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1. In 1880 A. H. Sayce (1880a) listed the recent findings of "Hamathite" inscriptions, noted their importance, argued that they belonged to the Hittite Empire and deplored the absence of a bilingual (or digraphic?) text which would help with the understanding of the script. A few months later he announced the discovery of the "Rosetta stone of Hittite decipherment", a silver seal first published some 17 years earlier which in his view could provide the basic evidence needed for a decipherment (Sayce 1880b). This seal had, as so many others which became known later, a Cuneiform inscription round the border and a Hieroglyphic inscription in the centre (see Fig. 1). Sayce read the Cuneiform as Tar-ril-im-me šar nat Er-me-e and translated it as "Tarkondemos, King of the Land of Erme"; he followed the first editor in identifying the Cuneiform name with the Greek name Ταρκονδημος of a King of Cilicia of the end of the first century B.C. (Strabo, Dio Cassius, etc.). Plutarch (Ant. 61,2) had quoted the same name as Ταρκονδημος, the name under which the seal became known in later studies. Sayce also established the fact that next to the central figure of the king the Hieroglyphic signs, twice repeated, were to be read from the top to the bottom on each side with the first two corresponding to the king’s name, followed by the symbol for KING which in its turn was followed by the name of the land and by the LAND symbol (even if he then read the country name from bottom to top). 1

Sayce’s basic assumption that the Cuneiform and the Hieroglyphic signs were meant to convey the same information was correct as was also his discovery that the large triangle sign was the symbol for king (REX, Cun. LUGAL) and the double triangle the symbol for land (REGIO, Cun. KUR). For the rest this new Rosetta stone created as many problems as it solved. The reading of the Cuneiform was to go through a number of transformations and the reading of the Hieroglyphic signs was to change too, following on the one hand the slow decipherment of the Hieroglyphs, on the other hand the new interpretations of the Cuneiform signs and the improved knowledge of the Hittite variety of Cuneiform. To add to the problems the seal was lost until it miraculously reemerged

1 Drawing of the Tarkondemos seal from W. Wright, The Empire of the Hittites (London, 1884).
in the Walters Art Gallery in Baltimore (Hill 1937). But well before that, as early as 1894, H.V. Hilprecht (1894:109ff) was able to list thirteen different readings for the Cuneiform; by then Szekey himself had replaced his earlier proposal with a different one: Tar-qu-u-dim-me seemed even closer to the Greek Tarkondemos. The later story has been related in full by Gitterbock (1977),2 but it is worth pointing out at the start that the so-called Tarkondemos seal is in a sense symbolic of the development of Hieroglyphic studies.

1.1. The decipherment of the Hittite Hieroglyphs bears no comparison with e.g., that of Linear B. It cannot be dated to a specific year or even decade and it cannot be attributed to any single individual; it is rather a remarkable example of cumulative work done by a number of experts all of whom at any given moment built on the work of their predecessors, while also being prepared to reject the earlier errors (including their own). For the smaller task, that of interpreting the seal (as indeed for the major one of deciphering the so-called Hittite Hieroglyphs) Gelb’s example is representative: in Hittite Hieroglyphs I (1951:34) he preferred, following Szekey, Tar-qu-u-tim-me but in Hittite Hieroglyphs II (1955: 20) he rejected with some regret his previous view and read Tar-kum-mu-wa in agreement with Albright (1927) who had proposed Tar-qu-mu-wa. By the time of Hittite Hieroglyphs III (1942:26ff) he felt it necessary to trace the history of “this famous seal” and to return to the previous reading “Tar-qu-u-tim-me.” As Szekey once acknowledged (1930:48), mistakes are inevitable in pioneering work of this kind. We hope in what follows to add a piece—would we like to think it is the final piece—to this century-long work of interpretation of the Tarkondemos seal. It is a pleasure to dedicate this paper to Calvert Watkins, a friend of long standing who has contributed more than most other scholars to the linguistic study of Anatolian, but has always made clear that the philological analysis of texts or documents must come first.

2. If the reading of the name has remained controversial, that of the country was established some time ago. By the 1930’s Albright (1927) and Friedrich (1930) had been able to correct the somewhat defectively written Cuneiform and read the name of the country as Mira, which had by then appeared in the Cuneiform Hittite texts: the owner of the seal wasugal Kur-ka-mar-a’-d a “king of the land of Mira.” In its turn this reading was bound to affect the reading of the Hieroglyphic part with the signs mi (ne for Gelb), ra and a (e for Gelb). In 1935 Gelb (p. 14) could object to Meriggi’s reading of the last sign of the city’s name as ra that a vocalic reading was necessary since in the Cuneiform of Bogazkoy the forms Me-ra-a, Mi-ra-a, Mi-e-ra-a, Mi-i-ra-a never showed a double -r- spelling. By 1977 Gitterbock (p. 14) knew that the three possible transliterations of the Hieroglyphic (mi-r-a, mi-ra-, mi-rä) represented different conventions but reflected the same interpretation. We now transliterate mi-ra-, accepting the same point. Mira was one of the Arzawa countries, thus Luwian territory, and we expect the king’s name to be Luwian.

