

ARCHAIC GREEK NAMES IN A NEO-ASSYRIAN CUNEIFORM TABLET FROM TARSUS

Philip C. Schmitz (Eastern Michigan University)

Nearly seventy years ago, Albrecht Goetze published nine cuneiform tablets and fragments excavated at Tarsus (Gözlü Kule),¹ one of the principal cities of the ancient Assyrian province of *Hilakku* (Cilicia).² Tablet no. 1 is Hittite³; the others are Akkadian and of later date. Tablets no. 2 and no. 3 are economic records and contain personal names.⁴ Tablets nos. 4–5 are very fragmentary but record personal names. Tablet no. 6 is a fragment, perhaps of a writing exercise, but its condition is too poor for reading.⁵ Tablet no. 7 is almost entirely legible. I will describe its contents below. Tablet no. 8 is a magical text.⁶ Tablet no. 9 lists Assyrian personal names. Goetze dated the Akkadian group from a putative reference to *ša[tu]* 33 in tablet no. 9, line 11. Taking the number 33 to refer to the thirty-third year of Ashurbanipal, he assigned them the date 636 BC.⁷

1. Hetty Goldman, “Excavations at Gözlü Kule, Tarsus, 1936,” *AJA* 41 (1937) 262–86. The tablets were found at the north end of a room in a building in section B (1937: 273, fig. 27). Goldman explains that the tablets were discovered “not lying on the floor, but in the composition of the floor itself, and also in the earth below the floor” (1937: 276). Preliminary discussion of the tablets appeared in A. Goetze, “Remarks on the Epigraphic Material Found at Tarsus in 1936,” *AJA* 41 (1937) 287–88, with full publication in idem, “Cuneiform Inscriptions from Tarsus,” *JAOS* 59 (1939) 1–16.

I am very grateful to Carolina López-Ruiz for perceptive comments on an earlier draft of this paper. My incorporation of her contribution has, I hope, improved the argument and not misrepresented her views. I remain responsible for the interpretations advanced in this article, and for any errors in the final version, as well as for other limitations that may be evident to the reader. Please note the following abbreviations: *CHLI* = J. David Hawkins, *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions, Vol. 1: Inscriptions of the Iron Age*, Untersuchungen zur indogermanischen Sprach- und Kulturwissenschaft 8.1 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2000); *KAI*⁵ = H. Donner and W. Röllig, *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften*, 3 vols. (5th, enlarged and revised ed.; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2002); *LGPV* = P. M. Fraser and E. Matthews, eds. *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*, 4 vols. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987–2005); *PNAE* = Simo Parpola and Karen Radner, eds. *The Prosopography of the Neo-Assyrian Empire* (Helsinki: Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 1998–).

2. The evidence associating Tarsus with *Hilakku* (rather than *Hiyawal/Que*) is marshaled by André Lemaire, “Tarshish-Tarsisi: Problème de topographie historique biblique et assyrienne,” in *Studies in Historical Geography and Biblical Historiography Presented to Zecharia Kallai*, ed. G. Galil and M. Weinfeld, SVT 81 (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 54–62.

3. Probably from a time before 1250 BC (Goetze, “Cuneiform Inscriptions from Tarsus,” 3).

4. *Ibid.*, 5–6.

5. *Ibid.*, 7.

6. See Erica Reiner, “Plague Amulets and House Blessings,” *JNES* 19 (1960) 153–54. The text was re-edited by Stefan M. Maul, *Zukunftsbewältigung: Eine Untersuchung altorientalischen Denkens anhand der babylonisch-assyrischen Löserituale (Namburbi)*, BagF 18 (Mainz: von Zabern, 1994), 185–90 (text D).

7. Goetze, “Cuneiform Inscriptions from Tarsus,” 16.

The cuneiform tablets from Tarsus have not received much sustained attention. Orthmann⁸ and Lemaire⁹ mention the Tarsus tablets but do not discuss them. Desideri and Jasink briefly summarize Goetze's analysis of tablet no. 7.¹⁰ Lebrun observes that tablet no. 7 contains "a majority of indigenous personal names of Luwian type,"¹¹ although he cites only the name *Sandapî* in line 5 (which I will discuss shortly). Goetze's interpretations of non-Assyrian personal names in Tarsus tablet no. 7 have apparently undergone no significant scrutiny since their publication.

