

ON THE ORIGIN OF THE ROYAL TITLE *TABARNA* / *LABARNA*

Oğuz Soysal*

– In memory of Erich Neu –

Cuneiform documents mostly designate Hittite rulers with the ordinary sumerogram titles LUGAL “king” and LUGAL.GAL “great king”, and once the sumero-akkadogram mixture LUGAL *kiššati* “king of the world”¹. Beside these, there are two more special royal titles², which have been hotly debated to date, especially in regard to their lexical origin. One of them is ^dUTU-ŠI, again, with a sumero-akkadogram mixture spelling for the Akkadian word *šamšī* “My Sun”³. It is usually translated as “majesty”. This title appears in an official document for the first time during the first half of the fifteenth century B.C., in the treaty of the early Middle Hittite King Zidanza II with Pilliya, the king of Kizzuwatna⁴. It is still an unanswered question, if this title was a genuine Anatolian product or was influenced by neighboring cultures like Egypt. The other special royal title is *tabarna* / *labarna*, which goes back much earlier. It was in use since the Old Hittite Kingdom in the early seventeenth century B.C., and was known as having been the personal name of the first two Hittite rulers, who were the founders of the dynasty. Almost all the Hittite kings to the end of the Empire bore the title *tabarna* / *labarna*. The only exception was an unexplained interruption of this old tradition in the Hittite royal seals during the reigns of Šuppiluliuma I and his immediate successors Arnuwanda II, Muršili II and Muwatalli II⁵. Because of its close connection to the proper names Tabarna and Labarna, this title, since the early years of Hittitology, has been compared with the Roman imperial attribute *Caesar* with its later reflection in German

* The manuscript was completed in October 2004. An early version of this paper was presented at *Hittites, Greeks and Their Neighbors in Ancient Anatolia*, An International Conference on Cross-Cultural Interaction. Emory University (Atlanta). September 17-19, 2004. My thanks are due to M. Schröder and Dr. C. Gates for correcting my English, and Prof. K. Hecker, for providing me valuable information from Kültepe documents.

I would like to dedicate this study to the memory of Prof. E. Neu, who, with his admirable skill as an “Indo-Europeanist”, had always approached the etymologies for the Hittite lexicon with a carefulness and objectivity that should be a guide for every scholar in the field of Hittitology.

¹ As attested so far, this presumptuous title was borne among the Hittites kings only by Tutḫaliya IV; H. Otten, MDOG 91 (1958) 73-74.

² The Hittite royal titles are compiled by H. Gonnert, Hethitica 3 (1979) 3-108.

³ Most recently discussed by G. Beckman, in: *Melammu Symposia III* (2002) 37-43; O. Carruba, in: *Gslmparati I* (2002) 145-154 with anterior literature.

⁴ The same title that appears in the Political Testament of the Old Hittite king Ḫattušili I KUB 1.16+ II 44 (OH/NS) may very well be a modernization of this new copy redaction.

⁵ O. Soysal, BiOr 60 (2003) 52-53. During this period the “Caesar” title *tabarna* seemed to be partially overruled by the “majesty” title ^dUTU-ŠI although *tabarna* was still effective in the royal historical-administrative documents. For a chronological view on the use of *tabarna* / *labarna* by various Hittite kings see Appendix, and cf. also H. Gonnert, Hethitica 3, 20-23; J.D. Hawkins, StBoT Beiheft 3 (1995) 113.

Kaiser and Russian *Czar*, and understood as “dominant ruler”⁶. The female counterpart of *tabarna* is *tawananna*, the “dominant female ruler”, the title borne by the reigning Hittite queen, or by the chief wife of the former king. The origin of the words *tabarna* / *labarna* and *tawananna* has always been controversial. The question of whether these words originally belonged to Hattian culture and were later adopted by the Hittites, or whether they represent genuine Indo-European (Hittite or Luwian) words still generates discussion. Both possibilities have strong advocates among Hittitologists. It is to be observed that the discussion of this issue has been transformed in the last twenty years almost into a “pro- or contra” Indo-European question⁷.

The title for the dominant ruler frequently appears in the Boğazköy texts in both its forms *tabarna* and *labarna*, and these forms may replace each other regardless of any dating factor in the history of the Hittite writing tradition. Up to now, it has not been possible to separate and distinguish the functions of the two forms. The problem becomes even more difficult if *Tabarna* and *Labarna* also occur as proper names without having a personal determinative in cuneiform spelling. I would like here, however, not to go into details on these problematic topics, instead confining myself to a reference to the statements in CHD under the lemmas *labarna*- / *tabarna*-⁸. Since the primary aim of this study is to trace the origin of the royal title in question, it would be meaningful to give first a survey of the texts and text passages with *tabarna* / *labarna* and classify them by

⁶ F. Sommer, OLZ 24 (1921) 317; F. Hrozný, JSOR 6 (1922) 65-66.

⁷ The royal title *tabarna*- was initially connected by A. Götze, *Madd.* (1928) 138 (n. 3) with the Hittite verb *tapar*- “Gewalt ausüben”. E.H. Sturtevant, *Chrest.* (1935) 85, 194-195, went a step further and derived the Luwian⁹ title *tab/parna*- “ruler” from the Luwian⁹ verb *tapar*- “to rule, govern”. M. Riemschneider, *BiOr* 11 (1954) 1-3, suggested a connection between *t/labarna*- and the hieroglyphic Luwian **tapara* / **lapara*(!) (sic.; never occurs in syllabic spelling, but the first mentioned form must somehow be the underlying word of the hieroglyphic sign L. 115 “hare” (to Lat. *lepus*, *leporis*). This idea is advocated again by H. Kronasser, *EHS* 1 (1966) 63 ff. A possible IE origin of *tabarna* / *labarna* has been eagerly defended later by O. Carruba, in: IX. Türk Tarih Kongresi, Vol. I (1986) 201 ff.; J. Puhvel, *JIES* 17/3-4 (1989) 360 (who, following H. Eichner, seeks in *tabarna* for the IE “ruler’s suffix” -no-); F. Starke, in: *RLA* 6 (1980-1983) 404 ff.; and H.C. Melchert, in: *The Luwians* (2003) 18 ff.; approvingly also A. Archi, in: *FsOtten*² (1988) 9 (n. 20), and S. Kimball, in: *Indo-European Perspectives* (2002) 191. Lately, with a different approach, I. Yakubovich, *Studia Linguarum* 3 (2002) 93 ff., takes the root of *tabarna* / *labarna* as not belonging ‘to the part of Anatolian lexicon that was inherited from Indo-Hittite’, but rather as a *Wanderwort* in consideration of the Labyrinth, the palace name of the Cretan kings. Against the numerous IE explanation attempts for *tabarna* / *labarna* with extremely broad lexic-semantic spectrum encompassing “hare”, “brave”, “labyrinth”, “tyrant” and “(double-) axe” (the opinions in question are compiled by J. Tischler, in: *FsOtten*², 353-354, n. 18-20) there are concerns expressed by other scholars in disfavor of a non-IE origin of *tabarna* / *labarna*; see most recently J. Tischler, *ibid.* 347 ff.; J. Klinger, *StBoT* 37 (1996) 207 ff., 622 f.; O. Soysal, *Kratylos* 44 (1999) 161 f., 163 and *HWHT* 9, 36, 152, 180.

The Luwian-influenced Hittite lemmata, along with the cuneiform Luwian words covering the lexical milieu of “to govern etc.”, and further derivatives of them, are exclusively formations in *tapar*⁰, but not in *labar*⁰, so that one does not need to compute for the word *labarna* any lexical value like “ruler” or “to govern”, at least for Luwian. The words in *tapar*⁰, on the other hand, still have no agreeable Indo-European etymology (J. Tischler, *HEG Lfg.* 8 [1991] 118). The words of the same lexical range in hieroglyphic Luwian are documented always with the rebus-writing for “hare” ⁹LEPUS+ra/i-⁰. It is clear that we do not have here any lexical-semantic value matching with the “hare” which is a prey animal, and therefore hardly fits the notion of “ruler, to govern etc.” In this respect, M. Riemschneider’s conception of “hare-man” for *t/labarna*- must be rejected; cf. also E. Laroche, *Ugar.* 3 (1956) 150-151 (n. 8). Actually, for the expression of the ruler title *labarna* in the hieroglyphic Luwian there is another possibility with different sign-combination L. 277 + *la* considered; for a full discussion on this see J. D. Hawkins, *StBoT Beiheft* 3, 108 ff.

⁸ They are compiled and briefly discussed in CHD 3/1 (1980) 43.

their languages. In the following is presented a list of the attestation of *labarna* and *tabarna* in the Boğazköy documents⁹. The dating of occurrences are based on the script and ductus features, where the textual contents are not considered since they could have experienced modernizations in many ways.

1) In Hittite context

1. Spelled with *la-*: For word attestations see CHD 3/1, 41; O. Soysal, HWHT 976 (lists exclusively the Hittite equivalents of Hattian forms).

Sg. nom.: *la-ba-ar-na-aš* (frequently in OS and NS); *la-pa-ar-na-aš* KUB 11.23 VI 4 (NS), cf. KUB 35.4 III 16' (NS; case unclear either nom. or gen.); ^m*La-bar-na-aš* (not PN!) KUB 36.89 rev. 42' (NS).

Sg. acc.: *la-ba-ar-na-an* (frequently in NS, and once in KBo 21.22 rev. (39') [MS]); *la-bar-na-an* KUB 36.89 rev. 50' (NS); ^m*La-bar-na-an* (not PN!) KUB 36.89 rev. 49' (NS); ^{LÜ}*la-ba-ar-na-an* IBoT 1.30 obv. 3 (NS).

Sg. gen.: *la-ba-ar-na-aš* (frequently in OS, MS and NS), *la-bar-na-aš* KUB 36.89 rev. 43' (NS).

