judge' in Ugaritic,⁶⁰ as well as in Punic and Aramaic.⁶¹ Yakubovich⁶² has argued for Phoenician as the primary language of the Karatepe bilingual. In any case, it is difficult to imagine that the author(s) of the bilingual was/were unaware of *špt* as '(to) judge'. Therefore, if that were the primary sense of the title *tarrawann(i)*-, we would expect a form of *špt* in the sense 'judgment' to match the abstract in KARATEPE 1, §XVIII.

On the contrary, as Pintore contends, the West Semitic root *šdq* does not refer to the *function* of a judge, but rather expresses 'justice' in the sense of moral rectitude, righteousness, and piety, a *quality* adhering not just to judges. It appears conjoined with the near-synonym *yšr* '(up)right' in Phoenician, Hebrew, and Ugaritic—in the first instance as an epithet of *mlk* 'king'.⁶³ In a religious context the meaning shades into 'pious, devout'.⁶⁴ In Ugaritic *āt šdq* as a nominal epithet of 'wife' the sense is 'lawful, legitimate'.⁶⁵ Pintore⁶⁶ argues that Luvian *tarrawann* SERVUS is the Iron Age continuant of Bronze Age Akkadian *ārad kitti* 'loyal servant'. He rightly asserts that in the contexts of examples (3), (5) and (6) from BULGARMADEN, EĞRİKÖY, and BOYBEYPINARI 2, where the relationship is to a human superior, the sense could still be 'loyal servant'. However, he avoids assigning this as the synchronic meaning, and for good reason. Evidence for *šdq* expressing personal loyalty to another is lacking in Iron Age West Semitic, and a collocation of 'bd 'servant' with *šdq* is unattested.

A tendentious interpretation of *tarrawann* SERVUS-*lis* as 'loyal servant' is in any case unnecessary. The meaning 'just' in the sense 'righteous, upright, honest' is appropriate for all uses of Luvian *tarrawann* as an epithet, and the same basic meaning is assured for the abstract. Personal loyalty is an inherent and salient quality of any 'righteous, upright' servant. Likewise, integrity would have been a prerequisite for any responsible scribe. Similarly, honesty and fairness would have been expected of any 'just' king or country lord, whether he was serving in the role of ruler/administrator or of judge. I also find it very unlikely that Panamuwatis in BOYBEYPINARI (examples 5 and 6) is insisting (in an overly defensive manner) that she is Suppiluliumas's lawful wife. She is rather underscoring that she fulfills the role of a pious wife who is dutiful towards the gods. Religious piety is also surely the quality being attributed to Alamus in example (23) from ŞARAGA. In other instances it is pointless to try to decide between the general sense of 'just, righteous' and the more specific 'pious'. What is important is that Pintore's principal claim must be upheld: all uses of Luvian *tarrawann(i)*- are

⁵⁹ E.g., Yakubovich 2002: 112.

⁶⁰ del Olmo Lete and Sanmartín 2015: 912–913.

⁶¹ Hoftijzer and Jongeling 1995: 1181–1182.

⁶² Yakubovich 2015a: 44–48.

⁶³ Avishur 1975: 28–29. Also noteworthy is the collocation 'because of my justice and my wisdom' in KARATEPE 1, §XVIII (Phoenician *b-šdqy w-b-ḥkmty* = Luvian |á-[mi]-ya-ti |IUSTITIA-na-ti |á-mi-ya+ra/i=ha |('COR')á-ta-na-sa-ma-ti), which has parallels in Hebrew and Aramaic (Avishur 1975: 28).

⁶⁴ For Hebrew see Koehler and Baumgartner 1994–2000: 3.1002–1003, section 5). The use of *tarrawann(i)*- as a substantivized epithet 'the just/righteous/pious one' is also paralleled by a similar use of *šdyq* in Aramaic (Hoftijzer and Jongeling 1995: 963).

⁶⁵ del Olmo Lete and Sanmartín 2015: 768.

⁶⁶ Pintore 1979: 477.

⁵¹ See Hawkins 2000: 476.

⁵² E.g., Hawkins 2000: 263.

⁵³ Pintore 1979: 474–481.

⁵⁴ Laroche's comparison (1960: 198).

⁵⁵ Reiner *et al.* 1989: 459 s. v. *šāpītu*.

⁵⁶ Koehler and Baumgartner 1994–2000: 4.1624 regarding *šōfātīm*.