Stephanie Dalley points out that Goetze's interpretation of the number 33 in 9.11 as a year number is wrong: Assyrian documents of this period bear eponym dates.¹² From Stefan Maul's recent edition of the incantation text (no. 8),¹³ Dalley concludes that 708–658 BC is the probable range within which the Akkadian group should be dated.¹⁴

In this study I am concerned with tablet no. 7, which has twelve lines of cuneiform writing. Inscribed only on the obverse, the text is ruled into six registers, each containing two lines of text. The text of each register is formulaic: the first line contains a non-Assyrian personal name; the second line begins *ina pān* "before,"¹⁵ followed by an Assyrian name. Thus the text appears to assign Anatolian individuals to supervision or supply by Assyrian managers.

Altogether there are six names of Anatolian personnel and six Assyrian names. Goetze's working assumption was that all of the non-Assyrian names in the list were Luwian. Encouraging to such an assumption is the name in line 5, *Sandapî*, which is a Luwian name.¹⁶ It includes the divine name *Sanda-* associated with Tarsus and found in both place names¹⁷ and personal names.¹⁸ The component *pî* is from Hittite and Luwian *piya* "give."¹⁹ Assuming that the other names in tablet no. 7 were also Luwian, Goetze sought illustrations from pertinent sources, but with very limited results. Goetze reviewed a number of Cilician personal names more than twenty years later but did not reconsider the names he identified in Tarsus tablet no. 7.²⁰

8. W. Orthmann, "Gözlükule," *RIA* 3 (1957–1971) 503.

9. André Lemaire, "L'écriture phénicienne en Cilicie et la diffusion des écritures alphabétiques," in *Phoinikeia Grammata: Lire et écrire en Méditerranée: Actes du Colloque de Liège, 15–18 novembre 1989*, ed. Cl. Baurain, C. Bonnet, and V. Krings (Namur: Société des Études classiques, 1991), 141 and n. 30; *idem*, "Tarshish-Tarsisi," 61 n. 97; *idem*, "Les langues du royaume de Sam'al au ix^e–viii^e s. av. J.-C. et leurs relations avec le royaume de Qué," in *La Cilicie: Espaces et pouvoirs locaux (2^e millénaire av. J.-C.–4^e siècle ap. J.-C.). Actes de la table ronde internationale d'Istanbul, 2–5 novembre 1999 = Kilikia: mekânlar ve yerel güçler (MÖ 2. binyıl–M.S. 4. yüzyıl). Uluslararası yuvarlak masa toplantısı bildirileri, Istanbul, 2–5 Kasım 1999*, ed. E. Jean, A. M. Dmçol, and S. Durugönül, *Varia Anatolica* 13 (Istanbul: Institut français d'études anatoliennes Georges Dumézil; Paris: De Boccard, 2001), 189 n. 37 (read: Goetze "Cuneiform Inscriptions from Tarsus").

10. P. Desideri and A. M. Jasink, *Cilicia: Dall'età di Kizzuwatna alla conquista macedone*, *Storia* 1, Università degli Studi di Torino, Fondo di Studi Parini-Chirio (Florence: Le Lettere, 1990), 144–46.

11. René Lebrun, "Kummanni et Tarse, deux centres ciliciens majeurs," in *La Cilicie: espaces et pouvoirs locaux* (see n. 4 above), 91 n. 17.

12. Stephanie Dalley, "Sennacherib and Tarsus," *AnSt* 49 (1999) 76, with Dalley's hand copy of tablet no. 9, p. 77. The fragment is a tally, and 33 is a sum.

13. Maul, *Zukunftsbewältigung*, 185.

14. Dalley, "Sennacherib and Tarsus," 77.

15. *AhW* 821–22. In the present context, *ina pān* probably signifies "at the disposal of" (*CAD* 12: 87 A1h 3').

16. *PNAE* 3.1: 1087–88 (R. Pruzsinszky).