2.1. The matching up of the Cuneiform and Hieroglyphic signs for the name of the royal owner of the seal turned out to be much more problematic, not least because it was felt that, by analogy with the country name, the Cuneiform signs were open to emendation. In the Cuneiform the initial tar sign was recognized from the start and never disputed, but the remaining wedges kept being differently grouped and differently interpreted. Gitterbock (1977) gives a clear account of the progress of the discussion. Early efforts concentrated on attempts to find a correspondence with the name Tarkondemos. Later this was discarded as a red herring—correctly, though the name may usefully be retained to identify the object. As the decipherment of Hieroglyphic advanced, Cuneiform readings were sought which could in some way be linked up with the Hieroglyphic signs (Gelb’s proposals described above fit into this pattern), but the problem remained extremely recalcitrant. The position is different today because a) we have proceeded much further in the decipherment of the Hieroglyphic script, b) we have new documentary evidence (seals) which we can bring to bear onto the problem, c) previous work, particularly by Gitterbock (1975, 1977, 1987) and Nowicki (1982), has removed the major difficulties and opened the way to a real solution. Last but not least, as Gitterbock pointed out, the increased knowledge of Hittite Cuneiform has imposed some constraints on the interpretation of the name.

By the time Gitterbock reconsidered the problem in 1975 (p. 52) and 1977, rejecting some of his earlier views (1950), he was able to make serious use of his unique expertise of seals and of the much more advanced readings of the Hieroglyphic signs. As others before him, he could have no doubts about the fact that the Hieroglyphic name consisted of two signs only and consequently one or both of them had to be read logographically if they were to correspond to the numerous Cuneiform signs. Gitterbock compared the first Hieroglyphic sign, an animal’s head (Laroche, HH no. 101, here Fig. 2a), with the head of animal found in ASSUR iv 3 (Fig. 2b), where it was followed by a Hieroglyphic word which Meriggi (e.g. 1967:140) read as tar-ka-s-ri-s (we would now transliterate tarali-ka-sa-ni-sa) and understood (because of the logogram) as either donkey or mule. Given that the first Cuneiform sign was tar, the Hieroglyphic word helped Gitterbock, following the suggestion of M. van Loon, to reach the crucial reading kAs for the second Cuneiform sign, then simply to emend the third

---

sign to read *na, giving an initial element tar-kaš-na- for the king’s name. The name’s final Cuneiform and Hieroglyphic signs still need explanation. Gitterbock proposed to read the last two Cuneiform signs as ti-wa and the second Hieroglyphic sign as a logogram for the sun, i.e., for Hier. Luw. ṭawī- ‘sun.’ The king’s name would then have been Targnasatiwa rendered in Cuneiform as *Tar-kaš-na-ti-wa and in Hieroglyphic as *101-*320 (with *101 = Targnas- and *320 = Tiwa-). The 1975 and 1977 articles marked an important step forward though, as Gitterbock himself suspected, they still did not offer the definitive solution. Five years later Nowicki (1982) pointed out that a compound such as that postulated was not plausible and that the reading of the second Hieroglyphic sign was not likely to be SOL ‘sun’. Nowicki himself read the Cuneiform as Tar-kaš-na-mu-wa, returning to Albright’s suggestion *muwa for the second part and accepting in full Gitterbock’s reading for the first part. But his perspicacious new step concerned the Hieroglyphic text: he pointed out that the second sign of the name could be a form of Laroche, HHI no. 165 which is used logographically for BONUS and syllabically for wallī. He preferred a syllabic reading both for this sign and for the animal’s head; the protuberance under the chin of the latter he took as equivalent to the ‘horn’, the rāš sign. The whole sequence Tar-rāš-walle was then taken as an abbreviated writing which simply rendered the first and the last syllable of the name Turksamunawu found in the Cuneiform.

Here too some of the suggestions are both new and correct. Nowicki supported his reading of the second Hieroglyphic sign by comparing two seal impressions published by Gitterbock in 1975 (StI, see Fig. 3 a – b); in both them, the central part, which is the only one preserved, has a broken version of the title REX M[i+rāš]-d [REGIO?] and the name is written with the two signs *101 and *439. Nowicki’s suggestion that the name is the same as that on the Tarkon- demos seal is convincing and, if so, this confirms the validity of the reading BONUS i.e. wallī on that seal, since Laroche, HHI no. 439 is the standard sign for wallī (never used as a logogram). Moreover, recently found inscriptions from the archive of bullae excavated at Boğazköy-Nişantepe in 1987/1988 provide ample evidence for the alternation wallī - *320. Less convincing, however, is Nowicki’s interpretation of the whole Hieroglyphic name. Abbreviated readings of the type he suggests are almost non-existent and if the second element of the compound were really -muwa we would not expect it to be expressed only by its second sign. Also in the Empire period it is far from certain that *101 can be used syllabically (see below pp. 250 and 252). Moreover the Cuneiform reading -muwa depends on a correction of the actual text, just as the reading na in Cuneiform Tar-kaš-na-