Sg. dat. (old): *la-bar-na-i* KUB 2.2+ III 9 (NS); *la-bar-na-i(≈a)* KUB 36.89 rev. 61' (NS).

Sg. dat.: *la-ba-ar-ni* KBo 21.22 rev. (45') (MS); *la-bar-ni* KUB 31.136 III 4' (NS); [*l*]*a-pa-ar-ni* Bo 5156 obv. 9' (NS) (for text see H. Otten, StBoT 15 [1971] 28).

Pl. acc.: ^l*a-bar-nu-uš* KUB 24.5 obv. 6' (NS).

Stem form (in Akkadian influenced – and mostly genitive – constructions): *la-ba-ar-na* (frequently in MS and NS); *la-bar-na* KBo 16.58 II 3, 6 (NS); ^m*La-ba-ar-na* (not PN!; frequently in NS); ^m*La-pa-ar-n[a]* (not PN!) KuSa 1/1.5 rev. 10' (LNS).

2. Spelled with *ta-*: For word attestations see CHD 3/1, 41; O. Soysal, HWHT 983 (the Hittite equivalents of Hattian forms).

Sg. nom.: *ta-ba-ar-na-aš* (frequently in NS); *ta-ba-ar-na-aš*¹⁰ KBo 17.22 III 14'' (OS); *ta-ba-ar-na-š(≈a≈ši)* KUB 44.60+ II 18' (NS); *ta-bar-na-aš* KBo 12.38 II 22' (Šupp. II).

Sg. dat. (old): *ta-ba-ar-na-i* KUB 44.60+ III 15 (NS).

Sg. dat.: *ta-ba-ar-ni* KBo 20.59:5' (MS), KUB 44.33 II 4' (NS).

Notice also unique and faulty writing [*š*]*A* (or: *É*) *ta-<<ar>>-ba-ar-n^la^l* KUB 60.28 I 11 (NS).

Stem form (in Akkadian influenced – and mostly genitive – constructions): *ta-ba-ar-na* (frequently in OS, MS and NS); *ta-pa-ar-na* Bo 90/1199 (royal seal of Urḫi-

⁹ The material presented in the following list is mainly adopted from CHD 3/1, 41, with some small additions and precisions. Since this study deals with the cuneiform attestations from the second millennium B. C., and has primarily a lexical task, the occurrences from the sphere of hieroglyphic Luwian and the proper names should be excluded here.

¹⁰ On this error typology see Chr. Rüster, in: FsOtten², 297.

Tešup; see H. Otten, *Zu einigen Neufunden* [1993] 26-27); *ta-bar-na* KBo 12.38 I 11', KUB 26.32 I 1 (both Šupp. II).

It has been occasionally observed that some Hittite texts may use both forms *labarna* and *tabarna* in the same context. They are mostly Hittite portions of the bilingual compositions dated earliest as OH/OS: KBo 17.22 III 5', 9', 10', 18' (*labarna*) versus *ibid.* 14'' (*tabar<na>*), KUB 28.4 obv. r. col. 32' ([*t*]*abarna*) versus *ibid.* 33' (*labarna*), KUB 28.8(+) rev. r. col. 2', 5', 7' (*labarna*) versus *ibid.* 10' (*tabar[na]*)¹¹; cf. also KUB 44.56 rev. 2 (*tabar[na]*) versus *ibid.* 15 (*labar[na]*).

II) In Hattian context

For word attestations see: O. Soysal, HWHT 752-757, 774.

Stem form: *ta-ba-ar-na* (frequently in OS, MS and NS); *da-ba-ar-n¹a¹* KBo 19.162 obv. 8 (MS); *ta-ba-ar-na-ma* (= *tabarna≈ma*) KUB 12.8 + KUB 20.87 IV 3 (NS); [*ta-ū*]*a_a-a-ar-na* KBo 37.92:4' (NS).

Oblique form (in *-n*): *ta-ba-ar-na-an* (in OS, MS, NS); ^m*Ta-ba-ar-n¹a-an²* (not PN!) KBo 19.161 IV 18' (NS); [*ta-ū*]*a_a-ar-na-a[n]* KUB 28.70 obv. r. col. 5' (ENS²) and [*ta-ū*]*a_a-a*]*r-na-an* KUB 28.70 obv. r. col. 1'.

Unclear: *ta-ba-ar-na-aš* KUB 1.17 VI 21 (NS) which can be an oblique form *tabarna≈š(u)*, otherwise, a defective writing under influence of the Hittite nominative case *tabarnaš*.

III) In Akkadian context

For word attestations see CHD 3/1, 41.

Spelled with *ta-*: *ta-ba-ar-na* (frequently in OS, MS and NS).

IV) In Palaic context

For word attestations see: O. Carruba, StBoT 10 (1970) 73.

Nom. (eventually also **Gen.**): *ta-ba-ar-na-aš* KBo 19.152 I 15', KBo 19.155:6', (21'), KUB 35.165 obv. 5, 26, rev. (3') (all MS), KBo 19.154 + rev. (16') (MS²), KBo 19.153 III² 10', (21'), KUB 35.159 II (9') (both NS); *ta-ba-ar-na-š(a)* KUB 35.167+ 21' (NS).

Voc. [*ta-b*]*a-ar-na* KUB 35.165 rev. 24' (MS).

Acc. [*t*]*a-ba-ar-na-an* KUB 35.163 III¹ 14 (NS).

Dat. *ta-ba-ar-na-i* KBo 19.152 I 17' (MS), KUB 35.166+ rev. (5') (MS²); *ta-ba-ar-ni* KUB 35.165 obv. 21 (MS), KBo 19.153 III² (12') (NS); *ta-ba-ar-<<na>>ni* KUB 35.165 rev. 10' (MS).

¹¹ Cf. J. Tischler, in: FsOtten², 354-355.

V) In Luwian context

For word attestations see: F. Starke, StBoT 30 (1985) 280, 283, 366; H. C. Melchert, CLL (1993) 125.

Nom.: *la-ba-ar-na-aš* KUB 35.133 II (13'), KUB 35.134:8' (both NS).

Dat.: *[l]a-ba-ar-na* KBo 32.126 obv. 6' (NS).

VI) In Hurrian context

The only (possible) occurrences are *ta-ua_a-ar-[na]* and *[ta-ua_a]-ar-na*, the latter with following ^{MUNUS}*ta-ua-a[n[?]-(or: -n[a-)]* ... in unpublished fragment Bo 4790:9' and 13' (text available in an old transliteration of H. Ehelolf). These are first mentioned by E. Forrer, 2 BoTU II (1926) p. 28*, and later referred by F. Sommer, HAB 25 (n. 3); H.-S. Schuster, HHB I (1974) 88; V. G. Ardzinba, VDI 131 (1975) 185 (n. 46).

The compilation given here roughly illustrates the following statistics of the usage of the appellative *tabarna* / *labarna* within the documents of different languages and as products of the Hittite scribal school:

Hittite: Very rich word attestation for both *labarna* and *tabarna*.

Hattian: Very rich word attestation for *tabarna* < *tawa_arna* only.

Akkadian: Rich word attestation for *tabarna* only¹².

Palaic: Moderate word attestation for *tabarna* only.

Luwian: Poor word attestation for *labarna* only.

Hurrian: One uncertain word attestation for *tawa_arna* only.

One may make now the following observations on the occurrences in the various ancient Anatolian languages of different families, except for Akkadian from the Semitic range: The non-Indo-European Hattian uses exclusively *tabarna* and rarely *tawa_arna*. The other non-Indo-European representative, Hurrian, has the form *tawa_arna* reminiscent of the Hattian form, if the source mentioned for it is reliable. From the Indo-European languages of ancient Anatolia of the second millennium B.C., the south-western branch Luwian prefers *labarna*, while the central-northern branch Palaic employs *tabarna*. It should be remembered in ethno-geographical respects that the Palaic phonetic was heavily influenced by the Hattian, although these languages genetically have nothing in common. The list given above illustrates the statistical fact that only the Indo-European languages Hittite and Luwian possess the form *labarna*. On the phonetic level, it should be pointed out that even despite its rare documentation, the spelling *tawa_arna* for *tabarna* in Hattian and Hurrian contexts indicates a /**f*/ sound within this word which is customary for both non-IE languages, but hardly to be claimed for Hittite and Luwian.

Even in the very early phase of Hittitology it was thought striking that the title for the dominant ruler should exhibit a unique feature in its initial part, if *tabarna* and

¹² The old Babylonian letter of Ḫattušili I addressed to the Hurrian ruler Tunip-Teššub (M. Salvini, SMEA 34 [1994] 61-80, and *idem*, The Ḫabiru Prism [1996] 107-116) mentions the Hittite king as *Labarna* (obv. 3) without any personal determinative, although this indicates not the title, but the personal name. Note that the name of the addressee Tuniya (thus, somehow a nickname for Tunip-Teššub) too is written without the determinative “*m*” in the same letter (obv. 1).

labarna are to be understood as the same title. The drastic phonetic *t* / *l* alternation observed between *tabarna* and *labarna* is considered by many scholars as a special peculiarity of Hattian, and has been compared since E. Forrer with the phonology of some modern Caucasian languages¹³. Contrary to this view, however, we have the following arguments to express:

1) To date, no single pure Hattian text or text passage mentions the form *labarna* alongside *tabarna*. If such a phonetic interchange is customary for this language why do we have only the form *tabarna* in Hattian context?

2) Initial phonetic *t* ~ *l* interchange between *tabarna* and *labarna* never occurs in the female title *tawananna* although this has exactly the same formation pattern as *tabarna*, as we will discuss later. Such a form **Lawananna* is not seen as a variation of usual *Tawananna*, either in Hattian or in Hittite documents. Thus, we should come to the conclusion that this *t* / *l* alternation is valid for the masculine royal title only.

