

A Stele of Prince Anaziti in the Yozgat Museum

İLKNUR TAŞ
HİTİT ÜNİVERSİTESİ, ÇORUM

MARK WEEDEN
SCHOOL OF ORIENTAL AND AFRICAN STUDIES, LONDON

The stele published here is currently housed in the Yozgat Archaeological Museum in Central Turkey, where it is booked under the inventory number 1603. It was brought to the museum from Çalapverdi in the municipality of Boğazlıyan. According to information received from the Çalapverdi council, the inscription was brought in from Kaletepe, a mound in the vicinity of Çalapverdi village.¹ Further, more precise, details of its original whereabouts are currently unknown. The inscription is on a small stele shaped somewhat like a modern tombstone, which is slightly unusual for its period.² It is not absolutely clear if this was the original shape of the stone, but there does not appear to be anything missing from the short text of the inscription, nor is the stone broken. The text is almost certainly an inscription of Anaziti, a prince, who is also attested on a seal impression found in the Nişantepe archive at Boğazköy (Herbordt 2005: 118, Kat. 26). The inscription is almost certainly to be dated to the thirteenth century B.C.

The mound at Çalapverdi was surveyed by T. Özgüç in 1967 and the results of the survey published in his 1971 monograph *Kültepe and Its Vicinity in the Iron Age*.³ Here Özgüç noted that no pottery of the second millennium B.C. was found either on the surface or in trenches, although he conceded that this might be due to chance.⁴ On the other hand he also noted that the mound at Çalapverdi conformed to the type of Iron Age mountain fortress known from Kerkenes Dağ, Göllüdağ, and Kululu. The find of an Empire period inscription at this site would invalidate this supposition. It is indeed very unusual to find Hittite Empire period cities on mountain-tops.⁵ As long as precise details of the circumstances under which this inscription was found are not officially known or made public, we must content ourselves with the knowledge that the stele comes from the region of Çalapverdi, or at the very least became known there. For this reason we give it the label ÇALAPVERDI 3, with a view to its relation to the *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions*.⁶

Author's Note: We would like to thank the General Directorate of Monuments and Museums, Ministry of Culture and Tourism, which gave Ilknur Taş the necessary permission to allow her to study this inscription in the Yozgat Museum, and Hasan Kerim Şenyurt, Director of the Yozgat Museum, for his hospitality during her research. We are also very grateful to Mr. Şenyurt for providing us with a photograph of the inscription that is reproduced here. For helpful comments we are also indebted to J. D. Hawkins and two anonymous readers. Mark Weeden's research is funded by a post-doctoral fellowship from the British Academy.

1. Reports of the find were issued in press statements on the internet by the office of the mayor of Çalapverdi, M. Tanrikulu, in May 2009.

2. Dimensions: 93 x 42 x 26 cm. Similarly shaped stelae are attested in the Iron Age, and sometimes they are funerary inscriptions, e.g., KULULU 2 (Hawkins 2000: 489–90 and plate 272), KULULU 4 (Hawkins 2000: 445–47 and plates 246–47), but this is obviously not the case for the present inscription.

3. Özgüç 1971: 117–19.

4. Özgüç 1971: 118.

5. For remarks on Hittite Empire period settlement types based on more recent surveys, see Omura 2006: 73.

6. Hawkins 2000. The two other inscriptions from Çalapverdi date from the Iron Age (Hawkins 2000: 497–98).

To the north there are numerous Empire period sites apart from the well-known centers at Boğazköy and Alaca Höyük. Hittite Empire period stone-quarrying activity is attested at the site of Karakız. This appears to have been a large quarrying operation over an extended area, where numerous items of sculpture were left unfinished until today, all of them lions.⁷ Rescue excavations are currently underway at the site. Another local site of Imperial Hittite date is of course the mound at Kuşaklı Höyük, which has been supposed to have been the city of Zippalanda, with the associated sacred Mt. Daha being equated with Kerkenes Dağ.⁸ Further local excavations and survey work dating to the Hittite Empire period are underway at Büyük Nefes, which has been equated with Hittite Tawiniya.⁹