3. Our own proposal is much simpler and, we hope, is definitive. Yet it depends heavily on both Gitterbock’s and Nowicki’s insights, i.e. on the one hand on the link between the Cuneiform reading and the Hieroglyphic animal head (= tarkasna-) proposed by Gitterbock together with the *kaš value of the second Cuneiform sign, and on the other hand on the reading of the second Hieroglyphic sign as BONUS or wallī proposed by Nowicki and later accepted by Gitterbock (Boehmer and Gitterbock 1987:83). Accepting both suggestions, the Hieroglyphic signs can be read as *101-wallī and interpreted as TARKASA-walle (logogram + syllabogram), where wallī is the final syllable of the name. The Cuneiform may now be easily read as Tar-kaš-ka-na-wa with the absolute minimum of emendation. The first two signs were validated by Gitterbock (1977), the third is a perfectly acceptable form of *kaš (with the internal vertical absent as occasionally), the fourth sign is very different from Albright’s and Nowicki’s mu but very close to na (missing the lower diagonal only), and the final wa requires no emendation. Fig. 4 is adapted from that produced by Gitterbock in 1977, both Nowicki’s suggestions and our own are included.

1 If *320 is indeed the Empire Period form of *165, we would expect that in addition to the established syllabic value wallī, it could have a logographic value BONUS which is not yet attested. We could then read SERVUS.BONUS in SUVASA inscription C (see above, footnote 3) and interpret it as a correct archaism with both signs used as logograms, “dear (good) servant” (cf. Hawkins 1998: ad loc.).

2 Cuneiform ‘kaš-š’ is Kuntuzili but this is not a two-element name. The supposed Hieroglyphic readings hāw-il and nu-s-ši for Hattušil and Mursili must probably be rejected (Hawkins 1985:246, 72), but in any case these too are not compound names.

---

* Gitterbock (1977:14f) identified a Late Period occurrence of the sign *320 on the late but archaizing SUVASA (inscription C) after SERVUS, ‘servant’. He read the sequence as mi-ta- identifying *320 with ša, HHI no. 319 (our *319) and thus obtained an Empire value ša for the sign. Though the damaged SUVASA sign does indeed seem to resemble *320, we suppose it to be either an incorrect archaism for ta, or perhaps a logogram (see below, footnote 4).
Of Donkeys, Mules and Tarkondemos

4. Our reading is established by purely epigraphical arguments, but something more needs to be said about the spelling of the name and the name itself. First of all we are ready to abandon Sayce’s grand name Tarkondemos (i.e. presumably Tarhunta-nuwa) for something as humble as ‘Donkey’ or ‘Mule’? Is the very existence of such a name probable? And even assuming that the reply is positive, what would justify our Cuneiform spelling Tar-kaš-na-na in lieu of Gitterbock’s Tar-kaš-na? The last question is easy to answer because, if the reading is correct, the nearest comparison is with the personal name Targasnalli of a king of Hapalla (Laroche 1966:179), obviously related to the Luwian noun tar-ga-ša-na-al-li-iš (KUB XXXV 111 iii 1). The name is spelled both -aš-na- and -aš-sa-na-, while the two forms of the noun attested in Cun. Luwian have -aš-ta-na- (cf. the evidence Tischler HEG III 176 f; Melchert 1993: s.v.). Let us now assume that the Hier. Luwian tarkasnis, our main source for the basic word, does indeed mean ‘donkey’ or ‘mule’. If so, Targasnalli ought to mean ‘donkey driver’ or ‘muleteer’, but what about Tarkasnaw? Is this a compound or a derivative of tarkasnis?

A compound seems unlikely, but then the final -wa remains unexplained. Presumably it is an additional suffix, as already suggested by Gitterbock (in Boehmer and Gitterbock 1987:83), but the question is whether it indicates a particular form of the name of the animal, so that the name would actually mean ‘donkey’ or ‘mule’, or a derivative, so that the name could mean e.g. ‘rich in donkeys or mules’. A clear-cut solution is not possible, but we can at least make some suggestions.

Anatolian onomastics includes a large number of names ending in -wa (Jie 1994:63), but some may be “Achaean” like Tawgalawā and conceivably Antarawa (see below) and most of them are in fact a-remodellings of u-stems: Kukku, Kukkuwa; Luliu, Luliuwa, etc. (see Laroche 1966:244ff, 313f). This is not the case here since tarkasnis is not a u-stem; on the contrary for an animal name we may expect a na-formation (Starke 1990:410, note 1477). However, names like An-ta-ra-wa-aš (if not “Achaean”), EN-ta-ra-u-wa, In-na-ra-a-wa, En-na-ru-u-wa-aš, En-na-ru-u-wa-aš, vi-u-za-ta-ra-wa, U-ma-wa-aš appear to have a wa-variant even if we cannot etymologize them. Next to In-na-ra-wa-nas we have In-na-ra-ali In-na-ra-a which ought to speak for the segmentation of -wa. This is confirmed by the name of the well-known King of Tuwana (Tyana), Warralawa (e.g. in BULGARMADEN and BOR; cf. Ask. Ur-bal-la-a) which must be built on the Luwian adjective warpaš-ni-. For Luwian Starke (1990:183), following in footsteps of Laroche (1960b:125), postulates a wa-suffix which forms both adjectives and nouns (often in combination with other suffixes) and means ‘provided, equipped with’. If he is right in comparing this suffix with that found in the feminine personal names in -wir or -wi-ja of Hitite (Pihawija, Zamawija) which he derives from *waw-ia-, or even with the ethnics in -wai-za- of Hieroglyphic Luwian, we could hypothesize that Tarkasnaw includes the simple -wa- and has a meaning which ranges from ‘provided with donkeys/mules’ to ‘in some way connected with donkeys/mules’. The plausibility in semantic terms of an -a-stem is not in question. We have already referred to Targasnalli who was the king of Hapalla but in addition there is rich evidence in the area for names which literally mean donkey or mule; cf. Akk. I-ma-ra-um, Ema-ru-um (CAD, s.v. imaru, 12) from imaru ‘donkey’ (other names in Hoffner 1966:396), Akk. Ku-ka-ni-n (CAD, s.v. kudana, 1?) from kudana ‘mule’ or ‘hinnai’, etc.