⁵⁷ And according to some also in Amorite and Ugaritic (del Olmo Lete and Sanmartín 2015: 912–913 with references).

⁵⁸ Giusfredi 2009: 142.

compatible with—and some require—the same meaning as shown by its West Semitic equivalent *šdq*.⁶⁷

The origin of *tarrawann(i)*-

Several scholars have already suggested that Luvian *tarrawann(i)*- is the source of the Wanderwort also attested in the Hebrew transposition *šnym* of Philistine princes or military leaders,⁶⁸ Ugaritic *srn* ‘prince’ (also as a personal name), and Greek *τύραννος* ‘tyrant’.⁶⁹ A transfer from Luvian to Philistine and Greek has received further support from recent evidence for contact between the Luvians and respectively the Philistines in the Amuq⁷⁰ and the Greeks in Cilicia.⁷¹ As per Yakubovich,⁷² whatever the details of the mode of transmission, it is hardly surprising that the Philistines and Greeks borrowed the Luvian word in its secondary use as a title, quite possibly reanalyzed not as an honorific, but as referring to a position of authority. I forgo any further speculation on this issue here.⁷³

Identification of the original sense of *tarrawann(i)*- as ‘just, righteous, honest’ (adjective) and ‘justice, righteousness, rectitude’ (noun) does suggest a straightforward source of the word: a Proto-Indo-European base reflected in English ‘true’, German *treu* and other cognates in Germanic from a thematic stem **trewwo-* < **drewH-o-*.⁷⁴ The oldest sense was ‘steadfast loyal, faithful’, which is the dominant sense in Modern Standard German, while in Modern English the sense ‘in accordance with fact’ is now most common. However, in older stages of both English and German one also finds the adjective used to mean ‘honest, just, upright’ (see *OED* s. v. meaning 2 and *DW* 22.258–60, 1.B).

The multiple ambiguities of hieroglyphic Luvian orthography create problems for the phonological analysis of the attested *tara/i-wa/i-n°*, which can represent a word with initial /*traw-*/, /*triw-*/, /*truw-*/, /*tar(r)aw-*/, /*tar(r)iw-*/, /*tar(r)uw-*/, or /*tarw-*/.⁷⁵ Greek *τύραννος* is helpful in suggesting that we should assume a stem in /-*wann(i)*-/, which also fits known Luvian nominal morphology.⁷⁶ Since Greek would have

no difficulty with an initial sequence /*trV-*/, that reading seems unlikely. There is also some reason to doubt whether Luvian had an initial sequence /*tr-*/: see Melchert⁷⁷ on *tarr*-* ‘three’ < **tri-* (in *tariyanalli-* ‘third in command’) and *tarrapp-* ‘to plow’ < **trep-*. As Ilya Yakubovich has pointed out to me (pers. comm.), crucial is the unique spelling of the ablative-instrumental of the abstract noun in KULULU 1, §15: *tara/i-u-na-ti*. This spelling can hardly represent anything except /*tar(r)aunnadi*/, from syncope of a /*tar(r)awannadi*/ accented earlier than on the syllable *-wan-* (a reading /*tarunadi*/ or *tarunadi*/ syncopated from a /*tarwanniadi*/ would have been spelled *ta-ru-na-di*). Related forms in cuneiform Luvian and Hittite that cannot be discussed in detail here support a reading /*tárrawann(i)*-/.⁷⁹ A syncope of the second syllable in the transmission to Greek is unsurprising, and *τύρα-* may result from metathesis of /*tarwa-*/.⁸⁰

In trying to determine the morphology of our stem, we must begin with the fact that the abstract and the adjective seem to have the same stem: /*tarrawann(i)*-/ with so-called ‘*i*-mutation’ (by which an *-i-* is regularly inserted in Luvian between the stem and ending just in the common gender nominative and accusative, singular and plural).⁸¹ We have other examples where this synchronically unmotivated alternation was eliminated by Luvian speakers by generalizing the *-i-* to other cases, and the occurrence twice of an ablative of the abstract noun in /-*nidi*/ (KARKAMIŠ A11a, §4 and A12, §10) beside regular /-*nadi*- *-nari*/ argues that the abstract noun was common gender /*tarrawann(i)*-/. The derived verb /*tarrawannat^a-*/ ‘to make just, righteous’ without the ‘mutation’ *-i-* suggests that the adjective was likewise /*tarrawann(i)*-/. Yakubovich⁸² also assumes that both stems are the same and suggests that the abstract was secondarily concretized.⁸³ This derivation is certainly possible, but so is the opposite: ‘just, righteous’ substantivized to ‘what is just, righteous’.

