



Research Archives-Director's Library  
The Oriental Institute  
The University of Chicago

CRRAI 47/I

# SEX AND GENDER IN THE ANCIENT NEAR EAST

*Proceedings of the 47th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale,  
Helsinki, July 2-6, 2001*

Part I

*Edited by*

S. PARPOLA and R. M. WHITING

THE NEO-ASSYRIAN TEXT CORPUS PROJECT  
HELSINKI 2002

J. D. HAWKINS London

## Eunuchs among the Hittites

A conference version of this paper was read at the Helsinki Rencontre on 4 July 2001. I offered it partly at the suggestion of Hayim Tadmor in order to append to his examination of the Assyrian *rab ša rēši* the Hittite evidence relating to the LÚ<sup>(MEŠ)</sup> SAG. But also I appear to have promised this treatment,<sup>1</sup> and now seems a suitable opportunity to deliver. The moment for such a review is particularly appropriate since the evidence of the Boğazköy texts has been considerably extended

recently by the discovery in 1990 and 1991<sup>2</sup> of the Nişantepe archive of seal impressions among which the seals of the officials<sup>3</sup> have established the Hieroglyphic equivalence of the Cuneiform LÚ SAG beyond any question and provided many examples of personnel bearing this title. At the same time the evidence relating to the Luwian word *wasinasi-* and its variant *usinasi-* found in the Hieroglyphic inscriptions of the Neo-Hittite states may be considered in this context.

General considerations: LÚ SAG / *ša rēši*, the writings

As a preliminary some general observations on the term LÚ SAG = Akkadian *ša rēši*, may be offered. The logographic — Akkadian equivalence was established by the Sultan-tepe discovery of the vocabulary *Igituh* short version,<sup>4</sup> and it seems that properly LÚ represents the *ša*<sup>5</sup> and is thus not a determinative and not omissible.<sup>6</sup> The normal Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian writings are logographic LÚ SAG with occasional exam-

ples of *ša/šá* SAG, but phonetic *rēši* is hardly found, though it is normal in Nuzi writings and also occurs at Ugarit.<sup>7</sup> Neo-Assyrian royal inscriptions normally use the archaizing (LÚ) *šu-ut* SAG which goes back to an Old Babylonian usage observed at Mari.<sup>8</sup> Approximately the same observations apply to the extended form (LÚ) SAG LUGAL (or MAN), normally so written.<sup>9</sup> Similarly (LÚ) GAL SAG is normally so written and its

<sup>1</sup> Grayson, Eunuchs in Power (in *Fs von Soden*<sup>2</sup>, AOAT 240 [Neukirchen - Vluyn, 1993], pp. 85-98 [see p. 90 n. 26;]) Deller, Assyrian eunuchs and their predecessors (in K. Watanabe [ed.], *Priests and Officials in the Ancient Near East* [Heidelberg, 1999], pp. 303-11 [see p. 309]).

<sup>2</sup> For the discovery, see P. Neve, *Arch. Anz.* 1991, pp. 322-35; 1992, pp. 307-16.

<sup>3</sup> Publication (forthcoming): S. Herbordt, *Die Prinzen- und Beamtensiegel der Hethitischen Grossreichszeit*, with commentary on the reading of the Hieroglyphs by J. D. Hawkins. These are cited here as Herbordt, *Katalog*

no. ... ; Hawkins, The Hieroglyphic Inscriptions.

<sup>4</sup> *Afo* 18 (1957-58), p. 83 l. 232

<sup>5</sup> For Borger, LÚ may be read *ša<sub>11</sub>*: *Zeichenliste* (AOAT 33A; 1978), p. 90f.

<sup>6</sup> Von Soden's transcription <sup>16</sup>SAG implies the opposite and is surely incorrect (*AHw*, p. 974, s.v. *rēšu(m)* (9)).

<sup>7</sup> These observations are based on the entries in CAD R, s.v. *rēšu* in *ša rēši* A, which should be adequate to substantiate them.

<sup>8</sup> CAD R, s.v. *rēšu* in *ša rēši* A, 1a3' compared with 1a1'.

<sup>9</sup> CAD R, s.v. *rēšu* in *ša rēš šarri*.

phonetic reading *rab ša rēši* is guaranteed only by the Aramaic and Hebrew *rb sr(y)s*.<sup>10</sup>

The normal plural of LÚ SAG in Assyrian and Babylonian is LÚ SAG<sup>MEŠ</sup>, to which the occasional phonetic complement *-ni* presumably indicates a reading *ša rēšāni*, thus the fossilized noun phrase *ša rēši* may take a normal Assyrian plural.<sup>11</sup> The application of LÚ SAG<sup>MEŠ</sup> to a single individual led Borger to suggest that SAG<sup>MEŠ</sup> represented the dual *rēši* following the isolated attestation of *ša rēšēn* in the Middle Assyrian Laws,<sup>12</sup> and a parallel use of SAG<sup>MEŠ</sup> in the phrase SAG<sup>MEŠ</sup> *ullû*, “hold up the head.”<sup>13</sup> This observation however does not agree with the attestations of LÚ SAG<sup>MEŠ</sup>(*-ni*) cited in CAD, which show that this is the normal writing of the plural of LÚ SAG. It certainly provides no grounds for generalizing the reading of the dual in the phrase *ša rēši*,<sup>14</sup> and it is wisely ignored by the dictionaries.

### The interpretation

The view followed in this article is that *ša rēši*, translated literally “(he) of the head,” has the basic meaning of “attendant,” drawn from the expression *ina rēši izuzzu*, “stand

at the head, attend upon.”<sup>15</sup> Though the phrase is famously paired with *ša ziqni*, “(man) with a beard,” the interpretation “(man) with a head” is not considered plausible, still less “(man) with two heads.”<sup>16</sup> From the basic sense “attendant,” *ša rēši* may undoubtedly connote “eunuch,”<sup>17</sup> as indeed it passes as a loan word in Hebrew *srys*,<sup>18</sup> but it does not explicitly refer to the physical state of the man so designated, i.e. is not an unambiguous term like “castrato.” It is therefore perfectly reasonable to enquire whether it could be applied at the same time to castrates and non-castrates and whether there might be an identifiable date at which the sense passed from the general “attendant” to the specific “castrato.”

In this context we may compare our Greek derived term “eunuch.” Its clear literal meaning εὐνοῦχος, “bed-keeper,” i.e. “chamberlain,” might have meant that the phrase “uncastrated eunuch” was meaningful and not self-contradictory. However at the time the word was coined, the office doubtless presupposed the mutilation, so its term of reference was exclusively “castrato.”<sup>19</sup> The likelihood is that *ša rēši* followed a similar semantic career.

distinguish the *ša rēši* from the *manzaz pāni*. The objection of Deller to this interpretation (see following note) may not be thought compelling.

<sup>16</sup> See the explanation attempted by Deller, in *Priests and Officials*, p. 304f; Dalley, below, n. 33; also this volume, p. 117.

<sup>17</sup> CAD R, s.v. *rēšu* in *ša rēši* A2, admits of only two such attestations, those noted below p. 219 with nn. 24, 25, extraordinarily excluding the contexts where the term is paired with *ša ziqni*. CAD Z, s.v. *ziqnu* in *ša ziqni*, is more specific. Also CAD M/II, s.v. *murruru* B; also M/I, s.v. *mazziz pāni/panuttu*.

<sup>18</sup> Hebrew *srys*, mostly in context of royal attendants, in particular in relation to the royal women: I Sam. 8:15; I Kings 22:9; II Kings 9:32; 20:18; 24:12, 15; 25:19. Explicit: Is. 56:3-4. Aramaic *srs*, Sefire 3 l. 5.

<sup>19</sup> Earliest references to eunuchs (εὐνοῦχος, also ἐκτομίος = “castrato”) and the practice of castration in Herodotus (III 48, 92, 130; VI 9, 32; VIII 105), in the context of the Persian imperial administration and its imitators among the medizing Greek tyrants.

If however we were to pursue the question of whether “attendant” passed to “castrato” at a specific date, we would find firm and explicit evidence almost entirely lacking. No explicit references to castration of *ša rēši* are found, nor is a verb definitely meaning “castrate” known.<sup>20</sup> The majority of references to the *ša rēši* are completely open on the question of castration or non-castration, as would indeed be many Greek references to eunuchs. But it may be argued that while few references demand the translation “castrato,” fewer or none exclude it.