3) It is acceptable that the Hattian has in fact several unique consonantal interchanges like *l* ~ *n*, and more interestingly, *š* ~ *t* which are supported by rich textual evidence. An alternation between *l* and *t* in this language, however, may not be claimed. The study in the HWHT has shown that there is no good evidence for the existence of a /**tl* / voice in Hattian, which we possibly could detect in a phonetic *t* ~ *l* interchange. Neither within the Hattian lexicon nor among the Hattian loanwords in Hittite has such a phonetic feature yet been discovered with certainty. Some exceptions, namely proper names like *Ḫalipinu* / *Ḫatipinu*, *Ḫalinzūwa* / *Ḫatinzūwa* of Hattian domain and with internal *t* / *l* alternation cannot be explained by a simple phonetic interchange, but rather by the morphological fact of the different sex of the bearer of the names, as we will see later.

4) How the Hittite cuneiform writing system might work for rendering a foreign word with initial *tl*-sound is questionable. It is quite possible that the *tl*-sound is reflected in cuneiform writing simply as *t(V)-l(V)-^o*, which would necessitate for **tlabarna* the spelling **ta-la-ba-ar-na*. If the identification of classical Tlos with the Lycian Tlawa (in hieroglyphic Luwian *TALA-wa/i^(REGIO)*) is correct, this would be of particular interest since the same geographical name apparently was written down in cuneiform Hittite as (KUR) ^{URU}*Ta-la-u-ua* / ^{URU}*Da-la-u-ua*.

In the second volume of his monumental work on the Hattian-Hittite bilinguals H.-S. Schuster introduced a new idea about the interpretation of *tabarna*¹⁴. According to his suggestion, *tabarna* includes the Hattian nominal stem *par* (< *wa_{ar}*) for “thousand” which

¹³ F. Hrozný, BoSt 5 (1920) 49-50: “Offenbar begann der Name dieses Königs mit einem Laut, der zwischen *t* und *l* stand”; JSOR 6, 65-66: “Ich nahm hierbei an, daß der Name dieses Königs mit einem Laut anlautete, der zwischen *t* und *l* stand”; E. Forrer, ZDMG 76 (1922) 183 (n. 1), 229: “In all diesen Fällen muß der aus nordkaukasischen Sprachen bekannte *tl*-Laut das Ursprüngliche sein”. This idea has been uncritically adopted by some scholars, for example, E. A. Speiser, Mesopotamian Origins (1930) 123, who writes: “The variant writings of the name *Tabarna* or *Labarna* indicate for Hattic the formerly observed *tl*-sound”. Cf. also P. Kretschmer, Glotta 19 (1931) 279-281; F. Sommer, HAB (1938) 25-26 (with n. 4) (both on *t* / *l* in connection with discussion of *tabarna* / *labarna*); OLZ 48 (1953) 12, 19 (on *t* / *l* with *tabarna* / *labarna* and the ‘Caucasian’ *tl*-voice); J. Tischler, in: FsOtten², 350: “Daß *labarna* ein Substratwort sei, nahm Forrer wegen der Anlautschwankung *l*- / *t*- an, und er fühlte sich diesbezüglich an gewisse nordkaukasische Laterale erinnert”.

¹⁴ HHB II (2002) 247 (with n. 453). More detailed *apud* J. Tischler (see n. 16 below).

had been recently revealed in a bilingual text, since it corresponded there with the Akkadian word *LĪM* “thousand”¹⁵. But H.-S. Schuster did not make further statements on the subject, and referred one to chapters of his forthcoming work. After his recent death, however, we cannot hope for any future publications. Fortunately, his idea was briefly made public in 1988 *apud* J. Tischler’s contribution to the second *Festschrift* of Heinrich Otten¹⁶. H.-S. Schuster proposes that *tabarna* containing the Hattian nominal stem *par* (< *wa_ar*) for “thousand” should be analyzed as *ta~par~n~a*, namely nominal prefix *ta*¹⁷ + *par* + *n* + *a*. From these morphemes, *-n* is taken by him as the genitive marker and the final *-a* as a pronominal element. Thus, he interprets the title *tabarna* as “the (lord) of / over a thousand”.

Since H.-S. Schuster in two volumes of his work (HHB I and II) was not able to discuss the nominal formations with the prefix *ta-* in Hattian¹⁸, it would be appropriate here first to make some remarks on this morphological feature. The prefix *ta-* perhaps serves an individualizing function like a kind of nominal article. There are a number of nominal forms with *ta-* in Hattian which render a feminine character. They are distinguished generally by the suffix *-t* that is actually missing in the title *tawananna*. I want to note some relevant examples:

1) *Ṭaḫšaḫziyati* (hittitized name of a Hattian goddess) “the (goddess) of the town *Kakša(ze)t*” → derivation from the geographical name ^{URU}*Kakšazet* (Hatt.) / ^{URU}*Kakšat(a)* (Hitt.). This is to be analyzed as *ta~*h/kakšazer*¹⁹.

2) ^d*Tašimmet* (name of a Hattian goddess) → extended form for ^d*Timmet* as the designation of the same goddess. This is to be analyzed as *ta~*timmet*²⁰.

3) ^d*Taurit* (name of a Hattian goddess) “the vigorous one” → derivation from the Hattian adjective *urit* “strong (marked as feminine)”²¹. This is to be analyzed as *ta~uri~t*.

4) *taziyahdu* (attribute of the garment of the Sun goddess of Arinna) means “that is from the heaven, the heavenly one” → goes back to Hattian lexical entry *ziyahdu* “from the sky”. This is to be analyzed as *ta~zi~yah~du*. Compare also the divine designation ^d*Tazziyašu*²².

5) ^d*Tazzuwaši* (hittitized name of a Hattian goddess who is the concubine of the god *Zali(ya)nu*) means “the divine concubine” → derived from the Hattian noun *zuwatu*

¹⁵ The nominal root **par* in the spelling ^o*pa_a-ar* appears in two close related word complexes *eš~ta~wa_ar* and *nu~*eš~ta~wa_ar* (KBo 37.1 I 31-34, 40-42, 45, 47-48) as a counterpart of Akkadian *LĪM* in Hittite column (KBo 37.1 II 31, 34, 40, 45). On this see H.-S. Schuster, HHB II 243-247; O. Soysal, HWHT 299, 417 f., 658 f. After this determination, the early statement of O. Carruba, in: IX. Türk Tarih Kongresi, Vol. I, 205, that in Hattian no such stem *bar* would exist, is no longer tenable; cf. J. Klinger, StBoT 37, 212 (n. 339).

¹⁶ H.-S. Schuster *apud* J. Tischler, in: FsOtten², 350-351; later cited again by J. Tischler, HEG Lfg. 5 / 6 (1990) 39, and HEG Lfg. 9, 285-286.

¹⁷ This morpheme is designated by Schuster *apud* J. Tischler as “*Präformativ*”, and briefly mentioned in HHB II 246 with a reference to the upcoming chapter § 4.7.1 of his book. Thus, a nominal prefix *ta-* is to be surely detected in Hattian in spite of O. Carruba’s counter-view in: IX. Türk Tarih Kongresi, Vol. I, 205.

¹⁸ See previous note. For *ta-* see now O. Soysal, HWHT 244, sub *ta*².

¹⁹ If not *taḫša~*(ka)kšazi(ya)t(i)*; on this possibility see O. Soysal, NABU 2001 Nr. 4, p. 89; cf. now HWHT 147, 182.

²⁰ HWHT 152, 817.

²¹ HWHT 183, 319.

²² HWHT 153, 244, 313, 775.

“wife”. This is to be analyzed as *ta~*zuwat(u)*. Compare also the pure Hattian occurrence *tazzuwašiuinu* in KBo 37.94 obv. 7' (= *ta~zuwašiu~inu*)²³.

H.-S. Schuster gives, in order to strengthen his idea of the meaning of *par / wa_ar* as “thousand”, other lexical examples *wa_ar~wa_a~šhap* and *ta~par~wa_a~šhap* in the monolingual Hattian texts whose meaning can now easily be determined as “(the) thousand gods”²⁴. This is the exact equal of the well-known Hittite cult term and religious idea “thousand gods” that is written down in Hittite documents always as a Sumero-Akkadogram combination *LĪM DINGIR.MEŠ*. According to H.-S. Schuster²⁵, further evidence for a formation *ta~par~* including the concept of “thousand” would be the bread designation *taparwa_ašu* which is known only from the Hittite texts, but refers clearly to a Hattian origin. This word appears often in rituals as the name of a high-quality bread associated with the Storm god²⁶. Surprisingly, the same word with the god determinative alternates in a list of gods with the patron deity ^dTaru, so that we may assume that *taparwa_ašu* is primarily an epithet of the Hattian Storm god²⁷. Fortunately, we can also analyze this epithet within the Hattian lexicon since all elements are so far known to us: *ta-* (nominal prefix) *par-* “thousand”, and finally *wa_ašu* means “plenty”. The final element appears in a Hattian-Hittite bilingual text as deified and masculine ^dWa_ašul, and this is translated into Hittite with *iyata tameta* “abundance (and) plenty”²⁸. The epithet of the Storm god and the name of his bread both mean then “the thousand plenty”²⁹. It sounds, therefore, quite logical that *tabarna* may designate the dominant ruler, if *taparwa_ašu* is to be ascribed to the supreme god of the Hattian and Hittite pantheons.

Although H.-S. Schuster's idea for the analyzing of *tabarna* is basically acceptable, some points concerning the functional determination of each morpheme and the meaning of the whole word *tabarna* need further discussion:

1) Today we know with certainty that the simple suffix *-n* is not a genitive marker³⁰, but indicates the dative case if it appears alone at the end of the nominal chain³¹. Its genitive function can be claimed if it is modified by the possessive prefixes *le-*, *še-* and *te-* of the following noun; for example: *tabarna~n le~wu_ar* “the land of *tabarna*”.