5. If the basic stem of Tarkondemos has now been demoted (or promoted?) from god to animal or to a lexeme referring to animal involvement, something more must be said about the animal in question. Why should it be an equid?

In addition to Targasnalli we also have an example of Ta-ar-ge-ša-an in the Cappadocian texts (Laroche 1966:178). Presumably the name is related but the formation is not clear. For -wa one may point out that through a series of unrelated developments a number of Luwian animal names end in -wai-: hawawi- ‘sheep’, wawalati- ‘ox, cow’, astuwa- ‘horse’ as well as wawat- ‘lion’. It would not be impossible, though highly speculative, to think of a wa-remodelling of the word for donkey/mule.

Of course, Laroche (1966: s.v.) for the references. Laroche thinks of -wa- as a secondary suffix extracted from the u-derivatizations of u-stems. For our purposes what matters is that the suffix exists as such, not where it comes from. Neumann (1985:24) has suggested that in some instances (such as *Ka-pi-ša-wa,*[M]a-za-la-u-wa-aš) we are dealing with compounds of imaru- ‘cow, ox’, but it seems unlikely that this may apply to many of the names quoted above.
And if it is, and is not a horse (word and logogram are different), is it a donkey or a mule? More exactly is it a donkey or a mule (born from a donkey and a mare) or a hinny (born from a stallion and a female ass)? It is now time to turn to Hieroglyphic texts and logograms.

The animal head on the Tarkondemos seal is of a peculiar shape. It has a single swept-back ear and a large proboscis under the chin. Laroche (1960a: 63) listed it as no. 101 to distinguish it from the ordinary donkey’s head (no. 100) which is clearly recognizable because of the characteristic long ears and which is used both in the second and in the first syllabogram with the value tu. HH no. 101 also recurs on the Boğazköy seal impressions mentioned before (Güterbock 1975:51ff; Noack 1982:252, here Fig. 3 a-b) but here the proboscis has a much more definite shape; it consists of a half ring attached to the animal’s chin with a short straight appendix. The 1990/91 archive of sealings from Boğazköy-Nişantepe has also produced a few signs of this type.

An Empire variety (perhaps more common) of Laroche, HH no. 101 has the same ear shape but no proboscis under the animal’s chin. We may compare some Boğazköy seals, especially SBo II, nos. 182 and 191. Further evidence is now provided by YALBURT, block 13 § 4 and block 3 § 3, where in the first passage the logogram is preceded by the number 4100 in a text which refers to things encountered by Tudhalia IV on campaign. Again the new Boğazköy-Nişantepe seals have produced an impression with the name *101-ta-li.

We have no direct evidence to equate Laroche, HH no. 101 with HH no. 100 in the Empire period, nor do we have Empire evidence which gives us a syllabic reading for *101, the Tarkondemos seal is the only document which provides a reading for the logogram. By contrast in that period a reading ta is assured for *101 by a series of reliable correspondences, while we have no clear evidence for a logographic *100.10 The evidence which allows us to give a lexical value to *100 and/or *101 comes from a combination of the Hieroglyphic texts of the first millennium and of Cuneiform Luwian texts from the second millennium with the seals which we have been discussing.

5.1. For HH no. 100 the crucial first millennium texts are (i) ASSUR f-g, iii-iv, §§21-22; (ii) BULGARMADEN, §9, (iii) CEKE, §6, in all of which we find *100 in logographic function, sometimes accompanied by the ANIMAL determinative. *100 is also the normal syllabogram for ta. In ASSUR, §22 Laroche recognizes a unique form of *100, but this logogram—an equid with one forward-pointing ear and a proboscis under the chin (Fig. 5b)—is much closer to a form of the Empire sign *101 and we shall transcribe it as such. The same animal head, but without the proboscis under the chin appears as a syllabogram with a tu-value (where we would expect *100) in the stela of MEHARDE-SHEIZAR (Hawkins 1979).

