



Alice Mouton (dir.)

**Hittitology today: Studies on Hittite and Neo-Hittite Anatolia in Honor of Emmanuel Laroche's 100th Birthday**  
5<sup>e</sup> Rencontres d'archéologie de l'IFEA, Istanbul 21-22 novembre 2014

Institut français d'études anatoliennes

---

## The Luwian Title of the Great King

Ilya Yakubovich

---

DOI: 10.4000/books.ifeagd.3452  
Publisher: Institut français d'études anatoliennes  
Place of publication: Istanbul  
Year of publication: 2017  
Published on OpenEdition Books: 27 April 2020  
Serie: Rencontres d'Archéologie de l'IFEA  
Electronic ISBN: 9782362450839



<http://books.openedition.org>

**Printed version**

Date of publication: 1 January 2017

**Electronic reference**

YAKUBOVICH, Ilya. *The Luwian Title of the Great King* In: *Hittitology today: Studies on Hittite and Neo-Hittite Anatolia in Honor of Emmanuel Laroche's 100th Birthday: 5<sup>e</sup> Rencontres d'archéologie de l'IFEA, Istanbul 21-22 novembre 2014* [online]. Istanbul: Institut français d'études anatoliennes, 2017 (generated 06 mai 2020). Available on the Internet: <<http://books.openedition.org/ifeagd/3452>>. ISBN: 9782362450839. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4000/books.ifeagd.3452>.

---

**5<sup>èmes</sup> RENCONTRES D'ARCHÉOLOGIE DE L'IFÉA**

**HITTITOLOGY TODAY:  
Studies on Hittite and Neo-Hittite Anatolia  
in Honor of Emmanuel Laroche's 100<sup>th</sup> Birthday**

**L'HITTITOLOGIE AUJOURD'HUI :  
Études sur l'Anatolie hittite et néo-hittite  
à l'occasion du centenaire de la naissance  
d'Emmanuel Laroche**

**OFFPRINT/AYRIBASIM**



**5<sup>èmes</sup> RENCONTRES D'ARCHÉOLOGIE DE L'IFÉA**

**HITTITOLOGY TODAY:  
Studies on Hittite and Neo-Hittite Anatolia  
in Honor of Emmanuel Laroche's 100<sup>th</sup> Birthday**

**L'HITTITOLOGIE AUJOURD'HUI :  
Études sur l'Anatolie hittite et néo-hittite  
à l'occasion du centenaire de la naissance  
d'Emmanuel Laroche**

Alice MOUTON (éd.)

Istanbul  
21-22 novembre, 2014

HITTITOLOGY TODAY:  
Studies on Hittite and Neo-Hittite Anatolia  
in Honor of Emmanuel Laroche's 100<sup>th</sup> Birthday

L'HITTITOLOGIE AUJOURD'HUI :  
Études sur l'Anatolie hittite et néo-hittite à l'occasion  
du centenaire de la naissance d'Emmanuel Laroche

Éditées par Alice MOUTON

ISBN 978-2-36245-067-9

Illustration de couverture : Emmanuel Laroche en train de copier l'inscription  
hiéroglyphique située sous le relief d'Ivriz en 1955.

Ce volume a été composé par Zero Prodüksiyon Ltd.  
Abdullah sok. 17, 34433 Taksim, Beyoğlu-İstanbul/Turquie.

La publication a pu en être réalisée grâce au concours financier  
du Ministère des Affaires étrangères et du développement international  
et du CNRS.

© 2017, Institut Français d'Études Anatoliennes Georges - Dumézil  
Nuru Ziya sok. 22, 34433 Beyoğlu-İstanbul/Turquie.

Secrétaire aux publications : Aksel Tibet

Production et distribution  
Zero Prod. Ltd.  
Abdullah Sokak. No 17 Taksim 34433 Istanbul-Turkey  
Tel : +90 (212) 244 75 21 Fax : +90 (212) 244 32 09  
info@zerobooksonline.com  
www.zerobooksonline.com

Imprimé par  
Oksijen Basım ve Matbaacılık San. Tic. Ltd. Şti.  
100. Yıl Mah. Matbaacılar Sit. 2. Cad. No 202/A Bağcılar - İstanbul  
Tel : +90 (212) 325 71 25 Fax : +90 (212) 325 61 99  
numéro de certificat : 29487

# SOMMAIRE

- IX**    ABRÉVIATIONS
- XIII**    INTRODUCTION  
Alice Mouton
- I. LINGUISTIQUE, GRAMMAIRE ET ÉPIGRAPHIE**
- 3**    SYNTAX OF THE HITTITE "SUPINE" CONSTRUCTION  
Harry A. Hoffner, Jr. et H. Craig Melchert
- 7**    AGREEMENT PATTERNS OF COLLECTIVE NOUNS IN HITTITE  
Elisabeth Rieken
- 19**    YAYINLANMAMIŞ BAZI Bo TABLETLERİNE YENİ DUPLİKAT VE  
PARALEL METİNLER  
Rukiye Akdoğan
- 39**    THE LUWIAN TITLE OF THE GREAT KING  
Ilya Yakubovich
- 51**    A NEW HIEROGLYPHIC LUWIAN EPIGRAPH: URFA-KÜLAFLI TEPE  
Massimo Poetto
- 63**    OLD AND NEWLY DISCOVERED LYCIAN INSCRIPTIONS FROM TLOS  
Recai Tekoğlu
- II. PHILOGIE ET HISTOIRE DES RELIGIONS**
- 71**    A NEW INTERPRETATION OF THE HITTITE EXPRESSION *ŠARĀ AR-*  
Willemijn Waal
- 81**    SANDAS IN TRANSLATION  
Ian Rutherford
- 101**    L'INDIVIDU ET SON CORPS EN ANATOLIE HITTITE :  
UN NOUVEAU PROJET  
Alice Mouton
- 113**    KUBABA IN THE HITTITE EMPIRE AND THE CONSEQUENCES FOR  
HER EXPANSION TO WESTERN ANATOLIA  
Manfred Hutter

### III. HISTOIRE ET GÉOGRAPHIE HISTORIQUE

- 125** LE RÔLE DE PURUŠḪANDA DANS L'HISTOIRE HITTITE  
Massimo Forlanini
- 151** THE HURRIAN LANGUAGE IN ANATOLIA IN THE LATE BRONZE AGE  
Stefano de Martino
- 163** AN ALTERNATIVE VIEW ON THE LOCATION OF ARZAWA  
Max Gander
- 191** PRELIMINARY REPORT OF THE FASILAR SURVEY  
Yiğit Erbil
- 201** THE NORTHERN BORDER OF TABAL  
Zsolt Simon

### IV. ARCHÉOLOGIE

- 215** CULT AND RITUAL AT LATE BRONZE AGE II ALALAKH:  
HYBRIDITY AND POWER UNDER HITTITE ADMINISTRATION  
K. Aslıhan Yener
- 225** A NEW TABLET FRAGMENT AND A SEALED POTTERY FRAGMENT  
FROM ALACAHÖYÜK  
Belkis Dinçol
- 229** LE SITE DE ZEYVE-HÖYÜK-PORSUK AUX ÉPOQUES HITTITE ET  
NÉO-HITTITE. REMARQUES SUR LA SUCCESSION DES SYSTÈMES  
DÉFENSIFS  
Dominique Beyer et Françoise Laroche-Traunecker

### V. HISTORIOGRAPHIE

- 247** LAROCHE AND THE SEALS OF MESKENE-EMAR  
J. David Hawkins
- 267** "WHAT DO WE UNDERSTAND IN HURRIAN?"  
Susanne Görke
- 277** EIN PHILOLOGISCH-SPRACHWISSENSCHAFTLICHER BLICK AUF DEN  
FORTGANG DER LYKISCHEN STUDIEN SEIT EMMANUEL LAROCHE  
Heiner Eichner