²³ HWHT 244, 330, 776.

²⁴ HHB II 246, 597-598; cf. now O. Soysal, BiOr 61 (2004) 366, 375.

²⁵ HHB I 122 (n. 273); HHB II 247.

²⁶ As in the “Monthly Festival” KUB 20.78 III 3'-7' and in numerous similar texts read: “The chief bodyguard describes the *taparwa_ašu*-bread to the king: ‘The *taparwa_ašu*-bread is the thick bread of the Stormgod. It is (decorated) with three limbs of a ram on it’ ”; cf. J. Tischler, HEG Lfg. 8, 119-121 (with previous literature); more recently, J. Klinger, StBoT 37, 493 f; D. Yoshida, THeth 22 (1996) 321 f, 326; O. Soysal, HWHT 312.

²⁷ Cf. J. Tischler, *ibid.* 120 (with previous literature); later also D. Yoshida, BMECCJ 6 (1992) 148-149 and THeth 22, 321.

²⁸ KUB 2.2 + KUB 48.1 III 27 (Hattian // KBo 21.110 obv. 10') = KUB 2.2 + KUB 48.1 III 28-29 (Hittite); see H.-S. Schuster, HHB I 122-123.

²⁹ H.-S. Schuster, HHB I 122 (n. 273); HHB II 247: “*tausend(fache) Fülle*”.

³⁰ Thus, contra H.-S. Schuster *apud* J. Tischler, in: FsOtten², 350. Similarly, Chr. Girbal, Beiträge (1986) 135, AoF 28 (2001) 292-294 and AoF 29 (2002) 269, 271, takes a possible ending *-(n)na* in Hattian serving for genitive formations.

³¹ HWHT 185, 186, 232. Once H.-S. Schuster too, HHB I 119, 123-124, was considering the nominal ending *-n* primarily with a dative function.

2) H.-S. Schuster's meaning "the (lord) of the thousand" for *tabarna* appears rather to be based on a free translation, since the title does not include any nominal stem for "lord", if we follow his analysis³².

3) The other analogous formations mentioned by Schuster, *taparwa_ašhap* and *taparwa_ašu*, do not contain the suggested *-n* element as a possible genitive marker.

Taking these critical points into account, I rather tend to analyze *tabarna* with the formation pattern *ta₁par₂na*, on the basis of nominal prefix + adjective (number) + noun, in the sense of "the thousand *na*". The nominal stem *na* remains here unknown, but it appears in Cappadocian personal names as a very frequent final element³³, which is also observed in the appellative of the ruling queen *tawananna* (*ta₁wan₂na*). In the latter royal title we find *wanan* as the middle element in place of *par* "thousand". The meaning of *wanan* cannot yet be determined, but functionally it stands parallel to *par*³⁴. On the semantic level, I do not see any necessity to understand *par* in *tabarna* literally in the sense of the number "thousand". It could simply be a figurative phrase referring to a high rank or quality. Meanwhile, K. Hecker has drawn my attention to the Old Assyrian designation of official *līmum* "eponym" among the Anatolian colonies mentioned in Kültepe texts which would possibly be connected to Akkadian number *līmu* "one thousand".

The following is an overview of the Hattian words with various functions containing *ta₁par₂*, and the position of *tabarna* / *tawananna* in this nominal category. According to these samples we now may claim a full analysis and a partial understanding of the lemma *tabarna* within Hattian.

³² On the other hand, one of the word(s) for "lord" in Hattian is perhaps *šail*; HWHT 306.

³³ E. Bilgiç, AfO 15 (1945-1951) 5; cf. H. Kronasser, EHS 1, 62 (with reference to E. Bilgiç).

³⁴ According to E. Forrer, 2 BoTU II, p. 28*, *tawananna* is derived from the Hattian **tawarnanna* which may mean the "Königinmutter" (= *tawarna* [for *tabarna*] + *anna* "mother"). This idea should be rejected not only on historical basis, but also for two further reasons: Phonetically, the assimilation *-rn-* > *-nn-* is highly problematic, which, for example, does not occur with *tabarna*. Within the Hattian occurrences we can find as the closest case *-rl-* > *-rr-* (HWHT 156) which does not particularly support E. Forrer's assumption. Lexically too, one should consider the possibility that the word for "mother" in Hattian is more probably *mu* (HWHT 295). The other analysis attempts for *tawananna* cited or compiled by J. Tischler, in: FsOttén², 350 and HEG Lfg. 9, 285-286, as *ta₁(w)anna₂n₃a* (thus, H.-S. Schuster after a personal communication; formally parallel to *ta₁par₂n₃a* [see above in main text]), or as a derivation from the city name Tawana (thus, M. Forlanini) are not convincing either. For the discussions on the origin of *tawananna* see furthermore, S. R. Bin-Nun, RHA 30 (1972) 54 ff.; *eadem*, THeth 5 (1975) 30 ff.; J. Klinger, StBoT 37, 213 ff. For the suggestions in point of Indo-European view see J. Puhvel, JIES 17 (1989) 360-361; N. Oettinger, HS 108 (1995) 43; H.C. Melchert, in: The Luwians, 19 f.

As a very special case ^dTawan[nanna] (restored after ^{MUNUS}Tawannanna in dupl. KUB 55.60 IV⁷ 7) appears once in KUB 58.31 rev. 20' as a deity who is worshiped by the "cult drinking" in the company of ^dLAMMA LUGAL and ^dDAG.

1) Lexical use or expression (in Hattian)

<u>Word</u>	<u>Analysis</u>	<u>Meaning</u>
(<i>ta</i>) <i>p/wa_arwa_ašhap</i>	(<i>ta</i> ~) <i>p/wa_ar~wa_ašhap</i>	“(the) thousand gods”

2) Attribute of Storm god and also bread designation (in Hittite)

<u>Word</u>	<u>Analysis</u>	<u>Meaning</u>
<i>taparwa_ašu</i>	<i>ta~par~wa_ašu</i>	“the thousand plenty”

3) Royal title of King (in Hittite)

<u>Title</u>	<u>Analysis</u>	<u>Meaning</u>
<i>tab/wa_aarna</i>	<i>ta~p/wa_ar~na</i>	“the thousand ‘na’ ”

4) Royal title of Queen (in Hittite)

<u>Title</u>	<u>Analysis</u>	<u>Meaning</u>
<i>tawananna</i>	<i>ta~wanan~na</i>	“the ‘wanan’ ‘na’ ”

Additionally I would like to refer to my remarks in AoF 28 (2001) 287, where I interpreted the Hattian sentence *tu~p~kã~tu[h] gammammã~n te~wa_a~š~ta~wa_ar* (this improved analysis is now in HWHT 299 and 811) *ãš~mãiu* in KUB 28.40 II 9 as “He kept taking the goddess Gammama’s linen in thousands?”. Furthermore, the Hattian morpheme sequence *~š~*ta~wa_ar* is apparently reflected in a very Hittitized manner also in the name of the Old Hittite queen Ištapariya, the wife of Telipinu, which sounds very close to the Hattian formation *eš~ta~wa_ar* (see n. 15).

Since we have now a reasonable Hattian starting point for the explanation of *tabarna*, further discussions on this word from an Indo-European basis would be not helpful. Therefore, the often discussed *t ~ l* interchange cases in the Indo-European range should be now regarded with a certain reservation³⁵. Concerning a possible *t ~ l* interchange in Hattian, we have suggested that this appearance should be seen not in a phonetic, but rather a morphological context. H.-S. Schuster too had come to the same conclusion. But his explanation, in the second volume of his book and *apud* J. Tischler, that the initial *t / l* alternation between *tabarna* and *labarna* should be a reflection of the Hattian prefixes *t(a)*- for “there” deixis and *l(a)*- for “here” deixis, cannot be regarded as proven. First of all, he was not able to produce supporting arguments for his idea, so that we know nothing about this suggested “there - here” deixis relationship in Hattian³⁶.

³⁵ On this phonetic feature within the IE-languages of Ancient Anatolia (second and first millennium B. C.) and in general see P. Kretschmer, Glotta 19, 279-281; H. Kronasser, EHS 1, 61-64; cf. also O. Carruba, IX. Türk Tarih Kongresi I, 204; J. Tischler, in: FsOtten², 352 ff. (with n. 14-19); N. Oettinger, in: GsPedersen (1994) 313-318.

³⁶ Again, *apud* J. Tischler, in: FsOtten², 350-351. Regrettably, in HHB II there is no discussion by the author on this subject, except for a brief notice on p. XXIV.

Secondly, the form *labarna* which, according to H.-S. Schuster, should include the deixis *l(a)-* for “here” does not appear in Hattian texts at all, as we mentioned before³⁷.