### The evidence

Attestations of *ša rēši* occur in a number of contexts which while falling short of the explicit may nevertheless be characterized as very suggestive. Thus the frequent summarization of Neo-Assyrian officials as *ša rēši ša ziqni* (“[those] with beards”) is most naturally understood as “castrated and non-

castrated,” as it is normally taken,<sup>21</sup> and this understanding is reinforced by the passage which shows that *ša ziqni* had sons, but *ša rēši* had *halpete* (“successors[?]”).<sup>22</sup> Further in this context it has also been noted that sale documents involving the LÚ SAG normally omit the regular formulae referring to their sons and grandsons.<sup>23</sup> Nearest to the explicit is the incantation passage: “Like a *ša rēši* who does not beget (*la ālidi*), may your semen dry up.”<sup>24</sup>

For the Middle Assyrian period the Laws and the Palace Edicts offered suggestive but not completely certain attestations. The MAL penalty for adultery and sodomy of turning the offender into a *ša rēšēn* (*ana ša rēšēn turru*) is easily understood as castration in the context of the physical mutilations of that gruesome document, and so it is usually taken.<sup>25</sup> Potentially more explicit, but clouded by the uncertain identification of the key word *marruru*, are two Palace Edicts, for which the following translations may be offered:<sup>26</sup>

§20. The *mazziz pāni* of the king or the *širku* of the palace personnel, who are to enter the palace may not enter the palace without selection. If one is not *marrur*, they shall return him a second time for *mazziz pāni*-hood. If (the responsible officials) let a *mazziz pāni* (who is) not *marrur* enter the palace, and afterwards it has been noticed (lit. “they have seen”), (penalty).

§8. ... as (the responsible officials) select the *mazziz pāni*, the *ša rēš šarri* or the *mazziz pāni* who is not *marrur* they shall name, and they shall give him a second time for *mazziz pāni*-hood. If those responsible officials do not name (him), they shall bear the error.

This translation is as literal as possible. As more exact meanings I understand:

§20. Those who are to enter the palace as *mazziz pāni* or *širku* ...

§8. ... those selected as *ša rēš šarri* or *mazziz pāni* ...

(both) ... they shall return/give him a second time for *mazziz pāni*-hood (sc. where *marruru* will be effected).

<sup>20</sup> Unless it be *marruru*, see below with n. 27.

<sup>21</sup> CAD R, s.v. *rēšu* in *ša rēši* A, 1b5c'; CAD Z, s.v. *ziqnu* in *ša ziqni*. Cf. n. 16 above. Watanabe has noted the general correspondence on Assyrian official seals between the designation of the seal-holder as LÚ SAG and the representation of the worshipping figures as beardless: see Watanabe (ed.), *Priests and Officials* (above n. 1), pp. 319-21.

<sup>22</sup> CAD R and Z, as for previous note; also CAD H, s.v. \**halpatu*.

<sup>23</sup> Postgate, *NA Leg. Docs.*, p. 18f.

<sup>24</sup> One of the two contexts admitted by CAD R (*rēšu* in *ša rēši* A, 2) to mean “eunuch.”

<sup>25</sup> MAL tablet A, §§15, 20, the other context where CAD R admits the meaning “eunuch” (see previous note). For the isolated use of the dual *rēšēn* here, see above, with nn. 12-14, 16.

<sup>26</sup> Text: Weidner, *Afo* 17 (1954-56), pp. 276f (§8), 286f (§20). Cf. the translation in Grayson, *ARI* I, p. 131f; II, p. 42f.

<sup>10</sup> CAD R, s.v. *rēšu* in *rab ša rēši*. The Aramaic docket ADD 129[= SAA 14 98]:8 transcribes LÚ GAL SAG, the title of Nabu-šarru-ušur as *rb srs*, which circumvents the scruples of Borger (*Zeichenliste* (AOAT 33A; 1978), p. 91), who objects to SAG without LÚ as a writing of *ša rēši*. For Hebrew *rb srys*, see Tadmor, this volume, pp. 604-12.

<sup>11</sup> Adequate illustrative examples in CAD R.

<sup>12</sup> *Zeichenliste* (AOAT 33A, 1978), p. 91; also, though less dogmatically, BAL (Rome, 1963), p. LXXVla

<sup>13</sup> *Esarh.*, p. 40 comment on l. 11. *rēšu* generally is indeed not infrequently attested in the dual, with no obvious meaning, certainly not “two heads”! CAD notes “occ. often in dual” without further comment: examples may be seen, esp. s.v. *rēšu*, 1a.

<sup>14</sup> Unfortunately adopted by Dalley (see below, n. 33).

<sup>15</sup> CAD R, s.v. *rēšu*, 1d1'a; *AHW*, p. 973f, s.v. *rēšu(m)*, A4d. To “stand at the head” surely implies that the head's owner is prostrate, i.e. in bed, and thus expresses a more intimate form of attendance in the bed-chamber than to “stand in the presence” (*ana pāni izuzzu*). This should

It may be argued that a translation of *marruru* and *marrur* as “castrate” and “(is) castrated” (either explicit or by euphemism) gives obvious and perhaps the most convincing sense, but without the definite establishment of such a meaning, this can only be provisional.<sup>27</sup> The Edicts certainly show that to be *marrur* is a necessary condition for serving as *mazziz pāni* and *ša rēši šarri*.

Counter-examples where the identification of the LÚ SAG as a “castrato” is precluded may be sought. The most obvious such example should be references to son(s) of a LÚ SAG, and indeed these do occur.<sup>28</sup> Their relevance to the question of castration/non-castration is however undermined by evidence that eunuchs could and did adopt children in Mesopotamian as in other eunuch-employing societies.<sup>29</sup> In any case these counter-examples run contrary to the well-founded observation of the significant omission of reference to descendants in the case of LÚ SAG contracts.<sup>30</sup> Other substantial counter-examples appear to be lacking.

### Differing views

Here one must observe that our Akkadian dictionaries adopt a sceptical approach to

the interpretation of *ša rēši* as “eunuch.” The CAD as noted allows only two attestations of this sense,<sup>31</sup> otherwise preferring “attendant, soldier, officer, official,” on the grounds that “the evidence ... does not demand a meaning eunuch.” Similarly von Soden (*AHw*, s.v. *rēšu(m)*, 9 (b), apropos Assyrian provincial governors: “keine Eunuchen !”<sup>32</sup> Such statements without supporting evidence or argument simply prejudice a question which demands serious consideration.

A recent review article by Stephanie Dalley carries this scepticism to more extreme conclusions.<sup>33</sup> In it she seeks to reinterpret all references previously supposed to support the meaning “eunuch,” including those noted above. Since she cannot contest the loan of *ša rēši* into Hebrew and Aramaic with the meaning “eunuch,” it may well be questioned whether she is prudent in seeking so vigorously to reinterpret the Akkadian passages suggesting the same meaning for *ša rēši*. Certainly it must be stated that in her handling of the Hittite evidence, she introduces some misunderstandings which will require comment below.

All this information on the LÚ SAG / *ša rēši* is well known, and has been much discussed.<sup>34</sup> It is presented here again only as background to the discussion of the Hittite evidence, since I have felt it necessary to try

to clarify the points at issue. This is probably the point at which I should declare that I believe that the logogram LÚ SAG, Akkadian *ša rēši* is indeed actually the word for

### The Hittite evidence

#### Loyalty oaths of LÚ<sup>MEŠ</sup> SAG

The Cuneiform logogram LÚ<sup>(MEŠ)</sup> SAG is found in the Boğazköy texts,<sup>35</sup> where its Hittite reading is unknown, and the contexts of the attestations are quite limited. In the first place there are the Loyalty Oaths sworn to Tudhaliya IV.<sup>36</sup> The first (abbr. SAG 1) is specifically addressed to the LÚ<sup>MEŠ</sup> SAG, and entitled in its colophon “Tablet 1 of the Oath (*MĀMĒTI*) in the city Ussa of the LÚ<sup>MEŠ</sup> SAG.” For the second oath (abbr. SAG 2) the main exemplar is a tablet which has lost its upper part and thus is missing the beginning of cols. i and ii and the ends of cols. iii and iv (including any colophon), approximately 20 lines in each case. Cols. i and ii + iii are addressed to the “lords” (*BĒLŪ<sup>HLA</sup>*), specified as those who are “royal family” (*MÁŠ.LUGAL*, i 8) or brothers and cousins of the king (i 11-13), and in col. iii the “princes” (*DUMU<sup>MEŠ</sup> LUGAL*) are explicitly added to the “lords” (iii 3, 7-8, 13). Just where col. iii begins to fail, a double ruling marking the beginning of a new text is visible, followed by an indication that it is now the LÚ<sup>MEŠ</sup> SAG who are being addressed (iii 35-36), and this is continued throughout col. iv, except that one section addresses “any brother of the king, lord, prince (or) LÚ SAG ...” (iv 43). Another section envisages attempts by bro-