INDEX

**301** NOMS GÉOGRAPHIQUES

**303** NOMS DIVINS

**304** NOMS DE PERSONNES





# ABRÉVIATIONS

ABoT	Ankara Arkeoloji Müzesinde Bulunan Boğazköy Tabletleri. Millî eğitim basımevi, İstanbul.
AfO	Archiv für Orientforschung.
AnSt	Anatolian Studies.
AoF	Altorientalische Forschungen.
AS	Assyriological Studies.
AT	Alalakh Text.
BiOr	Bibliotheca Orientalis.
Bo	Fragments de tablettes inédits de Boğazköy/Hattuša.
BoHa	Boğazköy-Hattuša, von Zabern, Mayence.
BSIEL	Brill's Studies in Indo-European Languages and Linguistics, Brill, Leyde.
BSL	Bulletin de la Société de linguistique de Paris.
CAD	OPPENHEIM, A. L. et al. (éds.), <i>The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago</i> . Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, Chicago, 1964-2010.
CHANE	Culture and History of the Ancient Near East, Brill, Leyde.
CHD	GÜTERBOCK, H. G. / HOFFNER, H. A. / VAN DEN HOUT, T. (éds.), <i>The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago</i> . Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, Chicago, 1989-.
CHLI 1	HAWKINS, J. D., <i>Corpus of hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions 1. Inscriptions of the Iron Age</i> (Untersuchungen zur indogermanischen Sprach- und Kulturwissenschaft NF 8/1). de Gruyter, Berlin – New York, 2000.
ChS	Corpus der hurritischen Sprachdenkmäler, Multigrafica editrice, Rome.
CTH	LAROCHE, E., <i>Catalogue des textes hittites</i> . Klincksieck, Paris, 1971.
DBH	Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz.
dupl.	Duplicat
EA	Tablettes provenant d'el-Amarna.
Eothen	Eothen. Collana di studi sulle civiltà dell'Oriente antico, LoGisma, Florence.
FGrHist	Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker.
GrHL	HOFFNER, H. A., Jr. / MELCHERT, H. C., <i>A Grammar of the Hittite Language. Part 1: Reference Grammar</i> (Languages of the Ancient Near East 1). Eisenbrauns, Winona Lake, 2008.
HE	FRIEDRICH, J., <i>Hethitisches Elementarbuch, 1. Teil: Kurzgefaßte Grammatik</i> . 2 <sup>nd</sup> edition. Winter, Heidelberg, 1960.

HED	PUHVEL, J., <i>Hittite Etymological Dictionary</i> , Trends in Linguistics. De Gruyter, Berlin – New York, 1984.
HEG	TISCHLER, J., <i>Hethitisches Etymologisches Glossar</i> (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 20-). Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck, Innsbruck, 1977-.
hethiter.net	<a href="http://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/">http://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/</a> .
HKM	ALP, S., <i>Hethitische Keilschrifttafeln aus Maşat</i> (Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları VI/34). Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, Ankara, 1991.
HS	<i>Historische Sprachforschung</i> .
HW	FRIEDRICH, J., <i>Hethitisches Wörterbuch, Kurzgefasste kritische Sammlung der Deutungen hethitischer Wörter</i> , Winter, Heidelberg, 1952.
HW <sup>2</sup>	FRIEDRICH, J. / KAMMENHUBER, A. / HOFFMANN, I. (éds.), <i>Hethitisches Wörterbuch, zweite, völlig neu bearbeitete Auflage auf der Grundlage der edierten hethitischen Texte</i> , Indogermanische Bibliothek. Winter, Heidelberg, 1975-.
HZI	NEU, E. / RÜSTER, Chr., <i>Hethitisches Zeichenlexikon</i> (StBoT Beiheft 2). Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 1989.
IBOT	<i>İstanbul Arkeoloji Müzelerinde bulunan Boğazköy Tabletleri</i> . Millî Eğitim Basımevi, İstanbul.
IF	<i>Indogermanische Forschungen</i> .
InL	<i>Incontri Linguistici</i> .
JANER	<i>Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions</i> .
JAOS	<i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i> .
JCS	<i>Journal of Cuneiform Studies</i> .
JNES	<i>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</i> .
KASKAL	KASKAL. <i>Rivista di storia, ambienti e culture del Vicino Oriente antico</i> , LoGisma, Florence.
KBo	<i>Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi</i> , Berlin.
Konkordanz	KOŠAK, S., <i>Konkordanz der hethitischen Texte</i> , hethiter.net:/hetkonk (v. 1.91).
Kp	Numéros d'inventaire des tablettes de Kayalipınar/Şamuha mises au jour lors des fouilles régulières.
KUB	<i>Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi</i> , Berlin.
Kt	Numéros d'inventaire des tablettes de Kültepe mises au jour lors des fouilles régulières.
L.	Numéros des signes hiéroglyphiques de LAROCHE, E., 1960: <i>Les hiéroglyphes hittites, I – L'écriture</i> . Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Paris.
LHK	RÜSTER, Chr. / WILHELM, G., <i>Landschenkungsurkunden hethitischer Könige</i> (StBoT Beiheft 4). Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 2012.
LIMC	KAHIL, L. (éd.), <i>Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae</i> . Artemis, Munich, 1981-2009.
LGNP	FRASER, P. M. (éd.), <i>A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names</i> . Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1987-2000.
LSU	RIEMSCHNEIDER, K., „Die hethitischen Landschenkungsurkunden“, <i>Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung</i> 6, 1958: 321-381.
Luwian Corpus	<i>Luwian Corpus – “Annotated Corpus of Luwian Texts / Hieroglyphic Vocabulary”</i> (I. Yakubovich) online: <a href="http://web.corpora.net/LuwianCorpus/search/">web.corpora.net/LuwianCorpus/search/</a> (last accessed September 3rd, 2015).
MH	Middle Hittite
MDOG	<i>Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft</i> .
MIO	<i>Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung</i> .
MS	Middle Hittite Script
MSS	<i>Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft</i> .
N	NEUMANN, G., <i>Neufunde lykischer Inschriften seit 1901</i> (Ergänzungsbände zu den Tituli Asiae Minoris Nr. 7, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse, Denkschriften, 135. Band). Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vienne, 1979.
N.A.B.U.	<i>Nouvelles assyriologiques brèves et utilitaires</i> , Société pour l'étude du Proche-Orient ancien, Paris.
NEA	<i>Near Eastern Archaeology</i> .
NH	New Hittite

---

NS	New Hittite Script
obv.	Obverse
OH	Old Hittite
OIP	Oriental Institute Publications, Oriental Institute, Chicago.
Or NS	<i>Orientalia Nova Series.</i>
OS	Old Hittite Script
PEG 2.1	BERNABÉ, A. P. (éd.), <i>Poetarum epicorum Graecorum testimonia et fragmenta II, Orphicorum et orphicis similium testimonia et fragmenta. Fasciculus 1</i> (Bibliotheca scriptorium Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana). Saur, Leipzig, 2004.
PNAE 3/1	BAKER, H. D. (éd.), <i>The Prosopography of the Neo-Assyrian Empire 3/1. The Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project</i> , Helsinki, 2002.
PRU	SCHAEFFER, C. (éd.), <i>Le palais royal d'Ugarit</i> , Mission de Ras Shamra, Paris, 1956-.
PW	<i>Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft.</i>
r. col.	right column
RA	<i>Revue d'assyriologie.</i>
rev.	Reverse
RHA	<i>Revue Hittite et Asianique.</i>
RHR	<i>Revue de l'Histoire des Religions.</i>
RIA	<i>Reallexikon der Assyriologie.</i>
Ro	Recto
RS	Numéros d'inventaire des tablettes de Ras-Shamra/Ugarit mises au jour lors des fouilles régulières.
SBo	GÜTERBOCK, H. G., <i>Siegel aus Boğazköy I, II</i> (Afo Beiheft 5, 7). H. G. Güterbock, Berlin, 1940, 1942.
SEG	<i>Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum.</i>
SGO	MERKELBACH, R. / STAUBER, J. (éds), <i>Steinepigramme aus dem griechischen Osten</i> . Teubner, Munich, 1998-2004.
SMEA	<i>Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici.</i>
SNG	Sylloge nummorum graecorum, Bibliothèque nationale de France – Numismatica ars classica, Paris – Zurich, 1931-.
StBoT	Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz.
TB	Numéros d'inventaire des tablettes de Tell Brak mises au jour lors des fouilles régulières.
THeth	Texte der Hethiter, Heidelberg, Winter.
TL	KALINKA, E., <i>Tituli Lyciae lingua lycia conscripti</i> . Hoelder, Vienne, 1901.
TTC	CONTENAU, G., <i>Trente tablettes cappadociennes</i> . Geuthner, Paris, 1919.
TUAT	Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments.
UEM	Numéros d'inventaire des tablettes de Tell Umm el-Marra mises au jour lors des fouilles régulières.
VAT	Tablets preserved at the <i>Vorderasiatisches Museum</i> of Berlin.
Vo	Verso
VS (NF)	<i>Vorderasiatische Schriftdenkmäler der Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin (Neue Folge)</i> . Ph. von Zabern, Mayence.
WAW	Writings from the Ancient World, Society of Biblical Literature, Atlanta.
WdO	<i>Die Welt des Orients.</i>
ZA	<i>Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie.</i>
zBoTU	FORRER, E., <i>Die Boghazköi-Texte in Umschrift 2. Geschichtliche Texte aus Boghazköi</i> (Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichung der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft 42). O. Zeller, Osnabrück, 1969.



