

On the Old Assyrian *tuzzinnum*

Federico Giusfredi¹

1. Introduction

The Old Assyrian texts from the *kārum* settlements of Anatolia contain several loanwords,² a fair amount of which are probably of Hittite (or, more generally, Anatolian) origin.³ Among these, some are names of *realia*, while others connect to the spheres of society, local politics and, of course, administration. In the latter category, a culturally and linguistically important case is that of the loanword *tuzzinnum*, regularly written with the two signs *tù-zi-* followed by a single nasal element and an inflected ending of one's choice. The meaning of this word has long been debated: initially, it was assumed to indicate an official (for instance, by Hecker 1980), but, because of the various problems that emerged from this interpretation (which will be discussed later in this contribution), other significant proposals have been made based on the context of the several occurrences that have been identified in Old Assyrian documents (e.g. Dercksen 2004, 2007).

2. Attested forms

Based on the occurrences that I was able to collect and verify, the attested forms of the substantive *tuzzinnum* are the following:

¹ This paper is part of the project PALaC, that has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement n° 757299). I employ the abbreviations used by the *Chicago Assyrian Dictionary* and by the *Chicago Hittite Dictionary*; abbreviations not available there will be included in the final bibliography. I thank Simonetta Ponchia for discussing with me some aspects of this paper. The responsibility for its contents, and for any shortcomings, belongs, of course, entirely to me.

² Cf. Dercksen 2007 and Marazzi 2010 for recent lists of and references to previous works.

³ Luwian loanwords are quite limited, and include, possibly, *targumannum* “interpreter, translator” (Starke 1993) and *ubadinnum*, a type of estate or property (but different interpretations exist in the literature: Bilgiç 1954, 48f., Güterbock 1957, 360, Starke 1990, 198, Melchert 2003, 20, Hecker 2004, 52, Dercksen 2004, Schwemer 2005, Goedeghebuure 2008, 172, Michel 2011, 324).

Nom.sg. *tù-zi-num* (BIN 4, 209 obv 9, envelope rev. 12; OIP 27, 53 obv. 7; etc.), *tù-zi-nu-um* (e.g. BIN 4, 209 rev. 13, envelope rev. 19; Chantre 2 obv. 8; Kt a/k 250b obv. 7; Kt a/k 1263a obv. 4; Kt r/k 19 rev. 12; Kt 87/k 312 obv. 3, rev. 11, 17; Kt 91/k 282; AuOr 8 – Wenzel rev. 15; etc.).

Acc.sg. *tù-zi-nam* (Kt r/k 19 obv. 3; Kt 87/k 253 rev. 14; Kt 87/k 285 rev. 15; etc.).

Obl.sg. *tù-zi-ni-im* (Kt 87/k 39 obv. 7, 15; Kt n/k 74 rev. 13; etc.); *tù-zi[-nim]* (Kt n/k 72 rev. 15); *tù-zi-ni* (VS 26, 100 rev. 4).

As is typical in Old Assyrian cuneiform orthography, the writing is defective as far as the notation of geminate consonants is concerned. The geminate notation of the *-n-* element in the normalization of the form depends on Akkadian suffixation (cf. below, §5), while that of the *-z-* depends on the very solid hypothesis that this word is, in fact, a derived and adapted loan from the Hittite *tuzzi-*, a common gender substantive that, in historical times, consistently meant “army.”⁴ As solid as the hypothesis is from a formal point of view (see discussion below, §§4–5), the semantics involved in the process have turned out to be quite deceiving. A fresh attempt at organizing the available evidence is one of the aims of this modest contribution.

3. Previous analyses and contexts of occurrence

From the first contexts of occurrence that were studied, *tuzzinnum* was initially assumed to indicate a figure or a group of people (cf. e.g. Hecker 1980, 71 with fn. 33) involved in specific types of transactions. These figures/groups were usually mentioned in vindication formulas of contracts, such as in BIN 6, 226 (tablet; the envelope features similar content):

- obv. 1. $\frac{1}{2}$ *ma-na* [kù].babbar
 2. *ší-im Šu-pí-a-ah-šu*
 3. *Ša-ak-ri-ù-ma-an <a-na>*
 4. *Še-zu-ur Ta-mu-ri-a*
 5. *ù Wa-áš-hu-pá*
 6. *gal ma-hi-ri-im*
 7. *hu-bu-li-šu*
 8. *iš-qú-ul Šu-pì-a-ah-[š]u*
 9. *ih-pì-ar*

⁴ Cf. Kloekhorst 2008, s.v. and Tischler 1994, s.v., for occurrences, semantics and etymological discussion. The substantive *tuzzi-* is attested in tablets that present an Old Hittite script, e.g. KBo 7.14 rev. 4 (acc. *tu-uz-zi-in*); in Old Hittite compositions it denotes the army (for instance in the bilingual Annals of Hattusili I, the Akkadian correspondence is *ummānum* or the Sumerogram ERIN^{MEŠ}). On Hittite *tuzzi-* as a military designation, see Beal 1992, 23–33, 128.

