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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 *tarwa(n)*- '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 *ṣdq*), parallel to ‘hero’. Reexamination of current evidence fully vindicates his analysis and suggests a reading *tarrawanni*-. While the new meaning and shape do not preclude the popular view that Greek *ṭyrannos* ‘tyrant’, Ugaritic *ṣrn* ‘prince’, and the Hebrew transposition *šrnym* 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, *ṣrn, šrnym, *ṣdq, *tarwan(n)i-, ṭyrannos

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 Early interpretations the references assembled by Laroche.3 ‘Heerführer’ according to context. See for further similar readings of a few hieroglyphic signs, most notably L 172 as *la/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.

The first partial publications of the Luvian-Phoenician bilingual from Karatepe shed important new light on the word. Bossert4 is ambivalent about the connection of the title (or perhaps epithet ‘just’) with the possibly homonymous word for ‘justice’ (meaning assured by Phoenician *ṣdq*), but in their respective handbooks a decade later Laroche5 and Meriggi6 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. *ṣph.*

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’.5 Meriggi’s alternative of an honorific epithet ‘the just one’ has been almost entirely forgotten. A notable exception is the paper by Franco Pintore,6 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 *ṣdq* in the Iron Age.7 Pintore’s analysis has occasionally been acknowledged,8 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 *tarrawanni*- 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 *tarrawanni*- as an Adjective

*tarrawanni*- modifying *SERVUS*-i/-j, *servant* and FEMINAT(i)-/‘wife’

There are several compelling examples in Iron Age Luvian that permit only an analysis of *tarrawanni*- as an adjectival modifier of a following noun. The first is cited by Pintore, who correctly terms it ‘una ricorrenza che non consente dubbi’.9

(1) KARKAMIŠ A17b,§1: *... (LITUUS)da(?)-za-[i]-wa/i-ra/i-sa DEUS-ni-sa *371-ni-sa SERVUS-la/i-i-sa ka-ma-ni-si-sa [...]DOMINUS- [...]-sa[...]

8 Pintore 1979.
9 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.
11 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 *la/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 *tarrawanni*-, a reading that will be justified in the last section of the paper.
Hawkins 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. This example is entirely parallel to the following cited by Bauer and analyzed as such by Hawkins:

(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:

(3) BULGARMADEN, §1

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

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

The attempt by Hawkins to construe the second *371-ni-sa as a genitive, a title of Wargalawas (‘…servant of Wargalawas, 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-sá- |[*371-ni-sa |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 other four instances where he is mentioned in the role of his mother of Hattusilis, seated.’

Likewise in MARAŞ 14, §11 and NIĞDE 2. In view of the incontrovertible examples (1) and (3), one must follow Pintore in analyzing all examples of *371-ni-sa SERVUS as a collocation. This is certainly the most natural analysis of the following:

(5) EĞRİKÖY, §3

(8) …-[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) BOYBEYPINAR1 1, §4

(PES)u-pa-ta-pa-wa/i-ta- |d-za-mi-i-sá PURUS,FONS,Mi *371-ni-sa SERVUS-la/i-sa

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

As cogently argued by Pintore, the alternate reading ‘Azamis, the ruler Suppiluliumas’s servant’, 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) BOYBEYPINAR1 1, §1

[z]-a/wa/i (THRONUS)-sà-tara/i-tà-za za-ha MENS-A-sa mu’pa-na-mu-wa/i-ti-i-sa PURUS.FONS.Mi *371-ni-sa FEMINA-na-ti-sa PONERE- wa/i-ha

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

(8) BOYBEYPINAR2 2, §1

za-wa/i d-1a/i-ta-na DEUS,AVIS mu-u ‘pa-na-mu-wa/i-ti-sa PURUS,FONS.Mi *371-ni-sa FEMINA-na-ti-sa’HÀ-LÍ-sa // […]sá (SOLIUM)i-sa-mu-wa/i-ha

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

This inscription, commissioned by Panamuwatis, wife of Suppiluliumas, refers to her husband (likely a king of Kummuh, as per Hawkins) no less than eight times. In the other four instances where he is mentioned in the role of his husband he is consistently referred to as ‘my lord’, but with no title of office. Likewise, he is given no title of office in BOYBEYPINAR1 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).

This also applies to the structurally ambiguous example in MALPINAR, §1, not known to Pintore.
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-t(i)-x p[| (front)-[ya -i]-já

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

(10) MALPINAR, §1

(a) a-wa/i á-[m]-i DOMINUS-ni-i Há-ti-l[i-i *371-ni-i REX-ti-i [...|[(b)] ‘SCALPRUM- wa/i FLAMMAE7/?-x-tà-tì-i ku-ma-ha (URBS) áx-wa/i-ni-śd-ha

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

(11) BOROWSKI 3, §1

EGO-wa/i-mi-i ha-mi-ya-ta-sa *371-[j]-wa/i-ni-i-sa [REX-ti-sa [ma-su-wa/i-ra/i-za-sa(URBS) _ ...]

