

ДРЕВНИЙ ВОСТОК

DOI: 10.31857/S086919080028904-1

HITTITE *ĀNT*- AND RELATED LEXEMES

© 2023

Valerii A. IVANOV^a^a – Lomonosov Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia

ORCID: 0000-0003-3164-1540; v.v.a.ivanoff@yandex.ru

Abstract: *There are two terms designating “equal” in cuneiform texts from Ḫattuša-Boğazköy, namely annauli- and ānt-. The lexeme ānt- has been connected with the Luwian terms ayawala- and ayal(a/i)-. The first one is a hapax in Hittite cuneiform corpus found in the so-called Tawagalawa letter (CTH 181), while the second one appears several times in the royal hieroglyphic inscriptions from Masuwari (Tell Ahmar).*

Although the meanings and etymologies of all these terms were discussed in recent scholarship, they have never been analyzed as part of a lexical system. The present article focuses on the contextual study of these terms.

The author comes to the conclusion that Hitt. annauli- is to be interpreted as “of equal status”, while Hitt. ānt- means “equal by appointment”. Thus, the lexeme annauli- describes the balance of powers in the Ancient Near East of the 2nd millennium BCE, when all the Great Kings were supposed to be equal to each other. The term ānt- designates a substitute, who becomes equal to the ritual patron in the course of the ritual, while the term annauli- is mentioned in texts as the antonym of the ritual substitute. The Luwian terms ayawala- and ayal(a/i)- are ultimately derived from the Luwian verbal stem aya- “to do”, while Hitt. ānt- is possibly cognate with Latin aequus “equal”. The term ayal(a/i)- is a title linked to the performance of certain duties by the heir apparent, and ayawala- is connected with the ability of a prince or high official to act as king’s deputy.

Keywords: Hittite language, Luwian language, Tawagalawa letter, substitution rituals, Hittite diplomacy.

For citation: Ivanov V.A. Hittite *ānt*- and Related Lexemes. *Vostok (Oriens)*. 2023. No. 6. Pp. 42–51. DOI: 10.31857/S086919080028904-1

All animals are equal

But some animals are more equal than others

George Orwell, *Animal Farm*

Hittite cuneiform texts from the archives of Ḫattuša contain two terms: *annauli*- and *ānt*-, which are assumed in modern scholarship to have the same interpretation “equal (person)”. These terms appear in a variety of contexts: international correspondence and treaties, literary and lexical texts, ritual and omen texts. The present research¹ focuses on the semantic difference between these lexemes. The connection with two additional Luwian terms: *ayal(a/i)*-, occurring in

¹ I would like to thank my supervisor Boris Alexandrov (Moscow) for his helpful comments and Ilya Yakubovich (Marburg) for his kind help with the Hieroglyphic Luwian sources and the stylistic features of the article. All the errors contained therein are mine alone.

hieroglyphic inscriptions from Tell Ahmar, and *ayawala-* from the Tawagalawa letter (CTH 181), will be discussed as well.

An extensive body of literature is devoted to this topic. The majority of contexts containing Hitt. *annauli-* are cited in [Puhvel, 1984, p. 64–65]. This term frequently appears in the texts of treaties and correspondence between rulers of Bronze Age Anatolia. Hitt. *annauli-* and its Akkadographic equivalent *MEĦRU*² can refer to the balance of power in the Ancient Near East when the Great King of Hatti calls other mighty kings his “equals” (1–2). The etymological analysis of *annauli-*, supposedly a Luwian loanword, is undertaken in [Yakubovich, 2021, p. 237–238]. According to this paper, it is derived from a Luwian local adverb *an(ni)-* “con-” with the help of the suffix *-wa-*, which marks a social status in the Anatolian languages, and therefore the whole lexeme can be literally translated as “co-rank-ed”³.

(1) ... A-*NA*^d UTU-*ŠI*
ku-e-eš LUGAL MEŠ *an-na-ú-li-e-eš*⁴ LUGAL KUR ^{URU}MI-IZ-RI LUG[AL KUR ^{URU}ša-an]-*ha-ra* LUGAL KUR ^{URU}ha-ni-*kal-pát na-aš-ma* LUGAL KUR *aš-šur*

‘The kings, who are equals of My Majesty – the king of Egypt, the ki[ng of Babyl]onia, the king of Haniḡalbat, or the king of Assyria’ KUB 21.5 rev. iii 24–25, CTH 76.B: Treaty of Muwattalli II with Wiluša [Beckman, 1999, p. 90].

(2) LUGAL MEŠ-*ia-mu ku-i-e-eš* LUGAL *MI-IĦ-[RU]-TI*
 LUGAL ^{URU}MI-IZ-RI-I LUGAL KUR *ka-ra-an-du-ni-aš*
 LUGAL KUR *aš-šur* *LUGAL KUR *aḡ-ḡi-ia-u-wa-ia**

‘And the kings who are my equals in rank are the king of Egypt, the king of Babylonia, the king of Assyria, *and the king of Aḡḡiyawa*.’ KUB 23.1+ rev. iv 1–3, CTH 105: Treaty of Tudḡaliya IV with Šaušḡamuwa of Amurru [Beckman et al., 2011, p. 602–603].