# THE LUWIAN TITLE OF THE GREAT KING

Ilya Yakubovich  
University of Moscow / University of Marburg

## I. Introduction

The title Great King was understood in the Late Bronze Age Near East as a king who is powerful enough to secure the loyalty of the neighbouring kings.<sup>1</sup> It was apparently quasi-synonymous with the somewhat later title King of Kings. Thus the 13<sup>th</sup> century Assyrian king Tukulti-Ninurta I, who was the first one to use the title King of Kings, was also the first ruler of Assyria to extract a grudging recognition of his status as a Great King from the rulers of Hattusa.<sup>2</sup> In the Apology of Hattusili III the title ‘great king’ is contrasted with the expression ‘king of one province’. This contrast also speaks for the hierarchical interpretation of the title under discussion.<sup>3</sup>

The Hittite or Luwian designations of the Great King are never spelled fully phonetically in the published texts. Usually they are hidden under the spurious Sumerogram LUGAL.GAL in the cuneiform and the complex logogram MAGNUS.REX in the Anatolian hieroglyphic corpus. The conventional Hittite reading of LUGAL.GAL as *salli-hassu-*, lit. “great king” will be discussed in Section 8. Since the Luwian words *ura/(i)-* ‘great’ and *hantawatt(i)-* ‘king’ are both known in syllabic transmission, it is likewise assumed that the Luwian reading of MAGNUS.REX represents their combination.<sup>4</sup> It is, furthermore, usually taken for granted that the order of the Luwian constituents is the same as that of the corresponding logograms. Thus Federico Giusfredi affirms that “[t]he reading of the two logograms MAGNUS.REX may be postulated as *\*ura(zza)-\*ha<sup>n</sup>dawati-*”<sup>5</sup> and a similar reading *ura-hantawat(i)-* is offered in the latest manual of Hieroglyphic Luwian prepared by Annick Payne.<sup>6</sup>

\* The research on this paper was conducted within the framework of the project *Digitales philologisch-etymologisches Wörterbuch der altanatolischen Kleinkorpussprachen* (RI 1730/7-1) funded by the *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft*. I am grateful to George Dunkel, Stephen Durnford, Federico Giusfredi, Craig Melchert, Annick Payne, Elisabeth Rieken, Diether Schürr, Turna Somel, and Mark Weeden, with whom I had a chance to discuss various topics pertaining to the content of this paper. Final responsibility remains, of course, my own.

1 Artzi/Malamat 1993: 31.

2 Cf. Hoffner 2009: 323 with en. 322.

3 Otten 1981: 22, iii 69-70. Note, however, that Otten understood the Akkadogram HALŠJ as ‘fortress’. For its correct understanding as ‘province’, see Klinger 1996: 200 w. ref.

4 Whether *ura/(i)-* ‘great’ should be analyzed as an *a*-stem or semi-vocalic stem is somewhat unclear because the “mutated” stem *uri-* is attested only once in a Hittite context (see HEG U: 87-88). This dilemma is ultimately irrelevant for the conclusions of the present paper and will not be addressed here in any further detail.

5 Giusfredi 2010: 81.

6 Payne 2014: 156.

Contrary to the present consensus, I intend to propose a new reading *hantawatt-(an)-ura/(i)-*, lit. “the great(est) of kings” for the Luwian title in question. I shall begin my analysis by addressing the syntactic and semantic structure of various classes of compounds containing the morpheme *ura/(i)-* ‘great’. The proposed interpretation of the complex logogram MAGNUS.REX ‘great king’ identifies this title as a member of a particular compound class described for the first time by Emmanuel Laroche. This identification is corroborated through adducing additional titles belonging to the same class, as well as through combinatory analysis of Luwian compounds containing the elements ‘great’ and ‘king’. In conclusion I will argue that the phonetic interpretation of the Sumerographic title LUGAL.GAL need not impact the proposed understanding of the matching hieroglyphic title MAGNUS.REX, since no Hittite reading of LUGAL.GAL can be regarded as certain.

## II. Compounds beginning in *ura/(i)-*

The compounds of the Empire period beginning with *ura/(i)-* ‘great’ are restricted to personal names.<sup>7</sup> Recently the members of this group attested in cuneiform transmission received summary interpretative treatment as descriptive compounds.<sup>8</sup> In my opinion, such an analysis is assured only for <sup>m</sup>*Ura-walkui-* “great lion”, a fitting name for a warrior.<sup>9</sup> As for the theophoric names, <sup>m</sup>*Ura-d*U and <sup>m</sup>GAL.<sup>d</sup>ŠTAR-a,<sup>10</sup> their interpretations as predicative compounds, respectively “Tarhunt (is) great” and “Šawoška (is) great”, appear to be pragmatically more attractive. The first of these two names may represent a calque of Hurrian *Talmi-Teššub* “Teššub (is) great”, while the second one can be either Luwian-Hurrian (i.e. *Ura-Šawoška-*) or completely Hurrian (i.e. *Talmi-Šawoška*). Although their interpretations as “great Tarhunt” or “great Šawoška” would not require Hurrian inspiration, they seem rather unlikely on semantic grounds, as few individuals would dare give such hubristic names to themselves or their children. Continuing the same line of reasoning, I would propose interpreting <sup>m</sup>*Ura-Hattusa* not as “great Hattusa”, but either as “Hattusa (is) great” or, more likely, as an elliptic theophoric compound “(the Storm-god of) Hattusa (is) great”.<sup>11</sup>

The compound names beginning in *ura/(i)-* ‘great’ that survived into the Early Iron Age are likewise restricted to personal names. The predicative compounds, which continue the earlier pattern of likely Hurrian inspiration, are found in Carchemish. These are *Ura-Tarhunt-* “Tarhunt (is) great” (KARKAMIŠ A4b, KARKAMIŠ A11b+C, CEKKE), *Ura-Sarma-* “Šarruma (is) great” (KARKAMIŠ A4a), and its close variant *Urahi-Sarma-* “Šarruma (is) greatness” (KARKAMIŠ A2+3).<sup>12</sup> On the other hand, several personal names coming from other Neo-Hittite states can be analyzed as possessive compounds. The most obvious among them is *Ura-muwa-* “(having) great might” (KULULU lead strip 1). I had a chance to propose the same syntactic analysis for the name of *Ura-hilana-* / *Ura-hilina-*, king of Hama, which, in my opinion, could be synchronically interpreted as “(having a) great gate” regardless of its original Hurrian etymology.<sup>13</sup> A consideration that supports this analysis is the possibility to interpret the name *Ura-dam(i)-*, which belongs to Urahilina’s son and likewise occurs in Hama inscriptions, as “(having a) great building”. Apparently the kings of Hama had a weak spot for architectural forms.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>7</sup> Most of the relevant examples can already be found in Laroche 1966.

<sup>8</sup> Melchert 2013: 41.

<sup>9</sup> For the assumed meaning of *walkuwa/i-* ‘lion’ see Lehrman 1987, but the *i*-mutation reconstructed in this noun speaks against its being a Hittite cognate of Luw. *walw(i)-* ‘lion’. One wonders whether the alternation /walgwV-/ ~ /walwV-/ might reflect Luwian dialectal variation.

<sup>10</sup> This personal name (KBo 47.11 obv. 7), not yet found in Laroche 1966, is listed in the online supplement to Laroche’s work prepared by Marie-Claude Trémouille and known as *Répertoire onomastique* (<http://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/hetonom/ONOMASTIdata.html>).

<sup>11</sup> For the productive pattern of Luwian “topophoric” names with theophoric interpretation, see Yakubovich 2013a: 103-107.