‘I am Hamiyas, the/a _ king, Masuwarean [...].’

In the three preceding examples *371-ni-sa 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-i-ha-mi-ya-ta-sa *371-ni-sa [ma-su-wa/i-ra/i-za-sa(URBS)] REX-ti-i-sa

‘I am Hamiyas, 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-i-[ka-tu-wa/i-sa] *371-ni-sa DEUS-ni-ti (LITUUS) á-za-mi-sa kar-k[a]-m-si-ta-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-sa-sa(REGIO) REGIO DOMINUS-ya-sa ‘su-hi-si-sa [REGIO-ni DOMINUS-ya-sa [INFANS]-mi-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-sa 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)nimuwia- ‘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 sḏq ‘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

[EGO-mi á-za-sa-[wa/i-la/i]-ma-[za]-s[ ? ] ] [kk]-ar-ka-mi-sá-zia-sa(REGIO) [REGIO DOMINUS-iva-sa ‘su-hi-si *371-ni-sa ] [INFANS]-mi-mu-wa/i-zia-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’:

27 This reading is certain also in KARKAMIŠ A11b-c, §1, KARKAMIŠ A15b, KARKAMIŠ A31-fragments A30bi-3, §7, MARAŞ 14, §1, and NİDE 2. It also seems the more likely possibility in KARKAMIŞ A6, § 1.
28 For reasons given above, the examples MARAŞ 1, § 1 and MARAŞ 4, § 1 with ‘king’ are ambiguous (contra Pintore 1979: 483), as are KARKAMIŞ A11a, § 1, CEKEK, § 6a, KELEKLİ, § 1, and KARKAMIŞ N1, §7 (Dinçol et al. 2014) with ‘country lord’, and ANDAVAL, § 1 (‘lord’ of a city).
29 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’.
30 Strictly speaking, given the doubtful status of i-stem appellatives in Iron Age Luvian (compare note 3 above), *371-ni/ní-sa/sa in these examples likely represents nom. sg. comm. /tarrawannis/
It seems very unlikely that tarrawann(i)s here forms a collocation with 'great-great-grandson'. Furthermore, in the uniquely elaborate genealogy of MARAŞ 1 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-ni-tara/i-wa/i-ni-sa/ (‘‘*371’’ tara/i-wa/i-ni-sa) [ku-ri/i-ku-ma-wa/i-ni-i-sa (URBS) REX-ki-sa/mu-wa/i-ta-la/i/i-i-sa [‘‘*371’’ tara/i-wa/i-ni-sa] (INFANS) mi-mu-wa/i-i-za-sa

‘I am Halparuntiyas, 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-ti:** ‘man, person’

Pintore also argues correctly that tarrawann(i)- serves as an adjectival modifying CAPUT-ti (‘‘*371’’ tara/i-wa/i-ni-sa) 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-(ni)- CAPUT-ti- ‘inferior man’, the generic value of which is clearest in ALEPPO 6, §11, where it is contrasted with ‘king’, ‘king’s son’, ‘country lord’, and ‘river-country lord’. One may also directly compare the frequent characterization of someone as (DEUS)SOL- (CAPUT-ti-) = /tiwadama/i-/ (/t s’CAPUT-ti/) ‘man’ in the Storm-god of Aleppo—nothing in it supports the assumption that he held a position of political power. The nature of KARKAMIŞ A184 also suggests a private document. Neither ‘Ruler-Prince’ nor ‘homme juge’ makes much sense for the former. 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)- its function as an epithet or honorific title (for discussion of the abstract see the next section). The example in KARKAMIŞ A7, §14 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’’ tara/i-wa/i-za-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

Ego-wa/i-mi ru-wa/i-sa,*371-ni-sa á-sá-ha SOL-wa/i-ru/wa/i-mi-sa

‘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 inessentical generic ‘man, person’. There is no justification for the interpretation as ‘prince’. 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-VIR/i-la-sa [‘‘*371’’ tara/i-wa/i-ni-sa] CAPUT-ti-i-sa

‘I am Lap(a)rizidis, a_ person.’

(21) KARKAMIŞ A18a, l.1

EGO-mi pi'-sa-mi-tá-sa tara/i-wa/i-ni

‘I am Pisamitas, a_ one.’