Another passage containing *annauli-* is found in a fragment belonging to the Kuwattalla tradition, CTH 761 (3), and deserves a separate treatment. This is the only instance where *annauli-* occurs in a Luwian context.

(3) [... š]ar-li-aš-ši-in-zi tar-pa-a-aš-ša-a-an-zi [...]
 ma-a-na-aš ‘MUNUS’?-iš za-ú-i-na-aš ma-a-na-aš a-x-[...]
 ma-a-na-aš *an-na-ú-li-iš* ma-a-na-aš tar-pa-a[š-ša-aš ...]

² For the interchangeability of *annauli-* and *MEĦRU*, see the treaty between Hattušili III of Hatti and Ulmi-Teššub of Tarḡuntaša (CTH 106, KBo 4.10 obv. 46’ *ma-a-an A-NA*^dUTU-*ŠI* LUGAL *ku-iš-ki ME-ĦI-RI-ŠU a-ra-a-i* ‘But if some king of equal rank rises up against My Majesty ...’) and the parallel passage in the treaty between Tudḡaliya IV and Kurunta (CTH 106, Bronze tablet iii 39 *ma-a-an-ma A-NA* LUGAL KUR ^{URU}HA-AT-TI *an-na-ú-li-iš ku-iš-ki a-ra-a-i* ‘But if someone of equal rank rises up against the king of Hatti ...’). The translations are given according to [Beckman, 1999, p. 109–124].

³ Here and below the numbered Hittite examples are italicized, unlike the Luwian examples (in both cuneiform and hieroglyphic transmission), cf. (3, 9).

⁴ I cannot support reading this term as *an-[te(?)]-e-li-e-eš*, which is proposed in [Kitchen, Lawrence, 2012, p. 556–557] following one of the readings offered by Friedrich [Friedrich, 1930, S. 179]. First of all, there are no other examples of writing *ant-* without *scriptio plena* (see examples 4–7), so the comparison with this lexeme is not possible. Second, there are many contexts where *annauli-* is “equal”, for example, see (Bronze Tablet iii 39; KUB 14.3 obv. ii 13–15 (Tawagalawa letter); KBo 22.6 obv. i 25’–26’ (*ŠAR TAMḡARI* epic)). Third, the signs TE and NA of KUB 21.5 have a lot in common (see KUB 21.5 obv. I 20, rev. iii 19, 22), therefore, their comparison with the partially broken second sign in the word under discussion cannot testify in favor of one of them. Moreover, although the last double vertical of the hypothetical E is present in the autography of KUB 21.5, it is absent on the photo at the *Konkordanz* and therefore the reading *Ú* is preferable.

‘[...] substitutes for the upper [...], whether she (is) woman, (then) here she (is). Whether he (is) [...], (then) here he (is)]. Whether he (is) of equal rank, whether he (is) a substi[tute ...]’ KUB 35.24+ rev. 3’–5’’, CTH 761: Great Ritual, cf. [Yakubovich, Mouton, 2023, p. 212 – 213].

One can see that Luw. *annauli-* stands in opposition to Luw. *tarpašša-* in this fragment. Merisms of such a type, mentioning two possibilities, one of which fully excludes the other one, appear frequently in the Hittite-Luwian incantations⁵. Luw. *tarpašša-* is translated as “substitute”⁶ and designates a special ritual actor, which is associated with the ritual patron (becomes *equal* to him), takes his miasma upon himself and is destroyed at the end of the ritual [Gurney, 1977, p. 52; Soysal, 2004, p. 103–104, n. 11]. Since *tarpašša-* is paired with *annauli-*, which also means “equal”, the sense of opposition between these two terms is not immediately clear. One can, however, argue that other contexts mentioning *annauli-* refer to *natural* equality. According to the Hittite stance, there was unchangeable quantity of centers associated with the great kingship: Egypt, Southern Mesopotamia, Northern Mesopotamia, Anatolia and the Aegean. In order to become a great king, a ruler should establish his control over the whole territory of the one of these centers [Alexandrov, 2007, p. 20]. Therefore, great kings of the Ancient Near East were equal by virtue of their positions (1–2), while the change of status was virtually impossible⁷. It is hard to imagine that a pharaoh could become a substitute for a Hittite king. Thus, the incantation from the Kuwattalla tradition reflects the opposition between natural equality and equality by assignment (substitution).

The Hittite lexeme *ānt-* has a more complicated interpretation history due to the paucity and complexity of contexts where it appears, cf. [Goedegebuure, 2002, p. 61–64]. The first suggestions about its meaning were based on the ritual texts and a lexical list (4–5). The initial idea, proposed by Güterbok [Güterbok, 1950, S. 228] in the course of his investigation of Hittite names containing element *-muwa-*, was to see here the logogram A.A-*an-za* with the reading *muwanza*. Neu [Neu, 1983, S. 16, n. 76; S. 223] proposed the meaning “strength, power” for the Sumerographic interpretation.