The sign-forms of has been text are not entirely usual, and the surface of the inscription is quite worn. Some of the signs are also cut very roughly and irregularly. In particular the form of the sign STELA (L.267) is highly unusual, and might be taken to represent in some form the structure which prince Anaziti is supposed to have erected. If this were the case it would be clear that the structure looked nothing like this little stele. It may thus be the case that the sign represents the location of a dedication, although this has grammatical implications (see below). Also unknown is the nature of the sun-deity in whose honor the stele has been made. While one might have expected to find a place name localizing the sun-deity, it would be very unwise to argue that a place name is attested. The interpretation of the signs following the sun-god sign (L.191) is unclear, but there does not appear to be a manifest place name determinative, although the status of the two to three upright strokes in the middle of the logogram is open for discussion.

The text is three lines long, in high relief, and written in boustrophedon style starting in the top right-hand corner. The three lines are separated by roughly cut relief horizontal lines, into which the signs frequently merge. The copy is a composite from a direct tracing from the stone made on acetate in the Yozgat Museum in rather poor light and from a number of photographs. We present two possible transliterations and translations, the merits of which are then discussed in the following notes.

Transliteration (a):

- (1) *zi/a* STELA
L.376 L.267(+L.268)
- (2) (DEUS)SOL SCUTELLA[?]+*zi/a*.III.SUPER PONERE
L.360 L.191 L.402+L.376 III L.270 L.65
- (3) *á-na-VIR*[!].*zi* REX.FILIUS
L.19 L.35 L.313.376 L.46.1

(a) Prince Anaziti dedicated this stele to the sun-deity of L.402.III.SUPER

or Transliteration (b):

- (1) HIC STELA
- (2) (DEUS)SOL L.402-*zi/a* III SUPER PONERE
- (3) *á-na-VIR*[!].*zi/a* REX.FILIUS

7. See Summers and Özen 2007; I. Taş presented a paper, "Identification of an Unfinished Statue Found in a Quarry at Karakız, Turkey," at the 56th RAI Barcelona, July 26–30, 2010.

8. Gurney 1995: 71; Popko 1994: 13 contra.

9. Strobel and Gerber 2007. For the latest survey results including several Hittite Empire period sites and a supposed *hēkur*, see Strobel and Gerber 2009 (Turkish).




Fig. 1. Scale drawing of the text of ÇALAPVERDI 3.

(b) Prince Anaziti offered (lit. 'put') up L.402(-offering)s, 3 (in number), at this stele (for) the sun-deity.

For the reasons elaborated below, we prefer transliteration and translation (b).

Notes:

(Line 1) L.376: the upright of *zi/a* continues into the line-divider. It appears to be of the normal Hittite type, here with sinistroverse orientation. It has occasionally been suggested



Fig. 2. Photograph of ÇALAPVERDI 3 by H. K. Şenyurt.

that *zila* should be transliterated HIC in similar contexts to this, and that it functions as a logogram.¹⁰ Translation (b) assumes that this is the case.

L.267: the presence of the two humps on the left top of the sign as well as the SCALPRUM (L.268) element, which accompanies signs for objects made of stone, and is frequently an

10. The use of Latin words in capital letters is used solely to indicate a logographic usage. We are not trying to write Latin here, but to transliterate hieroglyphs, and have thus intentionally avoided writing the correct Latin forms (huic stelae). For HIC as a logographic use of L. 376 see Marazzi 1990: 240 with further literature and specific reference to Emirgazi and BOĞAZKÖY bases 1 and 2; more recently D'Alfonso 2008: 164, although there are clearly more cases of non-logographic L.376 with the phonetic value *za* in Empire period inscriptions: YALBURT §11 *zila-tá-zila-* for *zata(n)za*, *á-zila-tá* for *azata* (Poetto 1993: 33), etc.



Fig. 3. Photograph of ÇALAPVERDI 3 by I. Taş.

integral part of the STELA-sign, are indicators enough to secure the identification of this sign with the usual STELA-sign (L.267). It is, however, considerably different from the usual form of the sign. Its top, the only part to allow an identification with L.267, rests on two columns consisting of three vertically arranged circles each, the bottom of which is slightly squashed in each column and the top left of which is not closed.