I tend to prefer the latter scenario because it is easier to derive an adjective /*tarrawann(i)*-/ ‘just, righteous’ from a virtual preform **drewH-éno-* plus the usual Luvian ‘*i*-mutation’. Ilya Yakubovich reminds me that strictly speaking, such an adjective should have had a stem /*tarrawanna/i-*/. However, the *a*-stem variant would have appeared only in the neuter nominative-accusative (likely rare in our adjective), so transfer to the class with a stem in /-*ann(i)*-/ would not be surprising.⁸⁴ Furthermore, if one adopts the alternative scenario of the adjective being derived from the abstract, which remains fully viable, the result would be directly /*tarrawann(i)*-/ (the common gender noun having no *a*-stem variant). One final point needs to be made explicit: one must

⁶⁷ This also extends to the very atypical example in TELL TAYINAT 2, frag.1b (Hawkins 2000: 369 and 371): (‘SCALPRUM’) *tara/i-pi-i* *371-*wa/i-ni-zi-ha* [(‘LAPIS’) *zi-pa-ta-ni-i* [...]]. The fragmentary context precludes certainty, but the last word can hardly be separated from (*256) *zi-pa-ta-na-ti* at İSKENDERUN, §4 and the measure word *zipattani-* attested in Hittite. The position of the conjunction *-ha* ‘and’ suggests we should restore *zipattaninzi* and take *tarrawanninzi* as an adjective modifying it. A sense ‘just/honest/accurate *zipattani*’s’ would match the similar use of Hebrew *šdq* referring to weights and measures (Koehler and Baumgartner 1994–2000: 3.1005, section 1.a).

⁶⁸ On the problem of trying to define the role and status of these figures see Pintore (1983: 291–298).

⁶⁹ E.g., Pintore 1983: 286; Yakubovich 2002: 112; Giusfredi 2009: 142.

⁷⁰ Dinçol *et al.* 2015: 60–63; Hawkins 2009: 166–172; 2011: 51–53.

⁷¹ Hawkins 2009: 165–166; Yakubovich 2015a: 36–41.

⁷² Yakubovich 2002: 112.

⁷³ I do call attention to the vigorous arguments by Parker (1998: 149–154) that the earliest occurrences of *τύραννος* in Archilochus and Pindar have a positive meaning. Recent evidence for Luvian-Greek contact in Cilicia does not entirely exclude the alternative scenario that the Greeks acquired the word through the Lydians and the example of Gyges (cf. Pintore 1983: 308–311).

⁷⁴ I leave open the much-debated question whether this is related to the **der-u-*/**dr-eu-* of the PIE word for ‘wood, tree’, the common denominator being ‘hard, lasting, enduring’.

⁷⁵ For the possibility that the sign <*tara/i*> can also stand for /*t(a)r(r)u*/ with *u*-vocalism note the spellings *tara/i-sa* and *tara/i-sà* for /*taru=sa*/ ‘statue’ (NiğDE 1, §1 and İVRİZ 1, §3).

⁷⁶ Since Greek would have had no motivation to create a geminate in such a word (compare *ῥόδαρος* ‘ruler, leader’), there seems no reason

to doubt that the geminate reflects the Luvian original.

⁷⁷ Melchert 1994: 58 and 84 with references.

⁷⁸ Thus Meriggi 1967: 52.

⁷⁹ Hittite *tarrawā(i)*-, which means ‘to establish, fix’ (provisions for festivals), unconvincingly derived until now from **terh₂u-* ‘to be strong’ (Tischler 1991: 154–155 with references), is better explained from **to make firm, lasting*’ (compare German *festsetzen*), from a variant **derH₂u-* of our base. A full account of all the related Luvian and Hittite words will appear elsewhere.

⁸⁰ Yakubovich 2002: 113.

⁸¹ For a revised synchronic account of ‘*i*-mutation’ (followed here) see Yakubovich 2015b: section 6.3.

⁸² Yakubovich 2002: 112.

⁸³ He took the sense of the epithet to be ‘judge’, but the analysis remains viable with the sense shown here: ‘justice’ > ‘just’ > ‘the just one’. The cited parallel of Hittite *kurur* is still valid: noun ‘enmity’ to ‘hostile, inimical’ (originally only predicatively) > ‘enemy’.