A different stem *ānt-* “warm” occurs in the collocation NINDA *ānt-* [Meriggi, 1962, S. 104–105]. Etymologically this stem comes from the Proto-Anatolian root **ay-* “to be hot” with the loss of the intervocalic /y/ [Melchert, 1994, p. 28; Goedegebuure, 2002, p. 68]. The possible link between this stem and the term *ānt-* in focus of the present paper was discussed in [Kümmel, 1967, S. 90] with regard to context (4), but rejected on the grounds of context (5). Haas [Haas, 1994, S. 210] goes a step further and interpreted *ānt-* in (4) as “a man of taboo” in a sense that it is dangerous to communicate with someone who has a fever, “is hot”. This interpretation does not take into account the other contexts discussed in the present paper, and therefore, it can be considered outdated.

⁵ Such pairs can consist of juxtaposed antonyms, for example “dead”/“living”, “past”/“future”, or an exhaustive description of a small closed set, for example “mother”/“father”, “brother”/“sister”, see [Mouton, Yakubovich, 2019, p. 213].

⁶ Its Hittite equivalent is *tarpalli-*.

⁷ The mention of kings of both Assyria and Ḫanigalbat in (1) reflects the political situation in the first half of the 13th century BCE, when there was no single ruler who could expand his dominance over the whole of Northern Mesopotamia. The Assyrian expansion aimed at establishing control over the heartland of Mitanni, where the center of the more ancient great kingdom was situated. Only in the mid-13th century BCE, after the subjection of the land of Ḫurri, the Assyrian great kingship was recognized by the Hittites (CTH 171, KUB 23.102), although the relations of “brotherhood” between the two rulers were not introduced [Alexandrov, 2007, p. 24–25].

For the great kingship in Ḫatti in the second half of the 13th century BCE, see [Houwink ten Cate, 2007]. The author states that although the rulers of Karkemiš and Tarḫuntašša hoped to increase their power in order to become equal with the king of Ḫattuša, there was only one great king, that of Ḫattuša, who was the head of ‘the whole territory of the Confederacy of Ḫatti Land, the land of Carchemish and the land of Tarḫuntašša’ [Houwink ten Cate, 2007, p. 205].

The new stage of research on this term has begun with the publication of Goedegebuure [Goedegebuure, 2002, p. 61–73]. The Old Hittite text KBo 17.17 (6), published by Neu [Neu, 1980, S. 23–26], was identified by Goedegebuure [Goedegebuure, 2002, p. 70–72] as the most ancient example of a substitution ritual in Anatolia. Goedegebuure argued that *ānt-* in this text designates a royal substitute, an equal of the king, which links this text with the Hittite royal substitution ritual of the Empire period, in which example (4) is found. Context (5), where the meaning “equal” for *ānt-* is supported by its Akkadian equivalent, is discussed in [Goedegebuure, 2002, p. 66]. As one can see from the examples below, the meaning “equal” fits the relevant contexts better than the alternatives discussed above.

(4) *na-ʿan-ʿza-an LUGAL Ú-UL ku-iš-ki ḫal-za-a-ʿi ʿ [...]*
*nu-uš-ši LÚ.MEŠ a-a-an-da-aš i-wa-ar me-ʿna-ʿ[ah-ḫa-an-da(?) ...]*⁸

‘No one calls him king. [...] They [shall ...] t[o] him like an equal.’ KUB 17.31 obv. i 5’–6’, CTH 421: Great Substitution Ritual [Kümmel, 1967, S. 60–61]. Also see parallel text (KBo 15.2 rev. 3’–4’).

(5) (Sum.) [LÚ-GABA-GI-NU-TUKU] = (Sum. pronunciation) lu-KI.MIN-ki-nu-ut-ku = (Akk.) ŠA <ŠA>-NI-NAM LA-A I-ŠU = (Hitt.) *a-a-an-za ku-iš UL*

(Sum.) [LÚ-GABA-GI-NU]-ZU = (Sum. pronunciation) lu-KI.MIN-ki-nu-zu = (Akk.) ŠA <ŠA>-NI-NAM LA-A I-DU-U = (Hitt.) *a-a-an-za ku-iš ʿUL*⁹

‘He who has no rival = he who [is not] rivalled/equalled. // He who knows no rival = he who [is not] rivalled/equaled’ KBo 1.30 obv. i 2–3, CTH 305: Vocabulary LU = ša [CHD (L–N), p. 314; Goedegebuure, 2002, p. 66].