10. *Wa-áš-hu-pá*
- rev. 11. *i-na¹ Zi-lu-ú-na*
 12. *it-ru-a-šu*
 13. *lu tù-zì-nu-um*
 14. *lu bé-el ší-mì-šu*
 15. *lu ma-ma-an*
 16. *a-šu-mì Šu-pí-a-ah-šu*
 17. *a-na Ša-ak-ri-ú-ma-an*
 18. *lá i-tù-a-ar*
 19. *šu-ma i-tù-a-ar*
 20. *2 ma-na i-ša-q[a]l*
 (witnesses)

“Šakriuman paid half a mina of silver – the price of Šupiahšu,⁵ to Šakriuman, Tamuria and Wašhupa the overseer of the market. Šupiahšu escaped and Wašhupa⁶ carried him to Ziluna. The *tuzzinnum*, the *bēl šimi* and anyone (else) will not go back to Šakriuman about Šupiahšu. If one does, he will pay 2 minas of silver.”

In other cases, however, it is utterly impossible to interpret *tuzzinnum* as the designation of a single person, and it is debatable whether it indicates a group of people. These problems were convincingly illustrated by Dercksen (2004), who examined a number of pieces of evidence that I briefly summarize in the following list:

1. The “*t.* of the father” (Kt 87/k 39): if the slave flees and returns *a-na tù-zì-ni-im ša a-bi-šu*, a certain penalty is applied.

2. A woman and her son accept/take the “*t.* and the house(hold)” (Kt. 87/k 285). Also: after dividing the household, two brothers hold (*ú-kà-lu-ú*) the *t.* (Kt. 87/k 253). One may reasonably wonder whether the double-holding of the *tuzzinnum* indicates that it was “divided” (each one held his own *tuzzinnum*) or that they jointly held the same *tuzzinnum*.

3. Both a *rabi sikkātim* in Kt a/k 1263/b and a “Chief of the Staircase” (*rabi simmilti*) in Kt 91/k 282 have their own *t.*, which, in the latter case, is taken (*leqû*) by a different person along with a share in a transaction. These occurrences, according to Dercksen (2004, 149f.), also indicate that the *tuzzinnum* was a part of a larger unit (possibly, a part of an estate).

⁵ Anatolian personal name containing the elements *suppi-* and *(-)ahsu-*, as already recognized by Bilgiç 1954, 17.

⁶ In all likelihood, *Wašhupa-* is an Anatolian name, possibly Luwian and built on the substantive *washa-* (a problematic word, on which cf. Melchert 1993, s.v., Giusfredi 2010, 232; the best analysis at present being however that by Melchert 2015).

4. The king (*ru-ba-um*) enters to harvest the *t.* (*a-na tù-zi-nim e-ša-dim*) in Kt 88/k 90. This piece of evidence has, however, been disregarded, as Dercksen's (2005) later collation proved that the word in this text is in fact *hu-zi-nim* and not *tù-zi-nim*.⁷

The solution that Dercksen (2004) proposed was to assume that the *tuzzinum* was in fact a type of field, connected to a specific type of duty. The eSAD entry for *tuzzinum* is, accordingly: “a field tied to a type of service obligation; persons responsible for the performance of this obligation.”

In order to analyze this interpretation and assuming, of course, that *tuzzinum* was indeed a loan from Hittite, the substantive needs to be analyzed. Thus, in section §4, I will examine the formal aspects of the derivation process, while in section §5 I will discuss the semantics of the model word, Hitt. *tuzzi-*, to evaluate whether the meaning-related aspects of the derivation are conceivable. Finally, in section §6, based on the reconstruction I will outline, I will re-assess the problem of the meaning of *tuzzinum* in Old Assyrian texts.