“eunuch,” i.e. “castrato,” “chamberlain,” in the same way that the Greek εὐνοῦχος, properly “chamberlain,” also has this exclusive meaning.

thers and half brothers of the king, as well as princes, to seduce a LÚ SAG from his loyalty to the king (iv 22-32). Thus in SAG 2 the sworn obligations of the lords and princes are sharply demarcated from those of the LÚ<sup>MEŠ</sup> SAG. The sense of SAG 1 and SAG 2 together is that the LÚ<sup>MEŠ</sup> SAG form the king’s closest entourage, so that the lords and princes have to seek access to him through them.

Some points of von Schuler’s otherwise exemplary treatment of the texts have led to confusion and misunderstanding. One is his transcription <sup>LÚ</sup>SAG, implying that the title is SAG with LÚ as determinative,<sup>37</sup> and his translation of the term drawn from this perception as “Obere.” Another is his designation of SAG 2 as “Instruktionen für Prinzen, ‘Herren’ und ‘Obere,’” which may suggest to the unwary that the three terms were more or less equivalent.<sup>38</sup> In his note on the position of the LÚ<sup>MEŠ</sup> SAG,<sup>39</sup> he summarizes their obligations and explains his translation “Obere” and transcription <sup>LÚ</sup>SAG as chosen to avoid prejudging the grammatical analysis and understanding of the term (though of course it notably fails to avoid this). On the question of whether they were eunuchs, while admitting that they may be seen to stand in a certain relationship to the harem, he inclines against this interpretation on the grounds that the king might not

<sup>27</sup> Verb given separate entry (with other examples) and meaning “check” by CAD (M/II, s.v. *murruru* \**murruru* B). In view of the uncertainty, this is prudent. The dictionary explicitly relates the “checking” to castration; so also CAD M/I, s.v. *mazziz pani*, *mazziz panuttu*. *AHw* lists the same attestations under *marāru(m)* I, “be bitter,” D(3), with special meaning “scharf, genau prüfen.” Pardee (*UF* 10 [1978], pp. 252-55) considers the range of Akk. *marāru* I, “be bitter,” including the lexical equivalence with *danānu*, “be strong,” in a specific restricted sense, but does not include *marruru*, probably because of CAD’s separation of the verb.

<sup>28</sup> Examples collected by Dalley (below, n. 33), p. 204, with nn. 25 (note that the seal is that of Adad-ušabši, naming Kidin-Marduk as father), 27 (note that only ND 3426 of the documents cited attributes the possibility of sons and grandsons to a LÚ SAG), 28, 29 (see now Kataja

and Whiting, *SAA* XII no. 93), 30.

<sup>29</sup> Most notable statement referring to this is *CH* §§ 187, 192, 193, adoption by a *girseqūm* (and by *sekrētum*): see recently Roth, *Law Collections from Mesopotamia and Asia Minor* (Atlanta, GA, 1995) p. 199f. I agree with those who consider the OB term for “eunuch” to be *girseqūm* (*ša/šūt rēši* attested only at Mari).

<sup>30</sup> Postgate, above, n. 23.

<sup>31</sup> Above, nn. 24, 25.

<sup>32</sup> *AHw*, s.v. *rēšu(m)*, 9(b).

<sup>33</sup> *BiOr* 58 (2001), pp. 197-206. I am grateful to Dr. Dalley for showing me her MS in advance, and regret that I have to disagree with her arguments and conclusions.

<sup>34</sup> Bibliography may be found in the recent articles of Grayson and Deller (above, n. 1) and of Dalley (above, n. 33).

<sup>35</sup> Collected by Pecchioli Daddi, *Mestieri*, pp. 513-15. The plural of LÚ SAG, contrary to Akkadian LÚ SAG<sup>MEŠ</sup>, is written LÚ<sup>MEŠ</sup> SAG.

<sup>36</sup> *CTH* no. 255. 2 and 1; edited by von Schuler, *Dienstanweisungen*, pp. 8-21 and 22-35.

<sup>37</sup> As does von Soden (above, n. 6).

<sup>38</sup> In his synopsis however (*Diensanw.*, p. 22), he does make clear that the text has two parts addressed to (a) the princes and lords, and (b) the LÚ<sup>MEŠ</sup> SAG.

<sup>39</sup> *Diensanw.*, p. 34f.

risk impurity by including mutilated individuals in his entourage. On examination, this argument may not be thought to have much validity, since castration might well be regarded as removal of a potential source of impurity.

Güterbock answered these points forcefully in his reviews of Friedrich's *HW* under the entry LÚ SAG,<sup>40</sup> where he based his interpretation, unequivocally "eunuch," precisely on the Loyalty Oaths' passages relating to the duties of the LÚ<sup>MEŠ</sup> SAG towards the king's women. He was able to clinch the argument that the logogram LÚ SAG was read as Akkadian *ša rēši* from the then recently discovered Sultantepe vocabulary *Igituh*,<sup>41</sup> and asserted the interpretation "(man) of the head = person (of the king)." Additionally he recognized the "man of the bed-chamber" (LÚ É.ŠÀ, hapax legomenon) as a further term for "eunuch." As far as I know, Güterbock held this opinion to the end of his life.

Güterbock's argument was questioned by F. Pecchioli Daddi,<sup>42</sup> on the basis of SAG 1, §§ 32-34 (col. iv 29-45), which she interprets as bans on the LÚ<sup>MEŠ</sup> SAG "approaching" (sexually) the king's women. Since these are obviously very significant, it is necessary to consider them in some detail below.

More recently Starke in a closely argued article advances from von Schuler's LÚSAG/"Obere" standpoint, reasserting that LÚ should be regarded as a determinative, that Hitt. LÚSAG is unconnected with Akk. *ša rēši*, and from there that the LÚ<sup>MEŠ</sup>SAG, "Vorrangige," were a late Empire develop-

ment of an elite corps drawn from the lords and princes, which was brought about by the needs of imperial administration.<sup>43</sup> New evidence however establishes beyond doubt that Hitt. LÚ SAG is indeed identical with Akk. *ša rēši*,<sup>44</sup> thus that the basis of Starke's theory of the LÚ<sup>MEŠ</sup> SAG is not correct.

It is my contention here that Güterbock was right and that Hitt. LÚ SAG like Akk. *ša rēši* specifically means "eunuch." Most of what Starke has argued about their position in the Hittite state is entirely relevant, namely that they constituted an important social group in the later Empire period drawing their power from their closeness to the king's person in his "inner chamber" (É.ŠÀ). But the unifying feature of this group was not that they were an élite corps originating from the princes and lords, but that they were an essentially inferior group, eunuchs, who nevertheless rose to highly prominent, important and influential positions. Such prominence is too well paralleled in later societies to occasion surprise.

Turning to the passages from SAG 1 considered by Pecchioli Daddi to argue against the interpretation "eunuch," we note that they are difficult to understand and have lost some words which may be crucial to their understanding: the main exemplar A (*KUB* XXVI 1, col. iv), §§ 32-34, has lost the beginnings of the lines which are only partially restorable from exemplar B (*KUB* XXVI 8, col. iv ll. 16-32).

In the translation offered below, I read and translate following von Schuler except where otherwise noted.

alternation of SAG with LÚ.SAG (i.e. the omission of LÚ) occurs only in the titles of the scribe Anuwanza (see *Mestieri*, p. 514f), which simply shows him to have been less sensitive to the one-to-one equations LÚ = *ša*, SAG = *rēši* than a Mesopotamian scribe. Cf. above, p. 217 with n. 5.

<sup>44</sup> The digraphic seals of Pihatarhunta (*Kat.* no. 305) on which the title LÚ SAG = Hier.L.254, and of Taprammi (RS 17.231) on which the title LÚ *ša rēši ekallim* = Hier.L.254. See below, pp. 225-26 and nn. 55, 64.