(6) [(DINGIR.MEŠ-na-an ʰUTU-i)] ʿkaʿ-a-ša DINGIR.MEŠ-aš a-ši p[(é-eš-ki-mi ʰUTU-šum-ma-an la-ba-a)]r-[(na-an)]

[(DINGIR.MEŠ-aš a-ši pí-iš-ki-mi)] ʿtaʿ a-a-an-da-aš-ša-an [(pí-i)š-ki-mi a-(a-za-aš-ši-iš T)]I-ʿan-zaʿ-aš-ši-i[(š ka-a-š)a]

‘O Sun-god of the gods, I hereby give that one to the gods, Our Sun Labarna. I shall give that one to the gods. [I shall] giv[e] his equal. Her[e] (is) his [eq]ual, his living (substitute).’ KBo 17.17(+?) obv. 6’–7’, CTH 412: Ritual and Myth of Zuwi [Goedegebuure, 2002, p. 64, 70]. Also see the parallel text (KUB 43.53 obv. i 16’–18’).

The passage (7), belonging to an oracle text, was added to the same dossier in [Soysal, 2004, p. 99–105]. In Soysal’s point of view, *ānt-* there should designate an enemy who is equal to the Hittite king. The verb *nakkuššiya(e)-* is a derivative from the noun *nakkušši-* “scapegoat” [CHD (L–N), p. 376–377], a living ritual carrier who takes upon itself and transports away the miasma of the ritual patron. Soysal [Soysal, 2004, p. 104] interprets the verb *nakkuššiya(e)-* as “to become a scapegoat”, a metaphor referring a drastic fall of the enemy king.

(7) [tá-k]u ʰXXX SI-ŠÚ al-ki-iš-ta-ni-eš k[i-i-ša-ri ...]
 ʿaʿ-an-za-aš-še-eš na-ak-ku-uš-še-e-eš-ʿkánʿ!-[zi]
 [tá]k-ku ʰXXX A-NA SI.GÙB-ŠÚ al-ki-iš-ta-aš [ar-ta(?)]
 ʿLÚ KÚR-an-ni a-a-an-za-aš-še-eš na-ak-ku-uš-še-eš-ʿkánʿ!-[zi]

⁸ It is highly likely that there is a finite verb in the lacuna at the end of the line.

‘[I]f the horn of the moon [turns] to branches, / his *ānt*-s wi[II] be scapegoats. / [I]f towards the left horn of the moon [stands(?)] a branch, / in hostility his *ānt*-s wi[II] be scapegoats.’ KUB 8.13 obv. 5–8, CTH 533: Lunar omens [Soysal, 2004, p. 100–101]⁹.

Goedegebuure [Goedegebuure, 2002, p. 67–68] linked *ānt*- with the Luwian hapax *ayawala*- occurring in the Tawagalawa letter (8). An unidentified Hittite king¹⁰ sent his high-ranked envoy (^{LÚ}TARTENU) to the local ruler Piyamaradu for accepting him into a Hittite vassalhood, but Piyamaradu rejected the proposal and humiliated the prince. The rejection of the Hittite envoy could be motivated by the difference between the positions of ^{LÚ}TARTENU and ^{LÚ}tuḫkanti- (whose arrival was expected by Piyamaradu) in the Hittite palace structure [Heinhold-Krahmer, 1991, S. 144]. According to Heinhold-Krahmer and Rieken [Heinhold-Krahmer, Rieken, 2020, S. 74–75], the rhetorical question of the Hittite king implies that ^{LÚ}TARTENU possesses the same value as ^{LÚ}tuḫkanti-.

(8) ... ‘^{LÚ}TAR-TE-NU-ma
Ú-UL A-NA ‘LUGAL a’-ia-wa-la-aš

‘But isn’t ^{LÚ}TARTENU the deputy of the king?’ KUB 14.3 obv. i 11–12, CTH 181: Tawagalawa Letter, cf. [Beckman et al., 2011, p. 102–103].

A variety of translations were proposed for *ayawala*- in previous scholarship. Melchert [Melchert, 1981, p. 93–95] hypothesized that it is a Hittite word for “son”, which is hidden in the Hittite texts beneath the Sumerogram DUMU. Puhvel [Puhvel, 1984, p. 13] suggested that *ayawala*- means “agent, deputy” and consists of the Luwian root *aya*- “to do, make” and the agentive suffix *-wala*-. Hoffmann [Hoffmann, 1992, S. 290] rejected the interpretation of *ayawala*- as “son” and proposed that *ayawala*- means “equal”, as does *annauli*-.

The relation of *ānt*- and *ayawala*- is discussed in [Goedegebuure, 2002, p. 67–68] with the conclusion that the two lexemes are cognate. In the meanwhile, however, an internal cognate of *ayawala*- was found in Luwian hieroglyphic inscriptions of the Iron Age (6). This is *ayal(a/i)*-, found in parallel passages TELL AHMAR 1 § 2, TELL AHMAR 2 § 2 and TELL AHMAR 6 § 2. For its last occurrence see [Hawkins, 2006, p. 12–16]¹¹, where this term was translated as “first-born (child)”. As one can infer from example (9), a king stresses the legitimacy of his rule, underscoring that he accessed the throne as a rightful heir. Melchert (apud [Rieken, Sasseville, 2014, p. 306]) suggested that the Luwian stems *ayawala*- and *ayal(a/i)*- together with Hitt. *ānt*- go back to the root **āi*-, the missing cognate of Latin *ae-quus* “equal”. The presumable implication of his analysis is that the prince *ayali*- should be equal to the king in order to act as his deputy.