4. Formal aspects: the -(V)nn- suffix and the loans into Akkadian

That several non-Semitic (and also Semitic) loans in Akkadian include a root- or theme-extension involving a nasal consonant is a fact that has not escaped the attention of either Assyriologists or Hittitologists. Since the nasal element, when the graphemics of the Akkadian variety involved allows it, appears to be geminate, and since the vowel preceding it is problematically elusive and variable, I will tentatively indicate this suffix as -(V)nn- (cf. also Dercksen 2007, 39ff.; Simon 2015, 104 with reference to an unpublished conference presentation by Vernet – Vernet 2014). While this formal peculiarity was previously mentioned in the study by Bilgiç (1954, 28–60), who concentrated on identifying Anatolian components and listed a number of words and morphs from the Cappadocian corpus, the role and origin of the -(V)nn- suffix remained unclear. Another important study was published by Starke (1993), who concentrated on the word *targumannum* (“interpreter, translator”)⁸ and took into consideration a limited number of lexical items. More recently, Marazzi (2010) conducted a more systematic analysis of the loans in Old Assyrian and proposed that the affixing of the Akkadian inflectional ending *-um* may in some cases have taken place starting from the accusative c. of the Hittite and Luwian substantives, with apparent exceptions that follow the pattern being explained by analogy.

⁷ Whether *h.* is also a loan from Anatolian is unclear. In LB 1216 (Dercksen 2005), it seems to be related to the “runners” and it occurs in a context in which TÚG textiles are also mentioned, which might relate to the Hittite ^{GADA}*huzzi-*, but a connection seems unlikely if one tries to connect the context of Kt 88/k, where cloths and textiles would be rather out of place.

⁸ *Targumannum* is emphatically *not* a nominal build from *ragāmu*.

This analysis would certainly explain the Old Assyrian evidence. If one extends the research to other loans that entered Akkadian, however, there is sparse evidence of the use of the *-(V)nn-* extension outside of loans from Anatolian (or Indo-European, in which a *-n* termination of the singular accusative might have entered the derivation). The instances of loans from Aramaic in Akkadian are unlikely to be explainable based on the plural morph *-n* (especially when one deals with the adaptation of personal names, e.g. *Hajjanu* for *HYH*, the name of a member of the Iron Age Aramaean ruling family of Sam'al),⁹ while Hurrian loans may or may not be taken into consideration because the article-like morph *-ne-* may have interfered (e.g. *daprānu* < *tabri-ne-*).¹⁰ Finally, Sumerian loans in Akkadian that present an *-(V)nn-* suffix also exist, e.g. *aluzinnum* (< *alan.zu* “trickster”),¹¹ possibly *agarunnum* (of unclear Sumerian origin; cf. George 1992, 324), but the problem with Sumerian-Akkadian lexical interference is often understanding the direction of borrowing, especially when no clear Semitic etymology is available and the Sumerian word is not clearly a genuine simple or compound morph.

As discussed by Streck (2005), there are also good reasons to hypothesize that a productive denominative nominal morpheme *-an-* existed in Akkadian, which produced concrete nouns from other nouns. All in all, it is, at present, very difficult to evaluate the nature and origin of the *-(V)nn-* suffix added to Anatolian loans in Old Assyrian. Adaptation strategy (possibly involving an Anatolian inflectional ending), analogy with respect to triconsonantal trisyllabic stems in the case of shorter words and extension of a genuine Akkadian morpheme to the construction of new nouns; all of these factors may have had an effect, and one cannot exclude that, to some extent, all of them did.

5. The origin of the loan and the meaning of the Hittite *tuzzi-*

Even if one were to commit oneself to a single interpretation of the nasal suffix (which in any case would appear attached both to animate and inanimate nouns), this would not be helpful in casting greater light on the meaning of *tuzzinum*. The idea that the word indicated both the type of field (or field-related service) and the person or people who were connected with it (possibly those who had to perform the duty), is aimed at giving a plain explanation of the occurrences as outlined above in §3, but the metonymic process would be typologically unusual, and it is necessary to at least attempt an explanation thereof.

⁹ Mentioned by Salmanassar III in the Kurkh Monolith (RIMAP 3.2 I 41ff.).

¹⁰ Also Ugaritic *dprn*. Cf. Haas and Wilhelm (1974, 89) and Watson (2004, 114).

¹¹ It was hypothesized that this pair of Mesopotamian words may have traveled all the way to the West and entered the Greek lexicon, where the word ἄλαζών, without convincing Greek etymology, designated a “trickster, fool” (cf. in general West 1994; Griffiths – Marks 2001, Rumor 2017).

What complicates things in the first place is the attempt to connect the word with the semantic field of the military, to which all historical occurrences of the Hittite base *tuzzi-* are strictly related (cf. HEG T, s.v.).