That *100 represents an equid and most probably a donkey is shown by the shape of the animal’s head with its long ears. The meaning of *101, particularly in its Empire form, is less obvious, since the characteristic ears are missing; however the first millennium textual evidence speaks for linking *101 and *100. We may start with ASSUR f-g, §§21-24 (see Hawkins 1980:110):

| a-pi-ha-wa-li-sa | *100 (ANIMAL)-na-zil | a-pa-zil | ARHA- | MORI-ta |
| a-me-pa-wa-li-u | *101 (ANIMAL)-na-zil | a-me-pa-wa-li-u | REL-ti-i | a-sa-ti |
| u-wa-li-ma-u | VIA-wa-li |
| ...for us those *100 (ANIMAL)-na-zil have died. |
| Now if there is a *101 (ANIMAL) tarkas(a)nis to you, send it to me. |
| Come, shall I go out on foot? |

The somewhat different shape of the logograms *100 (Fig. 5a) and *101 (Fig. 5b), joined to the fact that the plural of tarkas(a)nis ought to end in -nizi and not in -nanz, speak for two different animals—though not very different given that one type is asked for in order to compensate for the loss of the other. Note also that the text makes clear that *101 indicates an animal used for transport. As noted by Hawkins (1980:110), this speaks against the original suggestion by Gelb (1931:44) and Güterbock (1977:16) that *101 indicates a goat—a suggestion which Güterbock himself took back at a later stage (Boehnner and Güterbock 1987:83).

---

2For a phonetic reading of a version of *101 in the first millennium see S.1, also below p. 252.
3For Empire *100 = ta cf. i) the toponyms Tamina and Tana (SÜDBERG, §§11b, 4b, and 16); ii) the uncertain group -(j)ak-na-sa (EMIRGAZI altar B, §13; altar C has -(j)ak-(j) which thus alternates with ta; cf. Hawkins 1995:59 with suggestions by van den Hoout; iii) ta-ka-ta, the goddess (Dana) Dakta (YAZILIKAYA no. 40). Laroche listed this occurrence separately under HH no. 116, being uncertain whether it was a hare or a donkey and his doubts were echoed by Güterbock 1975:182; in our opinion there is today no longer any doubt about this very good donkey head; cf. also Güterbock 1982:42; iv) the name Hier. ta-ku-ri-ti = Cum. Tük-ha-ri-ti, etc. (Laroche 1966:171); v) the Hier. ta-ta-ka- rendering of the name of the god Dagon, Cum. KUR, in the Mekene seals.
The ASSUR passage does not tell us much about the full reading of *100 as contrasted with *101 = tarkas(anis), but BULGARMADEN, §9 is more informative:

| á-p[a]-sa-pa-wai-mu-u (*100)terrai-ka-na-ni-ia-za (*92)za-la-la
| \(\text{"ARGENTUM DARE"}\) pi-ia-ta

("My lord Warpalawas I benefited well,
and he sold to me chariots (?) for the (*100) tarkas(an)"
(or "he sold me the tarkas(an)-chariots"?)\(^{11}\)

Here *100 (Fig. 5c) appears with the same (or a very similar) word as that which follows *101 in ASSUR; this should lead us to read *100-naz of ASSUR as tarkas(an)zani. But what is tarkas(an)niyana? Formally both a dative plural and a nom.-acc. sing. neuter would be possible, but in either case we cannot start from a simple na-stem (the dative plural would end in -nanzal). The simplest hypothesis is that this is a -iya-derivative of tarkas(an)a-, but see below.

The final bit of evidence comes from CEKKÉ, §7:

\[\text{wait-ma-za 600 *100(ANIMAL)-i-za DARE-ta}\]

("Kamani, the Ruler, ...Saturas, 'first servant' of Kamani, bought the city Kamana from the Kanapauweans,...")

to them they gave 600 *100(ANIMAL)-i-za."

After 'gave' we expect an accusative plural, but in Hieroglyphic Luwian a word of the common gender should have an acc. pl. ending in -izi and not in -i-za; more exactly we would expect a form like *100-na-zi of ASSUR. After a numeral a singular would also be possible, but a word of the common gender (the gender of the two ASSUR words) would require a -na ending. Meriggi (1967:109) thought of a collective noun and this still seems the most likely hypothesis. The -i- which precedes the -za of the neuter shows that we are dealing with a -iya-formation used here in the neuter nom.-acc. sing. -iyana > -inza.

Finally a word about the stelae of MEHARDE-SHEIZAR (Hawks 1979). Here in a series of clear words, including the particle -ta (wait-mu-ta -; cf. Hitt. -kan), the third person plural ending of the preterite (PONERÉ-wait-ta, za-wait-nu-wait-ta), etc. ta is written with a version of *101 (see above p. 251). The stela adopt a somewhat incoherent archaic style. We cannot exclude that it is a continuation of an older usage, but it is perhaps more likely that the sculptor imitated an attractive older logogram without worrying about its earlier function. Whatever the reason, the two stela confirm the functional similarity of *100 and *101.

\(^{11}\) For the meaning of załalq(a) see Starke (1990:337ff), who argues for 'chariot' on the basis of the logogram (a foot and wheels) and of the link with a reconstructed Luwian verb załaqiqi- 'to move, travel'.

