

Zehnder, Thomas. *Die hethitischen Frauennamen: Katalog und Interpretation*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2010. XXIX+345 pp. *Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie*, 29.

The monograph under review was written within a general framework of the project *Die indogermanischen Frauennamen*, funded through the University of Zürich between 2002 and 2007. The other two principal participants of the project were Karin Stüber, who concentrated on the Celtic data and Ulla Remmer, who worked on the Indic and Iranian female names. The main result of the joint work of the three researchers is the collective monograph *Indogermanische Frauennamen* [Heidelberg: Winter, 2009]. While the focus of the project was on the names of women, which had not been previously studied as a separate corpus, the scholars also had an option to address more general issues related to onomastics.

The last task was particularly urgent in the instance of Hittitology due to the rapid progress in the analysis of the Anatolian personal names. One of its main conditioning factors is our better understanding of the Luwian language achieved since the publication of Laroche's *Les noms des Hittites* [Paris: Klincksieck, 1966]. Fifty years ago the structure of the Luwian language was only vaguely known, but now we are reasonably familiar with Luwian historical phonology and have learned a good deal about the Luwian lexicon. Given that the majority of personal names in the Hittite Empire and the Neo-Hittite states have proven to be Luwian in origin, this new knowledge projects itself into the better understanding of their etymologies.

The advances in our knowledge of Hittite (Nesite) personal names have more to do with their growing number at our disposal. The regular excavations at Kültepe/Kaneš, which began shortly after World War II, continue to yield Old Assyrian business tablets of 20-18th centuries BC, many of which mention indigenous individuals, both male and female. Laroche 1966 failed to make a definite statement about the genetic origin of the "Cappadocian" names from Kaneš, but it has become clear by now that they are Hittite (not Luwian) in their majority, and indeed constitute the largest and most coherent corpus of Hittite personal names available to us. Such a steady addition of new data, albeit attested in foreign transmission, appears to be unparalleled within the Indo-European family and boosts the ongoing work on decoding the structure of Hittite onomastics.

The dynamic state of the field influenced the structure of the volume under review. It starts with the survey of primary sources for the study of Anatolian onomastics and the procedures of discriminating between men and women in individual groups of texts (pp. 1-31). The new interpretations of individual groups of names are treated in special excurses. Then Zehnder proceeds to provide the classification of Anatolian names according to the morphosyntactic and semantic parameters (respectively pp. 31-52 and pp. 53-65). These sections address Anatolian onomastics in a comprehensive fashion, which is quite appropriate given the lack of radical structural differences between male and female names. The classificatory parameters are those commonly used in Indo-European studies, but it is the first time they are consistently applied to the extinct languages of Asia Minor. Small sections are devoted to onomastic elements recurrent in individual families (pp. 66-7) and the structure of Hattic and Hurrian names (pp. 68-71). The last topic was to be treated in view of the author's decision to catalog the names of native Anatolian women with no regard to their genetic origin. The introductory part of the monograph concludes with the list of morphemes that are frequently attested in Anatolian female names (pp. 72-103). They are all discussed both from the etymological perspective and with respect to their gender distribution (i.e. how frequently they occur in the names of the opposite sex).

The catalog itself (pp. 104-333) represents a collection of the indigenous Anatolian female names attested in cuneiform and Anatolian hieroglyphic transmissions. The author did not endeavor to present completely either the onomastic material of the alphabetic Anatolian languages (Lydian, Lycian A and B, Carian, Sidetic, Pisidian) or Anatolian names in Greek transmission, but these data are frequently adduced for comparative purposes. So far as I can judge, the book covers all or nearly the published data within its declared scope. This is, of

course, a time-bound statement, because the Anatolian onomastic corpus is constantly growing, not only as a result of new diggings but also through gradual publication of the already excavated tablets. The long-lasting value of the catalog lies in the systematic etymological discussion of all the treated items, which was not the feature of Laroche 1966. This has consequences beyond the study of women's names, since an appreciable number of men's names are included in the entries as etymological comparanda. These, and the alphabetic names, are cross-referenced in the indices at the end of the monograph (pp. 335-45).

It must be emphasized that the etymological component of the volume under review is not a compilation of the already available hypotheses but a creative treatment of the available data leading to new discoveries. As examples of new convincing etymologies one can cite the explanation of the "Cappadocian" name *Ša-ar-ni-kà*, with variants *Ša-ar-ni-kà-an* and *Ša-ar-ni-kà-at*, as Hitt. /sarningant-/, lit. "redeemer, substitute" (pp. 11-12), or the analysis of the Hittite female name ^f*A-ya-tar-ša-* as /Aya-tarsa/, lit. 'offspring of (the goddess) Aya' (p. 104). In other cases Zehnder succeeds in refuting unfounded comparisons of other authors. Thus, *pace* my own tentative analysis of the "Cappadocian" morpheme *-kuni* as a reflex of the Hittite word for 'woman' (Yakubovich, *Sociolinguistics of the Luwian Language* [Leiden: Brill, 2010], p. 217 with fn. 18), he cogently argues that the majority of personal names where this element occurs are male and non-Hittite (pp. 5-8). A by-product of his intelligent discussion is the segregation of other morphemes that belong to the same onomastic stratum as *-kuni*. Zehnder speculates that this stratum may be Hattic but observes that it also contains the morpheme *šupi-*, reminiscent of Hitt. *suppi-* 'pure, holy'. This is a new argument for the borrowed origin of Hitt. *suppi-*, which does not have a convincing Indo-European etymology.