(Line 2) It is perhaps possible, although highly speculative, to associate the six circles in this sign with the six circles around the edge of the sign SOL (L.191). These latter have in the past been interpreted as eyes.¹¹ Whether these be eyes or not, it is possible that the presence

11. Laroche 1983: 309–12.

of the six circles or lozenges on the sign for the sun-deity has something to do with the six circles on the stela-sign, possibly even denoting a special kind of structure for the sun-deity, or a structure where a dedication has been made. If this is the case, it is clear that the structure denoted by this logogram (L.267) looks nothing like the stele we have before us. One should note that the circle-like protrusions on the sides of L.191 in this inscription are different. The three on the left of the sign are lozenges, perhaps indeed resembling eyes, while the three on the right are circles. It is also possible that the circles represent offerings for the sun-deity, such as bread, but the sign for bread is quite different (L.181).¹² See, however, the following group of signs and the summary discussion.

The following signs are entirely unclear. The identifications given in the transliteration are extremely speculative and tentative. The circle L.402 should have a dot in the middle strictly speaking, but a similar form of this sign was collected by A. Dinçol with other examples of L.402.¹³ He interprets the use of L.402 on Empire period seals as a professional designation, equivalent to Hittite LÚ GIŠBANŠUR.¹⁴ According to this interpretation the sign is supposed to represent a “plate,” which was indeed its old interpretation, resulting in its more recently being given the Latin name SCUTELLA.¹⁵ In Iron Age Hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions (eighth century B.C.) it is used syllabically with the value *sa*₄ and logographically determining the verb *sana-* ‘overturn’.¹⁶ This verb is used of overturning orthostats (KARKAMIŞ A1a §4) and of disturbing a tomb (KULULU 2 §5a). A rebus usage using the phonetic value of the verb *sana-* does not yield any immediate sense, however. A phonetic use of L.402 for *sa*₄ is virtually out of the question for Empire period hieroglyphic writing. For further considerations on the identity of this sign see below.¹⁷

The sign below L.402 is likely to be L.376 (*zi/a*). The upright is too long and the top diagonals too short and too straight for SCALPRUM (L.278) to be convincing as a reading. If the sign had been L.278, it would have been likely that the circle L.402 represented something made of stone. Unfortunately, the reading as *zi/a* is not entirely unproblematic, due to the fact that it does not display the typically Empire period writing of the diagonals with separate strokes. To the right of the *zi/a* there are three upright strokes, which could be interpreted as the numeral II with the third stroke being L.383 (-RA/I) attached to SUPER in an anomalous position, or simply the numeral III.

The large sign to the right of the two upright strokes could conceivably be interpreted as SUPER+RA/I, although the interpretation is not entirely satisfactory. If there is a -RA/I attached to SUPER then it must be the vertical stroke directly to the left of the sign, which is a peculiar place to put it, as well as SUPER-RA/I being unparalleled in the Empire period, when SUPER is always written without -RA/I. The phonetic value of SUPER+RA/I¹⁷ would be Luwian *sari*, meaning ‘upon, up’. Either this is a complex logogram L.402.II.SUPER+RA/I¹⁷ with a discrete meaning, presumably being an epithet of the sun deity: “dedicated to the sun-deity (of) L.402.II.SUPER+RA/I¹⁷”; or it is separate and functions as an adverb “he put up/

12. For bread-offerings to the sun-goddess of the earth in groups of three, see KBo 10.75 i 17'-18' (Yoshida 1996: 254–55). For temples of the sun-deity see Popko 2009: 36–45.

13. SBo II 63 (Güterbock 1942: 1963); Dinçol 2007: 228.

14. Dinçol and Dinçol 2008: 69–70 and *ibid.* Kat. 251, 284, 153, 196, 197, 198, 141, 112, 132. See also Pecchioli Daddi 1982: 151–59 for LÚ GIŠBANŠUR.

15. “Teller,” Dinçol 2007: 229; further Dinçol and Dinçol 2008: 69–70.