As properly emphasized by Pintore, 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 A184 also suggests a private document. Neither ‘Ruler-Prince’ nor ‘homme juge’ makes much sense for the former. 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.

---

15 Contra Hawkins 2000: 488. The same applies to KARKAMIŞ A 21, §2 and KULULU 5, §1, contra Hawkins 2000: 160 and 485, who correctly interprets all other instances as ‘Sun-blessed man/person’: KARATEPE 1, §1; KARKAMIŞ A5a, §1, A18b. The adjective also occurs alone as an epithet at BOYBEYPINARI 2, §§.
16 Pintore 1979: 479, note 29.
18 See Hawkins 2000: 393 with references to Meriggi and Laroche.
19 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) r(u)/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. 5).
20 For which see Hawkins 2000: 129 with references.
Further Luvian-internal evidence against *tarrawann(i)-‘ruler’

Pintore48 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.49 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 iminical kings and country lords (and in SULTANHAN, §48 a tabaryaliy(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) KARKAMIŠ A11a, §7

*a-wa/i-ku *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)zà-tà

‘And my lord Tarhuntzas, Karhuhas, and Kubaba favored me because of my justice/righteousness.’

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

(25) AKSARAY, §5

wa/i-tà á-mi-ya-tí || (IUSTITIA)MBAR-tà||wa/i-ka-sa (DEUS)TONITRUS-hu-ti-i ìr- | (DEUS)DOMINUS-di-ka-za-ha DEUS-ni-za zà-tí BONUS-zi-ya-zà-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? Tarhuntzas gave it to no one, but

---

48 Pintore 1979: 489.
49 Sasseville and Yakubovich 2016: 33.
51 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.
52 Bauer 2014: 297-302. The titles FILEUS/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.
to me, Kiyakiyas, the tarrawann(i)-, king, he gave it." 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 tarrawannazza- derived from tarrawann(i)-:

(26) MARAŞ 1, §§6–7

[wa/i-mu-ta | LIS-la/i-si-sá (DEUS)[SOL-]ti-i-sá | i-mara/i-si-ha' (DEUS)ru-ti-ya-sá | (*371)tnara/i-wa/i-na-za-ta–.]

[wa/i-mu/i (=]TJUSTITTA)tnara/i-wa/i-na-ra/i ħa-pat-tx-ha-la-i-ta

'The Sun-god' of the Lawsuit and Runtitiyas of the open country made me tarrawann(i)-, and because of through my justice/righteousness they b el 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 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 ădq.

The Meaning of West Semitic ădq

The evidence presented by Pintore53 for the meaning of the West Semitic root ădq 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 SPATH 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)- is that the Phoenician equivalent of the abstract in KARATEPE 1, §XVIII is ădq, not a reflex of ăgrp. The latter root is attested in the sense 'judge, to judge' in Ugaritic,58 as well as in Punic and Aramaic.59 Yakubovich60 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 ăgrp as 'to judge'. Therefore, if that were the primary sense of the title tarrawann(i)-, we would expect a form of ăgrp in the sense 'judgment' to match the abstract in KARATEPE 1, §XVIII.

On the contrary, as Pintore contends, the West Semitic root ădq 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 ysr 'upright' in Phoenician, Hebrew, and Ugaritic—in the first instance as an epithet of mlk 'king'.59 In a religious context the meaning shades into 'pious, devout'.60 In Ugaritic ăd = ădq as a nominal epithet of 'wife' the sense is 'lawful, legitimate'.61 Pintore62 argues that Luvian tarrawannis SERVUS is the Iron Age counterpart of Bronze Age Akkadian drašlīti 'loyal servant'. He rightly asserts that in the contexts of examples (3), (5) and (6) from BULGARMADEN, ERΓIKÖY, and BOBEYPINARI 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 ădq expressing personal loyalty to another is lacking in Iron Age West Semitic, and a collocation of bd 'servant' with ădq is unattested.

A tendentious interpretation of tarrawannis SERVUS-līs as 'loyal servant' is in any case unnecessary. The meaning 'just' in the sense 'righteous, upright, honest' is appropriate for all uses of Luvian tarrawannis 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 BOBEYPINARI (examples 5 and 6) is insisting (in an overly defensive manner) that she is Suppilluliuma'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 ŠARAGA. 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