## Translation

§32. <sup>29</sup>In your(?) own houses any women may be allowed, <sup>30</sup>but this which is [in/of] the king's house, whether she (is) <sup>31</sup>whatsoever woman of the king, whether she (is) a hierodule (<sup>SAL</sup>SU-HUR.LAL) <sup>32</sup>or she (is) free, and anyone knew any (woman) <sup>33</sup>and now he does not break (it) off <sup>34</sup>and they are aware of him (in relation) to her, <sup>35</sup>and it [becomes known], (or) from this day on to another <sup>36</sup>[woman of] the king he approaches (sexually), <sup>37</sup>let [these matter]s be placed under divine oath!

§33. <sup>38</sup>[If] anyone does not de[nounce] (his) friend, <sup>39</sup>and I, My Sun, hear it, <sup>40</sup>[and] I [question him], let him not conceal it from me! <sup>41</sup>[If] he conceals it, let it be placed under divine oath!

§34. <sup>42</sup>Or (if) anyone approaches (sexually) <sup>43</sup>any (woman), and (his) friend <sup>44</sup>sees him and <sup>45</sup>does [not] denounce him, let it be placed under divine oath!

## Notes

29. Restore *INA É<sup>MEŠ</sup>-KU-N[U<sup>21</sup>-m]a-aš-ma-aš*. Though the copied traces do not look like *NU*, I cannot see that any other restoration is possible.
30. Restore *ki-i-ma ku-i[t INA] É.LUGAL*.
34. Restore *na-an-š[i-kán]*.
35. Restore *na-at [iš-du-wa-r]i*.
37. Restore *pa-i[z-zi ki-e INIM<sup>M</sup>]É<sup>Š</sup>*.

## Interpretation

29. Line concedes that the LÚ<sup>MEŠ</sup> SAG may have women in their houses.

30-37. But if anyone (not a LÚ SAG) has known sexually any woman (of the king) and does not discontinue the affair but it becomes public knowledge, (or) thereafter he approaches another [woman of] the king, this infringes the oath.

38-41. If any (LÚ SAG) does not denounce his (uncastrated) friend, and the king hears it, (infringement).

42-45. If any (uncastrated male) approaches any (woman of the king), and his (LÚ SAG) friend looks on and does not denounce him, (infringement).

LÚ<sup>ara</sup>-, "friend." That a LÚ.SAG may have a "friend," dear to him, is several times envisaged in SAG 1 and 2. SAG 1 §§ 5 and 19 though both damaged seem similar, both noting occasions when a LÚ.SAG must break off friendship on the order of the king. In some cases (SAG 1, § 29, and SAG 2 §§ 24, 31), the pairing LÚ<sup>aras</sup> LÚ<sup>aran/ari</sup> may indicate one LÚ.SAG informing on another, but at least one case (SAG 2 § 25, ll. 29-31) envisages a prince making a friend of a LÚ.SAG, as may also SAG 1 § 19 envisage the same position for a (disgraced?) lord. There thus seems no objection to understanding LÚ<sup>aras</sup> in §§ 33 and 34 as a "friend" outside social grouping, especially since the pairing LÚ<sup>aras</sup> LÚ<sup>aran</sup> is avoided.

Thus I understand the general sense to be: houses, but the women of the king's house, The LÚ<sup>MEŠ</sup> SAG may admit women to their if one has had a previous liaison which is

<sup>40</sup> *Oriens* 10 (1957), p. 361.

<sup>41</sup> See above, n. 4.

<sup>42</sup> In her article on the LÚ *KARTAPPU*, *SCO* 27 (1977), pp. 178-82, specifically p. 180 n. 54.

<sup>43</sup> Zur "Regierung" des hethitischen Staates (*Zeitschrift für Altorientalische und Biblische Rechtsgeschichte* 2 [1996], pp. 140-82). Specifically Starke suggests that the occurrence of the writing SAG alongside LÚ.SAG shows LÚ to be a determinative and divorces the expression from Akk. *ša rēši* (p. 161). But it must be noted that the

not discontinued but public knowledge, or the same seducer further violates another king's woman, that is covered by the oath (in the following way). If a LÚ SAG does not denounce his (uncastrated) friend and does not reveal this when questioned, this is under oath; and if a LÚ SAG sees but fails to denounce his friend, that too is under oath.

The passage can by no means be quoted to show that the LÚ<sup>MES</sup> SAG might sexually approach the king's women. Rather it is a further example of their duties to protect the king's women from interference, and as such is consistent with their status as eunuch keepers of the harem. The language is convoluted and not particularly sequential in logic, but that is a well known characteristic of such Hittite legal phrasing.

#### LÚ SAG as a title

The other main appearances of the LÚ SAG in the Boğazköy texts is as a title of named individuals either alone or in combination with other titles. Preeminent here is Anuwanza, who is named in numerous colophons stating that other scribes had written the tablet *PANI* 'Anuwanza (LÚ) SAG (see above, n. 43). His appearance as witness on the Sahurunuwa donation<sup>45</sup> with the titles "scribe, Lord of the city Nerik, LÚ SAG," dates him to the early reign of Tudhaliya IV, thus doubtless also to Hattusili III, and shows him to be an official of great importance. Two other scribal LÚ SAG's, Palla and EN-tarwa, entitled "lord of Hurma" and UGULA É.GAL respectively, appear with him on the same document.

Two further named LÚ SAG's, Pihatarhunta and Tarhu(anta)nani, are mentioned as recipients of possibly misappropriated palace property in the depositions for the lawsuit against GAL-<sup>D</sup>U, as is another LÚ SAG, [...]anzi-Tešub in a similar document.<sup>46</sup> The first document at least was drawn up under the authority of the Queen (i.e. Puduhepa), which dates approximately these officials. In a prosopographical study of the prince(s) Pihatarhunta attested at Ras Shamra and Meskene, Imparati suggests the identity of this DUMU.LUGAL and the homonymous LÚ SAG.<sup>47</sup> This is in the highest degree unlikely, being based partly if not wholly on the misconception drawn from von Schuler, as noted above, that the two titles were near equivalents, whereas the reverse is apparently the case. There is no reason whatsoever to suppose that prince Pihatarhunta, operating in Ugarit and Emar, had anything to do with Pihatarhunta the LÚ SAG involved in shady dealings in the palace at Hattusa. If one were seeking to equate the titles DUMU.LUGAL and LÚ SAG, this example could not usefully be cited without other clear-cut examples, which are conspicuously lacking.

An earlier LÚ SAG in an important military position appears in a fragment of Mursili's annals (his name is lost), entrusted with an expedition in the company of a certain Kantuzzili.<sup>48</sup>

The LÚ SAG was clearly associated with the position of LÚ<sup>D</sup>KARTAPPU, the "charioteer."<sup>49</sup> A man Zuzu combining the two titles was employed by Puduhepa on a confidential mission to Egypt.<sup>50</sup> The LÚ<sup>MES</sup> SAG and the LÚ<sup>MES</sup>KARTAPPI are linked in an

oracle text,<sup>51</sup> and in a simile expressing disaster the LÚ<sup>D</sup>KARTAPPU is said to leave his

chariot as the [LÚ SAG] (restored) leaves the bedchamber (É.ŠA).<sup>52</sup>

#### Hieroglyphic evidence: Taprammi and the sign L.254

Further evidence on the LÚ SAG in the Hittite imperial administration, in addition to that of the Boğazköy texts, is found in those from Ras Shamra.<sup>53</sup> The connection with the office of LÚ<sup>D</sup>KARTAPPU is again apparent here, since two prominent holders of this title, Kila'e and Takuhlinu seem also to have been LÚ SAG's.<sup>54</sup> But the most important of all to judge from the number and distribution of his monuments, is the *ša rēši* Taprammi.

This man bearing the title *ša rēši ekallim* (LÚ<sup>D</sup>*ša re-ši É.GAL-lim*) appears on a tablet,<sup>55</sup> sealed with his seal,<sup>56</sup> selling a slave to the Queen of Ugarit. In a court case heard before Ini-Tešub king of Karkamiš,<sup>57</sup> a Taprammi, without title but doubtless the same man, sued the king of Ugarit who had wrongfully seized the "houses" of his servants (he settled for substitutes).