16. Discussion and attestations Hawkins 2000: 89–90.

17. Hawkins calls our attention to a similar circle without a dot in the middle on the “Quellgrotte” stele, where he considers that the sign may represent the place where the stele was set up (Hawkins 1998: 288, 295 fig. 5 and personal communication).

on (for) the sun-deity (of) L.402-*zi/a*.II.” The spacing makes the former interpretation as a complex logogram more likely from an epigraphic point of view, thus supporting reading (a). However, see below for further considerations that support reading (b).

The two strokes between the larger sign groups can be interpreted as the numeral II, although the sense is very obscure. The forms are not only not triangular enough to be the country-name determinative (L.228, REGIO) but are also far too small, as well as being in the wrong position. It is of course possible that there are three instead of two strokes, which would obviate the need to interpret the rightmost one as +RA// (L.383). We would then have L.402-*zi/a*.III.SUPER. As mentioned, the sign SUPER (Luwian *sari*) is never attested with +RA// in the Empire period, and the position of this +RA// would also be facing the wrong direction.¹⁸

Alternatively, transliteration and translation (b) construe the syntax differently. L.402-*zi/a* is taken as the accusative plural common gender (-*inzi*) or the acc. sg. neuter (-*anza*) of the word lying behind L.402. In view of the usual construction of Hittite and Luwian numbers with a singular noun, the latter is the more likely. L.402-*zi/a* is then an offering that is made three times or threefold. Admittedly the placing of the numeral is unusual, but could possibly stand for ‘three times’. To understand L.402-*zi/a* as the direct object of the verb (SUPER) PONERE necessarily entails interpreting the case of *zi/a* STELA in line 1 differently. This is made possible by interpreting *zi/a* as a logographic writing, to be transliterated HIC, rather than as a phonetic one. HIC would thus be a logographic writing for dat.-loc. *zadi* rather than a phonetic writing for accusative neut. *za*. Line 1 would thus read *zadi waniti*(?) “at this stele,” rather than *za wanisa*(?) “this stele.”¹⁹

If we accept the logographic usage of L.376, this interpretation (b) presents the least number of objections, the most potent still being the position of the numeral and the space between SUPER and PONERE. This type of construction is also completely unparalleled in dedicatory inscriptions from second millennium B.C. Anatolia.

Here we should mention the interesting suggestion made by an anonymous reader for *JAOS*. The proposal was made to read the second line as: (DEUS) SOL FONSI-*zi/a* REGIO¹ SUPER-RA// PONERE “put up (this stele) to the Arinnean sun-goddess.” This invokes the frequent writing of the name of the sun-goddess of Arinna in cuneiform documents with the logogram URU¹TÚL-*na*, using the logogram for ‘well, spring’, which is presumably used as a rebus writing for the name of the city Arinna. The -*zi/a* would then be part of an ethnic formation in -*iza*- like *Karkamisiza-*, perhaps *Arinnizi*. This would give us a typologically very satisfactory reading, with “this stele” being the direct object of PONERE, and the deity receiving a comprehensible epithet. While we are most intrigued by this suggestion, we cannot accept it for epigraphic reasons. The two strokes after L.402-*zi/a* simply are not REGIO, as much as we might like them to be.²⁰ The writing of SUPER-RA// would also be very unlikely, as mentioned above. The sign FONSI (L.215), furthermore, which is specifically

18. The objection that the third stroke is an integral part of the sign SUPER and must thus be construed as SUPER-RA// is met by the observation that the stone-mason frequently omits to indicate gaps between parts of signs and the line-dividers on this inscription. See also the extremely close writing of REX.FILIUS in line 3 and our remarks concerning the cutting of the sign VIR in line 3. SUPER is attested without -RA// at YALBURT §12 (Block 5, Poetto 1993: 41, ‘SUPER-a’?) as well as in the frequent writing of the name Šarri-Teššob as SUPER L. 318-*pa* (SBo I 39–41).

19. One should remember that *wanit-* (n.) ‘stele’ is not necessarily the word indicated by the logogram STELA in this case, especially in view of the sign’s very peculiar structure.