It is, however, possible to dispense with this problematic aspect. The relationship of the word with the semantic field of the “army” need not be assumed. In spite of some valiant attempts, the occasional associations of *tuzzinnum* with officials that bear military titles (Dercksen 2004) is not enough to conclude that the obscure Assyrian word was derived from a Hittite designation for the “army.” Indeed, following Melchert’s analysis, the military connotation of the Hittite *tuzzi-* is secondary: “Hitt. *tuzzi-* means primarily ‘camp’ (as proven by the denominative verb *tuzziya-* ‘to encamp’), only secondarily ‘army’ and reflects a virtual **dhh₁-u-ti-* ‘thing placed, pitched’ (Carruba 1966: 23, Neu 1971: 66, Melchert 1984: 166, Oettinger 1986: 29, Kloekhorst 2008: 908).”¹²

One may thus safely assume that the Assyrian *tuzzinnum* was in fact derived from the context in which the Hittite *tuzzi-* was the indication of a “camp” or “settlement” with no necessary relationship with the military sphere. This would make the borrowing scenario more convincing if one assumed that the *tuzzinnum* indicated, originally, not a field, but rather a portion of a larger household in which, perhaps, the people who belonged to the household were sheltered.¹³

6. The meaning of *tuzzinnum*

Once the problem of borrowing has been if not solved, at least duly analyzed in terms of all of its apparent features, it is time to turn to the issue of the meaning of the Old Assyrian substantive produced by means of the derivation and adaptation process. Based on the occurrences, there are cases in which *tuzzinnum* indicates one or more people, and cases in which it seems to refer to a portion of property. Following the interpretation proposed above, the portion of the property indicated would represent the quarters inhabited by the workers of a household. When the word indicates a group or a collective of people, these people would, of course, be this group workers who were obviously bound by duties of service. Finally, expressions such as *bēlū tuzzinnim* (Kt n/k 74, 12f., a contract for purchasing a slave that is typical in the vindication formula)¹⁴ would indicate the “managers” or representatives of this group.

The only evidence that strongly spoke for *tuzzinnum* being a field is its occurrence in Kt 88/k 90, where the king is said to come *a-na tū-zi-nim e-ša-dim*. This reading, however, is no longer defensible after Dercksen’s (2005) collation of the tablet, which showed that the word here is in fact *huzzinnum* and not

¹² Melchert 2016, 299 with fn. 3.

¹³ Note also that a similar extension of the meaning of *ubadi* (base to the Old Assyrian loan *ubadinnum*) seems to have taken place, as recorded by Marazzi 2010, 198–199, and also in that case the original meaning of the Anatolian word was *not* military.

¹⁴ Text in Donbaz 1988, 50–51.

tuzzinum.¹⁵ With this occurrence dismissed, the only evidence that would contradict the analysis presented in this contribution disappears.

7. Conclusion

In this modest contribution, I have examined the problem of the meanings of the Old Assyrian substantive *tuzzinum* and have reviewed some of the proposals concerning its correct interpretation to suggest a possible semantic explanation for its derivation as a loanword from Hittite *tuzzi-*, without assuming an unlikely relationship with the military sphere. According to my analysis, the meanings of *tuzzinum* derive from *tuzzi-* in its original meaning of “camp, encampment,” and indicates a portion of the estate inhabited by laborers that belonged to the household, and, by semantic extension, the laborers themselves. This hypothesis, while speculative, is semantically convincing and is consistent with the occurrences of the substantive that are currently attested.

Bibliography and bibliographical abbreviations

Beal, R.

1992 *The Organisation of the Hittite Military*. Heidelberg.

Bilgiç, E.

1954 *Die einheimischen Appellativa der Kappadokischen Texte und ihre Bedeutung für die anatolischen Sprachen*. Ankara.

Carruba, O.

1966 *Das Beschwörungsritual für die Göttin Wisurijanža* (StBoT 2). Wiesbaden.

Dercksen, J.G.

2004 “Some Elements of Old Anatolian Society in Kaniš”, in: J.G. Dercksen (ed.), *Assyria and Beyond. Studies Presented to Morgens Trolle Larsen*. Istanbul–Leiden, 137–177.

2005 “Again on Old Assyrian *tuzinum*,” *NABU* 2005/2, note 38.

2007 “On Anatolian Loanwords in Akkadian Texts from Kültepe,” *ZA* 97, 26–46.

Donbaz, V.