17. Ladislav Zgusta, *Kleinasiatische Ortsname*, *BzN* 21 (Heidelberg: Winter, 1984), 536–37, §§1158.2–59.2.

18. Ladislav Zgusta, *Anatolische Personennamensippen*, *Dissertationes orientales* 2 (Prague, 1964), 135–40; *idem*, *Kleinasiatische Personennamen* (Prague: Tschechoslowakischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1964). Dalley, "Sennacherib and Tarsus," 74–75, discusses the iconography of the deity *Sanda*.

19. Goetze, "Cuneiform Inscriptions from Tarsus," 9; cf. Zgusta, *Anatolische Personennamensippen*, 96–102; John Marangozis, *A Short Grammar of Hieroglyphic Luwian* (Munich: Lincom Europa, 2003), 25, 36.

20. A. Goetze, "Cilicians," *JCS* 16 (1962) 48–58. Note Goetze's comment: "there is nothing significant to be added to the commentary given l.c. 9ff." (p. 54).

My thesis in this study is that the names in lines 1, 7, and 9 of tablet no. 7 should be interpreted as archaic Greek names rather than as Luwian names. The discussion that follows is intended to demonstrate that this approach produces more promising results.

Regular correspondences between Neo-Assyrian cuneiform transcriptions and Greek letters provide a basis for interpreting the onomastic evidence from Tarsus. With Greek transcriptional equivalents in mind, I have proposed the following interpretations of the non-Assyrian names on Tarsus tablet 7.

^m*Ip-pa-ru-na-te* (tablet no. 7, line 1).²¹ The underlying Greek word is ἵππαρονάτη(ς) “coltish.” The stem ἵππο- adds the diminutive affix -αριον-, ἵππάριον (with long α) designating a young horse. The Akkadian writing *ru-* in the third syllable indicates that the medial semivowel ι has been lost before ο.²² It is difficult to determine whether this phonetic effect arises from the Greek word, however, because Akkadian transcriptions of Greek words often omit representation of ι before ο.²³ Akkadian *u* can transcribe Greek ο, ου, or ω,²⁴ so the writing of *po* with *ru* in Tarsus tablet no. 7, line 1, is orthographically unproblematic. The diminutive sometimes has “an ironical force, as . . . γάστρ-ων, fat-belly,”²⁵ and that sense is possible here.²⁶ The final syllable *te* may represent Greek η, as in the Late Babylonian transcription *De-me-ti-ri-ia* (Δημήτριος) (BRM 2.55.1).²⁷ Possibly an *E* sign is to be restored in the broken area at the upper right corner of the tablet, although the space is limited. The resulting reading, *te-[e]*, would follow the more strongly attested pattern of representing Greek η with the *plene*-writing *e-e*.²⁸

To the best of my knowledge, this name, which I have explained as Greek, has no satisfactory Luwian equivalent.²⁹ I am not aware of a Luwian name that is similar in sound shape, Goetze’s notes notwithstanding.³⁰ Cuneiform Luwian *azzu(wa)*³¹ “horse” corresponds to Hieroglyphic Luwian (EQUUS) *á-sü-wa*,³² in contrast to Gk. *hippo-*. A semantic cognate is thus ruled out. The explanatory example adduced by Goetze, Ἰμβρος, is a Carian toponym and a problematic candidate.³³ Although the name may be ancient, the *-b-* is epenthetic.³⁴ Transcription of *im(b)-* with Akkadian *ip-pa* is unlikely *a priori*. Houwink ten Cate argues that the Lycian personal name *m̃para-* also appears in the Greek alphabetic spellings Ἰμβρας and Ἰμβρης.³⁵ Reconciling these forms with the Akkadian transcription *Ip-pa-ru-na-te* seems futile to me.

21. PNAE 2.1: 560 (K. Åkerman). Classicist readers please note: in the conventions of Akkadian transcription, superscript *m* at the beginning of a personal name represents a determinative sign indicating that the form is a personal name.

22. Herbert Weir Smyth, *A Greek Grammar for Colleges*, rev. Gordon M. Messing (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1984), 11 §20a; 18 §43.