20. On first seeing photographs of the inscription we also hoped that the indistinct strokes were a place determinative. It was only direct inspection of the stone that showed that this could not be the case. Unfortunately we have to start with what is on the stone, not what we would like to be there.

used to write the element *luli-* ‘pond’ in the name Suppiluliuma, is never written without the central vertical that it has on seals from this period.²¹

Yet another interpretation that would allow us to see an epithet of the sun-deity here would be to read the numeral III phonetically as *tara/i*. Thus it would read: (DEUS) SOL L.402-*zi/a-tari* “to the *x-zitri/x-zat(a)ri* sun-deity.” A reading such as this would be extremely unusual due to the lack of the *-RA/I* on the numeral III (L.389), but is not inconceivable.

(Line 3) In the writing of the name Anaziti the sign *á* (L.19) appears in its typical Empire period form, as does *na* (L.35), with a long tail. VIR (L.313), however, is problematic, as it appears that the stone has not been cut away above the protruding stroke typically emerging from the right of the sign in a dextroverse orientation. This throws some slight doubt on the identification of the name, although the presence of *zi/a* and the shape of the body of the sign make it almost certain that this is indeed VIR (L.313). However, the *zi/a* sign is also not perfect, being crammed under the VIR-sign in such a way as to lose its coherence: the diagonals are somewhat dislocated. The only other possible reading would be *á-na-li¹-zi/a*, although the *li* (L.278) would not be well formed. The form of *li* would be highly unusual, however, and makes this reading epigraphically much less likely than the reading *Anaziti*.

Apart from the seal from Nişantepe (see above), the name Anaziti is not otherwise attested at Boğazköy. It is, however, found at Emar, albeit as the name of a woman, for which see Pruzsinszky 2003: 257. For the form of the name Hawkins has tentatively proposed a connection with Luwian *anna-* ‘mother’. More names containing this element are to be found at Boğazköy: *Anaruntiya*,²² *Anatali*,²³ *Annayati*,²⁴ *Anamuwa*.²⁵ The name *á-na-zi+ri/a*²⁶ is unlikely to be identical with *Anaziti*, because rhotacism would not be expected in this period.²⁷

L.46.1 is peculiar in that it writes the sign for male (VIR₂) with two more or less straight lines rather than with one straight and one curved line as is more usual.

SUMMARY CONSIDERATION OF POSSIBLE INTERPRETATIONS

The inscription thus most likely details an offering made by Prince Anaziti to a sun-deity at a cult installation in the region of Çalapverdi. As regards the nature of the cult-installation, it does not have to be one that is specifically designed for the worship of a sun-deity alone, but could presumably have housed other deities as well. One thinks of structures known to have been outside of Hattusa that were visited by the king as part of festival celebrations, such as the ^{GIŠ}*arhu(z)ana-/GIŠwarhuizna-*, located at the city of Kulila on the way to Arinna.²⁸ This shrine housed the storm-god, Mezzulla, and the sun-god.

The special form of the sign STELA, with its two columns consisting of circular shapes, could also refer to a part of a cult structure, again one that did not necessarily have to be particular to a sun-deity. One thinks here of the ^{GIŠ}*ila(n)-* ‘staircase, ladder(?)’ that we have attested belonging to both Mezzulla, daughter of the sun-goddess of Arinna, and to a sun-

21. The usual writing for the sun-goddess of Arinna on seals and inscriptions from this period is (DEUS) SOL SOL(-*RA/I*) for which see Hawkins 1995: 32.

22. Diñçol and Diñçol 2008: 42, Kat. 166A+B.

23. Diñçol and Diñçol 2008: 45–46, Kat. 189.

24. Laroche 1966: 31, no. 60.

25. Laroche 1966: 61.

26. Diñçol and Diñçol 2008: 56, Kat. 263.

27. See, for example, Hawkins 1995: 95.

28. For this structure see Popko 1986; Yoshida 1992: 152–53; 1996: 76, 102.

deity, but which was doubtless also a cult appurtenance of other divinities and their shrines.²⁹ The composition of the sign with the STELA-features set on two columns, as well as the fact that the offerings are put “up” may point in this direction.