The textual evidence illustrates clearly that within the pure Hattian texts there is no *t / l* alternation on a lexical basis. This feature occurs only with Hattian proper names in Hittite written documents; therefore, it is not of primary importance for Hattian phonetics³⁸. Among these names the most striking examples are the divine designations ^dHalipinu / ^dḪatipinu and geographical names ^{URU}Ḫalinzūwa / ^{URU}Ḫatinzūwa³⁹. Recently, however, F.P. Daddi correctly realized that the alternation between ^dHalipinu and ^dḪatipinu could be dependent on the different sex of the bearer of the names⁴⁰. This is true since the identity of ^dHalipinu and ^dḪatipinu in the Hattian-Hittite pantheon has been precisely defined: ^dHalipinu accompanies the masculine gods like Wu_urunkatte and the Storm god of Zaḫalukka; thus, he is male. ^dḪatipinu appears as the wife of the god Telipinu⁴¹. Moreover, both divine designations can now reasonably be analyzed as prefix *ḫa-* (a nominal morpheme, or even a meaningful adjective) + gender marker *-l-* for masculine versus *-t-* for feminine (accompanied always with a *Bindevokal*) + well-known nominal stem *pin(u)* “child”⁴². Since both divine names formally are almost identical except for their sexes, we may assume that they possibly represent a divine pair like brother and sister⁴³. The same formation can be seen also between the geographical names ^{URU}Ḫalinzūwa / ^{URU}Ḫatinzūwa⁴⁴, unless there is some concrete evidence available for the identity of both geographical units⁴⁵. In this case, however, the Hattian nominal stem

³⁷ Likewise, O. Carruba’s morphological approach to *tabarna / labarna* with the distinction in Hattian *te-* “your” against *le-* “his” in IX. Türk Tarih Kongresi I, 203, (mentioned also by J. Tischler, FsOtt², 352 n. 14) is no longer tenable, since the Hattian possessive prefix for the second sg. person has now been established as *u-* (HWHT 187, 258).

³⁸ Cf. A. Kammenhuber in: HbOr (Altkleinasiatische Sprachen [1969]) 444 f.; Chr. Girbal, Beiträge, 166-167.

³⁹ For the acceptance of the distinction between ^{URU}Ḫalinzūwa and ^{URU}Ḫatinzūwa on the phonological level see for example, H. Otten, in: FsFriedrich (1959) 355; G.F. del Monte-J. Tischler, RGTC 6 (1978) 70, 102 f., 563; M. Popko, AoF 13 (1986) 177; J. Tischler, in: FsOtt², 352 (n. 16); N. Oettinger, in: GsPedersen, 317. Contrarily, O. Soysal, HWHT 143.

⁴⁰ In: FsAlp (1992) 107-108; later adopted by V. Haas, Gesch.Relig. (1994) 310-311; O. Soysal, HWHT 143. In this regard it should be pointed out that a similar case once led E. Forrer, ZDMG 76, 234 f., to credit an apparent phonetic *l ~ š* interchange between *leppinu* and *šepinu* (and further two word pairs) for Hattian. But today we know with certainty that this difference is mainly caused by the possessive prefixes masculine *le-* in *le≈p≈pinu* “his (= the king’s) children” and feminine *še-* in *še≈p≈pinu* “her (= the queen’s) children”, thus they are to be seen rather on a morphological level; cf. HWHT 91.

⁴¹ H. Otten, in: RLA 4 (1972-75) 59, 147 f.; F.P. Daddi, in: FsAlp, 107.

⁴² Already correctly determined by F.P. Daddi, *ibid.* 108.

⁴³ The family background of both deities is clearly not to be understood as husband and wife, since ^dḪatipinu is wife of Telipinu, as stated above.

⁴⁴ That both geographical units here display different sexes should be conditioned by their nominal origin: a Hattian noun, or a proper (divine) name with gender mark; cf. feminine ^dḪatenzawu_u → ^{URU}Ḫatinzūwa (see n. 50 below).

⁴⁵ Besides the most referred-to examples ^dHalipinu / ^dḪatipinu and ^{URU}Ḫalinzūwa / ^{URU}Ḫatinzūwa, there are also the following proper names cited in the secondary literature in regard to *t ~ l* interchange: ^{URU}Gulpina / ^{URU}Kutpina (E. Forrer, ZDMG 76, 229), ^{URU}Paršananhila / ^{URU}Paršananhita (F. Sommer, HAB 25), ^dTaḫpillanu / ^dTaḫpiltanu (F. Sommer, OLZ 48, 19), ^{URU}Liḫšina / ^{HUR.SAG}Tiḫšina (J. Freu, in: Centre de Recherches Comparatives sur les Langues de la Méditerranée Ancienne 8 [1983] 185). However, except for the city names ^{URU}Paršananhila and ^{URU}Paršananhita, which alternate each other in duplicate texts KBo 2.31 obv. 14’ and HT 2 III 11, there is no firm textual evidence that the other name pairs may be the same. If the latter geographical names include the Hittite lemma *hila-* “courtyard” (according to E. Laroche, RHA 19 Nr. 69 [1961] 82, ^{URU}Paršananhila means “la cour aux léopards”) we may easily

**inzu* or **nizu* remains unexplained⁴⁶. In the same category we can add the well-known lemma ^E*halentuwa*- “palace complex”, a Hattian loanword in the Hittite lexicon, which is marked with infix *-l-* as masculine and contains the nominal element **ntiu* which goes back to the verbal root (*a*)*nti* “to stand”⁴⁷. The following compilation provides a list of words of Hattian origin with formations *ha~li~* and *ha~ti~*:

1) Proper Name

Designation	Analysis	Meaning
^d <i>Halipinu</i>	<i>ha~l(V)~pinu</i>	<i>ha~</i> (masculine)~“child”
^d <i>Hatipinu</i>	<i>ha~t(V)~pinu</i>	<i>ha~</i> (feminine)~“child”
^{URU} <i>Halinzuwa</i> ⁴⁸	<i>ha~l(V)~nzu(wa)</i> = ? Hitt. <i>halenzu</i> - ⁴⁹	<i>ha~</i> (masculine)~* <i>n(i)zu</i>
^{URU} <i>Hatinzuwa</i> ⁵⁰	<i>ha~t(V)~nzu(wa)</i>	<i>ha~</i> (feminine)~* <i>n(i)zu</i>

2) Lexical use

Word	Analysis	Meaning
<i>halantiu</i>	<i>ha~l(V)~ntiu</i> = Hitt. (^E) <i>halentu(wa)</i>	<i>ha~</i> (masculine)~“stand” “Palace” ⁵¹
<i>haliyanna</i>	<i>ha~l(V)~(y)anna</i>	<i>ha~</i> (masculine)~(y) <i>anna</i> (epithet of masculine divine being Kaḫalwu _u zzel with title <i>katte</i> “king”) ⁵²

take ^{URU}Paršananḫita (appears only in HT 2 III 11) as an erroneous form for ^{URU}Paršananḫila without bearing any *t ~ l* interchange in mind, because this is not customary for Hittite phonetic and lexicon.

⁴⁶ The root **inzu* or **nizu* in the Hittite occurrences can very well be the simplified form of a Hattian **n(i)zawu*, as it appears in ^d*Halenzawu*; see n. 50 below.

⁴⁷ HWHT 297.

⁴⁸ The same name designates also a river *Halenzuwa*; G.F. del Monte-J. Tischler, RGTC 6, 527.

⁴⁹ The Hattian origin of *halenzu*- has already been maintained by H.G. Güterbock, in: CRRAI 19 (1971 [1974]) 309-310, due to the initial feature *ha-le-^o*. This word obviously has a reflection on ^{URU}/^{ID}*Halinzuwa* (a formation with the typical *a*-vowel-theme) or at least it has the same nominal root with that geographical designation. N. Oettinger, in: GsPedersen, 317 (n. 47), with a certain reservation, postulates that *halenzu*- could be connected to Hittite verb *hat*- “to become dry, dry out” because of its cognate ^{URU}*Hatinzuwa*. The existence of a river name ^{ID}*Halinzuwa* may suggest that *halenzu*- may somehow be related to “water”. In fact, *halenzu*- is mentioned in Hittite context in connection with marsh[?] (*marmar(a)*-, KUB 17.10 I 12'-13') and pond (*huli*-, KBo 13.58 III 18'-22'), that it covers their surfaces, or grows (*huwai*-) on them. Therefore, in my opinion, H. Otten's interpretation of *halenzu*- as “*Alge(n)*, *Entengrütze* = alga(e), duckweed” in BagM 3 (1964) 95, still remains more feasible than “*Laub* = foliage” (thus, J. J. S. Weitenberg, U-Stämme [1984] 245; J. Friedrich-A. Kammenhuber, HW² H_u, Lfg. 11 [1991] 26 f.) or “overgrowth” (J. Puhvel, HED 3 [1991] 19 f.). I would like even to suggest for it “(lotus) water lily, lily pad” which is more appropriate for a geographical name.

On the other hand, however, the often used Hattian formula *ha~le~*(nominal stem) “to / for his (body part)” and *ha~te~*(nominal stem) “to / for her (body part)” in the ritual texts, which I briefly discussed in: GsForrer (2004) 624-626, should be kept apart from the Hattian nominal group with initial *hale-* / *hate-* preliminary indicating a proper name.

⁵⁰ From the Hittite texts there is also known a deity name ^d*Halenzawu* (B. H. L. van Gessel, Onomasticon I [1998] 109) which looks in its spelling even more Hattian, with a possible analyses *ha~te~n(i)zawu*.

⁵¹ HWHT 143, 297, 430, 435 with literature.

⁵² KUB 28.75 II 3-5; cf. B.H.L. van Gessel, Onomasticon I, 211.