5.2. Purely on the basis of the textual evidence above it seems likely that the normal long-eared donkey logogram *100 corresponds to a tarkas(an)a-stem (ASSUR).\(^{12}\) At the same time *101 with a single forward-swept ear is also written tarkas(an)-i (ASSUR). How do we reconcile the a-stem of *101 in ASSUR (nom. pl. -nanzal) with the apparent instances of *100 in BULGARMADEN and CEKKÉ and with the i-stem of *101 also in ASSUR (nom. sing. -nis)? The problem is not insoluble. If the long-eared donkey represented in *100 was called tarkas(an)as, an adjective formed from this noun with a -iya-suffix would appear as tarkas(an)nis (in Cuneiform Luwian this would have been -ni-i-iš, see Carruba 1982, Melech 1990). The neuter nom.-acc. would then be tarkas(an)niyan-za.\(^{13}\) We know that a -yan- sequence can (though need not) be replaced by a simple -i-,\(^{14}\) which explains the collective *100-inza of CEKKÉ. BULGARMADEN may contain the dative plural of (*100)tarkas(an)is, but, if so, the *100 logogram is unexplained. Partly because of the word-order (i.e. the position before the noun) it is easier to take tarkas(an)niyan-za as an adjective nom.-acc. neuter and understand 'donkey-chariots' or the like. The difficulty is caused by za-la-la which looks like a neuter plural (though it would be possible to read it as a singular collective zala); yet a failed agreement between neuter sing. and plural is not altogether surprising. There are examples in Ilitrite (Friedrich 1960:117) and Cun. Luwian offers instances like KUB XXXII 8 116 iš-sa-ša-as-aš-ša-an-zi-ni-ša-ta pa-a-ta-daš-ša-an-za ta-am-ša-u-ša la-a-at-ta he took the nail parings of the hands and of the feet), where the two adjectives in -annanza (nom.-acc. neut. sing.) are meant to agree with the neuter plural ammonia.\(^{15}\)

\(^{12}\) The logogram *100 also appears before a different word in a very obscure context in KARKAMIŠ A 24 a 2 3 § 3 pà-ra-li-na-za-pa-wai-ta-ša (URBS) (*100 ANIMAL) tâšral-ka-li-li-i-i-zi ARÎA CAPUT CULTER-zâ 'hefty -ed away the TURLAKALJSI's for/in from the city Pamassaha' (but TURLAKALJSI could also be subject). It is possible that we are dealing with a specific type of donkey. One may compare 'in-er-eš-ga-la'-hamming god' (KUB XXXII 127 1 62, cf. Tischler HEG III 461, s.v. tâšra-), but this is a clear derivative of the ške-informative tâšra 'harness.' Given the logogram, however, it is tempting to link our word too to the Luwian verb, particularly if one remembers phrases like ANSE.KUR.RA tâšralwaštu 'draught horse' and ANSE.tâšralwaštu 'draught donkey' (Tischler, ibid.).

\(^{13}\) See e.g. the nom.-acc. neuter sing. tâšra-yanza 'paternal' built on tâšra 'father' and found in BOYEBPINARI IV 3 B.

\(^{14}\) Cf. e.g. KARETPE XIV 70 (Hr), where DOMINUS-ni-ša 'lordly' (<-niyan-z) is an adjective nom.-acc. neuter singular built on DOMINUS-nis 'lord' (Hawkins and Morpurgo Davies 1978:107). Note that the nominals of the common gender in -is are explained in due to "i-motion," hence -iya is replaced by -i-ya > -ir (Melech 1990:206ff), but the same explanation cannot account for the neuters where i-motion does not occur. If a phonetic development (contraction, syncope, etc.) is excluded, we shall have to reckon with analogy with the nominative and accusative of the common gender forms.

\(^{15}\) Cf. Starke (1990:46ff), though differently from Starke we take the -za-za neuters as singulars.
If this is accepted, all forms associated with *100 represent either an *a-stem tarkas(a)na- or an *iya- derivative from it. We are then left with tarkas(a)nis associated with *101. Here the solution was first suggested by Mortiggi (1967: 140), who without explanation translated *101 tarkas(a)nis ‘null’ (i.e. mules). In 1980 Hawkins supported this view on the basis of the difference between the two logograms and later on Starke (1990:410), while suggesting that the *ni-suffix was responsible for the fact that tarkas(a)nis meant ‘mule’ rather than ‘donkey’, implied that *ni in its turn derived from -na-ya-. This is indeed plausible and, if we take seriously the first millennium contrast between *100 and *101, we may posit that the basic tarkas(a)na- ‘donkey’ yielded an *iya-adjective tarkasniya > tarkasni- ‘of the donkey’, which we find with this meaning in CEKKE and probably in BULGARMADEN. That same adjective, once substantivized, acquired a more specific meaning ‘the donkey-like’, ‘that which pertains to the donkey’, ‘the donkey’s descendant’ (one may even think of a patronymic value) which would then lead to ‘mule’ or ‘hinny’. Words for ‘mule’ or the like can be based on the word for ‘donkey’; in Greek a mule is a half-donkey (hiekov; in German a Mausel ‘mule-donkey’) is a hinny; in Lithuanian next to ėtis ‘donkey’ there is a neologism areli ‘hinny’. The evidence of the logogram confirms our suggestions. The animal of *101 looks like an equid but the different ears speak against a donkey; a hybrid is probable, but we cannot know whether it is a mule or a hinny. Both in reality and representation mules have longer ears as contrasted with mannies, whose ears are shorter, following the principle that hybrids inherit from the father the head and the tail (Salonen 1955:46,71,75; Chutton-Brock 1992:44); unfortunately our logograms are not clear enough to allow us to make a distinction in the first or second millennia.