Taprammi's seal provides important digraphic information, though this was misunderstood. The identifying Cuneiform epigraph reads "Seal of Taprammi, the LÚ<sup>D</sup>*ša re-ši É.GAL-lim*." His Hieroglyphic titles are: (centre) "scribe" and "great X" (un-

identified sign); (inner circle, right side, between *Taprammi* twice, dos à dos) SCRIBA-*la*; (left side, between Taprammi twice, dos à dos) PITHOS.VIR.DOMINUS, L.254 (the "barred rectangle"). It has been suspected, and has recently been confirmed,<sup>58</sup> that the equation in the titles is Hier.L.254 = Cun. *ša rēši*. Unfortunately Laroche, because of the unclarity of the seal impression, which is compounded by the published photographs and drawing, made incorrect Hier.-Cun. identifications: not recognizing PITHOS.VIR.DOMINUS,<sup>59</sup> he transcribed, ignoring PITHOS, HOMME (i.e. VIR), X (i.e. DOMINUS), PALAIS (i.e. L.254), thus inventing "homme (du) palais" as the Hier. equivalent of the Cun. LÚ<sup>D</sup>*ša rēši ekallim*.<sup>60</sup> The erroneous L.254 = PALAIS has stood uncorrected up to the present, providing much scope for confusion.<sup>61</sup>

Evidence from the Nišantepe seals<sup>62</sup> has however corrected the picture. On the one hand further and clearer examples of PITHOS.VIR.DOMINUS<sup>63</sup> confirm its occurrence on Taprammi's seal; on the other, a digraphic seal of Pihatarhunta<sup>64</sup> gives the

<sup>45</sup> KUB XXVI 43 rev. 34: see Imparati, *RHA* 32 (1974), p. 38f.

<sup>46</sup> KUB XIII 35 iii 13, i 38; 33 iv 17. See *StBoT* 4, pp. 10, 6, 34.

<sup>47</sup> F. Imparati, *Hethitica* VIII (1987), pp. 192-95, referring to the Ras Shamra tablet RS 17.148B = *PRU* VI 10, and the Meskene tablets Msk 73.1012, and Msk 73.1019,

with seal impression Beyer, *Emar* IV, A75; see also Laroche, *NH Suppl.* no. 971. Cf. further below, n. 76.

<sup>48</sup> *KBo* VIII 34+*KBo* XVI 12 = *AM* frag. 1: see recently Beal, *THeth* 20, p. 468f with n. 1738.

<sup>49</sup> For this office, see Beal, *THeth* 20, pp. 155-67; its connection with LÚ SAG, Pecchioli Daddi, above n. 42.

<sup>50</sup> KUB XXI 38 obv. 22: see now Edel, *ÄHK* no. 105.

<sup>51</sup> KUB V 3 i 8.

<sup>52</sup> *KBo* IV 14 iii 47f: see *CHD* P, s.v. *piddai*-A2.

<sup>53</sup> Main references collected in *CAD* R, *rēšu* in *ša rēši* A, (b)2'; also *rēšu* in *ša rēš sarri*, (a).

<sup>54</sup> Singer, *Tel Aviv* 10 (1983), p. 10f.

<sup>55</sup> RS 17.234 = *PRU* IV, p. 238, obv. 9, rev. 16 (see obv. 9, rev. 16).

<sup>56</sup> *Ugaritica* III, pp. 50, 52, 55 figs. 76-77; pp. 149-52 (Laroche).

<sup>57</sup> RS 17.337 = *PRU* IV, p. 168.

<sup>58</sup> See below with n. 64.

<sup>59</sup> Though he himself had identified the title in the first place, on seal *SBo* II no. 223, and KARAHÖYÜK (Elbistan), §1: see *HH* no. 312.1; also no. 482.2.

<sup>60</sup> *Ugaritica* III, pp. 149, 151; registered in *Les Hieroglyphes Hittites*, no. 254.


<sup>61</sup> I.e. transcription of L.254 as "PALAIS" etc.: e.g. Güterbock, *IstMitt* 17 (1967), p. 67.

<sup>62</sup> See above, nn. 2, 3.

<sup>63</sup> Herboldt, *Katalog*, nos. 3, 299, 460; see Hawkins, *The Hieroglyphic Inscriptions*, part 3, Titles and Professions, no. 32. I had earlier confirmed the reading on Taprammi's seal by examining a cast of RS 17.231 in the Collège de France. Cf. also Güterbock, *AnSt* 33 (1983), p. 30 n. 13.

<sup>64</sup> Herboldt, *Katalog*, no. 305; Hawkins, *Titles and Professions*, no. 15. The Pihatarhunta LÚ SAG/L. 254 of the seal could well be the same person as Pihatarhunta LÚ SAG of the GAL-<sup>D</sup>U case (above n. 46). In addition to this digraphic reading of Hier.L.254, another is found on a Meskene tablet, Msk. 73.1093: see Arnaud, *Emar* VI/1, p. 171, VI/3, pp. 215-17; Beyer, *Emar* IV, p.

unambiguous equivalence Hier.L.254 = Cun. LÚ SA[G], thus establishing Taprammi's digraphic equivalence of L.254 = <sup>LÚ</sup>ša rēši.

(Kat. no. 305) LÚ SA[G] = L.254 = <sup>LÚ</sup>ša rēši (ekallim) (RS 17.231)  
Pihatarhunta  Taprammi

These two digraphs, Nişantepe and Ras Shamra further confirm, if it were ever doubted, that in the context of the Hittite officialdom, log. LÚ SAG = Akk. ša rēši as in contemporary and later Assyria and Babylonia. Because of this evidence, we have felt able to adopt for Hier.L.254 the Latin transcription EUNUCHUS<sub>2</sub>.<sup>65</sup>

As to the person of Taprammi, Laroche proposed the identity of the two Ras Shamra attestations (one with seal impression) with (i) the holder of the seal *SBo* II 92 impressed on the Festivals of Karahna tablet,<sup>66</sup> and (ii) the figure on the Boğazköy stele base with inscription BOĞAZKÖY 1.<sup>67</sup> He also commented on the prominence of this individual among the generally anonymous ranks of Hittite officials.<sup>68</sup> These attestations have been extended by the appearance of Taprammi's name on a handsome bronze bowl as dedication<sup>69</sup> and in the Nişantepe archive as the holder of another fine seal showing him libating to the Stag-God.<sup>70</sup> In all these four occurrences he bears the sole title L.254, i.e. *ša rēši*.<sup>71</sup> The number of his appearances – three seals, a stele, a bronze bowl, and two documents showing important contacts with the royal family of

The equations gained from the two digraphs, those of Pihatarhunta and Taprammi, may be tabulated as follows:

Ugarit – suggest that he was a person of considerable prominence. He is dated as a contemporary of the Ini-Tešub of Karkamiš, and generally appears to belong in the mid to late 13th century BC.

The title L.254 (EUNUCHUS<sub>2</sub>) on the seals

Thus the evidence of the Taprammi and Pihatarhunta digraphic seals showing Hier. L.254 to equate with Cun. *ša rēši* / LÚ SAG, adds to the Cun. evidence for these functionaries the Hier. evidence of those who bear on their seals this title, which we now transcribe EUNUCHUS<sub>2</sub>. The older attestations were collected from *SBo* II and elsewhere by Laroche, who listed them under *HH* no. 254. Besides the Taprammi examples known to him,<sup>72</sup> the only dependable examples listed are: *SBo* II 147<sup>73</sup> and 152 (with SACERDOS<sub>2</sub>); Hogarth no. 330 (= Kennedy no. 10); TARSUS no. 42. Of the other entries, *SBo* II 12, 97, 201 and 215 are very uncertain (the last three do not even have photographs for checking); and TARSUS no. 40 is incorrect.<sup>74</sup>

162, C21. There the title of Ba'al-kabar, given as Hier. L.254 on his seal, is given as Cun. <sup>LÚ</sup>Ú.TU, taken by Laroche as <sup>LÚ</sup>IL/nāgiru, "herald": *Akkadica* 22 (1981), pp. 10 no. 14, 14. This identification does not appear to be correct, but it has to be admitted that no more plausible explanation is forthcoming.

<sup>65</sup> Following the principles set out in Hawkins, *CHLIV* 1, pp. 25-28; Marazzi, *Il Geroglifico Anatolico* (Naples, 1998), especially pp. 71-83. For EUNUCHUS<sub>(1)</sub> (L.474), see below, p. 229.