<sup>12</sup> Here and below, the precise citations of all the Iron Age Luwian forms in hieroglyphic transmission can be found in the Annotated Corpus of Luwian Texts (ACLT), sponsored by a research grant of the Presidium of the Russian Academy of Sciences, at the address <http://web-corpora.net/LuwianCorpus/search/>.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Yakubovich 2010b: 396, fn. 9., where the name under discussion is erroneously analyzed as Luwian in origin. For the convincing Hurrian etymology of *Ura-hilana* see Wilhelm 1998: 124. It is, however, unlikely that the Hurrian language was still spoken in Hama in the first millennium BC.

<sup>14</sup> These onomastic compounds can be typologically compared with Italian last names of the type *Casa-grande* or *Casa-nova*. I am grateful to Stefano de Martino for this parallel. Compare also the last names the French Anatolianist Olivier Casabonne and Adrien Maisonneuve, the publisher of Laroche 1959.

### III. Compounds ending in *ura/(i)-*

When one turns to compounds ending in *-ura/(i)-*, a different picture emerges. In this group, too, one occasionally encounters personal names, for example, *Massana-ura* “great among the gods”.<sup>15</sup> More frequently, however, the determinative compounds of this structure appear to denote administrative titles. It was the honorand of this volume, Emmanuel Laroche, who identified the first Anatolian titles in *-ura/(i)-* in Akkadian texts from Ugarit. These are RS 11.732 <sup>LÚ</sup>*tu-up-pa-nu-ri*, RS 11.732, <sup>LÚ</sup>*ḥu-bur-ta-nu-ri*, RS 16.180 <sup>LÚ</sup>*ḥu-bur-ta-nu-ru*, RS 17.382+380 <sup>LÚ</sup>*tu-up-pa-nu-ri* and RS 17.227 <sup>LÚ</sup>*tu-up-pa-la-nu-ri* (var. *-ra*). Laroche compared these titles with the personal name <sup>m</sup>*Ḥa-aš-ta-nu-ri*, occurring in the same corpus (RS 17.251).<sup>16</sup> He made the following etymological observation: “Il suffit d’attribuer ces noms à la langue hittite pour en apercevoir aussitôt la structure. Ce sont les composés, plus exactement des juxtaposés, d’un nom au génitif pluriel en *-an + uri* « grand ». *tuppan-uri* est « le grand des tablettes », tandis que *tuppalan-uri* est « le grand des scribes » ; le sens de *huburtan* n’est pas connu. Pour *ḥaštan-uri* se rapportant à un personnage de rang royal, on songe à hitt. *ḥaššant* « né, e.g. légitime, du sang »”.<sup>17</sup> Nine years later Laroche had a chance to reaffirm the same hypothesis.<sup>18</sup>

Later research demonstrated that Laroche’s basic insight has fully stood the test of time. The late 13<sup>th</sup> or early 12<sup>th</sup>-century tablet RS 94.2523, found in Ugarit in 1994, contains the pair of titles <sup>LÚ</sup>*tu-up-pi-nu-ra ḥu-pu-ur-ti-nu-ra* that is attached to the name of a certain Penti-Šarruma.<sup>19</sup> It turns out that there are bullae from the same region and period containing the hieroglyphic imprints of same name Penti-Šarruma alongside official titles MAGNUS.SCRIBA ‘Chief Scribe’, MAGNUS.AURIGA ‘Chief Charioteer’, and MAGNUS.DOMUS.FILIUS ‘Chief Palace Attendant’.<sup>20</sup> On the likely assumption that there was just one high-ranked official named Penti-Šarruma, one can propose a direct equation between the titles *tu-up-pi-nu-ra* and MAGNUS.SCRIBA. The comparison between the first element of *tuppan-uri* / *tuppin-ura* and Hittite *tuppi* ‘tablet’, implied in Laroche’s reasoning, remains as valid as ever, and so is the comparison between the first element of *tuppalan-uri* and Luwian SCRIBA-*la* = *tuppala* ‘scribe’. One may, however, doubt, that *tuppalan-uri* and *tuppan-uri* represent two different titles, since the functional distinction between “great of the scribes” and “great of the tablets” is not easy to grasp, and at any rate it would not correspond to any meaningful distinction between Sumerographic or hieroglyphic titles. It is easier to assume that *tuppan-uri* and similar forms came about as an abbreviation of *tuppalan-uri* ‘Chief Scribe’, lit. “great of the scribes”, while “great of the tablets” may have represented a convenient folk etymology.

The hypothesis of a morphologically conditioned abbreviation also comes in handy in dealing with the personal name <sup>m</sup>*Ḥa-aš-ta-nu-ri*. Laroche’s idea of syncope *\*hassant-* > *hast-* is not supported by any parallels and therefore appears to have little to recommend itself. On the other hand, the hypothesis that *Hastan-uri* represents a shortened variant of *\*Hastallan-uri* immediately yields an auspicious name with plausible semantics “great(est) of the heroes”. In this case, too, the shortening of the name might have been mediated by Luw. *hast-* ‘bone’, of which Luw. *hastall(i)-* ‘hero’ represents a derivative.<sup>21</sup> Only in the instance of the title *huburtan-uri* are we as much in the dark regarding the first element of this compound as at the time of Laroche. The etymology of the element *huburt(V)-* remains unknown, while the combinatory method does not offer a way to decide whether *ḥu-pu-ur-ti-nu-ra* as a title of Penti-Šarruma corresponds

15 Melchert (2013: 41) interprets the same name differently, as “great (one) of the gods”. I analyze this personal name as reflecting a wish that the gods perceive its carrier as a great person. This interpretation is in line with the likely meanings of other personal names of the same structure, e.g. Late Luwian TONITRUS.HALPA-*pa-wasu* “dear to (the Storm-god) of Aleppo” or Carian πον-σωλλος “dear to all”.

16 Cf. HED H: 238. On the prosopography of <sup>m</sup>*Ḥa-aš-ta-nu-ri* see Singer 2003: 343–344.

17 Laroche 1956: 28. Note also RS 34.126 <sup>LÚ</sup>*tu-pal-nu-ri* and RS 92.2007 *tup-pa-la-nu-ri* (Gordin 2008: 158).

18 Laroche 1965: 37.

19 Malbran-Labat/Lackenbacher 2005: 9. The phonetically sensitive rendering of this Hurrian name would be Fendi-Šarruma, literally “Šarruma (is) just” (cf. Richter 2012: 293b with ref.). For the *i*-vocalism of <sup>LÚ</sup>*tu-up-pi-nu-ra ḥu-pu-ur-ti-nu-ra* cf. fn. 14 above.

20 Singer 2006: 244. It is worth noting that this equation represents an argument for the traditional interpretation of <SCRIBA> as ‘scribe’ and against the reinterpretation of this sign as the generic term ‘official’, which was advanced by Theo van den Hout at the Ninth International Congress of Hittitology in Çorum, Turkey (September 2014). This new argument is, however, less strong than the existence of Luw. SCRIBA-*lalli(ya)-* ‘writing, script’, which Theo van den Hout himself acknowledged as a problem for his hypothesis.

21 On the etymology of Luw. *hastall(i)-* ‘hero’ see Starke 1990: 122, 124.



to MAGNUS.AURIGA ‘Chief Charioteer’ or MAGNUS.DOMUS.FILIUS ‘Chief Palace Attendant’. In fact, it may correspond to neither of the two hieroglyphic titles, since all three of them may ultimately represent different stages in Penti-Šarruma’s career.<sup>22</sup>

#### IV. Language of titles ending in *ura/(i)-*

Another point where Laroche’s analysis can be improved concerns the language of compounds in *-ura/(i)-*. It is true that at the time when Laroche originally labelled them as “hittite” little distinction was generally made between Hittite proper and other members of the Anatolian language family. Now, of course, we know that *ura/(i)-* is the standard term meaning ‘great’ in Luwian, while its standard Hittite equivalent is *salli-* ‘great’. Accordingly, all the compounds in *ura/(i)-* can be taken as Luwian formations unless proven otherwise. This is in line with their prominence in the onomastics of the Empire of Hattusa, which was dominated by names of Luwian origin. It is, however, interesting that Laroche insisted on the Hittite character of the compound *tuppalan-ura-* not only in his pioneering article but also in the dictionary of the Luwian language, where *ura/(i)-* in its other occurrences is properly analyzed as a Luwian adjective.<sup>23</sup> There are two considerations that could sway him in favour of such a solution: the oddity of a Luwian title embedded in Akkadian discourse and the possibility of interpreting the element *-an-* in *tuppal-an-ura-* as a Hittite genitive plural marker.