If, however, we deem that the structure denoted by the sign STELA here is in some way related to the offerings that are made to a sun-deity, it becomes more likely that this was a structure especially associated with sun-worship. We observed above the possible internal cohesion between the circular shapes in the form of the sign STELA, and those on the right side of the sign for the sun-deity (L.191). If L.402-*zi/a* are to be interpreted as “plates” it is unlikely that this is the case, as it is hard to see why plates should be especially associated with a sun-deity, apart from the fact that they are round. This is also the case if we interpret L.402 as referring in some way to bread.³⁰

On the other hand we also have the “sun-discs,” Sumerographic AŠ.ME, which are not offered to the sun-deities *per se* but do take part in the cult of the sun-goddess of Arinna, alongside statues of the same deity, in the Nuntariyašša-festival.³¹ It is clear from this passage that the AŠ.ME is in fact a symbolic representation of the sun-goddess of Arinna:

KUB 25.14 obv. i

(10') LÚ¹HAL-*ma-kán* VIII DUTU^{HLA} URU¹*a-ri-in-na*

(11') É¹ha-*le-en-tu-u-wa-aš an-da pé-e-da-i*

(12') III ALAM^{HLA} V AŠ.ME ŠÀ.BA III AŠ.ME GAL^{TI}

(13') EGIR-*an* ¹*iš-g¹a-ra-an-te-eš ta* GIŠBA[NŠU]R[MEŠ]

(14') ¹*ti-ia¹-an-zi še-¹er-ra-aš-ša¹*[*-an* DUTU^{HLA} URU¹*a-ri-in-na*]

(15') *ti-ia-an-zi nu* DUTU^{HLA} URUT[ÚL²-*na*]

(16') *ar-ra-an-zi iš-kán-zi* [. . .]

(17') *na-aš-kán* GIŠBANŠUR^{MEŠ}.ŠU-NU EGIR-*pa* [*ti-ia-an-zi*]

(10'–11') The seer on the other hand brings eight sun-goddesses of Arinna into the Halentuwa-building, (12'–13') three statues, five sun-discs, among them (are) three large sun-discs (which are) pierced at the back, (13'–14') and they place tables (14'–15') and they place [the sun-goddesses of Arinna] on them, (15'–16') and they wash (and) anoint the sun-goddesses of Arinna [. . .] (17') and [they put] their tables back.³²

According to M. Nakamura's interpretation of this passage, the sun-discs in the group of three form a tripartite representation of the sun-goddess of Arinna.³³ There are thus six representations in total. The fact that the three large ones are pierced at the back may mean they are to be hung up. Further evidence of the use of the AŠ.ME to represent the sun-goddess of Arinna is provided by the statement of the priest Hutarli, who declares: “my father had

29. Puhvel 1984: 357; Tischler 1983: 354 with doubts on the meaning; Yoshida 1996: 101–2 for the “Treppe der Sonnengöttin.”

30. SCUTELLA (L.402) is used alongside PANIS (L.181) in a compound logogram which is used as a determinative for the word *tunikara-* in ASSUR f+g §45, and is used on its own to determine the same word (*tunikala-*) in KARKAMIŠ A 3.2 (Hawkins 2000: 111). (SCUTELLA/PANIS.SCUTELLA *tunikala-*) has been explained as a professional derivation from the noun attested in Hittite as ^{NINDA}*tunik*, a kind of bread (Hawkins loc. cit.).

31. KUB 25.14 obv. i 10'–17'; Yoshida 1996: 193–94; Nakamura 2002: 193. An AŠ.ME object is offered to the deity ^DNIN É.GAL, however (KUB 58.32+ i 13–14). Hēbat also asks for an AŠ.ME of lapis from the Hittite queen in a dream (KUB 15.1 i 12).

32. Text after Nakamura 2002: 192, translation largely after Nakamura 2002: 193. GIŠBANŠUR^{MEŠ}.ŠU-NU is, however, taken as accusative plural object of [*tiyanzi*], whereas Nakamura has it as an indirect object without A-NA: “und sie stellen sie auf ihre Tische zurück.” Our interpretation assumes that the tables are brought out for the washing and anointing process, and then removed when that is finished.