<sup>66</sup> *KUB* XXV 32 (+XXVI 70), rev.: see McMahon, *AS* 25 (Chicago, 1991), p. 53f.

<sup>67</sup> BOĞAZKÖY 1 reads: zi/a STELE EGO LEPUS+ra/i-mi

EUNUCHUS<sub>2</sub> VERSUS PONERE, "This stele I, Taprammi the Eunuch, dedicated."

<sup>68</sup> Above, n. 56.

<sup>69</sup> Hawkins, *Fs Nimet Özgüç* (Ankara, 1993), pp. 715-17.

<sup>70</sup> Herbordt, *Katalog*, no. 409.

<sup>71</sup> The seal Herbordt, *Katalog*, no. 408, belongs to a Taprammi with sole title "scribe." The question remains whether this could be the same man as our Taprammi the *ša rēši*: cf. Table 1 (entry 25), and below p. 228.

<sup>72</sup> RS 17.234, *SBo* II 92 and BOĞAZKÖY 1.

<sup>73</sup> = Herbordt, *Katalog*, no. 85.

<sup>74</sup> The sign is not L.254 but L.490: see the impression of a duplicate seal, Beran, *Boğazköy* III, no. 15.

TABLE 1

Entry	(i) name	(ii) EUNUCHUS <sub>2</sub>	(iii) additional titles	(iv) homonym	(v) other titles
1.	Alalime	4-5	—	3	PITHOS.VIR.DOMINUS
2.	"			6, 8	SCRIBA
3.	"			7	URCEUS
4.	Armamuwa	28	—	27	[?]
5.	Armapihami	55-57	VIR <sub>2</sub> (55 <sup>2</sup> , 57)	53-54	SCRIBA
6.	Armawalwi	65-66	MAGNUS.PASTOR (66)	67	MAGNUS.†x <sup>1</sup>
7.	Azatarhunta	82-85	SCRIBA (82, 83, 84)	86	[...]
8.	"			87	URCEUS
9.	Innarawa	138-139	L.414.DOMINUS	← (140)	without EUNUCHUS <sub>2</sub> )
10.	Iyarinu	152	URCEUS		
11.	Kilani	162	VIR, SCRIBA		
12.	?	205	SCRIBA		
13.	Masaya	232-233	L.135(2) (233)		
14.	?	239	L.135(2)		
15.	Nanuwa	281, 284-285	AVIS.MAGNUS (285)		
16.	"	288, 289	+SCRIBA (286)		
17.	Pihamuwa	299	PITHOS.VIR.DOMINUS	300, 301	?, [...]
18.	"			302	PITHOS[...]
19.	Pihatarhunta	305-306	AVIS <sub>3</sub> .MAGNUS (306)	307	REX.FILIUS
20.	Pukana	332	L.414.DOMINUS	← (333-338)	without EUNUCHUS <sub>2</sub> )
21.	Sariya	350-353, 356	L.135 (2) (350-352)	354	URCEUS(?)
22.	"		MAGNUS.PASTOR (353)	355	REX.FILIUS
23.	Ta	388	SIGILLUM (389 <sup>2</sup> )	387	VIR <sub>2</sub> (?)
24.	"			390	MAGNUS.SU+RA/†.X
25.	Taprammi	409	—	408	SCRIBA
26.	Tarhu(†)nani	412	MAGNUS.PASTOR	410, 411	—, MAGNUS.L.398
27.	Tarupasaniya(?)	444	—	446, 447	SCRIBA
28.	Tuwazi	485	SACERDOS <sub>2</sub> (?)		
29.	Uku	488-489	MAGNUS.PITHOS	← (490)	without EUNUCHUS <sub>2</sub> )
30.	Za(?)	521	VIR <sub>2</sub>		
31.	Zuwana	542	—	543(?)	SCRIBA
32.	[...]	562	—		
33.	AVIS <sub>3A</sub> -ziti	597	—		
34.	Runzapiya(?)	604	MAGNUS.PITHOS		
35.	LINGUA+CLAVUS-a	618	—	615, 616; 617	VIR <sub>2</sub> , +SCRIBA; SCRIBA
36.	"			619	URCEUS
37.	LINGUA+CLAVUS-i(a)	622	SCRIBA	← (621)	without EUNUCHUS <sub>2</sub> )
38.	"			620	REX.FILIUS
39.	VITA+RA/I	666(?)	REX.FILIUS(?)	665	REX.FILIUS
40.	"			667-677	SCRIBA
41.	"			664	[...]
42.	?	759	URCEUS		
43.	[...]	774	SCRIBA(?)		
44.	?	775	SCRIBA		

Note: The readings of the names and transcription of the Hier. logograms are as decided and listed by Herbordt and Hawkins in *Die Prinzen- und Beamstensiegel*. See also Marazzi *et al.*, *Il Geroglifico Anatolico* (Naples, 1998).



The new occurrences of the title EUNUCHUS<sub>2</sub> in the Nişantepe archive are as tabulated in Table 1 (p. 227). Of the numbered entries, the first three columns show (i) the name of the seal-holder; (ii) the *Katalog* no. of the impression on which the title EUNUCHUS<sub>2</sub> appears; (iii) any additional title on

AVIS <sub>3</sub> .MAGNUS	(entries 15, 19)	= Cun. LÚ <sub>1</sub> IGI.MUŠEN(?)
MAGNUS.PASTOR	(entries 6, 22, 26)	GAL NA.GAD(??)
MAGNUS.PITHOS	(entry 17)	
SACERDOS(?)	(entry 28)	LÚ <sub>1</sub> SANGA
SCRIBA	(entries 7, 11, 12, 16, 36, 43 <sup>75</sup> , 44)	LÚ <sub>1</sub> DUB.SAR
URCEUS	(entries 10, 14)	LÚ <sub>1</sub> SILÀ.ŠU.DU <sub>8</sub> .A
VIR	(entry 11)	
VIR <sub>2</sub>	(entries 5, 30)	
L.135 (2)	(entries 13, 14, 21)	LÚ <sub>1</sub> MUŠEN.DÜ(?)
L.414.DOMINUS	(entries 9, 20)	

Examples of what are apparently the same individual including and omitting EUNUCHUS<sub>2</sub> beside another title are entries 9, 20, 29 and 36.

Cols. iv-v, the homonyms with different titles, are juxtaposed for consideration of the question as to whether these could be the same individuals. The main available criterion for determining this is the possibility or otherwise of combining the titles of the homonyms. For example, in the case of the Alalime's (entries 1-3), EUNUCHUS<sub>2</sub> may be seen to combine with all three of the homonyms' titles, PITHOS.VIR.DOMINUS, SCRIBA and URCEUS: thus Alalime EUNUCHUS<sub>2</sub> could in principle be the same individual as the PITHOS.VIR.DOMINUS, the SCRIBA or the URCEUS. Since EUNUCHUS<sub>2</sub> combines most frequently with SCRIBA, homonyms bearing these two titles separately on different seals may well be the same individuals: besides Alalime, also Armapihani, Taprammi, Tarupasaniya(?), Zuwana, LINGUA+CLAVUS-a, VITA+RA/I. Note that SRI-

the same impression. Cols. iv and v show where the same name occurs (identified by *Katalog* no.), with different titles.

The purpose of the tabulation is to demonstrate with what other titles EUNUCHUS<sub>2</sub> may combine. The titles which occur on the same seal include:

BA and URCEUS do not seem to combine, unsurprisingly if we consider the Cun. equivalents LÚ<sub>1</sub>DUB.SAR and LÚ<sub>1</sub>SILÀ.ŠU.DU<sub>8</sub>.A, whose functions are also unlikely to overlap. Thus if a EUNUCHUS<sub>2</sub> has homonyms entitled SCRIBA and URCEUS, he may be the same individual in one or the other case, but not both: e.g. LINGUA+CLAVUS-a; also Azatarhunta the EUNUCHUS<sub>2</sub> SCRIBA is not likely to be the same as the homonymous URCEUS.