23. W. Röllig, “Griechische Eigennamen in Texten der babylonischen Spätzeit,” *Or* 29 (1960) 388.

24. Röllig, “Griechische Eigennamen in Texten der babylonischen Spätzeit,” 386; Gilbert J. P. McEwan, “An Official Seleucid Seal Reconsidered,” *JNES* 41 (1982) 52. Contemporary examples are: φιλάγορα(ς) = *Pi-la-a-gu-ra(-a)* (Esarhaddon A V 64); Δάμασο(ς) = *Da-ma-su* (A V 67); Ἀντικρίτος (?) = *Ad-di-ik-ri-tú-šú* (ABL 140.18; PNAE 1.1: 52a; Robert Rollinger and Martin Korenjak, “*Addikritušu*: Ein namentlich genannter Grieche aus der Zeit Asarhaddons (680–669 v. Chr.),” *AoF* 28 [2001] 325–37).

25. Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, 235, § 856. A possible implication is that the name is a nickname, a suggestion for which I am indebted to Professor Lopez-Ruiz.

26. The personal name Ἰππαρ(ι)ονάτης is not found in *LGPN*.

27. Röllig, “Griechische Eigennamen in Texten der babylonischen Spätzeit,” 379.

28. *Ibid.*, 385 §13.

29. The obscure Hier. Luw. construction *hu-pi-tà-ta-tà* [. . .]-*ha-wa/i* (BOYBENPINARI 2 [CHLI 1: 339]) does not appear related.

30. Lycian *hpp̃nterus* (H. Craig Melchert, *Lycian Corpus* [unpubl. ms., 2001], 21, 58.5) is vaguely similar.

31. See H. Craig Melchert, *Cuneiform Luwian Dictionary*, *Lexica Anatolica* 2 (Chapel Hill 1993, <http://www.unc.edu/~melchert/LUVLEX.pdf>), 44 s.v.

32. KARATEPE 41 (CHLI 1: 515).

33. Goetze, “Cuneiform Inscriptions from Tarsus,” 9.

34. Zgusta, *Kleinasiatische Ortsnamen*, 199 §373–1.

35. Ph. H. J. Houwink ten Cate, *The Luwian Population Groups of Lycia and Cilicia Aspera during the Hellenistic Period*, *DMOA* 10 (Leiden: Brill, 1961), 14, 103.

³⁶*Kù-ru-ni-zu-ru-me-ri* (tablet no. 7, line 3).³⁶ Goetze compared *Kurunizurumeri* to Πωνζρυμερις,³⁷ a Luwian name attested in Cilicia at Corycus, near the Lamus River.³⁸ Houwink ten Cate derives this name from *Ru(n)-Šarruma+ri*.³⁹ The divine name *Šarruma* may appear in Lycian names as the suffix -σαρμας, and in Cilician names as -ζαρμας.⁴⁰ The suffix -*ri* is attested but semantically opaque.⁴¹ Attempts to account for the first syllable (*Ku-*) of the name as it appears in Akkadian transcription have resorted to uncertain Hittite etymologies of *Ru(nt)*, *Runti(ya)*, Hier. Luw. *Runzas*, a name associated with the stag god.⁴² There seems to be no fitting Greek equivalent for this name.

³⁷*Pi-i-me-na-tu*₁₂ (tablet no. 7, line 7).⁴³ The last sign of this line is broken away except for traces of its lower portion; thus its restoration and interpretation are open to question. Goetze restored the break with [*a-m*]i, but *tu*₁₂ fits the traces that appear in Goetze's hand copy and the reading provides a morphologically acceptable Greek word, (ἐ)πιμην-ατ-ο(ς). Greek η is infrequently represented by Akkadian *e*.⁴⁴ The epigraphically attested name Επιμηνά⁴⁵ appears to be related to ἐμῆνις "wrath, threat" (e.g., *Il.* 5.178). The form attested in the Tarsus tablet (no. 7, line 7) shows aphaeresis of initial ε-⁴⁶ and carries the adjectival suffix -ατ-ο(ς).⁴⁷ Note the cuneiform spelling *pi-i* for Gk. (ἐ)πί, with stress lengthening of -i.⁴⁸