33. “. . . ein dreiteiliges Gerät,” Nakamura 2002: 205. The context is that of offerings to the individual sun-goddesses of Arinna of past Hittite queens.

the sun-goddess of Arinna (as an) AŠ.ME of gold and Mezzulla (as an) AŠ.ME of silver.”³⁴ As with most cult objects the AŠ.ME is “set up,” albeit with the phrase *sarā tittanu-*, which has implications of making it stand.³⁵ One would have to interpret the practice of dedicating a representation of the sun-goddess to the sun-goddess herself as a parallel to the practice documented on the Inandik vase of offering a bull to the storm-god, himself represented as a bull.³⁶

AŠ.ME is apparently genus commune. However, one can say little about the gender of the word that would have corresponded to AŠ.ME in Luwian.³⁷

Interpretation of the sign transliterated here with L.402 as ‘sun-disc’ raises the unavoidable and presently unanswerable question of whether L.402 in fact hides two logograms. Possibly the form with the dot in the center (L.402.1) is used as a professional designation of some kind, possibly the ‘table-setter’. The other may be used to designate an offering to a sun-deity, here at least without the dot in the center (L.402.2). As usual, there is much we do not understand, especially given the use of the form without the dot in the middle at least once as a professional designation.

The interpretation of L.402 as ‘sun-disc’, which is here very tentatively proposed for this attestation and this attestation only, raises further questions about the purpose of the stele. It is also supposed here that the inscription recorded an offering made by Prince Anaziti at a cult locale rather than his dedication of a particular structure. Munificence is of course all the more effective in building social capital when everyone knows whose generosity has made the gift.

We saw above the connection between the “sun-disc” and the sun-goddess of Arinna together with her daughter, Mezzulla. If there is any merit to the association of L.402 in this inscription with the sun-disc AŠ.ME, then we might even suppose that this is a dedication by Anaziti to the sun-goddess of Arinna. This dedication does not, of course, have to have taken place in Arinna.

One must emphasize again the speculative and provisional nature of this background interpretation, which relies on an atypical reading of the syntax of this dedicatory inscription by comparison to more typical dedications of stelae. The atypical reading was suggested by the epigraphic identification of the relevant signs constituting the inscription. If an epigraphically convincing explanation can be found which explains the sign-sequence after (DEUS) SOL as an epithet of the sun-deity, it is to be preferred.

34. KUB 38.37 rev. (8) *A-NA A-BU-I[A-wa²] DUTU URUTÚL-na AŠ.ME KÙ.GI D^{me-ez-zu-la-aš-š[a]}* (10) AŠ.ME KÙ.BABBAR.

35. KUB 29.4 i 12.

36. Özgüç 1988: plate 46.

37. The correspondence of AŠ.ME (Akk. *šamšatu*) to Hitt. *sittar*, suggested by H. Ehelolf and comprehensively treated in Sommer 1940, was discarded by F. Starke, who demonstrated that *sittar* has the meaning of ‘blade’ or ‘spear-head’ (1990: 408–16; see also Kloekhorst 2008: 761–62). Popko (2009: 30 n. 29) keeps the equation AŠ.ME = *sittar*. AŠ.ME is common gender: KUB 25.14 i 13; neuter: KUB 42.78 iii 12, 14 (also EGIR-*an iš-ga-ra-a-an*; for discussion of this see Nakamura 2002: 204–5).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- D’Alfonso, L. 2008. Talmi-Šarruma Judge? Some Thoughts on the Jurisdiction of the Kings of Aleppo during the Hittite Empire. *Studi Micenei ed Egeo Anatolici* 49: 159–69.
- Dinçol, A. 2007. Fünf neue Siegel und Siegelabdrücke aus Boghazköy und Überlegungen über die Bedeutung des Hieroglyphenzeichens L.402. *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici* 49: 227–33.