This examination leads to the important question of whether EUNUCHUS<sub>2</sub> can combine with REX.FILIUS, which mirrors the same question on the Cun. LÚ SAG and DUMU.LUGAL, which is considered and dismissed above (p. 224). The substantive question here is of course whether princes might be (made) eunuchs. The answer is that EUNUCHUS<sub>2</sub> and REX.FILIUS never appear clearly and unambiguously as titles on the same seal, either in the Nişantepe archive<sup>75</sup> or elsewhere. This conspicuous failure to combine is surely significant, in

relation to the substantive question too. Where homonyms' seals have REX.FILIUS and EUNUCHUS<sub>2</sub>, they are not likely to be the same individual,<sup>76</sup> and it is not likely that a prince might be a eunuch.

To summarize the Boğazköy - Ras Shamra evidence on the LÚ<sup>(MEŠ)</sup> SAG, we may say that while the clauses of their loyalty oaths are mostly too general to be informative, those relating to the king's women appear significant. Where the LÚ<sup>(MEŠ)</sup> SAG appear on the same tablet as the "lords" and "princes," so far from showing that the former with the latter constitute a single group or class, it is clear that the "lords" and "prin-

ces" are sharply distinguished from the LÚ<sup>(MEŠ)</sup> SAG. What the two groups have in common, which accounts for their presence on the same tablet, is proximity to the person of the king.

The double digraphic evidence Cun. LÚ SAG = Hier.L.254 (EUNUCHUS<sub>2</sub>) (seal of Pihatarhunta) and Hier.L.254 = LÚ<sub>1</sub>ša rēši (*ekallim*) (seal of Taprammi) confirms that the LÚ<sup>(MEŠ)</sup> SAG of the Hittite designate the same class of functionaries as the contemporary Middle Assyrian *ša rēši/rēšēn* and not as has been mistakenly supposed something different ("Obere," "Vorrangiger"!).

#### Late Hier. Luwian evidence: *wasinasi-* / *usinasi-*

It remains to compare the completely independent evidence of the Late Hier. Luwian inscriptions of the Neo-Hittite states, where there occurs a word *wasinasi-* (var. *usinas-i-*), usually determined by the logogram L.474 with no other attested usage. For this word I have argued the meaning "eunuch," and for the logogram, the transcription EUNUCHUS<sub>(1)</sub>.

The word was observed by Bossert (context 1 below) to refer to the beardless figures on the Royal Buttress at Karkamiš, *Carchemish* I, B. 4-5, and he translated "Gefolge."<sup>77</sup> Further in treating context 2 below, he translated "Gefangenen."<sup>78</sup> He was followed by Meriggi, translating "Knappe?" and "paggi" (context 1), "schiavi, servi" (context 2).<sup>79</sup>

The new readings<sup>80</sup> transformed the word

into *wasinasi-/usinasi-*, and suggested its identification with Cun. Luw. *wassinassi-*, genit. adj. of *wassina-*, "body,"<sup>81</sup> itself interpreted following the alternation *wassini* // *NÍ.TE-ni* (dat. sing.).<sup>82</sup> It thus has a basic meaning "(that) of the body."<sup>83</sup> Combining this with the contextually determined interpretations of the Hier. Luw. attestations "retinue/prisoners" (Bossert), and "pages/slaves" (Meriggi), we arrive at an interpretation "body-servant, attendant." The more precise meaning "eunuch" is suggested by a closer examination of the contexts of the attestations, including three comparatively recent additions (contexts 3, 4 and 9 below).

The full transliteration, translation and commentaries on the passages may be found in my *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Lu-*

<sup>75</sup> A very dubious case is the seal of VITA+RA/I (entry 39, *Katalog*, no. 666), a poor impression of a poor seal, where one title was drawn EUNUCHUS<sub>2</sub>.VITA+RA/I, but is otherwise entitled REX.FILIUS (*Katalog*, no. 665), and

SCRIBA (*Katalog*, nos. 667-77). Thus on *Katalog* no. 666 the title is actually likely to be SCRIBA which frequently combines with REX.FILIUS, rather than EUNUCHUS<sub>2</sub>, which never does elsewhere.

<sup>76</sup> E.g. seals of Pihatarhunta's (entry 19): the EUNUCHUS<sub>2</sub> (*Katalog*, no. 305), is not likely to be the REX.FILIUS (*Katalog*, no. 307), though the seal-holders could well be the LÚ SAG and DUMU.LUGAL respectively (see above, with nn. 47, 64).

<sup>77</sup> *SCO* 1 (1951), pp. 47, 49.

<sup>78</sup> *JKF* 1 (1951), p. 278.

<sup>79</sup> *Manuale* II/1, pp. 30, 129.

<sup>80</sup> Hawkins, Morpurgo Davies and Neumann, *NAWG* no. 6 (1973), pp. 145-97, specifically the reading *si* (p. 165).

<sup>81</sup> Hawkins, *AnSt* 30 (1980), p. 143.

<sup>82</sup> Laroche, *DLL*, s.v.; *RHA* XVI/63 (1958), p. 105f; see Starke, *StBoT* 30, pp. 156 (iii 11), 164 (ii 8).

<sup>83</sup> Annexed in one attestation to "(that) of the head": Starke, *StBoT* 30, p. 83 (obv. 15).



wian *Inscriptions* vol. I/1-2 (de Gruyter, 2000). Here the contexts are translated and discussed, and for the sake of completeness all are included.

Context 1. KARKAMIŠ A6, §§ 25-30 Date, c. 800 BC  
(*CHLI* I/1, pp. 125, 127f).

- § 25. If this seat shall pass down to any king,  
§ 26. who shall ...,  
§ 27. whether he shall take away on the one hand a stone from the stones,  
§ 28. or he shall take away a stele for a stele,  
§ 29. or who shall erase my name,  
§ 30. or who shall take away on the one side (one) from the children, or on the other side (one) from the WASINASI's...

As was seen by Bossert, the "children" of § 30 are those represented on the front of the Royal Buttress, the children of Yariri's lord Astiruwa, and the WASINASI's are the beardless attendants round the corner to the left.

Context 2. MARAŞ 4, §§ 12-15 Date, c. 850 BC  
(*CHLI* I/1, p. 257f)

- § 12. [when] I captured [the city] Ilu[wasi],  
§ 13. (of) the men I cut off the feet,  
§ 14. but the children I made USINASI's to us,  
§ 15. and thereby I exalted my image.

The capture of Iluwasi was mentioned earlier in the text (§ 4). An atrocity similar to that described in § 13 is depicted on the Bronze Gates of Shalmaneser III (a contemporary of the author of the present inscription): see King, *Bronze Reliefs*, Band X.3 (lower), pl. LVI.

Context 3. MARAŞ 14, §§ 1, 5 Date, c. 800 BC or later  
(*CHLI* I/1, pp. 265-67)

- § 1. I (am) [Astiwasu...] great U[SI]NASU' of [So-and-so] the Ruler, the Hero.  
...  
§ 5. (He) who shall be made my son, or grandson, or great-grandson...

Parallel clauses in other inscriptions understand the verb "(he) who (is) my son ...": EMIRGAZI altars, § 4; KÖYLÜTOLU YAYLA, 1.2 (Hawkins, *StBot* Bh. 3, pp. 88f, 93); SHEIZAR, § 5 (*CHLI* I/2, p. 417f). The present clause is unique in inserting "will be made/become" (3 sing. pres. med.-pass. of *iziya-*, "make").

Context 4. MALPINAR, §§ 18-22 Date, c. 800 BC  
(*CHLI* I/1, p. 342)

- § 18. (He) who shall erase with [malice] this image of Atayaza, Hattusili's servant, and these words,  
§ 19. whether [he] (be) River Lord of the city Sarita,  
§ 20. or whether any inferior person shall erase them,  
§ 21. whether an USINASI,  
§ 22. or [...]

The range of possible defacers of the monument, a River Lord, an inferior person, an USINASI, or [...], is not particularly illuminating.

Context 5. ASSUR letter f+g, §§ 6-7 Date, late 8th century BC  
(*CHLI* I/2, pp. 536, 549f).

- § 6. Cause to live(?) the \*474-HISA and the HUMIRA dead from ZIKUNA,

§ 7. ... they died from the curse ...

The passage is very obscure. Since the logogram L.474 is not attested with any other reading than *wasinasi-/usinasi-* (except context 9 below), it is likely that the word here represented is \**wasinasahisa*, which has the appearance of being an abstract noun formed with the suffix *-ahi(t)-*, giving the sense "WASINASI-hood," perhaps serving as a collective noun for *wasinasi-*.