54 Pintore 1979: 474–481.
55 Laroche's comparison (1960: 198).
56 Reiner et al. 1989: 459 s. v. šipitu.
58 And according to some also in Amorite and Ugaritic (del Olmo Lete and Sanmartín 2015: 912–913 with references).
59 Giusfredi 2009: 142.
60 E.g., Yakubovich 2002: 112.
61 del Olmo Lete and Sanmartín 2015: 912-913.
64 Avisur 1975: 28–29. Also noteworthy is the collocation 'because of my justice and my wisdom' in KARATEPE 1, §XVIII (Phoenician b dağıt w-b-bhmty = Luvian [a-[mil]-ya-ti] IUSTITIA-na-ti [a-[mi]-ya-na-rvha ([COV]:)-ta-na-sc-ne-ma-ri, which has parallels in Hebrew and Aramaic (Avisur 1975: 28).
65 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 ădq in Aramaic (Hoftijzer and Jongeling 1995: 963).
66 del Olmo Lete and Sanmartín 2015: 768.
67 Pintore 1979: 477.
The origin of tarrawann(ı)-

Several scholars have already suggested that Luvian tarrawann(ı)- is the source of the Wanderwort also attested in the Hebrew transposition srmyn of Philistine princes or military leaders,29 Ugartitic srm 'prince' (also as a personal name), and Greek τυράννος 'tyrant'.30 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 Amuq29 and the Greeks in Cilicia.31 As per Yakubovic31, 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(ı)- as 'just, righteous, honest' (adjective) and 'justice, righteousness, rectitude' (noun) does suggest a straightforward source for the word: a Proto-Indo-European base reflected in English 'true', German treu and other cognates in Germanic from a thematic stem *trewo-.31 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, 1.8).

The multiple ambiguities of hieroglyphic Luvian orthography create problems for the phonological analysis of the attested tara/i-wu/i-n’, which can represent a word with initial /tarwa-/ or /tarwa/i- or /tarwa/i-w/- or /tara/i-w/-, or /tara/i- or /tara/i-sà/.73 Greek τυράννος is helpful in suggesting that we should assume a stem in /-wann(i)-/, which also fits known Luvian nominal morphology.73 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 /trV-/; see Melchert73 on tarrı-. three ‘< tři- (in tariyanalli- ‘third in command’) and tarrapp- ‘to plow’ < třepr-. As Ilya Yakubovic 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-n-ı-tı. This spelling can hardly represent anything except /tara/iawnnadi/, from syncope of a /tara/iawnnadi/ accentuated earlier than on the syllable -wan- (a reading /tara/iawnnadi/) syncopated from a /tara/iawnnadi/ 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 /tara/iawnnani/i-/.79 A syncope of the second syllable in the transmission to Greek is unsurprising, and τύρα- may result from metathesis of /tara-iwa-/.

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 -ı- is regularly inserted in Luvian between the stem and ending just in the common gender nominative and accusative, singular and plural).74 We have other examples where this synchronically unmotivated alternation was eliminated by Luvian speakers by generalizing the -ı- 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 /tarrawanna/a/- to make just, righteous’ without the ‘mutation’ -ı- suggests that the adjective was likewise /tarrawann(i)-/. Yakubovic73 also assumes that both stems are the same and suggests that the abstract was secondarily concretized.75 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-o- plus the usual Luvian ‘-mutation’. Ilya Yakubovic 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 /-wann(i)-/ would not be surprising.76 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 to doubt that the germinate reflects the Luvian original.73 Melchert 1994: 58 and 84 with references.

29 Thus Meriggi 1967: 52.
30 Hittite tarrawal(i)-, which means ‘to establish, fix’ (provisions for festivals), unconvincingly derived until now from *teru- ‘to be strong’ (Tischler 1991: 154–155 with references), is better explained ‘to make firm, lasting’ (compare German festsetzen), from a variant *deru-u- of our base. A full account of all the related Luvian and Hittite words will appear elsewhere.
31 H. Craig Melchert: Iron Age Luvian TARRAWANN(I) 343
33 For a revised synchronic account of ‘i-mutation’ (followed here) see Yakubovic 2015b: section 6.3.
34 Yakubovic 2002: 112.
35 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 ‘emnity’ to ‘hostile, inimical’ (originally only predicatively) > ‘enemy’.
36 Especially since Luvian has a productive suffixed /-wa-/ from a consonant stem*wen-.
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start from a virtual dreníténo- (or derived abstract *drenít-éno-) to explain the geminate -n- from the preceding accented short *e (by 'Cop's Law', on which see Ó Cop 1970). Anaptyxis in the word-initial cluster would have then led to *drewenni-.

Retraction of the accent to the first syllable (/tarrawann(i)-/) to explain syncopated /tarrauunadi/ may seem ad hoc, but tarr-i- 'three' cited above also requires such a shift, since the geminate -rr- also requires an application of 'Cop'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 ṣdq. Neither has anything directly to do with the office of judge or ruler.6 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'.
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