6. So far we have concentrated on the texts of the first millennium and we have concluded that these provide evidence for both donkeys and hybrids. In the second millennium the only logogram known at present is *101 as it appears in the Tarkondemos seal and in the two other seals of the King of Mira. We cannot of course exclude that *100 too had a logographic use. For *101 Nowicki (1982) suggested that the protuberance under the animal’s chin was in fact a rendering of the “thorn”, the rali sign. This is implausible, inter alia because in the first millennium version from ASSUR the protuberance is very different from the shape of the rali sign found in that text. The explanation does in fact come from the other Mira seals discussed by Nowicki (Glitterlock 1975:51f, above Fig. 3). The ring-shape of the protuberance makes it clear that we are dealing with a part of the equid’s harness, possibly with a throatlash, defined as “strap or thong passing under the neck or ear of a donkey, from cheekstrap to cheekstrap and securing headstall” (Littauer and Crouvel 1979:7). We learn then that *101 refers (or can refer) to an equid with its harness. It is conceivable that this points to a riding animal or an animal harnessed to a chariot and we may remember in this context that hybrids had greater strength than donkeys and were more normally used for drawing chariots (though donkeys could be used too).

As for the word, on the strength of the first millennium evidence we can now return to the second millennium data provided by Cuneiform Luwian and by Luwian onomastics to which we referred earlier. We have on the one hand the Cappadocian name Targasan (Laroche 1966:178) and the name Targasanalliti/ Targasanallitis (Laroche 1966:179), 16 on the other hand tar-qa-a-na-na-al-li-jā (a word from a broken Luwian text, which does not allow a reconstruction of the meaning (KUB XXXV 111 i1), and the Luwian noun *tar-qa-a-na-na-al-li/ja-an-za in an Hittite text (KUB XXXI 71 i14; cf. Tischler HEG, s.v.). The first word is normally translated ‘muleteer’ or ‘donkey driver’ (Pecchioli Daddi 1982:18; Melchert 1993:212); the second is rendered by Tischler (loc. cit.) as ‘Gemeinschaft des Hauses der Esselreiber’, but we must realize that the connection with donkeys or mules is entirely based on the Hieroglyphic data of the first millennium, as was first shown by Laroche (1958:110 note 21).

A problem then arises: for the first millennium we assumed that tarkas(a)na- meant ‘donkey’ and was rendered by *100, while the derived adjective tarkas(a)niya- when substantivized indicated the hybrid animal (‘mule’ or ‘hinny’) and was rendered by *101. From the Tarkondemos seal, however, with the newly gained equation Tar-qa-a-na-na-wa = *101-wālī, we learn that *101 = tarkas(a)na-. Is this a contradiction? Certainty is not possible, but we may remember the perennial discussions about the meaning of the various Sumerian forms with their Akkadian equivalents. Did ANŠE mean ‘donkey’ or was it a generic term for ‘equid’? What are the exact distinctions indicated by forms like ANŠE.DUN.GI or ANŠE.DIN.BIR (probably ‘donkey’), ANŠE.BARAN (probably ‘hybrid’ from donkey and charger), ANŠE.GIR.NUN.NA (probably ‘mule’ or ‘hinny’)? This is not the place to reconsider that problem, all the more so since it is becoming clear that the terms and their usage change in the course of time (see e.g. Zarins 1978, 1986, Postgate 1986). However, the very existence of this discussion makes it possible that the Luwian terminology of the second millennium differed from that of the first millennium. In other terms it is conceivable (even if so far unprovable) that in the second millennium (and even later) tarkas(a)na-wa was used generically for both donkeys and their hybrids, while later on a new term was created from a -iya- derivative. 17 The first millennium use in MEHRAR-

---

16 The newly appeared *101-ta-li in a seal impression (see above p. 250) may be a -di-lati-variant of Targasanali; for the alternating forms in -di-lati-, -di-see see van Broek (1972).

17 It would help to know the etymology of tarkas(a)na-, but here too nothing is certain. The best account of previous views is in Tischler HEG s.v. targasanali; Neumann (1964:61; 1979:260) argued for a compound formed by an adjective + an-ita- a word which could be compared with Latin asinus, if this, as normally supposed, is not of Indo-European origin. Hoffner (1966:398) too made the same comparison with asinos, though he referred to an IE *asinos-: for the first element he thought of the IE root of *in, troho, etc. (even if there are no parallels in Anatolian). The comparison with asinos seems possible (on the assumption that the word is not of Indo-European origin) and one cannot exclude a link with Sumerian anta. For the first element both Neumann’s suggestion (1979, 260; cf. *trēka- in the Lydian divine name *Trēka-trēka- and Hoffner’s etymology cannot be excluded but are not assured.)
SHEIZAR of *101 for *ta, a syllable elsewhere rendered by *100, if genuinely old and not merely archaizing, might point in this direction.

7. What does emerge from this excursion in the highways and byways of Luwian equid terminology?

First, a reading which at long last confirms Gelb's dictum about the Tarkondemos seal (1931:34): "In spite of the fact that it has been rejected by recent decipherers as without value for the understanding of the Hieroglyphs, I believe that its Hieroglyphic and Cuneiform parts agree with each other and with other comparable Hittite inscriptions". This is indeed so, but it took a long time to acquire sufficient knowledge of the Hieroglyphs to prove it; the seal provided us with the first evidence for two basic logograms REX and REGIO; the later inscriptions provide us with the knowledge of syllabograms and logograms which allows us to make sense of the name on the seal.