The first consideration, perfectly understandable within the context of mid-twentieth-century Anatolian studies, loses its cogency in the face of recent advances in understanding of the sociolinguistic situation in Bronze Age Asia Minor. As long as Luwian was taken as a peripheral language of the Empire of Hattusa, while the Luwian forms embedded in Hittite texts were attributed to the mediation of semi-literate provincial scribes, it would indeed remain unclear why Luwian and not Hittite was chosen for rendering imperial titles in official Akkadian texts. The perspective changes completely if one admits that Luwian and not Hittite was the main spoken language in Hattusa in the thirteenth century BC, while the king and members of the royal family were bilingual in Hittite and Luwian in the period under discussion.<sup>24</sup> The titles embedded in Akkadian texts were free of the conventions of Hittite orthography, and as long as the scribes were unwilling or unable to render them in Akkadian, it was only natural for them to fall back upon the main colloquial language of the Empire, which happened to be Luwian. Indeed, it would be the use of Hittite, as opposed to Luwian, to require special pleading under such conditions.

The second potential objection is based on the contrastive synchronic analysis of Hittite and Luwian grammars. The genitive plural ending *-an* is attested in Old Hittite, but the Luwian grammar shows no formal distinction between the expression of singular and plural genitive: the same ending *-a-si-i* can be deployed for both in hieroglyphic transmission.<sup>25</sup> Only in the Luwian dialect of Kizzuwadna, where genitive endings were completely replaced with possessive suffixes, an innovative suffix *-assanz-* was calqued on a Hurrian model to indicate plural possession.<sup>26</sup> But from the historical viewpoint, the Hittite morpheme *-an* under discussion clearly represents an archaism, because it continues the Early Indo-European genitive plural ending *\*-om*. Furthermore, the Lycian genitive plural ending *-ē* assures that the reflexes of *\*-om* also existed in Proto-Luwic, the common ancestor of Luwian and Lycian.<sup>27</sup> Therefore the Luwian interfix *-an-* in determinative compounds can simply be taken as a vestige of the genitive plural maker, which outlived the generalization of genitive singular endings in word-final position.<sup>28</sup>

<sup>22</sup> Singer 2006: 244.

<sup>23</sup> Laroche 1959: 102

<sup>24</sup> Yakubovich 2010a, Chapter 5.

<sup>25</sup> Yakubovich 2010a: 45-46.

<sup>26</sup> Yakubovich 2010a: 47-53.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Melchert 2012: 275.

<sup>28</sup> As a parallel for a genitive case marker developing into an interfix, one can consider the situation in German. While the German genitive ending *-s* is normally restricted to masculine and neuter nouns, its cognate in determinative compounds can also link feminine nouns to their syntactic heads, e.g. *Sicherheit-s-dienst* ‘security service’, *Forschung-s-gemeinschaft* ‘research team’.

## V. Origin of titles ending in *ura/(i)-*

A separate question is how the compounds of this type could come into being in Luwian. If one accepts that *tuppal-an-ura-* and similar forms are not Hittite, then Hittite does not appear to feature the affix *-an-* as compound linker. Neither can one claim that this suffix represents an Indo-European archaism, since compounds linked by *\*-om-* cannot be reconstructed for Early Indo-European (Indo-Anatolian). The remaining alternative is to treat the compounds of this type as Luwian or Luwic innovations, but in order to make such an interpretation credible, one should first identify a syntactic construction that could provide a source for the new formation.

In my opinion, *tuppal-an-ura-* and similar titles may represent a morphologization of the Proto-Luwian superlative construction. Although I have argued that the Luwian adjectives secondarily developed comparative and superlative forms in *-(a)zza-*, it remains very likely that at an earlier stage of its development they lacked morphological expression for the degree of comparison, just as was the state of affairs attested in Hittite.<sup>29</sup> Furthermore the genitive case was used for the expression of scope in the Luwian superlative construction. This phrase displays the expected left-branching word order, which is to say the noun expressing scope appears in front of the superlative adjective,<sup>30</sup> as illustrated through the following Late Luwian example.

- (1) PORSUK § 5<sup>31</sup>
- |           |                                     |                   |            |
|-----------|-------------------------------------|-------------------|------------|
| u-mi-i    | EXERCITUS-la/i/u-na-sa <sub>8</sub> | MAGNUS+ra/i-za-sa | á-sa-ha    |
| PTCL=REFL | army.GEN                            | greatest.NOM.SG.C | be.1SG.PST |
- ‘(King Masaurahissas(?)) was well disposed toward me) and I was the greatest (=commander) of (his) army’.

According to my reconstruction, at the time when Pre-Luwian still distinguished between singular and plural genitives and had not yet grammaticized the superlative suffix *-(a)zza-*, the phrase ‘greatest among the heroes’ sounded approximately like *\*hastallan ura-*. The semantic interpretation of such phrases as titles or personal names could easily trigger their morphological reanalysis as compounds. Thus determinative compounds with the last element *ura/(i)-* appear to be younger than their counterparts beginning in *ura/(i)-*. This agrees with the fact that models of composition displayed by the compounds of the latter group and discussed in Section 2 are overall typical of the ancient Indo-European languages.

## VI. Late Luwian titles ending in *ura/(i)-*

To be sure, skeptics among philologists may question etymological considerations as probative arguments for the Luwian origin of *ura/(i)-* titles, unless their specimens are attested in the actual Luwian texts. The requisite examples come from Late Luwian. Their main difference from the Empire period titles attested in Akkadian texts is the absence of the linker *-an-*, but otherwise they conform to the structural pattern outlined in Section 3. The most salient example yields us the Luwian title of the Chief Eunuch. Although this title had already been identified in the standard edition, the assumption that it constitutes a noun phrase and not a compound left Hawkins with the transliteration (“\*474”)u-[si]-na-SU<sup>i</sup> MAGNUS+ra/i-sa. The phonological interpretation *ussinassura/(i)-*, straightforward under the new analysis, immediately explains the function of the <su> sign.

<sup>29</sup> See Yakubovich 2013b for Luwian and *GrHL*: 273-276 for Hittite. In my opinion, the Luwian function of the suffix *-(a)zza-* represents an innovation *vis-à-vis* the situation of Hittite, where the cognate suffix *-zziya-* < *\*-tjo-* was restricted to polar adjectives. A different analysis is offered in Isebaert/Lebrun 2010, where Luw. *-(a)zza-* is synchronically analyzed as a substantival suffix, although the authors ultimately derive it from the same Indo-European suffix *\*-tjo-* forming polar adjectives.

<sup>30</sup> On the left-hand branching word order in Luwian, see Bauer 2014: 36-37 and *passim*.

<sup>31</sup> Yakubovich 2013b: 161, cf. Hawkins 2000, II: 528.

(2) MARAŞ 14 § 1<sup>32</sup>

[E]GO [ ... ]-si-i-sa |IUDEX-ni-sa |HEROS-sa  
 I.NOM ? .NOM.SG.C of.ruler.NOM.SG.C of.hero.NOM.SG.C  
 (“\*474”)u-[si]-na-su-MAGNUS+ra/i-sa  
 chief.eunuch.NOM.SG  
 ‘I [am Astiwasu], Chief Eunuch of [X], the ruler, the hero’.

The interpretation of the compounds *amurallura/(i)-* and *astaruri(ya)-* (vel sim.) as titles in *-ura/(i)* also imposes itself in the two cases below, even though the precise functions of these titles remains elusive.<sup>33</sup>

(3) ASSUR f+g § 33<sup>34</sup>

‘|a`-wa/i |á`-pi [|DOMUS]-ni-wa/i+ra/i-ia  
 PTCL=PTCL then Parniwarri.DAT.SG  
 [| (X)]á-mu+ra/i-la/i/u+ra/i-’ |a`-sa-ti  
 Amurallura.DAT.SG be.3SG.PRS  
 ‘(Send us any *kapara*, and if you do not have it), but Parniwarri the *amurallura* has it, (then buy it from him and send it to us)’.