⁸⁴ Especially since Luvian has a productive suffix /-*wann(i)*-/ from a consonant stem **-wén-*.

start from a virtual **dreuH-éno-* (or derived abstract **dreuH-éni-*) to explain the geminate *-nn-* from the preceding accented short **e* (by ‘čop’s Law’, on which see Čop 1970). Anaptyxis in the word-initial cluster would have then led to **déréwenni-*. Retraction of the accent to the first syllable (/tárrawann(i)-/) to explain syncopated /tarraunnadi/ may seem *ad hoc*, but *tarrí-** ‘three’ cited above also requires such a shift, since the geminate *-rr-* also requires an application of ‘čop’s Law’.

Conclusion

A thorough review of all currently available evidence fully upholds the claim of Pintore that Luvian *tarrawann(i)-* referring to persons is in origin an adjective meaning ‘just, righteous’, secondarily used as an honorific epithet ‘the just/righteous one’ like ‘hero’. It refers to a moral quality just like the homonymous abstract *tarrawann(i)-*, whose meaning is assured by its equivalence to Phoenician *šdq*. Neither has anything directly to do with the office of judge or ruler.⁸⁵ Luvian *tarrawann(i)-* thus defined may be plausibly derived from the same PIE root as English ‘true’ and cognates, via an intervening sense ‘firm, steadfast’.