- Dinçol, A., and B. Dinçol. 2008. *Die Prinzen- und Beamtensiegel aus der Oberstadt von Boğazköy-Hattuša vom 16. Jahrhundert bis zum Ende der Grossreichszeit*. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern.
- Gurney, O. R. 1995. The Hittite Names of Kerkenes Dağ and Kuşaklı Höyük. *Anatolian Studies* 45: 69–71.
- Güterbock, H. G. 1942. *Siegel aus Boğazköy*, pt. 2: *Die Königssiegel von 1939 und die übrigen Hieroglyphensiegel*. Berlin: Selbstverlag E. Weidner.
- Hawkins, J. D. 1995. *The Hieroglyphic Inscription of the Sacred Pool Complex at Hattusa*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- _____. 1998. The Land of Išuwa: The Hieroglyphic Evidence. In *Acts of the IIIrd International Congress of Hittitology, Çorum, September 16–22 1996*, ed. S. Alp and A. Süel. Pp. 281–96. Ankara: TTK Basımevi.
- _____. 2000. *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions*, vol. I: *Inscriptions of the Iron Age*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Herbordt S. 2005. *Die Prinzen- und Beamtensiegel der hethitischen Grossreichszeit auf Tonbullen aus dem Nişantepe-Archiv in Hattusa*. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern.
- Kloekhorst A. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden: Brill.
- Laroche E. 1966. *Les Noms des Hittites*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- _____. 1983. Notes sur les symboles solaires hittites. In *Beiträge zur Altertumskunde Kleinasien. Festschrift für Kurt Bittel*, ed. R. M. Boehmer and H. Hauptmann. Pp. 309–12. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern.
- Marazzi, M. 1990. *Il geroglifico anatolico: Problemi di analisi e prospettive di ricerca*. Rome: Herder.
- Nakamura, M. 2002. *Das hethitische nuntarriyašha-Fest*. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten.
- Özgüç, T. 1971. *Kültepe and Its Vicinity in the Iron Age*. Ankara: TTK Basımevi.
- _____. 1988. *Inandıktepe: An Important Cult Center in the Old Hittite Period*. Ankara: TTK Basımevi.
- Omura, S. 2006. Preliminary Report on the 2005 General Survey in Central Anatolia. In *Kaman-Kalehöyük 15*, ed. S. Omura. Pp. 63–74. Ibaraki, Japan: The Middle Eastern Cultural Centre in Japan.
- Pecchioli Daddi, F. 1982. *Mestieri, professioni e dignità nell'Anatolia ittita*. Rome: Edizioni dell' Ateneo.
- Poetto, M. 1993. *L'iscrizione luwio-geroglifica di Yalburt*. Pavia: Gianni Iuculano Editore.
- Popko, M. 1986. Die kleinasiatischen Stadtnamen Kulila und Matila. *Altorientalische Forschungen* 13: 176–79.
- _____. 1994. *Zippalanda: Ein Kultzentrum in Kleinasien*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- _____. 2009. *Arinna: Eine heilige Stadt der Hethiter*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Pruzsinszky, R. 2003. *Die Personennamen der Texte aus Emar*. SCCNH 13. Bethesda: CDL Press.
- Puhvel, J. 1984: *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*, vol. 1: *Words Beginning with A*; vol. 2: *Words Beginning with E and I*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Sommer, F. 1940. Aus Hans Ehelolf's Nachlass. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 46: 5–52.
- Starke, F. 1990. *Untersuchungen zur Stammbildung des keilschriftluwischen Nomens*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Strobel, K., and Chr. Gerber. 2007. Tavium (Büyüknefes, Provinz Yozgat): Bericht über die Kampagnen 2003–2005. *Istanbuler Mitteilungen* 57: 457–621.
- _____. 2009: Tavium/Tawiniya International Research Project 2007 Yılı Kampanyası. In *26. Araştırma Sonuçları Toplantısı*, vol. 3, ed. Adil Özme and Fahriye Bayram. Pp. 59–72. Ankara.
- Summers, G., and E. Özen. 2007. A Hittite Quarry and Sculpture Workshop at Karakız Kasabası. *Kerkenes News* 10: 10–11.
- Tischler, J. 1983. *Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar*. Innsbruck: Rauchdruck.
- Yoshida, D. 1992. Das AN.TAḪ.ŠUM^{SAR}-Fest im Tempel der Sonnengöttin. In *Cult and Ritual in the Ancient Near East*, ed. T. Mikasa. Pp. 121–56. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- _____. 1996. *Untersuchungen zu den Sonnengöttern bei den Hethitern*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