(4) KULULU lead strip 1, #43<sup>35</sup>

200 “\*179”-za-’ ‘hu-li-ia-ia |CUM-ni |á-`sa<sup>2</sup>-tara/i<sup>2</sup>-MAGNUS+ra/i<sup>2</sup>-ia  
 200 grain.ACC.SG Huliya.DAT.SG for *astaruriya*.DAT.SG  
 ‘200 (measures of) grain for Huliya, the *astaruri*’.

In purely formal terms, the first component of *á-mu+ra/i-la/i/u+ra/i-* in (3) appears to be cognate with the noun *á-mu+ra/i-* of unclear meaning (KULULU 1 § 11).<sup>36</sup> It is tempting to reconstruct it as *amurall(i)-* on the assumption that it is derived from *amura/(i)-* on the same model as e.g. *hastall(i)-* ‘hero’ from *hast-* ‘bone’. In the instance of *á-`sa<sup>2</sup>-tara/i<sup>2</sup>-MAGNUS+ra/i<sup>2</sup>-* it does not even seem productive to speculate about the etymological connections of its first morpheme in view of its fragmentary state of preservation. But both contexts (3) and (4) are well compatible with the mentions of official titles, since the forms under discussion follow personal names and agree with them in case in both passages. The absence of personal determinatives rules out the interpretation of the same forms as additional names.

In the case of (4) there are, of course, certain complications. The position of *CUM-ni* is easy to explain, because this postposition regularly separates personal names from the accompanying titles in the allocation list KULULU lead strip 1. More intriguing is the dative-locative ending *-ia* attached to the stem *á-`sa<sup>2</sup>-tara/i<sup>2</sup>-MAGNUS+ra/i<sup>2</sup>-*, which implies an etymological *ya*-stem adjective derived from base noun *astarura-* (vel sim.). I prefer to think that this derivation did not radically alter the sense of the form in question and is compatible with its translation along the lines ‘having the function of *astarura-*’,<sup>37</sup> but one cannot altogether exclude the possessive reading ‘belonging to *astarura-*’. The last interpretation is grammatically more straightforward but yields a unique interpretation, since the recipients of grain in

32 Cf. Hawkins 2000, I: 265 and Hawkins 2002: 230.

33 Cf. the previous analysis of *amurallura/(i)-* in Giusfredi 2010: 162: “No etymology can be provided for the word. The stem ending in *-(al=)ura/i-* is quite surprising, and, although it appears also in the mysterious title *á`satar<sup>2</sup>ura/i-*, it provides no clue to an interpretation”. *Ibid. sub astaruri(ya)-*: “No interpretation of this word can be attempted, since the context is, in this case, no help at all. For the *-(al=)ura/i-* ending see *amurallura/i-*”.

34 Cf. Hawkins 2000, II: 537.

35 Cf. Hawkins 2000, II: 508-509.

36 Cf. Hawkins 2000, II: 443.

37 Compare the title *uryall(i)-* of a certain Nunuya mentioned as a recipient of sheep in KULULU lead strip 2 #4 (Hawkins 2000: 510).

KULULU lead strip 1 are normally defined through patronymics, title or places of origin, but not through the titles of individuals they belong or are related to.

Despite the difficulties stated above, we have obtained a clear proof that the compounds ending in *ura/(i)-* are well at home in Late Luwian, which in turn corroborates the Luwian character of the similar compounds attested in Akkadian texts. The disappearance of the linker *-an-* in the first millennium BC need not amaze us, since we have seen that it represents an isolated archaism even in the forms of the late second millennium BC. Furthermore, the comparison between Bronze and Iron Age forms yielded five titles ending in *ura/(i)-*, as opposed to two personal names, *Massanaura* and *Hastanuri*, having the same structure. This is in stark contrast to the group of compounds beginning in *ura/(i)-* treated in Section 2, which entirely consists of personal names.

## VII. Back to MAGNUS.REX

Against such a background we can return to the interpretation of the hieroglyphic title MAGNUS.REX ‘great king’. The structure of other Luwian titles *ura/(i)-* treated in this paper would suggest that if this title was indeed a compound, its Luwian reading must have been *\*hantawatt-an-ura/(i)-* lit. “great(est) among the kings” in the Empire period and probably *\*hantawatt-ura/(i)-* in the Neo-Hittite period. Nonetheless, one should not a priori exclude a theoretical possibility that the Luwian title for the Great King did not form a compound, but represented a noun phrase *urazza- hantawatt(i)-* “the greatest king”, or something similar. In order to refute such a reconstruction, one should turn to positive arguments pertaining to Anatolian compounds with elements ‘great’ and ‘king’.

The most important piece of evidence is a passage from the Late Luwian AKSARAY inscription, which contains a unique instance of the title under discussion spelled with phonetic complementation. The fact that only one of its stems is provided with an inflectional ending speaks strongly for its compound character, because the inflectional morphology is otherwise overtly expressed in the sentence under discussion. The drawing in (5) below reproduces a fragment that has been read up to now as |MAGNUS-RA/I-REX-zi |REX-ti-zi ‘great kings (and) kings’.<sup>38</sup> The proponents of this reading failed, however, to explain why the first stem of the compound MAGNUS.REX acquires a phonetic complement, whereas the second one does not. The contrast between the complements (-)REX-zi REX-ti-zi in the two immediately adjacent words likewise remains begging a question under the traditional interpretation. Therefore I would like to propose that the same group of signs is to be read as |REX.MAGNUS+ra/i-zi |REX-ti-zi. Under such a reading, each of the two coordinated nouns acquires a phonetic complement pointing to the last consonant of its lexical representation and its inflectional ending. The implied phonetic reading of the coordinated pair is *hantawatturinzi hantawattinzi*.

### (5) AKSARAY § 6

za-ti-pa-wa/i-ta                      URBS-ni              |REX.MAGNUS+ra/i-zi  
 this.DAT.SG=but=PTCL=PTCL    town.DAT.SG    great.king.NOM.PL  
 |REX-ti-zi      |OMNIS-mí-zi    INFRA-tá-ta    OCULUS(-)zá-ni-ta  
 king.NOM.PL all.NOM.PL.C    below            admire 3PL.PRT  
 ‘And all the great kings and kings admired this town’



It is true that the order of the signs <REX> and <MAGNUS+ra/i> is a non-canonical one under the new interpretation. This irregularity, however, finds a close match in the divergent order of the signs <zi> and <ti> in the following noun. This does not, of course, imply that the scribe strove for a symmetrical pattern of inversion in the two coordinated nouns. One should rather acknowledge that the order of signs in Anatolian hieroglyphic inscriptions can be inverted for a variety of reasons and generally represents a weaker guide to arriving at their correct transliteration than combinatory constraints. One reason for the

<sup>38</sup> For the most recent edition of the AKSARAY inscription see Hawkins 2000, II: 475-478, where the earlier editions of the same text are also cited.

graphically inverted sequence of graphemes for ‘king’ and ‘great’ is the fact that the logogram <MAGNUS> is consistently placed on top of <REX> when the two signs form a ligature.<sup>39</sup>

The other relevant piece of evidence comes from Lycian. Although the personal name *xñtabura* occurs twice in the Lycian A corpus (TL 103,2; 125b),<sup>40</sup> its origin can be safely assigned to the Lycian B (“Milyan”) language based on its formal features.<sup>41</sup> The first part of this compound is probably not to be separated from Lyc. (B) *xñtaba-*, a noun pertaining to the sphere of kingship and cognate with Luw. *hantawatt(i)-* ‘king’, while its second part is the familiar element *ura-* ‘great’. Whether Lyc. (B) *xñtaba-* means ‘ruler’ or ‘rule’ is still a matter of debate,<sup>42</sup> but even if the second opinion should be given more weight, this need not fundamentally alter the analysis of the name *xñtabura*. Since the nouns *xñtawat(i)-* ‘ruler, king’ and *xñtawata-* ‘kingship’ coexist in the Lycian A language, it is intrinsically likely that the situation in the closely related Lycian B language was roughly the same. This is to say, even if Lyc. (B) *xñtaba-* meant something like ‘kingship’, there probably existed also a cognate Lyc. (B) *xñtab(i)-* meaning ‘king’ or ‘ruler’.