(9) *a-wa/i-mu |á-ia-lá/i-na |(INFANS.L282)[ní]-wa/i-ra+a CAELUM (DEUS)TONITRUS-sa ... || ... |(LITUUS)á-za-ta
*a-wa/i-mu |á-ma-za |tá-ti-ia-za |“LIGNUM”-la-ha-za || |pi-ia-ta

‘Celestial Tarḫunt (and the other gods) loved me, the *ayal(a/i)*-child, and they gave me my paternal power’. TELL AHMAR 6 § 2–3. [Rieken, Yakubovich, 2010, p. 212].

⁹ In addition to the example cited above, Soysal mentions two other oracle texts containing the same apodosis (KBo 13.13 obv. 5’–14’; KUB 43.7 rev. iii 7–8), which he interprets as *ŠUMMA IZBU* omens.

¹⁰ Most of the scholars suppose that it is Hattušili III [Beckman et al., 2011, p. 120–121; Heinhold-Krahmer, Rieken, 2020, S. 1–2].

¹¹ The reading of this term was clarified in [Rieken, Yakubovich, 2010, p. 212–213].

Despite the far-reaching hypotheses about the connection between *ānt-* and *ayawala-* advanced in modern scholarship, the synchronic meaning of *ānt-* was never fully investigated on the basis of the full set of its attestations in the Hittite texts. For example, the semantic distinction between *ānt-* and *annauli-*, which belongs to the same semantic field, has never come under scrutiny. I submit that the comparison between the contexts for *ānt-* and *annauli-*, *ayawali-* and *ayal(a/i)-* can help to approach the etymologies of these lexemes.

Although Hitt. *ānt-* and *annauli-* can be both interpreted as “equal”, their meanings turn out not to be identical. The term *ānt-* occurs in substitution rituals (4, 6), omen texts (7) and a vocabulary composition (5). In the substitution rituals it designates a substitute, which is *equal* to the ritual patron (6), or describes the position of the king, who lost his status during the royal substitution ritual and became *equal* to the common people (4)¹². Moreover, according to the logic of the royal substitution ritual, a substitute becomes a king¹³, and the king, who has lost his title, takes place of his substitute¹⁴. Therefore, calling a king with the term *ānt-*, which is used for defining a substitute, can reflect a ritual mechanism whereby the king exchanges his place with a commoner. The meaning of the term *ānt-* in the omen texts can likewise be interpreted in the context of a royal substitution rituals. In the text CTH 419 a king states that the ritual is performed because the Moon-god has given him a bad omen (KUB 24.5+ obv. 9', 13', 32', rev. 4, 13–14). Example (7) tells us that in the case of some changes of the Moon, *ānt-* should become a scapegoat. Although scapegoats are technically not part of the substitution rites (see above), they could be used as metaphors for expelled substitutes¹⁵. Therefore, *ānt-* in (7) designates a substitute, who should be expelled because of the bad omen, and not the defeated enemy of the king, which would be a far more complicated metaphor¹⁶. The final occurrence of *ānt-* is found in a vocabulary text, which contains a propagandistic formula describing a mighty ruler (5). The Hittite stance on the political situation of the late 2nd millennium BCE implies the existence of several equal rulers, each in his own part of the Oikumene (1, 2), therefore, the example under discussion relates to the discourse of the 3rd millennium BCE¹⁷, which is also reflected in the literary compositions of the Late Bronze Age¹⁸. Hitt. *ānt-* in (5) can be interpreted as “rival”, which prompts a typological parallel with Hittite terms *tarpalli-* and

¹² According to the Hittite ideology, a king was not equal to the other people, because he has to become a god after his death, whereas the rest of people descended to the Netherworld. The loss of the royal status led to the loss of the privilege to become a god, and therefore, put the king in the same position as the common people [Cognetti, 2021, S. 345–346].

¹³ The royal substitution ritual includes the coronation of a prisoner of war, a human substitute who is acting as king [Yakubovich, 2005, p. 124].

¹⁴ This swap is based on a ritual mechanism, described in several mythological systems, whereby two similar characters can exchange their positions in the Netherworld vs. Earth. For example, Lugal-irra and Meslamta-ea were divine twins who replaced each other in Mesopotamian mythology [Black, Green, 2004, p. 123–124], whose Greek counterparts are Castor and Polydeuces (*Od.* XI. 340–344) [Bachvarova, 2016, p. 107–108].

¹⁵ The living substitute for the Hittite king was not expected to be killed during the ritual. Its fate was similar to the fate of a scapegoat, it was expelled from the country.