Secondly, a reminder and confirmation of some linguistic facts: tarkas(sajna) is apparently an *a-stem both in the Empire period and in the first millennium ASSUR text; it does not undergo "-omotion". The *i-form tarkas(sajni) of the first millennium is in fact not a variant but a derived adjective formed with the -iya-suffix. The adjective may be substantivized and in that guise may have a different but related meaning. Following Meriggi, we postulated a contrast between donkey, the basic word, and mule or hinny, the derivativ. The name Tarkas(sajnawa) is apparently built on the *a-stem during the Empire period—which speaks for a connection with the word for donkey, though the logogram is that which we read as mule later on. Quite simply we do not have sufficient evidence to know if one and the same logogram in the early period covered both donkey and mules (or hinnies).

Finally in a paper dedicated to Calvert Watkins we cannot dispense with cultural phenomena. We have seen that the Akkadian parallels guarantee that it is not impossible to call a man and indeed a king 'donkey' or 'mule'. In our case we cannot know for sure the actual value of the wa-suffix in Tarkas(sajna), but we must at least remember how important all equids (and not only horses) were in the second and first millennium economy. The Hittite laws establish the price of each animal: a sheep is a silver shekel, a ploughing ox twelve silver shekels, a draught horse twelve silver shekels and a mule (or a hinny) a silver mina, i.e. forty silver shekels. The importance of draught animals and pack animals in the ancient world is considerable and there is no reason to treat donkeys and mules as humble animals. In the Gilgamesh epic Enkidu is called a kudantu šarādu, akkamasu ša šadi, "a swift kudantu (mule/hinny), a wild donkey of the steppe";18 in Homer the two Achaean heroes, Menelaos and Meriones, who carry away the body of Patroklos in the midst of the fiercest battle are compared to ἵμανιν κρατημένον μενοὶ δμιήλαλοντες ‘mules who put on their mighty strength’ and carry timber down from the mountains along a rugged track (II.17, 742 ff). As Watkins (1979) has shown, the standard categorization is in terms of a feature + EQUINE /-EQUINE and in Hittite texts ANŠE.KUR.RA.ḪLA 'horses', ANŠE.GIR.NUN.ŠA.ḪLA 'mules', ANŠE.MES 'donkeys' occur in this order forming a sort of class (+EQUINE) contrasted with GUD 'cattle' (-EQUINE). The two categories belong to 'large cattle'. It is not surprising to see the names of the animals which belong to these categories being reused in onomastics. Again Watkins (1979:277) has drawn attention to Varro's statement about Roman names (RR 2.1.10): nominum multa habebus ab utroque pecore, a minore Porcius, Ovius, Capilius, sic a maior Equitus, Taurus, Asinius. We may wish to speculate whether Tarkas(sajnawa) and the Cappadocian Targasna fit into this pattern. More daringly we may also ask whether Cappadocian names like Aša-la and Wa-wa-li / Wa-wa-lu20 (Laroche 1966: s. v.) are in fact Luwian, are connected with horses and cows, and complete the Luwian version of Varro's triad.

ADDENDUM

After the submission of this article, J. D. Hawkins was examining some good photographs of the Karabel relief with its inscription KARABEL A (see K. Kohlmeyer, Acta Praehistorica et Archaeologica 15 [1983] 12-27). From this inspection he identified the name of the woman on the spot in September 1997 gave the following reading:

(1, sinistroverse) REX TARKASNA-wa-li REX mi+ra-li-a
(2, dextroverse) AVIS, REX mi+ra-li-a REGIO INFANS1
(3, sinistroverse) ... INFANS REX mi-ra-li-a REGIO (?) NEPOS

"(King) Tarkasna, king of <the land> Mira, son of BIRD, king of the land of Mira, grandson of ..., 'king of the land of Mira (?)."

Thus the relief should be the work of the same Tarkasnawa of Mira as the author of the Tarkondemos seal and the Boğazköy seal impressions, Bo. 388/2, 385/2, etc. Hawkins proposes to report this, and its implications for the history and geography of Mira, in Anatolian Studies 48 (1998).

18 For the second millennium (but not for the first) it would be possible to think of an *n-stem comparable to that of the Cappadocian name ḫa-ar-go-la-an, later re-determined as an *a-stem or an *iya-derivative—once again something impossible to prove.
19 Cf. CAD, S.VI, akkamasu 1. kudantu 5 for the references.
20 We have quoted Wawalati- because it matches Asa-la- but Neumann (1983:127; 1985:24) draws attention to the Cappadocian *U-wa-a and the later *U-wa-a (Laroche 1966:200), which could be based on the second millennium word for 'cow, ox'; for the first millennium he follows Sheveroshkin in recognizing the Lycian word wa-a 'cow, ox' in the personal names maC. Oxeas, fem. Oxeia.
References


Tischler, J. HEG see Tischler 1977ff.


MÍR CURAD

STUDIES IN HONOR OF CALVERT WATKINS

Edited by
Jay Jasanoff, H. Craig Melchert
and Lisi Oliver

Innsbruck 1998
MÍR CURAD

STUDIES IN HONOR OF
CALVERT WATKINS

Edited by
Jay Jasanoff, H. Craig Melchert
and Lisi Oliver

Innsbruck 1998