The precise meaning of the compound *xñtabura-* cannot be determined with certainty. The auspicious name ‘great king’, lit. “(the) greatest of kings” remains a distinct possibility, especially given the fact that the brother of its carrier was called *lusāñtra-* “Lysander” in the Lycian inscription TL 103.<sup>43</sup> As a more mundane alternative, one can envisage the interpretation “great among the kings”, which implies a wish for the favourable disposition toward *xñtabura-* on the part of the rulers of this world. Under the latter interpretation, the compound under discussion is typologically similar to the Empire Luwian name *Massana-ura-* “great among the gods”, discussed in Section 3. But whichever of these two solutions one prefers, one winds up with a determinative compound that represents a close formal match of the reconstructed Luwian *\*hantawatt-ura/(i)-*. Given the combined positive evidence of Late Luwian and Lycian B, which is typologically in agreement with the structure of other Luwian compounds for superior officials, the proposed reading of the complex logogram MAGNUS.REX can be regarded as substantiated.

## VIII. The title LUGAL.GAL

It is appropriate to conclude this paper by preempting a possible objection coming from the side of cuneiformists. The Anatolian hieroglyphic title MAGNUS.REX was used for the Great King of Hattusa alongside the Sumerographic cuneiform title LUGAL.GAL ‘Great King’. It is frequently assumed that the Hittite reading of LUGAL.GAL was *\*sallis hassus*, lit. “great king”.<sup>44</sup> The apparent morphosyntactic mismatch between the Hittite and Luwian titles would stand incongruous with the progressive grammatical convergence between Hittite and Luwian in the Empire Period.<sup>45</sup>

In order to obviate this difficulty it is necessary to discuss the genesis of the Sumerogram LUGAL.GAL. It was first introduced into Anatolia in the Assyrian colony period as an equivalent of the Akkadian title *rubā’um rabūm*, which is conventionally translated as ‘Great Prince’. The only sovereign attested with such a title before Anitta’s conquests was a ruler of Purushanda, even though the reading of the relevant passage is not altogether assured (TTC 27 7 *ru-ba-im* GA[L<sup>2</sup>]). After the conquests of Anitta, ruler of Kaneš/Nesa, which culminated in a peaceful submission of the principality of Purushanda, the title ‘Great Prince’ came to be attached to the rulers of Nesa. Thus the genitive form *rubā’im rabīm* appears next to Anitta’s name in OIP 27 49 (A: 24-25; B: 26-27) while the Sumerographic title LUGAL.GAL accompanies the name of

39 For the role of aesthetic considerations in determining the order of Anatolian hieroglyphs, which reflects their erstwhile use for rendering names and titles on official seals, see lately Rieken 2014.

40 The same name also occurs in Greek transmission as *Κενδαβυρα / Κινδαβυρις* (Melchert 2004: 109).

41 This is not the only cases when personal names of Lycian B origin are embedded in Lycian A texts. Compare, for example, the names *Masasa* and *Masauwēti* (Melchert 2004: 98), which both apparently contain the Lycian B element *masa-* ‘god’, a cognate of Lyc. (A) *maha(na)-* ‘id’.

42 The first interpretation is advocated by Schürr (2001: 105) and endorsed by Shevoroshkin (2011: 594, 598, 605), while the second one can be found in Melchert 2004: 136. Given our present level of the knowledge of the Lycian B language, I hesitate about making a choice between these two options. Cf. Neumann 2007: 126-127 and, for a different segmentation of the compound name under discussion, Eichner 2006: 234, fn. 25.

43 Neumann 2007: 240.

44 Thus e.g. Steiner 1999: 428, Vanséveren 2006: 125. Weeden (2011: 571) reconstructs the Hittite noun phrase *\*salli- hassu-* on the basis of KBo 16.45 rev. 5 LUGAL.GAL-uš (OS/MS?). It is not, however, to be ruled out that the heterogram LUGAL.GAL had the plain reading *hassu-* in this hapax, arguably pertaining to the period when the Akkadogram LUGAL.GAL had not yet been calqued into Hittite.

45 On which see Rieken 2006.

Anitta's successor Zuzzu (Kt 89/k 369 1). Finally the Deeds of Anitta in the Hittite language also refer to him once as LUGAL.GAL (KBo 3.22 obv. 41).<sup>46</sup> But as far as one can judge, the use of this title never became fully consistent in the Colony period, as we also find the plain *rubā'u-* 'Prince' as the title of Zuzzu, the last known ruler of Nesa (Kt 89/k 370 35).

On the other hand, the metropolitan Assyrian and Syrian traditions apparently connected the Sumerogram LUGAL.GAL with the Akkadian title *šarrum rabûm* 'Great King'. Although the first attestation of this title is found in a flattering letter sent to the Assyrian king Šamši-Adad I emanating from Mari (circa 1800 BCE), somewhat later it is attested at Alalakh with reference to the rulers of Yamhad.<sup>47</sup> The destruction of the Kingdom of Yamhad and the sack of its capital Aleppo was the accomplishment of Mursili I, King of Hattusa. The later historical tradition of Hattusa, reflected in the preamble to the Talmi-Šarruma Treaty, preserved the recollection of the fact that the rulers of Yamhad were Great Kings, and may have even hinted at the connection between the expedition of Mursili II against Yamhad and the emerging Great Kingship of the rulers of Hattusa.<sup>48</sup> It is therefore likely that the Sumerogram LUGAL.GAL in the bulk of Hittite texts does not represent a carry-over from the Old Assyrian colonial tradition but rather reflects the influence of Syrian scribal culture. But whichever of the two scenarios one chooses, it is clear that the spurious Sumerogram LUGAL.GAL represents a calque of an Akkadian royal title, which emerged within a Semitic scribal milieu. Its internal structure is ultimately irrelevant for the issue of reconstructing the underlying Hittite or Luwian forms.

Can one, then, offer any clues that could help us to approach the structure of the Hittite term for the 'great king'? On a plausible assumption that this title was coined on the same model as the other Hittite designations of superior officials, one can attempt to use their structure as a typological parallel. A sober synopsis of templates for hierarchical titles can be found in CHD Š: 100. It turns out that the Sumerograms GAL and UGULA, traditionally translated as 'chief', and 'overseer, superintendent' respectively, were frequently placed in front of plural forms in Hittite texts. Thus one finds GAL LÚ.MEŠA.ZU 'chief physician' alongside UGULA LÚ.MEŠA.ZU 'overseer of physicians', GAL LÚ.MEŠAŠGAB 'chief leatherworker' alongside UGULA LÚ.MEŠAŠGAB 'overseer of leatherworkers', GAL LÚ.MEŠ GIŠBANŠUR 'chief pantler' alongside UGULA LÚ.MEŠ GIŠBANŠUR 'overseer of pantlers' etc.<sup>49</sup> Differences in English translation need not obfuscate the fact that both titles in GAL and titles in UGULA adduced above match the structure of the Luw. *tuppāl-an-uri-* 'Chief Scribe' and similar determinative compounds, except for the head-dependent word order, which is expected of the Sumerographic syntax. Although the Hittite readings of the titles headed by GAL and UGULA remain, strictly speaking, unknown, the hypothesis that they also represented determinative compounds or possessive noun phrases emerges as the simplest solution.

As has already been noted at the beginning of this paper, the title LUGAL.GAL had the hierarchical meaning 'overking'. As such, it was semantically different, for example, from the expression LÚ.MEŠ GAL 'grandees, notables', lit. "great people", but resembled the Sumerographic titles discussed in the previous paragraph. Therefore its Hittite reconstruction as *\*hassuwan sallī-* lit. "(the) great(est) of kings" appears to be in no way worse, and perhaps even preferable, in comparison with *\*sallī-hassu-*, lit. "great king". Being far from claiming that we have enough data to advocate a particular Hittite reading for the title 'great king', I maintain that Hittite offers no arguments against the interpretation of MAGNUS.REX as Luw. *\*hantawatt(-an)-ura(i)-* "(the) great(est) of kings". It is rather the new Luwian reading of MAGNUS.REX that should be used from now on as one of the considerations in determining the Hittite reading of LUGAL.GAL.

46 The interpretation of this piece of evidence depends, of course, on the date of the Deeds of Anitta. If one assumes that it was first put in writing in Hattusa at the time of Hattusili I or later, then the use of the title LUGAL.GAL in this text may reflect a different tradition coming from Syria (see immediately below). The most recent paper defending the early date of the Anitta text is Archi 2015, which can also be consulted for the history of the debate.