The nominal sex differentiation in Hattian is not proper only to the lemmas in *ha~li~* and *ha~ti~*, but also to the more easily understood formations *te-* “great” + gender markers *-l-* for masculine and *-t-* for feminine (accompanied always with a *Bindevokal*) + nominal stem⁵³. The following are the formations in *te~ti~* and *te~li~* from this nominal group:

Feminine

1) Proper Name

<u>Designation</u>	<u>Analysis</u>	<u>Meaning</u>
^d <i>Tetahhiwala</i>	<i>te~t(Vh)~(h)iwala</i>	“the big (<i>h</i>) <i>iwala</i> ” (a goddess with title <i>kattah</i> “queen”) ⁵⁴
^d <i>Tetepiri</i>	<i>te~t(V)~piri</i>	“the big <i>piri</i> ” (a goddess)
^d <i>Tetešhapi</i>	<i>te~t(V)~šhapi</i>	“the mighty goddess” ⁵⁵
^d <i>Tetewatti</i>	<i>te~t(V)~wati</i>	“the big <i>wati</i> ” (a goddess)
^d <i>Tethapati(a)</i>	<i>te~t(hV)~pati</i>	“the big <i>pati</i> ” (a goddess, possibly = ^d <i>Tetewatti</i>)
^d <i>Titiutti</i>	<i>ti~t(V)~uti</i>	“the big <i>uti</i> ” (a goddess, possibly = ^d <i>Tetewatti</i>)

2) Divine Attribute

<u>Designation</u>	<u>Analysis</u>	<u>Meaning</u>
<i>tetimu(n)</i>	<i>te~t(V)~mu(n)</i>	“the big mother” ⁵⁶

3) Lexical use

<u>Word</u>	<u>Analysis</u>	<u>Meaning</u>
<i>tetekuzzan</i>	<i>te~t(V)~kuzzan</i>	“the big hearth” ⁵⁷
<i>titahzilat</i>	<i>ti~t(Vh)~zilat</i>	“the great chair = throne” ⁵⁸

⁵³ F.P. Daddi, in: *FsAlp*, 107, 108; cf. also O. Soysal, *HWHT* 33 f.

⁵⁴ KUB 48.12 r. col. 8'-10'; cf. B. H. L. van Gessel, *Onomasticon* I, 509.

⁵⁵ This nominal complex includes the lemma *šahap* “deity” (*HWHT* 305).

⁵⁶ This nominal complex possibly includes the lemma *mu* “mother” (*HWHT* 295; discussed by F. P. Daddi, *SMEA* 40 Nr. 1 [1998] 7).

⁵⁷ This nominal complex includes the lemma *kuzan* “hearth” (*HWHT* 292); with *tetekuzzan* “big hearth” is meant perhaps the “smelting furnace” with which the smith performs his work; see O. Soysal, in: *Gslmparati* II (2002) 779 (n. 37).

⁵⁸ This nominal complex includes the lemma *zilat* “chair, stool” (*HWHT* 328). In Hattian, the wooden substances and products apparently were considered feminine cf. *HWHT* 183.

Masculine

1) Proper Name

<u>Designation</u>	<u>Analysis</u>	<u>Meaning</u>
^d Telipinu	te≈l(V)≈pinu	“the mighty son” ⁵⁹
URU Tiliura	ti≈l(V)≈ura	“the great well / spring” ⁶⁰ (name of a town)

2) Divine Attribute

<u>Designation</u>	<u>Analysis</u>	<u>Meaning</u>
^d Tilitaru	ti≈l(V)≈taru	“the mighty Taru” (Storm god)

If we combine both our conclusions, that the form *labarna* is proper to Hittite and Luwian only, and that the *t* / *l* alternation in Hattian is not simply a phonetic feature, but rather has to do with the nominal gender, do we have now a clue for the peculiar alternation of the royal title *tabarna* and of its Indo-European remake *labarna* ? It is obvious that the Hattian feminine marker “*t*” is not attested only as a suffix (*ure-t* “strong female”, *takeḫa-t* “lioness, heroine”) or as infix (^d*Ha-t(i)-pinu*), but as a prefix as well, especially with the feminine possessive *te-* “her”⁶¹. This possessive even has a secondary form in *ta-*⁶². Thus, did this morphological fact possibly force the Hittites to reform or recreate the original Hattian title *tabarna*, in which they eliminated the initial *t-* that would be strongly reminiscent of the feminine *t-* morpheme, replacing it with the *l-* masculine marker? The latter is included in the masculine possessive prefix *le-* in Hattian as parallel to the feminine *te-*. The strong ethnic contrast between the non-Indo-European, matriarchal Hattians and the Indo-European, patriarchal Hittites, and the cultural consequences of this on Hittite society and pantheon are known. The most striking case is the gender metamorphosis of the Hattian Sun goddess Eštan into the Hittite Sun god Ištanu during Hittite times. Thus, the morphological transformation of the *tabarna* into *labarna* by the Hittites (or by the Luwians) would be intended to clear the king’s title of an apparent “feminine” character. That the Hittites might have conducted this possible gender operation with the morphological elements of Hattian is reasonable since the early Hittites living with, or close to the Hattians (see below) should have been well familiar with this language. Moreover, Hittite itself possessed neither a prefix nor a suffix to create a masculine form.

The oldest attestations of *tabarna* / *labarna* may be seen in the Kültepe texts from the eighteenth and seventeenth centuries B.C., but only within proper names. Thanks to the kindness of K. Hecker, I had the opportunity to check the personal names from this

⁵⁹ This nominal complex includes the lemma *pin(u)* “child” (HWHT 301). A feminine form for this as *^dTetepinu that is mentioned by V. Haas, *Gesch. Relig.*, 311, would theoretically be expected, but it is hitherto unattested.

⁶⁰ This nominal complex includes the lemma *ur(i)* “well, spring” (HWHT 318 f.).

⁶¹ HWHT 183, 187, 248-249.

⁶² The examples and bibliography for this morpheme are compiled in HWHT 244, sub *ta*³.

period. The name Tabarna is surprisingly not attested at all, while a name Zabarna occurs twice⁶³. This can possibly be a phonetic variation of Tabarna, since $t \sim z$ interchange is a common feature of Hattian phonology. A name Labarnaš occurs once⁶⁴, and there is also a king's name Labarša⁶⁵. The name Labarša, however, in spite of its close resemblance to Labarna, cannot be a variation of Labarna⁶⁶, since a phonetic $n \sim š$ interchange is observed neither in Hattian nor in Hittite. This form has just the same formation pattern as Labarna, but includes the different nominal stem *ša* instead of *na*, thus *la~bar~ša* "the thousand *ša*". E. Bilgiç, on the other hand, refers to a possible suffix *-ša* within Cappadocian personal names⁶⁷. It now becomes an interesting fact that the usage of the personal names Tabarna and Labarna in the Kültepe texts is extremely limited, although we find them in Hittite documents very often. Even the rare appearance of Labarnaš and Labarša in the Kültepe documents is important and would indicate that the Hittite remake with masculine prefix *l-*, suggested here, had already taken place at least in the early stage of Hattian - Hittite contact in the late eighteenth and early seventeenth centuries B.C. Indeed there are some onoma-historical points available that would indicate the Indo-European origin of these persons. It is to be noted that the form Labarnaš already employs the Hittite nominative ending *-š* even in an old Assyrian text⁶⁸. Labarša, on the other hand, is mentioned as a ruler of an Anatolian town, possibly one of the cities Ḫattum or Kaniš, but his accession to the throne is expressed in an unique manner as read in a Kültepe text: "When Labarša took / seized the rulership". This has been interpreted by some scholars as an usurpation⁶⁹. If this observation is correct, we can count him with the

⁶³ *Zabarna* is attested in Kt. a/k 1263 b obv. 7 (on this text see C. Günbattı, *Belleten* 53 [1989] 51-52; cf. HWHT 154) and in Kt. m/k 31:1 (this additional unpublished occurrence is according to the Cappadocian PN collection of K. Hecker).

⁶⁴ Kt. 88/k 713:3; on this text see V. Donbaz, in: *FsN.Özgüç* (1993) 145 f.

⁶⁵ K.R. Veenhof, in: *RLA* 6 (1980-83) 409.

⁶⁶ As K.R. Veenhof, *ibid.*, correctly pointed out. On the other hand, if the later plant name *lāparša-* (may be rather Luwian) in the Hittite lexicon may be related to this name, it has not satisfactorily been explained yet; cf. H. Kronasser, *EHS* 1, 62; E. Laroche, *NH* (1966) 339; *CHD* 3/1, 43; however, more sceptical J. Tischler, *HEG* 5/6, p. 42.

⁶⁷ *AfO* 15 (1945-1951) 7-8.

⁶⁸ Among the Cappadocian proper names there is a large number of types which possess the ending *-š*, and the unpublished evidences for it I owe to the Cappadocian PN collection of K. Hecker. Some of those names appear with and without *-š* like Ḫuziš / Ḫuziaš (alongside with Ḫuzi / Ḫuzia; *NH* Nrr. 421.1, 422.1; Kt. a/k 906:21), Ilališ (= Ilali; I 773:9', *ICK* II 12:9; *Kay.* 337:14; *TC* II 66:8; Kt. c/k 453:22 etc.), Kiriš (= Kiri; Kt. d/k 48 a:7, b:7), Šalkuataš (= Šalkuata; *CCT* V 26a:1; Kt. n/k 32:16, 45; Kt. 88/k 713:1, 2, 3), Šipunaḫšuš (= Šipunaḫšu; *NH* Nr. 1190; *AKT* III 41:17), Tatkapuš (= Tatkapu; *ICK* I 35 a:13, b:5) and Tuḫḫiliaš (Tuḫḫalia / Tuḫḫilia; *NH* Nr. 1389.1; cf. O. Soysal, *ZA* 90 [2000] 106 [with n. 38]) so that a "Hittite" nominative suffix *-š* for these can be ascertained; cf. E. Bilgiç, *App.* (1954) 6, and K. Hecker, *GKT* (= *AnOr* 44; [1968]) § 60d. The names Ḫuziaš and Tuḫḫiliaš, alongside with Labarnaš, are important because they are attested also in the earlier Old Hittite Kingdom period, designating the prime noble members of the royal family; see "phase 3" in the main text. These Hittites are, of course, not the identical persons with those in Kültepe texts, but they are living proof of continuation of an old name-bearing tradition.