¹⁶ This interpretation of *ānt-* is distinct from the meaning of *annauli-* in the ritual context (3), where it designates an antonym to the term “substitute” (see above).

¹⁷ The propaganda of the Old Akkadian Empire presented its kings as unrivaled [Foster, 2016, p. 83]. The subsequent rulers of Mesopotamia saw Sargon the Great as the first creator of a world-wide empire and used his image to emphasize their own power [Foster, 2016, p. 277–279].

¹⁸ As was mentioned above, the term *annauli-* appears in the Hittite text concerning Sargon the Great (KBo 22.6 obv. i 25'–26', CTH 306: *ŠAR TAMḪĀRI* epic), in the description of the dream of Nurdahḫi, king of Puruṣhanda, where the god Enlil encourages him to confront Sargon with the statement that he, Nurdahḫi, “knows no equal”. Therefore, the Mesopotamian concept of an unequaled ruler was reflected in the literary texts of the Hittite kingdom. A likely purpose of sending this dream was misguiding Nurdahḫi. For a parallel false dream in Iliad (*Il.* II. 1–34) see [Bachvarova, 2016, p. 173–174].

tarpanalli-, the first of which is used for the designation of a substitute, while the second may also refer to a usurper¹⁹.

Hittite and Luwian *annauli-* contains the same Luwian suffix *-wa-*, marking the social status, as does *ayawala-* [Rieken, Sasseville, 2014, p. 306–307]²⁰. Yet, *annauli-* was never used as an official title but only as an epithet, which could occur in both political and ritual contexts (see examples 1, 2 vs. 3 respectively). In contrast, the terms *ayawala-* and *ayal(a/i)-* are only mentioned in political contexts (8, 9). Both of these lexemes describe officials that can replace or represent the king. Luw. *ayal(a/i)-* was an official epithet of the king's son, whereas Luw. *ayawala-* was a designation of a prince or high official, his substitute in a political sense.

Thus, the meanings of all these terms are different. Hitt. *annauli-* can be interpreted as “of equal status”. Hitt. *ānt-* designates a substitute who is appointed to act as a king for a particular purpose, and thus can be interpreted as “equal by appointment”. This semantic distinction motivates the existence of both terms in Hittite language. The Luwian terms *ayawala-* and *ayal(a/i)-* are closer in meaning to Hittite *ānt-* but do not have religious connotations.

Judging by the meaning alone, Goedegebuure's etymological comparison between *ānt-* and *ayawala-* makes sense, but adding *ayal(a/i)-* to the same dossier complicates the matter. It seems unlikely that an heir to the throne would be called an “equal” or “substitute” son in (9). In contrast, the interpretation of *ānt-* as “equal, substitute” fits well with the hypothesis of Melchert (apud [Rieken, Sasseville, 2014, p. 306]) about the link of this term with Latin *ae-quus* “equal”, as two reflexes of the proto-Indo-European root **qj-*. Therefore, Hittite *ānt-* should be separated from Luwian *ayal(a/i)-*, and thus also from the formally similar Luwian *ayawala-*. Therefore, one can return to the old etymology of *ayawala-* in [Puhvel, 1984, p. 13], where it is treated as a derivative from the Luwian verbal root *aya-* “to do, make” with the meaning “agent, deputy”. The same etymology can be extended to *ayal(a/i)-* on the assumption that the official heir to the throne had some obligations associated with his status and thus could be described as “acting son”²¹. A formal support of this etymology comes from the use of the <ā> sign in both *ā-ia-* “to make” (SULTANHAN § 25 3SG.PRS |*ā-ia-ti-i*) and the term *ā-ia-lā/i-* in Anatolian Hieroglyphic orthography (9)²².

The following conclusions were drawn from this investigation. First of all, despite the fact that both *annauli-* and *ānt-* possess the same broad meaning “equal”, they occur in complementary contexts and never replace one another. Thus, *ānt-* designates a substitute in a religious context, whereas *annauli-* occurs together with such a substitute in a bipartite merism. Therefore, the term *annauli-* is interpreted as “(one) of equal status”, while *ānt-* is interpreted as “equal by appointment”. The two other lexemes under discussion, *ayawala-* and *ayal(a/i)-*, appear only in political contexts, where *ānt-* does not occur. Although *annauli-* frequently occurs in political

¹⁹ KUB 24.5 (KUB 24.5 rev. 16, CTH 419) features *tarpanalli-* in a context where one rather expects *tarpalli-* “substitute”. Therefore, these two terms can be mutually interchangeable. The mention of *tarpanalli-* “usurper” can be found in mythological texts from the Kumarbi-cycle, where this term refers to the creatures who can overthrow the Storm-god (KUB 33.96 obv. i 8; KUB 33.106 rev. iii 35', CTH 345). In the texts of treaties, one finds the derived verb *tarpanallašša-* “to become a rival” describing hostile actions of the rebellious vassal ruler (KBo 4.3+ obv. ii 29'–30', CTH 68).