³⁸*Pe-ri-da-u-ri* (tablet no. 7, line 9)⁴⁹ appears to represent *περιδούρι(ος) in contrast to Attic περιδότης "contended."⁵⁰ Goetze read the first sign as *pi*, but it can also be read *pe*. The vowel quality of CV signs is often ambiguous, as in the Late Babylonian transcription *Sile-lu-ku* (Σέλευκος).⁵¹ The Akkadian spelling -*a-u-* to represent the diphthong -*aw* also occurs in the name ^{KUR}*ia-ú-na-a-a* /yawnaya/ "Ionian."⁵² The related name Ἐπιδούριος is attested twice in Greek inscriptions of the classical and Hellenistic period.⁵³

[^mx-*t*]*i*²-iš[-x]-x-[x] (tablet no. 7, line 11). Part of the first sign of the name is visible, according to Goetze's hand copy. He reads the sign as *ti*.⁵⁴ The second sign, *iš*, is complete. Other possible values are *mil*, *ís/z/s*, or *eš*₁₅. If the correct phonetic value is *iš*, the name was probably not Greek. However, the syllable /-tis-/ could be a component of a Greek name. Read as *ís-*, the second sign could represent a

36. *PNAE* 2.1: 642 (E. Lipiński).

37. Goetze, "Cuneiform Inscriptions from Tarsus," 9.

38. A variant name Πωζαρμας also occurs (Houwink ten Cate, *Luwian Population Groups*, 190 n. 7).

39. Houwink ten Cate, *Luwian Population Groups*, 129, 131. Against the association of Πω(ν)ζρυμερις with names bearing the element -ζαρμας on the one hand or with the divine name *Š/Sar(ru)ma* on the other, see Zgusta, *Anatolische Personennamenssippen*, 34.

40. Houwink ten Cate, *Luwian Population Groups*, 136. Note Zgusta's warning that these elements may be Celtic (*Anatolische Personennamenssippen*, 34).

41. Houwink ten Cate, *Luwian Population Groups*, 183.

42. Houwink ten Cate, *Luwian Population Groups*, 128–29; *CHLI* 1: 63.

43. *PNAE* 3.1: 994–95 (R. Pruzsinszky).

44. See the late example from BRM 2.55.1 cited above.

45. *LGPV* 3b s.v. (1 occurrence).

46. Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, 24, § 76.

47. Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, 243, § 863.18.

48. A clear example of stress-lengthening is *Pi-la-a-gu-ra(-a)* (Esarhaddon A V 64), representing Φιλάγορας.

49. *PNAE* 3.1: 995 (G. Van Buylaere).

50. *Anthologia Palatina, Planudea*, ed. F. Dübner (Paris, 1864–1872); ed. H. Stadtmüller, vols. i, ii (1), iii (1) (Leipzig 1894–1906), 5.218 (Paul. Sil.).

51. For example, BM 55437, 5' (Matthew W. Stolper, *Late Achaemenid, Early Macedonian and Early Seleucid Records of Deposit and Related Texts*, AION Supp. 77 [Naples: Istituto Universitario Orientale, 1993], 48). I had the benefit of Professor Stolper's good counsel about this question, for which I am grateful.

52. Nimrud letter 69.3 (Parpola, AOAT 6, 303); J. Brinkman, "The Akkadian Words for 'Ionia' and 'Ionian,'" in *Daidalikon: Studies in Memory of Raymond V. Schoder, S.J.*, ed. R. F. Sutton, Jr. (Wauconda, IL: Bochazy-Carducci, 1989), 55 and n. 3; cf. Robert Rollinger, "Zur Bezeichnung von 'Griechen' in Keilschrifttexten," *RA* 91 (1997) [1999] 167–72. Note the similar stress contours of Greek -δᾶν- (in the example from Tarsus tablet no. 7) and ἰών- (in Ἴωνία). The syllables, which differ in vowel length, are both represented in Akkadian by -*a-ú*.

53. *LGPV* 1 s.v. (2 occurrences).

54. Goetze, "Cuneiform Inscriptions from Tarsus," 8.

Greek name beginning with Ἰσο.⁵⁵ The pattern established by previous names suggests that an Assyrian name is unlikely in this position.