Bibliography

- Arbeitman, Y. 1980. E Luwia Lux. *Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society of Columbia University* 12: 9–11.
- Avishur, Y. 1975. Word Pairs Common to Phoenician and Biblical Hebrew. *Ugarit-Forschungen* 7: 13–47.
- Bauer, A. 2014. Morphosyntax of the Noun Phrase in Hieroglyphic Luwian (Brill Studies in Indo-European Languages and Linguistics 12). Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Bossert, H.T. 1949. Die phönizisch-hethitischen Bilinguen vom Karatepe: 1. Fortsetzung. *Oriens* 2: 72–120.
- Čop, B. 1970. Eine luwische orthographisch-phonetische Regel. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 75: 85–96.
- Dinçol, A.†, B. Dinçol, J.D. Hawkins, N. Marchetti and H. Peker 2014. A Stele by Suhi I from Karkemish. *Orientalia, Nova Series* 83: 143–153.
- Dinçol, B., A. Dinçol†, J.D. Hawkins, H. Peker and A. Öztan 2015. Two new inscribed Storm-god stelae from Arsuz (İskenderun): ARSUZ 1 and 2. *Anatolian Studies* 65: 59–77.
- DW = J. and W. Grimm, *Deutsches Wörterbuch*. Reprint 1984. Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag.
- Forrer, E.O. 1932. *Das hethitische Bilderschrift* (Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilizations 3). Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Gelb, I. J. 1931. *Hittite Hieroglyphs I* (Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilizations 2). Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Giusfredi, F. 2009. The problem of the Luwian title *tarwanis*. *Altorientalische Forschungen* 36: 140–145.
- Hawkins, J.D. 1980. The ‘Autobiography of Ariyahinas’s Son’: An Edition of the Hieroglyphic Luwian Stelae Tell Ahmar 1 and Aleppo 2. *Anatolian Studies* 30: 139–156.
- Hawkins, J.D. 1995a. ‘Great Kings’ and ‘Country Lords’ at Malatya and Karkamiš, in T.P.J. van den Hout and J. de Roos (eds) *Studio Historiae Ardens: Ancient Near Eastern Studies Presented to Philo H. J. Houwink ten Cate on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday* (Publications de l’Institut historique-archéologique néerlandais de Stamboul 74): 73–85. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten.
- Hawkins, J.D. 1995b. *The Hieroglyphic Inscription of the Sacred Pool Complex at Hattusa (SÜDBURG)*. With an Archaeological Introduction by Peter Neve (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten, Beiheft 3). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Hawkins, J.D. 2000. *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions. Volume I. Inscriptions of the Iron Age*. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter.
- Hawkins, J.D. 2009. Cilicia, the Amuq, and Aleppo: New Light in a Dark Age. *Near Eastern Archaeology* 72: 164–173.
- Hawkins, J.D. 2011. The inscriptions of the Aleppo temple. *Anatolian Studies* 61: 35–54.
- Hoftijzer, J. and K. Jongeling 1995. *Dictionary of North-West Semitic Inscriptions*. Leiden, New York and Köln: Brill.
- Hutter, M. 2016. The ‘Lady’ Kubaba (ANCOZ 1 § 2 etc.) in Hieroglyphic Luwian. *Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires* 2016/1: 30–32.
- Koehler, L. and W. Baumgartner 1994–2000. *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*, revised W. Baumgartner and J.J. Stamm, trans. M.E.J. Richardson et al. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Laroche, E. 1960. *Les hiéroglyphes hittites: première partie l’écriture*. Paris: CNRS.
- Melchert, H.C. 1994. *Anatolian Historical Phonology* (Leiden Studies in Indo-European 3). Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodopi.
- Melchert, H.C. 2003. Prehistory, in H.C. Melchert (ed.) *The Luwians* (Handbook of Oriental Studies, Section One, The Near and Middle East 68): 8–26. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Melchert, H.C. 2014. Anatolian Nominal Stems in **(C)o-*, in N. Oettinger und T. Steer (eds) *Das Nomen im Indogermanischen: Morphologie, Substantiv versus Adjektiv, Kollektivum. Akten der Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 14. bis 16. September 2011 in Erlangen*, 205–214. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Meriggi, P. 1929. Die hethitische Hieroglyphenschrift. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 39: 165–212.
- Meriggi, P. 1932. Sur le déchiffrement et la langue des Hiéroglyphes ‘Hittites’. *Revue hittite et asianique* 9: 1–57.
- Meriggi, P. 1962. *Hieroglyphen-hethitisches Glossar*. Zweite, völlig umgearbeitete Auflage. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Meriggi, P. 1967. *Manuale di eteo geroglifico*. Parte II: Testi – 1ª Serie. Rome: Ateneo.
- OED = Oxford English Dictionary, viewed 24 June 2017 < <http://www.oed.com.libproxylib.unc.edu/> >
- del Olmo Lete, G. and J. Sanmartín 2015. *A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition*. Third Revised Edition (trans. and ed. W. G. E. Watson). Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Oreshko, R. 2016. Studies in Hieroglyphic Luwian: Towards a Philological and Historical Reinterpretation of the SÜDBURG inscription. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Freie Universität Berlin.
- Parker, V. 1998. Τύραννος. The Semantics of a Political Concept from Archilochus to Aristotle. *Hermes* 126: 145–172.
- Pintore, F. 1979. Tarwanis, in O. Carruba (ed.) *Studia Mediterranea Piero Meriggi dicata*: 473–494. Pavia: Aurora.
- Pintore, F.† 1983. Seren, Tarwanis, Tyrannos, in M. Liverani, C. Zaccagnini and O. Carruba (eds) *Studia orientalistica in ricordo di Franco Pintore*: 285–322. Pavia: GJES.
- Poetto, M. 2010. Un nuovo verbo luwio-geroglifico: *zapa-*, e la sua correlazione al luwio cuneiforme *zapp(a)-*, in R. Kim, N. Oettinger, E. Rieken and M. Weiss (eds) *Ex Anatolia Lux: Anatolian and Indo-European Studies in Honor of H. Craig Melchert on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*: 296–303. Ann Arbor and New York: Beech Stave.
- Reiner, E., R.D. Biggs, M.T. Roth (eds) 1989. *The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*. Volume 17. Chicago: The Oriental Institute.
- Rieken, E. and I. Yakubovich 2010. The New Values of Luwian Signs L 319 and L 172, in I. Singer (ed.) *ipamati kistamati pari tumatimis - Luwian and Hittite Studies presented to J.*

⁸⁵ We thus need not assume that the regent Yarris in Carchemish, Ilalis the scribe in KULULU 3, or the vizier in EĞRIKÖY claimed the title of ‘ruler’.

- David Hawkins on the occasion of his 70th birthday*: 199–219. Tel Aviv: Institute of Archaeology, Tel Aviv University.
- Sasseville, D. and I. Yakubovich 2016. The Luwian inscription ŞARAGA: an improved edition. *Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires* 2016/1: 32–35.
- Tischler, J. 1991. *Hethitisches Etymologisches Glossar*. Lieferung 8 (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 20). Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- Yakubovich, I. 2002. Labyrinth for Tyrants. *Studia Linguarum* 3: 93–116.
- Yakubovich, I. 2015a. Phoenician and Luwian in Early Iron Age Cilicia. *Anatolian Studies* 65: 35–53.
- Yakubovich, I. 2015b. The Luwian Language, viewed 24 June 2017. <<http://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199935345.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199935345-e-18>>