²⁰ It is, however, appropriate to observe that *annauli-* occurs many times in Hittite texts, and can thus be treated as an integrated loanword, whereas *ayawala-* is attested only once, which is consistent with its description as Luwian foreign word.

²¹ To be more precise, both *ayal(a/i)-* and *ayawala-* can be derived from the Luwian verbal stem *aya-* “to do, make” through the mediation of the abstract deverbal noun *aya-* “act”. In fact, this noun may be attested in (KUB 25.37+ obv. ii 45) *a-i-ia-an*, although the fragmentary context makes this suggestion speculative. Better attested is another derivative *ayattar*, which is also usually translated as “act” [Melchert, forthcoming].

²² In contrast, the comparison of *ayal(a/i)-* with Proto-Indo-European **oj-* “one” [Rieken, Yakubovich, 2010, p. 212–213] faces formal problems, since the Luwian reflexes of Proto-Indo-European words beginning with *e-* and *o-* are normally spelled with <a> in Anatolian Hieroglyphic texts [Melchert, 2010, p. 154].

contexts, it is never used as a title, whereas *ayal(a/i)-* should probably be interpreted as such. Both *ayawala-* and *ayal(a/i)-*, which mean “agent” and “acting one” respectively, can go up to the Luwian verbal stem *aya-* “to do, make”, while *ānt-* has nothing to do with it. The comparison between *ānt-* and Latin *aequus* “equal” remains possible.

ABBREVIATIONS

CHD – Güterbock H.G., Hoffner H.A., van den Hout Th. *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. 1989–.

CTH – Catalogue des textes hittites

HdO – Handbuch der Orientalistik

KBo – Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi

KUB – Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi

MVAeG – Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Agyptischen Gesellschaft

StBoT – Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten

THeth – Texte der Hethiter

UAVA – Untersuchungen zur Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie

REFERENCES

Alexandrov B.E. The Ideology of ‘Great Kingship’ in Anatolia of the Late Bronze Age. *Third International Conference “Hierarchy and Power in the History of Civilizations”*. D.M. Bondarenko, A.A. Nemirovskiy (eds.). Moscow: Center for Civilizational and Regional Studies of the RAS, 2007. Pp. 15–27 (in Russian) [Александров Б.Е. Идеология «великоцарственности» в Анатолии Позднебронзового века. *Третья международная конференция «Иерархия и власть в истории цивилизаций»*. Под ред. Д.М. Бондаренко, А.А. Немировского. М.: Центр цивилизационных и региональных исследований института Африки РАН, 2007. С. 15–27].

Bachvarova M.R. *From Hittite to Homer. The Anatolian Background of Ancient Homeric Epic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016.

Beckman G. *Hittite Diplomatic Texts; 2nd Edition (Society of Biblical Literature. Writings from the Ancient World 7)*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999.

Beckman G., Bryce T., Cline E. *The Ahhiyawa Texts. (Society of Biblical Literature. Writings from the Ancient World 28)*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011.

Black J., Green A. *Gods, Demons and Symbols of Ancient Mesopotamia. An Illustrated Dictionary*. Ehrhardt; Bath: The British Museum Press, 2004.

Cognetti C. *Totenkult und Ahnenverehrung im hethitischen Anatolien. Vorstellungen, Rituale und Institutionen (THeth 32)*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag WINTER, 2021.

Foster B.R. *The Age of Agade. Inventing Empire in Ancient Mesopotamia*. London; New York: Routledge, 2016.

Friedrich J. *Staatsverträge des Hatti-Reiches in hethitischer Sprache. 2. Teil: Die Verträge Muršiliš‘ II. mit Manapa-Dattaš vom Lande des Flusses Šeḫa, des Muwattalliš mit Alakšanduš von Wiluša und des Šuppiluliumaš mit Hukkanāš und den Leuten von Hajaša (mit Indices zum 1. und 2. Teil) (MVAeG 34/1)*. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1930.

Goedegebuure P.M. KBo 17.17+: Remarks on an Old Hittite Royal Substitution Ritual. *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions*. 2002. No. 2. Pp. 61–73.

Gurney O.R. *Some Aspects of Hittite Religion. The Schweich Lectures of The British Academy 1976*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977.

Güterbock H.G. Die Elemente muwa und ziti in den hethitischen Hieroglyphen. *Archiv Orientalní*. 1950. No. 18. S. 208–238.

Güterbock H.G., Hoffner H.A., van den Hout Th. *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. 1989–.

Haas V. *Geschichte der hethitischen Religion (HdO I/15)*. Leiden; New York; Köln: Brill, 1994.

Hawkins J.D. The Inscription. *Tell Ahmar II. A New Luwian Stele and the Cult of the Storm-God at Til Barsib-Masuware*. G. Bunnens, J.D. Hawkins, I. Leirens (eds.). Louvain; Paris; Dudley: Peeters, 2006. Pp. 11–31.