On the other hand, the author does not share the misconception of many amateur scholars that every personal name can be traced to its origins. The primary method of linguistic analysis adopted in the monograph under review is the study of recurrent onomastic patterns leading to the segregation of their constituents. Short names that do not succumb to combinatory analysis are either left without etymological explanation or supplied with a full dossier of conflicting opinions with regard to their etymologies. When appropriate, possible scenarios of scribal errors leading to the appearance of unusual names are duly investigated (see e.g. p. 130 under ^f*Ašpunawiya*). As a rule, Zehnder abstains from direct comparisons between the onomastic elements and reconstructed Proto-Indo-European morphemes. For a rare and unfortunate exception, see pp. 132-33, where the implicit comparison between the element *āššui-* of unknown meaning and Indo-European **ekwo-* 'horse' is used as an argument in favor of reading the Luwian word for 'horse' as *á-sù-wa/i-* and not *á-zú-wa/i-*.

I can hardly point to any outright mistakes in Zehnder's monograph, but his work prompts me to correct some former mistakes of my own (e.g. to retract the ghost-name *Uhha-zalma* in Yakubovich 2010: 91). What follows is a number of specific comments to individual entries and points made by the author. They are meant not to detract from the value of the volume under review, which will remain an important reference tool for many years to come, but rather to underscore its thought-provoking nature.

p. 51. There is no substantial difference between mine and Kronasser's suggestions with regard to the etymology of *Astuw-alamanza* (previously read *Astuwadamanza*). I understand 'Let there be a name to him' in the sense 'let him make himself a name'. For the use of Luw. *alamanza* 'name' with reference to glory or reputation, see e.g. KARATEPE §50-51 'If he is a prince and has a princely name...'. For the new reading *alamanza*, see [the forthcoming contribution of E. Rieken and I. Yakubovich to Fs. Hawkins](#).

p. 93-4. Zehnder's cogent critique of my Luwian etymology for the "Cappadocian" name *Alalmisar* prompts me to withdraw my hypothesis and to agree that this name is Assyrian and contains Akk. *mišaru(m)* 'justice'. Guido Kryszat (pers. comm.) suggests that it is theophoric and means 'Alalu is justice (vel sim.)'. Incidentally, the theonym Alalu also appears to serve as a base for the personal name *Alal-talli-* > *Alan-talli* (cf. p. 94). The relative significance of the

Mesopotamian god Alalu in Asia Minor follows, among other things, from the role of the first supreme god assigned to him in the Song of Kumarbi.

p. 97-8. While Melchert's hypothesis that Luw. *washa-* refers to a sacralized object is essentially correct, it is important to specify, in my view, that this object is normally offered to gods. This is particularly clear in KUB 35.54 ii 27-41, where *washa-* is given to the Storm-god of the Open Country. The same word *washa-*, written “*419”-*sa-ha-sa-a*, denotes an offering in the hieroglyphic text KARKAMIŠ A4a §11: (“PANIS.PITHOS”) *a-za-li-sa-pa-wa/i* DOMINUS-*na-ni* “*419”-*sa-ha-sa-a* DARE-*mi-na* ‘the feast is to be given by’ the lord as an offering’. The translation ‘offering, sacrifice’ is appropriate for (“*419”) *wa/i-sa-ha-* in the laconic legal clause TUNP 1 §6-7: (“PES₂”) *tara/i-pi+ra/i-pa-wa/i* || REL-*sa* |**a-wa/i* 1 “ARGENTUM”-*sa* 1 (“SCALPRUM”) *ma-na-sa* |1 (“SCALPRUM”) *ma-na-sa-ha-na* (“*419”) *wa/i-sa-ha-sa* ‘one who attacks (this stele, the fine is) one mina of silver, and one mina (befits) him as a (propitiatory) offering’. The derivative (“*419”) *wa/i-sa-ha-i-* in BABYLON 2 §4 apparently describes an offering of thanksgiving made to Tarhunt. In view of these facts, the “Cappadocian” onomastic compounds where *-washe* is combined with divine names are to be read as the dedication of a newborn daughter to a particular deity, e.g. *Ala-washe* (p. 107) ‘offered to Ala’, *Mala-washe* (p. 206) ‘offered to Mala’, *Maliya-washe* (p. 208) ‘offered to Maliya’. For additional theophoric names of the same structure in unpublished Old Assyrian texts, see Yakubovich 2010: 219-20. It is likely that the onomastic element *-washa* eventually underwent semantic bleaching and therefore extended its combinatory potential.