This single tablet provides a small amount of valuable information about Tarsus in the mid-seventh century BC. In a list of six names, two are Luwian, one is possibly Luwian, and three are Greek. A number of hypothetical explanations might account for this distribution of names. For example, the list might involve the assignment of war captives for labor. In such a circumstance, the Greek names would not indicate useful details about the languages spoken in Tarsus or greater Cilicia. If the text of tablet no. 7 is a list of local names, however, then it invites the question whether a Greek-speaking community resided in or near Tarsus.⁵⁶

Previous discussions of this tablet adhered to the reasonable assumption that Luwian was the primary language in Cilicia when the document came into existence. More recently, specialists in the Luwian language appear to be reconsidering the sociolinguistic assumption, giving greater place to the possible use of Greek in Cilicia alongside Luwian.⁵⁷ In a forthcoming publication, I demonstrate that the Phoenician divine designation (Baal) *Krntryš* in the Karatepe main text (e.g., Phu/A II 17b–19, text edited by Röllig, *CHLI* 2: 51) represents Greek *Κορυνητήριος (*korunētērios*) “mace-bearing.”⁵⁸ I have also proposed the identification of three transliterated Greek words in the Phoenician “Separate Inscriptions” from Karatepe (*CHLI* 2: 68–73; *KAI*⁵, p. 67, no. 26 [Nachträge, Bauinschrift D]).⁵⁹ The time may be propitious for reconsidering the role of Greek in the speech communities of ancient Cilicia.

55. Again I thank Professor López-Ruiz for this suggestion.

56. On the question of Greek presence in Cilicia, see Giovanni B. Lanfranchi, “The Ideological and Political Impact of the Assyrian Imperial Expansion on the Greek World in the 8th and 7th Centuries BC,” in *The Heirs of Assyria: Proceedings of the Opening Symposium of the Assyrian and Babylonian Intellectual Heritage Project, Held in Tvärminne, Finland, October 8–11, 1998*, ed. S. Aro and R. M. Whiting (Helsinki: The Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project 2000), 7–34; Robert Rollinger, “The Ancient Greeks and the Impact of the Ancient Near East: Textual Evidence and Historical Perspective (ca. 750–650 BC),” in *Mythology and Mythologies: Methodological Approaches to Intercultural Influences. Proceedings of the Second Annual Symposium of the Assyrian and Babylonian Intellectual Heritage Project, Held in Paris, France, October 4–7, 1999*, ed. R. M. Whiting (Helsinki: The Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project 2001), pp. 233–64. On the dynasty of Muksu/Mopsos, see André Lemaire, “La maison de Mopsos en Cilicie et en Pamphylie à l’époque du Fer (XIe–VIe s. av. J.-C.),” *Res Antiquae* 3 (2006) 99–107; Norbert Oettinger, “The Seer Mopsos (Muksas) as a Historical Figure,” in *Anatolian Interfaces: Hittites, Greeks and Their Neighbours: Proceedings of an International Conference on Cross-Cultural Interaction, September 17–19, 2004*, ed. B. J. Collins, M. R. Bachvarova, and I. C. Rutherford (Oxford: Oxbow, 2007), 64–67.

57. Annick Payne, *Hieroglyphic Luwian* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2004), 124–25; idem, “Multilingual Inscriptions and Their Audiences: Cilicia and Lydia,” in *Margins of Writing. Origins of Cultures*, ed. S. L. Sanders, University of Chicago Oriental Institute Seminars 2 (Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 2006), 121–36; Ilya S. Yakubovich, “Sociolinguistics of the Luwian Language,” (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 2008), 193 n. 100. Wolfgang Jenniges, “L’Asie mineure et ses langues,” *Res Antiquae* 3 (2006) 73–97, does not discuss Greek in Anatolia.

58. Philip C. Schmitz, “Phoenician KRNTYŠ, Archaic Greek *KOPYNHΘHPIOΣ, and the Storm God of Aleppo,” *KUSATU* 11 (2009) 119–60.

59. Philip C. Schmitz, “Archaic Greek Words in Phoenician Script from Karatepe,” *American Society of Greek and Latin Epigraphy Newsletter* 12.2 (October 2008) 5–9.