⁶⁹ *ICK* I 178:3': *inūmi Labarša rubā'uttam išbutuni*; cf. S. R. Bin-Nun, *THeth* 5, 30 (with n. 3). The idiom *rubā'uttam šabātu* is inherent in Kültepe-Assyrian (*CAD* R [1999] 401), but clearly synonym to standard Akkadian *kussā šabātu* (*CAD* Š [1962] 27-28 and *CAD* K [1971] 591) which also refers to usurpation against the legal succession to the throne; cf. also R. Harris, *JCS* 9 (1955) 47 f.

K.R. Veenhof, *RLA* 6, 409, thought that the residence of Labarša would have been either Ḫattum (= Ḫattuš(a)) or Kaniš (= Neša). Both cities became later the focus of attention of the Indo-European Hittites: According to the Anitta-Text *KBo* 3.22 (E. Laroche, *CTH* [1971] Nr. 1), Neša was favorably regarded by the Hittites while Ḫattuša was rather to be hated (*ibid.*, rev. 48-51). If the "Indo-European" Labarša was one of the former kings of Kaniš, this would explain the

early Hittite / Indo-European invaders and rulers in central Anatolia beside Pithana and his son Anitta of Kuššara.

The Indo-European creation *labarna* posited here, based on the proper name Labarnaš and partially on Labarša in the Kültepe documents, would, however, give rise to the question of why the Hittites later continued to use the early Hattian form *tabarna* both as proper name and title. Such a question is difficult to answer on the linguistic level, but may rather be associated with an ethno-historical reason. It might have to do, for instance, with the political relationship of the Hittites to the neighboring Hattian world in third and second millennium B.C. Anatolia. If we consider also the time factor, the Hittites who did stand in close connection with the Hattians over the centuries can theoretically be classified in the following categories within four phases:

Phase 1) The earliest Hittites who peacefully lived in Hattian cities under Hattian sovereignty without having any military-political claim. Their first contact with the Hattians or their infiltration in Hattian cities can be dated to sometime in the late third millennium B.C. after the Indo-European invasions into Anatolia.

Phase 2) The earlier Hittites who were independently organized in their own cities and showed up as a military-political power under Pithana and his son Anitta of Kuššara, having energetically fought against the surrounding Hattian cities (late eighteenth or early seventeenth century B.C.).

Phase 3) The Hittites who seem finally to have overthrown the Hattian sovereignty in Central Anatolia and established their own dynasty in Kuššara or somewhere else. This earlier Old Hittite Kingdom period is connected with the name of nobles like Tuḫaliya, Ḫuzziya, Pušarruma, Papaḫdilmah, Alašaili etc.⁷⁰ (from the late seventeenth to early sixteenth century B.C.).

Phase 4) The Hittites who arose as a central power in the early Old Hittite Kingdom in the reigns of Labarna I, Labarna II (= Ḫattušili I) and Muṣšili I. These kings who had their residence in Kuššara and later in Ḫattuša conquered the rest of the Hattian cities, so that the Hattians disappeared from Anatolian military and political history for good. Even so, the Hittites during the Old Kingdom kept borrowing many Hattian cultural customs and continued to use them for a long time (from the early sixteenth century B.C. on).

According to the occurrences in the Kültepe texts the usage of the forms Labarna and Labarša chronologically should fall in phase 2. This is the period when the Hittites might be in the most conservative stage in their relationship to the Hattians because of the intense struggle for power between both nations that restrained the Hittites from using the original Hattian form *tabarna* at all. But in phases 3 and 4, after the Hittites secured their existence as an established kingdom, a certain tolerance is possible as seen from the many Hattian cultural customs imported into Hittite society. Starting from this point on, both forms *tabarna* and *labarna* may have been used among the Hittite ruling class. The

conspicuous policy of Pithana who treated the Nešaens as “mothers and fathers” after he took the city by storm by night (*ibid.*, obv. 5-9).

⁷⁰ See most recently R.H. Beal, in: FsHoffner (2003) 13 ff, esp. 34-35. The name of Alašaili who is an overlooked member of the earlier Old Hittite royal family is mentioned in tiny Akkadian historical fragment KBo 28.137:4' right after [^mPap]aḫdilmah (with an erroneous spelling [...]*aḫkilmah*) and ^mḪuz[ziya] (l. 3').

earliest occurrences of *tabarna* for both title and proper name in Boğazköy documents are, so far, dated to the reign of Labarna I and Hattušili I (phase 4)⁷¹. We do not know whether the Hittites used *tabarna* before then, for example in phase 3. In any case, a form **Tabarna*(š) is not attested in the Kültepe texts (phase 1 and 2), while a “Hittitized” *Labarnaš* is known for this time. The decisive point would be, then, when the Hittites for the first time started to use the form *tabarna*. Hopefully this enigma will be clarified in new documents from Kültepe or Boğazköy.

Unfortunately, at this point I am not able to show further evidence to prove the initial *t*- for feminine versus *l*- for masculine hypothesis for pre- and early Hittite personal names. I would like, however, to point out some oddities on the onomastic level which illustrate the conflict between two different societies in close connection, as were the Hattians and the Hittites. Firstly, it is to be noticed that the use of Hattian personal names was not consistent when representing the sex of their bearers. I would like to mention the following cases:

1) The Hattian proper name Inar(a) designating the protective goddess was used for a male person both in Hattian and Hittite times⁷².

2) The Hattian personal name Aškaliya / Aškiliya was used in Hittite times both for male and female individuals⁷³. The same peculiarity is observed with the Cappadocian personal name Ilališka(n) which designates both sexes⁷⁴.

3) The Hattian name Kururu appears in the Kültepe texts affiliated with male persons while we find the same name in Boğazköy being borne by a female practitioner of a Hattian ritual⁷⁵.

4) The name of the male Hattian god Kattešhapi “the King-God” appears in Hittite times as the name of a Hittite great queen⁷⁶.

5) The queen name Hapšili of Hattian origin, surprisingly shows the masculine ending *-ili*, which is a unique case among the other names of similar formation in the Hittite onomastic. But the other spelling of this name as Hapšiti represents the correct

⁷¹ See Appendix. In his own documents Hattušili I very often denotes himself as *Tabarna*, as e.g. in his Annals (CTH 4) and in his Political Testament (CTH 6). From Labarna I no original document has survived, but in the Zalpa-Text KBo 3.38 obv. 11' (CTH 3) is a *Tabarna*, who at first has engaged in political-military activities against Zalpa during the early Old Hittite Kingdom. He is acting in the text narrative as the “first generation” king, i. e. the grandfather of the present king, thus he may, chronologically seen, very well be Labarna I; see O. Soysal, Muršili I. (Diss.) 140, 143; differently, R. H. Beal, in: FsHoffner, 21 ff.

⁷² For the occurrences of this goddess and the writing of her name in the Boğazköy documents see A. Kammenhuber, ZA 66 (1976) 68-88 and in: RLA 5 (1976-80) 89-90; cf. O. Soysal, ZA 90, 96 (with n. 19). The masculine proper names Inar(a) from Kültepe and Boğazköy are listed by E. Laroche, NH Nrr. 453, 454; in addition see the land donation text Bo 90/722 obv. 25 (H. Otten-Chr. Rüster, ArAn 3 [1997] 266).

⁷³ O. Soysal, ZA 90, 105-106, 112, 113, and HWHT 16 (n. 38).

⁷⁴ NH Nr. 445; one of the occurrences for feminine PN, Kt. n/k 39:10, 14, is published by V. Donbaz, in: FsT.Özgüç (1989) 85 f.

⁷⁵ For male Kururu in a document from Kültepe see now S. Çeçen, ArAn 5 (2002) 68 (Kt. 92/k 526 l. e. 38). A further occurrence is to be noted in Kt. 92/k 478:3 (N. Özgüç-Ö. Tunca, Kültepe-Kaniš [2001] 342). The “Old Woman” Kururu we come across in Boğazköy in KBo 37.23 IV 7-8 (coloph.); cf. O. Soysal, ZA 90, 116 (with n. 66).

⁷⁶ KBo 32.197 rev. 11; cf. also KUB 48.106:18' (2 x).

and genuine Hattian form⁷⁷. The Cappadocian female proper name Kapazili⁷⁸ too appears as an interesting exception.

6) The most striking cases are, however, the masculine proper names Pimpirit and Nakili(ya)t which display varied formations with and without final *-t* in Hittite documents. The hittitized forms of these are Pimpira and Nakkiliya⁷⁹. Why the Hittites did not create such forms like *Pimpirita and *Nakili(ya)ta⁸⁰, and instead eliminate the final *-(V)t* and then switch them in the *a*-class could be a simple phonetic matter, but also another attempt of the patriarchal custom of the Hittites to clear these names of an apparent “feminine” character as supposed above for the proper name and royal title *tabarna*.

To sum up, let us maintain that the origin of the royal title *tabarna* can be definitely claimed as Hattian because now it can be meaningfully interpreted within the Hattian lexicon. The process by which the Hittites (or Luwians) created *labarna*, and the relationship of *labarna* to *tabarna*, must still remain questions, for the hypothesis of a transformation between both words based on gender concerns must await support from new documents and from future research on the onomastics of ancient Anatolia.

⁷⁷ There is also a corrupt form Ḫarapšeki attested (NH Nr. 297.1) in a close reminiscence of Ḫarapšiti.

⁷⁸ Unpublished occurrence Kt. n/k 1840:9 is according to the Cappadocian PN collection of K. Hecker.

⁷⁹ Nakkiliya (cf. KBo 32.184 rev. 12'), on the other hand, can possibly be connected to Hittite lemma *nakki-* “difficult; important” (J. Tischler HEG Teil II, Lfg. 7 [1991] 258 f.) if one disregards the final *-t* of the earlier variation Nakkili(a)t (Kültepe, Old Hittite; NH Nr. 850), but Pimpirit (NH Nr. 1001) displays definitely a Hattian word structure that is observed in a pure Hattian form *pēnpirat* in KUB 28.53 IV 10' (with its different spellings in other documents; see HWHT 124); the same word may be represented also in the Anatolian deity designation ^dPi(n)pira (HWHT 149, with further bibl.). Contrarily, F. Starke, StBoT 31 (1990) 454 (n. 1643) takes the proper name Pimpira as Hittite domain, and even postulates from it a verbal stem **pimpiriya-*.