47 Artzi/Malamat 1993: 30.

48 Steiner 1999: 428-429.

49 For the representative lists of hierarchical titles in GAL and UGULA see Peccholi Daddi 1982: 526-528.

## Bibliographie

Archi 2015

Archi, A., "How the Anitta Text reached Hattusa", in: *Saeculum. Gedenkschrift für Heinrich Otten anlässlich seines 100. Geburtstags* (StBoT 58), Müller-Karpe, A. et al. (éds.). Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 2015, 1-13.

Artzi/Malamat 1993

Artzi, P. / Malamat, A., "The Great King: A Pre-eminent Royal Title in Cuneiform Sources and the Bible", in: *The Tablet and the Scroll. Near Eastern Studies in Honor of W.H. Hallo*, Cohen, M. E. (éd.). CDL Press, Bethesda, 1993, 28-38.

Bauer 2014

Bauer, A., *Morphosyntax of the noun phrase in Hieroglyphic Luwian* (BSIEL 12). Brill, Leyde, 2014.

Eichner 2006

Eichner, H., "Neues zum lykischen Text der Stele von Xanthos (TL 44)". In: *The 11th Symposium on Lycia: Symposium Proceedings*, M. Alparslan et al. (éds.). Institute of Mediterranean Civilizations, Antalya, 2006, 231-238.

Giusfredi 2010

Giusfredi, F., *Sources for a Socio-economic History of the Neo-Hittite States* (THeth 28). Winter, Heidelberg, 2010.

Gordin 2008

Gordin, Sh., *Scribal Families of Hattuša in the 13<sup>th</sup> Century BCE: A Prosopographic Study*, Tel-Aviv University MA Thesis, 2008.

Hawkins 2000

Hawkins, J. D., *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions, Volume 1: Inscriptions of the Iron Age, Part 1: Texts*. De Gruyter, Berlin, 2000.

Hawkins 2002

Hawkins, J. D., "Eunuchs among the Hittites", in: *Sex and Gender in the Ancient Near East, Proceedings of the 47<sup>th</sup> Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale*, Parpola, S. / Whiting, R. M. (éds.). The Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, Helsinki, 2002, 217-233.

Hoffner 2009

Hoffner, H. A., Jr., *Letters from the Hittite Kingdom* (WAW 15). Society of Biblical Literature, Atlanta, 2009.

Isebaert/Lebrun 2010

Isebaert L. / Lebrun, R., "Le suffix *-(a)za-* in Lycien", in: *Calliope: Mélanges de linguistique indo-européenne offerts à Francine Mawet*, Vanséveren, S. (éd.). Peeters, Louvain, 2010, 159-172.

Klinger 1996

Klinger, J., *Untersuchungen zur Rekonstruktion der hattischen Kultschicht* (StBoT 37). Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 1996.

Laroche 1956

Laroche, E., "Noms de Dignitaires", *RHA* 14, 1956, 26-32.

Laroche 1959

Laroche, E., *Dictionnaire de la langue louvite*. A. Maisonneuve, Paris, 1959.

Laroche 1965

Laroche, E., "Études de Linguistique Anatolienne", *RHA* 23, 1965, 33-54.

Laroche 1966

Laroche, E., *Les noms des hittites*. Klincksieck, Paris, 1966.

Lehrman 1987

Lehrman, A. A., "Anatolian cognates of the Indo-European word for 'wolf'", *Die Sprache* 33/1, 1987, 13-18.

Malbran-Labat/Lackenbacher 2005

Malbran-Labat, Fl. / Lackenbacher, S., "Un autre 'Grand-Scribe' ", *N.A.B.U.* 2005/1, no. 10.

Melchert 2004

Melchert, H. C., *A Dictionary of the Lycian Language*. Beech Stave Press, Ann-Arbor, 2004.

Melchert, H. C., 2012

Melchert, H. C., “Genitive Case and Possessive Adjective in Anatolian”, in: *Per Roberto Gusmani. Studi in Ricordo*, Volume 2: *Linguistica Storica e teorica*, Orioles, V. (éd.). Forum Edizioni, Udine, 2012, I, 273-286.

Melchert 2013

Melchert, H. C., “Naming Practices in Second- and First Millennium in Western Anatolia”, in: *Personal Names in Ancient Anatolia*, Parker, R. (éd.). Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2013, 31-49.

Neumann 2007

Neumann, G., *Glossar des Lykischen* (DBH 21). Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 2007.

Payne 2014

Payne, A., *Hieroglyphic Luwian: an Introduction with Original Texts*. Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 2014.

Pecchioli Daddi 1982

Pecchioli Daddi, Fr., *Mestieri, professioni e dignità nell'Anatolia ittita*. Ateneo, Rome, 1982.

Otten 1981

Otten, H., *Die Apologie von Hattusilis III.: Das Bild der Überlieferung* (StBoT 24). Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 1981.

Richter 2012

Richter, Th., *Bibliographisches Glossar des Hurritischen*. Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 2012.

Rieken 2006

Rieken, E., “Zum hethitisch-luwischen Sprachkontakt in historischer Zeit”, *AoF* 33: 271-285, 2006.

Rieken 2014

Rieken, E., “Bemerkungen zur Ursprung einiger Merkmale der anatolische Hieroglyphenschrift”, *WdO* 44, 2014, 162-173.

Schürr 2001

Schürr, D., “Karische und lykische Sibilanten”, *IF* 106, 2001, 94-121.

Shevoroshkin 2011

Shevoroshkin, V., “K ponimaniju milijskikh tekstov”, in: *Slovo i jazyk. Sbornik statej k vos'midesiatiletiju akademika Ju.D. Apresiana*, Boguslavskij, I. et al. (éds.). Languages of Slavonic Cultures, Moscow, 2011, 588-619.

Singer 2003

Singer, I., “The Great Scribe Taki-Šarruma”, in: *Hittite Studies in Honor of Harry A. Hoffner Jr. on the Occasion of His 65<sup>th</sup> Birthday*, Beckman, G. et al. (éds.). Eisenbrauns, Winona Lake, 2003, 341-348.

Singer 2006

Singer, I., “Ships Bound for Lukka: a New Interpretation of the Companion Letters RS 94.2530 and RS. 94.2523”, *AoF* 33, 2006, 242-261.

Starke 1990

Starke, F., *Untersuchungen zur Stammbildung des keilschrift-luwischen Nomens* (StBoT 31). Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 1990.

Steiner 1999

Steiner, G., “Syrien als Vermittler zwischen Babylonien und Ḫatti (in der ersten Hälfte des 2. Jahrtausends v. Chr.)”, in: *Languages and Cultures in Contact: At the Crossroads of Civilizations in the Syro-Mesopotamian Realm, Proceedings of the 42th RAI*, van Lerberghe, K., Voet, G. (éds.). Peeters, Louvain, 1999, 425-441.

Vanséveren 2006

Vanséveren, S., *Manuel de la langue hittite*, vol. 1. Peeters, Louvain, 2006.

Weeden 2011

Weeden, M., *Hittite Logograms and Hittite Scholarship* (StBoT 54). Harrassowitz: Wiesbaden, 2011.

Wilhelm 1998

Wilhelm, G., “Name, Namengebung. D. Bei den Hurritern”, in: *Reallexikon der Assyriologie*, vol. 9, D.O. Edzard (éd.). De Gruyter, Berlin, 1998, 121-127.



Yakubovich 2010a

Yakubovich, I., *Sociolinguistics of the Luvian Language* (BSIEL 2). Brill, Leyde, 2010.

Yakubovich 2010b

Yakubovich, I., “The West Semitic God El in Anatolian Hieroglyphic Transmission”, in: *Pax Hethitica. Studies on the Hittites and their Neighbours in Honour of Itamar Singer* (StBoT 51), Cohen, Y. et al. (éds.). Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 2010, 385-398.

Yakubovich 2013a

Yakubovich, I., “Anatolian Names in -wiya and the Structure of Empire Luwian Onomastics”, in: *Luwian Identities: Culture, Language and Religion between Anatolia and the Aegean* (CHANE 64), Mouton, A. et al. (éds.). Brill, Leyde, 2013, 87-123.

Yakubovich 2013b

Yakubovich, I., “The Degree of Comparison in Luwian”, *IF* 118, 2013, 155-168.