Context 6. IZGIN 1, § 17 Date, 11th century BC  
(*CHLI* I/1, p. 316f)

- § 17. but to him I did 'give(?)' Azami (as) a 'L.474' [WASI]NASI servant ...

Context is fragmentary and isolated, restorations not certain.

Context 7. KARKAMIŠ A 24 a 2+3, § 1 Date, c. 800 BC  
(*CHLI* I/1, p. 135)

- § 1. ... the [WA]SINASI's (nom./acc. plur. MF) the wagon (acc. sing. MF) ...

Context too fragmentary to attest more than the presence of the word associated with "wagon."

Context 8. KULULU 4, § 14 Date, late 8th century BC  
(*CHLI* I/2, p. 446f)

- § 8. ...] to my(?) USINASI's (dat. plur.) ... [...]

Too fragmentary.

Context 9. ANCOZ 4 Date, c. 800 BC  
(*CHLI* I/2, p. 349)

- § 1. ...] he was a SARIYASIS ((L.474)*sa-ri-i-ia-si-sa*),  
§ 2. and he to Hattusili and Suppiluliuma [...]

Fragment. The grammatical structure is however clear. This is the only attestation of the sign L.474 used to determine any other word than *wasinasi-/usinasi-*, and the word *sariyasi-* is not elsewhere attested.

Few and restricted though these contexts are, I would submit that they contain telling pointers which narrow the sense from the general "(he) of the body = attendant" to "eunuch." Context 1 describes the seven beardless but weapon-bearing attendants on the Royal Buttress, where on the front the young prince Kamani is introduced by Yariri, regent and guardian of the prince in his minority.<sup>84</sup> Kamani is unsurprisingly shown as beardless, but so is Yariri, from whose peculiar appearance I have suggested that he too was a eunuch,<sup>85</sup> thus a *wasinasi-* like the attendants.

Context 2, the atrocious treatment of cap-

tives. The cutting off of the men's feet is unlikely to be a euphemism for "genitals" as in Hebrew, since no such usage of Hitt.-Luw. "foot" is attested,<sup>86</sup> and the Hittites do not seem to have been euphemistic. Making the children USINASI- however, while not explicit, fits in this context easily into the sense "castrate."

Context 3, the title of Astiwasu combining "Great" with "Attendant," strongly suggests that it was parallel to the contemporary Neo-Assyrian *rab ša rēši* (LÚ GAL SAG, an office not attested in the Boğazköy texts). This is supported by the unparalleled "be made my son," which would point to the

<sup>84</sup> *AnSt* 29 (1979), pp. 157-60.

<sup>85</sup> *IX Türk Tarih Kongresi, Ankara 1981*. Kongreye su-

nulan bildiriler, I Cilt (Ankara, 1986), pp. 263-65.

<sup>86</sup> See e.g. *CHD* P, s.v. *pata-*.

attested practice of eunuch adoptions.<sup>87</sup>

Contexts 4-8 do not add much, though in context 5 it is easy to understand “eunuch,” and context 6 if correctly restored would usefully define the character of “servant.”

Context 9, the replacement of *wasinasi-/usinasi-* as the reading of the logogram L.474 with the hapax legomenon *sariyasi-* is surely significant. In the context it is not unreasonable to recognize it as a loan of Akk. *ša rēši* into late Hier. Luwian, as the word passed also into Hebrew and Aramaic. Other such loans into Hier. Luwian have also been recognized, notably Akk. *haziā-nul/hazannu*, “mayor,” and *sukkallu*, “vizier” (see *CHLI* I/1, p. 149f).

Thus I believe that the contexts of the term *wasinasi-/usinasi-*, while not explicit, are sufficiently suggestive of the precise nature of the “attendant” so designated: the beardless corps of functionaries linked to the beardless regent of curious appearance and otherwise unexplained status; the atrocity inflicted on the children of the defeated; the “Great Attendant,” who expects not to “have” sons and grandsons but to “have them made”; and the replacement of the usual term with a word which may plausibly be seen as a loan from Akk. *ša rēši*.

### Concluding remarks

It is necessary to conclude this review of Hittite evidence on LÚ SAG and the *wasinasi-* with some remarks on the misunderstandings of it as presented in the article of Stephanie Dalley noted above.<sup>91</sup>

On the question of the origin of the term *wasinasi-*, we should note that most of the contexts date to the end of the 9th or to the 8th centuries BC, with context 2 dating back securely to the mid-9th century. Only context 4 is substantially older, almost certainly 11th century BC, so, if it is correctly restored, it gains a chronological significance. For its relative proximity to the Hittite Empire period might suggest that *wasinasi-* could have been the Cun. Luw. reading of LÚ SAG,<sup>88</sup> possibly even the Hittite.

The formation *wasinasi-*, whether it goes back to the Hittite Empire or was a coinage of the Neo-Hittite period, does look as if in its literal meaning “(he) of the body” it was based on a loan translation or calque of Akk. *ša rēši*, “(he) of the head,” an impression reinforced by its substitution by the suggested loan word *sariyasi-*. Here I should note that I cannot favour Deller’s suggestion that the practice of castration for eunuchs may have been borrowed by the Assyrians from the Hittites.<sup>89</sup> The Hittite references to LÚ<sup>(MEŠ)</sup> SAG are all Empire period,<sup>90</sup> and they are not found among the many references to officials and courtiers of the Old Kingdom. Whereas I believe, though cannot argue here, that the institution has much earlier roots in Mesopotamia.

Taking up Imparati’s unfounded suggestion of the identity of Pihatarhunta, the DUMU.LUGAL with the homonymous LÚ SAG,<sup>92</sup> Dalley states:

This clear change of usage [i.e. Hitt./MA DUMU.LUGAL as “prince” as against NA *mār šarri* as “crown prince” only] seems to imply that Hittite LÚ SAG was equivalent to Akkadian *mār šarri* and eventually replaced it when the Akkadian term took on a more specialized meaning.

This argument, based on the false premise, leads to a conclusion which can only be characterized as bizarre. Unfortunately Dalley appears to regard it as support for her otherwise unsupported hypothesis that the LÚ SAG’s were in the first place relations of the king.

In her use of my arguments on the *wasinasi-/usinasi-*, Dalley misrepresents them:

[The word *wasinasi-/usinasi-*] is used by rulers who are shown without beards and who avoid referring to their own offspring.

Reference to the contexts of *wasinasi-* above, will show this to be inaccurate. Only in context 1 is it applied to the beardless, in this case the “attendants,” though of course I have argued that the beardless Yariri, ap-

parently a regent, was also a *wasinasi-*, though he does not say so.

Dalley proceeds:

The literal meaning of the Luwian term is close to the Egyptian term for a (genuine) son of the king, “king’s son of his body,” and might be considered a calque upon it.

While the meaning of *wasinasi-* is indeed “(he) of the body,” in no attestation is it applied to “son,” thus comparison with the Egyptian phrase is baseless. As it happens however, a concept corresponding to the Egyptian is known in Hittite and in Hier. Luwian, namely “child of the heart (i.e. loins).”<sup>93</sup>

Finally Dalley’s footnote 42 would more accurately represent my arguments (as will be seen from my discussion of the contexts above), if it were phrased:

Hawkins interprets both words [*wasinasi-* and *sariyasi-*] as meaning “eunuch” on the ground of beardlessness and other indications.

<sup>93</sup> *CHLI* I/1, p. 175 col. 2, s.v. *za+ra/i-ta-si-na* (i.e. *zartasi-*, “of the heart”).

<sup>87</sup> Above, n. 29.

<sup>88</sup> Melchert, (*CLL*, s.v. *waššina/i-*) actually suggests that the attested form *waššinaššinzi* may be an example of this usage in Cun. Luwian, but unfortunately this is from a broken passage without context, so the suggestion cannot be verified.

<sup>89</sup> Deller, above, n. 1, pp. 309-11.

<sup>90</sup> As may easily be seen from the references collected by Pecchioli Daddi (n. 35). The references to the LÚ<sup>MEŠ</sup> SAG of Sargon in the “King of Battle” text (*KBo* XXII 6 i 7) would be of course a late anachronism, but in any case is probably an error for LÚ<sup>MEŠ</sup> <UR.>SAG.

<sup>91</sup> See above, n. 33.

<sup>92</sup> See above, n. 47.