⁸⁰ Noticeably, an identical river name displays both forms, the reduced one ^{id}Nakkiliya and the original one ^{id}Nakkiliyata; cf. J. Tischler HEG Teil II, Lfg. 7, 259.

APPENDIX: A chronological view on the use of *tabarna* / *labarna*⁸¹

A) As proper name

Assyrian Colony Period

Labarna (see n. 64 below; cf. also PN *Labarša* [see n. 65 below])

Zabarna (see n. 63 below; a variant[?] of *Tabarna* that is not found in Kültepe documents)

Old Hittite Kingdom

[*Labarna*][?]: Son of Hattušili I's grandfather (KUB 1.16+ III 42)

L[abarna][?]: Son of Pu-šarruma; identical with the aforementioned person? (KUB 11.7 + I 11')

Labarna: =[?] Labarna I (KUB 11.9+ IV 24')

^m*Labarna*: = Labarna I (KBo 3.67+ I 2; KUB 3.85 obv. 2; KUB 21.29 II 4)

Tabarna: =[?] Labarna I (KBo 3.38 obv. 11')

Labarna: = Hattušili I (KUB 1.16 + III 55, 64; Letter to Tunip-Teššub, obv. 3; see n. 12 below)

^m*Labarna*: = Hattušili I (KUB 21.2 + KUB 48.95 I 3; KUB 11.4:4')

Tabarna: = Hattušili I (KBo 10.1 obv. 1, 13, rev. 9, 11, 19, 22; KBo 10.2 I 27, II 54, III 37; KUB 1.16+ I 1, II 1, IV / III 73, 74)

Labarna: Son of Hattušili I (KUB 1.16 + I 2, II 3, 31; also KBo 11.36 III 10'; see O. Soysal, Muršili I. [Diss. 1989 (1994)] 67, 105, 133-134)

^m*Tabarna*: Son of Muršili I[?] who conspired with the enemy city Zalpa against his father (KBo 22.2 rev. 11')

Labarna: Son of an Old Hittite king, who possesses the anonymous royal seal SBo I Nr. 89 (Bo 90/732; see H. Otten, AA 1991 Nr. 3 [1991] 347). SBo I 89 may be attributed to Telipinu; cf. D.F. Easton, JCS 33 (1981) 30, 31 and 41.

Middle Hittite Kingdom

So far no occurrence known.

New Hittite Kingdom

So far no occurrence known.

As far the available written documents would suggest, the royal name-giving tradition of Labarna / Tabarna seems to be limited to the time of the Old Hittite kings Labarna I, Hattušili I (= Labarna II), Muršili I, and a king with the anonymous royal seal impression SBo I 89 (= Telipinu[?]). Neither in Middle Hittite, nor in New Hittite times do we encounter both these words as proper names of the members of royal family. Labarna, however, may have survived later on in the first millennium Anatolia in the hieroglyphic Luwian name ^m*La-pa-ra/i-na* (Cekke, Inscription 2 rev. 3, § 9), and in ^m*Liburna* / ^m*Lubarna/i*, the names of two rulers of the late Hittite state Hattin (or Pattin) mentioned in the Assyrian historical documents (J. D. Hawkins, RIA 7 [1987-90] 106) which can be a rendering of the customary, Indo-European remake, Labarna.

⁸¹ Except for the first two proper names Labarna mentioned in Old Hittite Kingdom, all examples are taken from the fully preserved written sources. Those kings' names with many textual documentations are represented here by one occurrence only.

*B) As title*Old Hittite Kingdom

Telipinu: ^m*tabarna* (KUB 3.85 obv. 1)

Note that there are also numerous anonymous royal seals impression including the title *tabarna* which are to be ascribed to the Old Hittite kings before Alluwamna: İnandık 174/66, SBo I 87-91, BoHA XIV 251 (cf. O. Carruba, IM 43 [1993] 75), Ku 97/60 and some others from Kuşaklı (see A. Müller-Karpe, MDOG 130 [1998] 103).

Middle Hittite Kingdom

Alluwamna: *tabarna* (KBo 32.136 upper edge 1 and seal impression)
 Taḫurwaili: *tabarna* (Bo 69/200 seal impression; see H. Otten, MDOG 103 [1971] 59-60)
 Ḫantili II: *tabarna* (Bo 90/758 obv. 1, rev. 21 and seal impression; see Chr. Rüster, IM 43, 64-66)
 Zidanta II: *tabarna* (KBo 32.184 seal impression)
 Ḫuzziya II: *tabarna* (VAT 7436 obv. 1 and seal impression; see H.G. Güterbock, SBo I [1940] 51, 70, 74)
 Muwatalli I: *tabarna* (KBo 32.185 upper edge 1, rev. 8 and seal impression)
 Tuthaliya I / II: *tabarna* (KUB 40.62 + KUB 13.9 I 1)
 Arnuwanda I: *tabarna* (KBo 5.7 rev. 49)

The use of the title *tabarna* between the reigns of the early Middle Hittite rulers Alluwamna and Muwatalli I is documented exclusively in the donation texts, so that it may only reflect a stereotyped administrative tradition. For example, in their treaties with Eḫeya and Pilliya, the kings of Kizzuwatna, neither Taḫurwaili nor Zidanta II seems to use the title *tabarna*: KBo 28.109:7', KUB 36.108 obv. 1.

New Hittite Kingdom

Arnuwanda II or Muršili II: *tabarna* (KBo 1.28 rev. 5')
 Muwatalli II: *tabarna* (KUB 6.45+ I 1) and ^m*labarna* (KUB 21.1+ IV 39)
 Urḫi-Tešup: *taparna* (Bo 90/1199 seal impression)
 Ḫattušili III: *tabarna* (KUB 21.17 I 1) and ^m*tabarna* (KUB 1.1+ I 1)
 Tuthaliya IV: *tabarna* (KUB 26.43+ rev. 15)
 Šuppiluliuma II: *tabarna* (KBo 12.38 I 11', II 22')

The use of the title *tabarna* continues in the New Hittite Kingdom with the exception of the reign of Šuppiluliuma I, and of one of his sons Arnuwanda II or Muršili II. Remarkable variations of this title are to be noticed with Muwatalli II, who applies to himself the never before used title ^m*labarna*, and Urḫi-Tešup, whose seal displays the rare spelling *ta-pa-ar-na*.

References

For space reasons, in most cases I preferred to refer for bibliographical data for Hattian details to O. Soysal, *Hattischer Wortschatz in hethitischer Textüberlieferung*. HdO, Abt. 1, Bd. 74 (Leiden and Boston [2004]; henceforth *HWHT*), if they are already available there. The bibliographic and Hittitological abbreviations follow those used in CHD (1980 ff.) and HW² (1975 ff.). Additional abbreviations are:

Beiträge: Chr. Girbal, Beiträge zur Grammatik des Hattischen. Europäische Hochschulschriften: Reihe 21, Linguistik; Bd. 50 (Frankfurt am Main, Bern and New York [1986]).

FsHoffner: Hittite Studies in Honor of Harry A. Hoffner Jr. on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday. Edited by G. Beckman, R. Beal, and G. McMahon (Indiana [2003]).

GsForrer: Šarnikzel. Hethitologische Studien zum Gedenken an Emil Orgetorix Forrer (19.02.1894-10.01.1986). Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie 10. Herausgegeben von D. Groddek und S. Rößle (Dresden [2004]).

GsImparati: Anatolia Antica. Studi in memoria di Fiorella Imparati. Tomo I, II. Eothen 11. A cura di St. de Martino e F. Pecchioli Daddi (Firenze [2002]).

The Ḫabiru Prism: M. Salvini, The Ḫabiru Prism of King Tunip-Teššup of Tikunani. Documenta Asiana, Vol. III (Roma [1996]).

HHB II: H.-S. Schuster, Die Ḫattisch-Hethitischen Bilinguen. II. Textbearbeitungen Teil 2 und 3 (Leiden, Boston and Köln [2002]).

Indo-European Perspectives: Indo-European Perspectives. Edited by M.R.V. Southern. Journal of Indo-European Studies Monograph No. 43 (Washington D. C. [2002]).

Kultepe-Kaniš: N. Özgüç-Ö. Tunca, Mühürlü ve Yazıtlı Kil Bullalar. TTKY V/48 (Ankara [2001]).

The Luwians: The Luwians. Edited by H.C. Melchert. HdO, Sec. 1, Vol. 68 (Leiden and Boston [2003]).

Melammu Symposia III: Melammu Symposia III. Ideologies as Intercultural Phenomena Proceedings of the Symposium held in Chicago, October 27-31, 2000. Edited by A. Panaino and G. Pettinato (Milano [2002]).

Mesopotamian Origins: E. A. Speiser, Mesopotamian Origins. The Basic Population of the Near East (Philadelphia and London [1930]).

Muršili I. (Diss.): O. Soysal, Muršili I. -Eine historische Studie. Inaugural-Dissertation zur Erlangung der Doktorwürde der Philosophischen Fakultät I der Julius-Maximilians-Universität zu Würzburg (Würzburg [1989, published 1994]).

Onomasticon: B. H. L. van Gessel, Onomasticon of the Hittite Pantheon. Part I, II, III. HdO, Sec. 1, Vol. 33 (Leiden, New York / Boston and Köln [1998, 2001]).

Zu einigen Neufunden: H. Otten, Zu einigen Neufunden hethitischer Königssiegel (Stuttgart [1993]).