Heinhold-Krahmer S. Zur Bronzetafel aus Boğazköy und ihrem historischen Inhalt. *Archiv für Orientforschung*. 1991. No. 38. S. 138–158.

Heinhold-Krahmer S., Rieken E. (eds.). *Der „Tawagalawa-Brief“: Beschwerden über Piyamaradu. Eine Neuedition (UAVA 13)*. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter, 2020 [unter Mitwirkung von J.D. Hawkins, J. Hazenbos, J. L. Miller, E. Rieken, M. Weeden].

Hoffmann I. Das hethitische Wort für ‘Sohn’. *Hittite and Other Anatolian and Near Eastern Studies in Honor of Sedat Alp*. H. Otten, H. Ertem, E. Akurgal, A. Süel (eds.). Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1992. Pp. 289–293.

Houwink ten Cate Ph.H.J. The Hittite Usage of the Concepts of ‘Great Kingship’, the Mutual Guarantee of Royal Succession, the Personal Unswerving Loyalty of the Vassal to his Lord and the ‘Chain of Command’ in Vassal Treaties from the 13th Century B.C.E. *Das geistige Erfassen der Welt im Alten Orient – Sprache, Religion, Kultur und Gesellschaft*. C. Wilcke, J. Hazenbos, A. Zgoll (eds.). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2007. S. 191–207.

Kitchen K.A., Lawrence P.J.N. *Treaty, Law and Covenant in the Ancient Near East*. Vol. 1. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2012.

Kümmel H.M. *Ersatzrituale für den hethitischen König (StBoT 3)*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1967.

Melchert H.C. The Hittite Word for “Son”. *Indogermanische Forschungen*. 1981. No. 85. Pp. 90–95.

Melchert H.C. *Anatolian Historical Phonology (Leiden Studies in Indo-European 3)*. Amsterdam, Atlanta: Rodopi, 1994.

Melchert H.C. Spelling of Initial /a-/ in Hieroglyphic Luwian. *ipamati kistamati pari tumatimis – Luwian and Hittite Studies Presented to J. David Hawkins on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday*. I. Singer (ed.). Tel Aviv: the Emery and Claire Yass Publications in Archaeology, 2010. Pp. 147–158.

Melchert H.C. *A Dictionary of Cuneiform Luwian*. Ann Arbor: Beech Stave, forthcoming.

Meriggi P. Über einige hethitische Fragmente historischen Inhaltes. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*. 1962. No. 58. S. 66–110.

Mouton A., Yakubovich I. Internal or External Evil: a Merism in Luwian Incantations. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London*. 2019. No. 82. Pp. 209–231.

Neu E. *Althethitische Ritualtexte im Umschrift (StBoT 25)*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1980.

Neu E. *Glossar zu den althethitischen Ritualtexten (StBoT 26)*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1983.

Puhvel J. *Hittite Etymological Dictionary Vol. 1: Words beginning with A; Vol 2: Words beginning with E and I*. Berlin, New York, Amsterdam: Mouton Publishers, 1984.

Rieken E., Sasseville D. Social Status as a Semantic Category of Anatolian: The Case of PIE *-*uo-*. *Munus amicitiae – Norbert Oettinger a collegis et amicis dicatum*. H.C. Melchert, R. Rieken, Th. Steer (eds.). Ann Arbor; New York: Beech Stave, 2014. Pp. 302–314.

Rieken E., Yakubovich I. The New Values of Luwian Signs L 319 and L 172. *ipamati kistamati pari tumatimis – Luwian and Hittite Studies Presented to J. David Hawkins on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday*. I. Singer (ed.). Tel Aviv: the Emery and Claire Yass Publications in Archaeology, 2010. Pp. 199–219.

Soysal O. On Hittite (LÚ) Ānt- “(The) Equal (One) > Rival” Again. *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions*. 2004. No. 4. Pp. 99–105.

Yakubovich I. Were Hittite Kings Divinely Anointed? A Palaic Invocation to the Sun-God and its Significance for Hittite Religion. *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions*. 2005. No. 5. Pp. 107–137.

Yakubovich I. The Anatolian Connections of the Greek God Enyalios. *Linguistic and Cultural Interactions between Greece and Anatolia. In Search of the Golden Fleece (Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 122)*. M. Bianconi (ed.). Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2021. Pp. 233–245.

Yakubovich I., Mouton A. *Luwili. Hittite-Luwian ritual texts attributed to Puriyanni, Kuwattalla and Šilalluḫi (CTH 758–763). Volume I: Edition and commentary. In cooperation with Laura Puértolas Rubio (StBoT 72)*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2023.

ИНФОРМАЦИЯ ОБ АВТОРЕ / INFORMATION ABOUT THE AUTHOR

ИВАНОВ Валерий Алексеевич – аспирант
кафедры истории Древнего мира
исторического факультета Московского
государственного университета имени
М.В. Ломоносова, Москва, Россия.

Valerii A. IVANOV, PhD student, Faculty of
History, Lomonosov Moscow State University,
Moscow, Russia.