p. 98. The onomastic element *-wasti* is probably linked within the Caland system to Luw. *wasu-* ‘good, pleasing’ and Luw. *was(za)-*, *wasiyaza-* ‘to be dear, pleasing’ (for which see CHLI II, 621a with ref.). From the morphological point of view, it can be analyzed as an abstract noun in *-t* extended by the Luwian mutation suffix *-i*. Its likely etymological meaning is ‘pleasure’ and it governs dependent nouns that preserve their dative case endings within compounds, e.g. ^f*Hani-wasdi-* (p. 142) ‘pleasure to (her) grandmother’, ^f*Tāti-wasti* (p. 288) ‘pleasure to (her) father’. Cf. the related name ^f*Anni-wasu* (pp. 119-20) ‘pleasing to (her) mother’, where the case of the underlying dependent noun is likewise overtly expressed.

p. 99-101. The element *-wiya* is an unlikely exponent of the meaning ‘woman’, as the latter is normally rendered by Luw. *wana(tti)-*, while the Anatolian or Indo-European cognates of the putative *wiya-* ‘woman’ are not forthcoming. Furthermore, although the absolute majority of personal names endowed with this morpheme are indeed female, the Amuq Valley seal A12728 in the collection of the Oriental Institute Museum reads (VIR) DEUS-*wa/i-i(a)* ‘Mr. Massana-wiya’. I propose to take Luwian morpheme *-wiya* as a cognate of Hitt. *uiya-* ‘send’. The kernel of this class probably consists of theophoric compounds: ^f*Santa-wiya* (p. 264) ‘sent by Santa’, ^f*Tiwata-wiya* (p. 292) ‘sent by Sun-god’, ^f*Arma-wiya-* (p. 124) ‘sent by Moon-god’ etc. For the near-specialization of a gender-neutral formative element to female names, cf. *-uzzi* /*-wazzi*, presumably related to Luw. **wazzi(ya)-* ‘wish’ (pp. 101-103). Granted, many names in *-wiya* do not make obvious sense under the proposed interpretation, especially when the first member of the compound is a toponym. Yet one must reckon with the possibility of semantic bleaching or, at least, a secondary metaphoric extension ‘sent by’ > ‘coming from’. For the second element of a compound name reanalyzed as a “suffixoid”, cf. the discussion of *-nika* on p. 88.

p. 119. If the name ^f*Anni-massani-* consists of *anna/i-* ‘mother’ and *massana/i-* ‘god’, the use of the case-form *anni* prompts the inescapable interpretation ‘goddess to (her) mother’. As an alternative, I would like to suggest comparing *anni* with the Luwian preverb/adposition ‘with’, which is normally hidden under the spelling CUM-*ni* in hieroglyphic transmission. If one accepts this reading of CUM-*ni*, which is proposed by Petra Goedegebuure and argued for in some detail in [my forthcoming contribution to Fs. Melchert](#), then the name under discussion is to be understood as ‘(being) with god’.

p. 280. The name of the Hittite ritualist ^f*Susuma-*nniga** need not be separated from the structurally similar “Cappadocian” female name *Saptama-nika* (pp. 265-6). Given Neumann's explanation of the last name as ‘seventh sister’, one may wonder whether ^f*Susuma-*nniga** means

‘sixth sister’. This would imply the reconstruction of Proto-Anatolian or Pre-Anatolian **suk̂smo-* ‘sixth’ and the simplification of the complex cluster **k’sm* within Hittite. The Hittite pronunciation of the word for ‘sixth’ could be **sus(um)ma-*. The spelling *ṣu-ṣu-ma-an-ni-ga* instead of the expected **ṣu-ṣu-um-ma-ni-ga* may well reflect an error of perception on a part of the Luwian scribe to whom Susummaniga’s ritual was dictated. For the non-standard features of the tablet KBo 3.8+ containing this ritual, see Yakubovich 2010: 316 with ref. Besides the ritual tablet, the name is attested only on a label and in a shelf-list, where we expect it to have been mechanically copied from this tablet. This etymology, of course, must remain provisional until other cognates of Indo-European **swek̂s* ‘six’ are identified in Anatolian.

pp. 282-3. The discussion of the Cappadocian name *Tamna-sar* is incomplete without mentioning the interpretation of *ḏDamnassares* as ‘household deities’ advanced in *JANER* 1 (2001): 150-57. Craig Melchert derives this theonym from **damna-* < **de/omno-* or **d̂mno-* ‘house’ and adduces philological arguments against the association of *ḏDamnassares* with animal-shaped figurines. Although the name ‘domestic’ is likely to be female on semantic grounds, if one accepts Melchert’s etymology, one can no longer assert on morphological grounds that Tamnasar was a woman, because her/his name emerges with the gender-neutral derivational suffix *-sar* and not its gender-switching homonym. Melchert’s suggestion is also relevant for the name *Tamna-niga* (p. 282).

Ilya Yakubovich
Moscow State University