1988 “The Business of Ased, an Anatolian Merchant,” *AfO* 35, 48–63.

eSAD Supplement to the Akkadian Dictionaries, Altorientalisches Institut, Leipzig, <http://altorient.gko.uni-leipzig.de/etymd.html>.

¹⁵ Whether *huzzinum* is also a loan remains unclear. Its occurrence in LB 1216 (Dercksen 2005) associates it with the *lāsimu* and with cloths (TÚG), and in Hittite a ^{GAD}*huzzi-* is attested in VBoT 1, lower border, 32', but its meaning is obscure. Possibly, both the Hittite garment and the Assyrian *huzzinum* may derive from a third word, the meaning of which is not necessarily connected with textiles.

George, A.R

1992 *Babylonian Topographical Texts*. Leuven.

Giusfredi, F.

2010 *Sources for a Socio-Economic History of the Neo-Hittite States*. Heidelberg.

Goedegebuure, P.

2008 “Central Anatolian languages and language communities in the Colony period: The Luwian substrate of Hattian and the independent Hittites,” in: J.G. Dercksen (ed.), *Anatolia and the Jazira during the Old Assyrian period* (Old Assyrian Archives, Studies, Volume 3. = PIHANS 111). Leiden, 137–180.

Griffith, R.D. and R.B. Marks

2011. “A Fool by Any Other Name: Greek 'ΑΛΑΖΩΝ and Akkadian *aluzinnu*,” *Phoenix* 65, 23–38.

Güterbock, H.G.

1957 Review of J. Friedrich, *Hethitisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg 1952–54, *Oriens* 10, 350–362.

Haas, V. and G. Wilhelm

1974 “Zum hurritischen Lexikon,” *Orientalia* 43, 87–93.

Hecker, K.

1980 “Zur Beurkundung von Kauf und Verkauf im Altassyrischen,” *WO* 11, 64–75.

2004 “Altassyrische Texte,” in: B. Janowski and G. Wilhelm (ed.), *Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testament, Neue Folge. Band 1: Texte zum Rechts- und Wirtschaftsleben*. Gütersloh, 43–57.

Kloekhorst, A.

2008 *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon* (Leiden Indo-European etymological dictionary series 5). Leiden.

Marazzi, M.

2010 “Fenomeni interlinguistici e interscrittorî nella più antica documentazione hittita: qualche riflessione e alcune precisazioni di carattere linguistico-storico”, *Orientalia* 79, 104–206.

Melchert, H.C.

1984 *Studies in Hittite historical phonology*. Göttingen.

1993 *Cuneiform Luvian Lexicon*. Chapel Hill.

2003 “Prehistory,” in: H.C. Melchert (ed.), *The Luwians* (HdO 68). Leiden, 8–26.

2015 “Reciprocity and Commerce in Bronze and Iron Age Anatolia,” in: A. Archi (ed.), *Tradition and Innovation in the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the 57th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale at Rome, 4–8 July 2011*. Winona Lake, 409–416.

- 2016 “‘Western a nities’ of Anatolian,” in: B.S.S. Hansen, B.N. Whitehead, Th. Olander and B.A. Olsen (ed.), *Etymology and the European Lexicon. Proceedings of the 14th Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, 17–22 September 2012*. Wiesbaden, 297–305.
- Michel, C.**
2011 “The Kārum Period on the Plateau,” in: S.R. Steadman and J.G. McMahon (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Ancient Anatolia*. New York, 313–336.
- Neu, E.**
1971 “Noch einmal heth. *tuzzi-*,” *IF* 76, 66–71.
- Oettinger, N.**
1986 “*‘Indo-Hittite’-Hypothese und Wortbildung* (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, Vorträge und kleinere Schriften 37). Innsbruck.
- Rumor, M.**
2017 “There’s No Fool Like an Old Fool: The Mesopotamian *aluzinnu*,” *KASKAL* 14, 187–210.
- Schwemer, D.**
2005. “Lehnbeziehungen zwischen dem Hethitischen und dem Akkadischen,” *AoF* 51, 220–234.
- Simon, Zs.**
2015 “Altassyrisch *azuanum* : noch eine anatolische Entlehnung,” *NABU* 2015/3: 103-106 (Nr. 65).
- Starke, F.**
1990 *Untersuchungen zur Stammbildung des keilschriftluwischen Nomens* (StBoT 31). Wiesbaden.
1993 “Zur Herkunft von akkadisch *ta/urgumannu(m)* ‘Dolmetscher’,” *WO* 24, 20–38.
- Streck, M.**
2005 “Simply a Seller, Nothing but Gods. The Nominal Suffix *-an* in Old Babylonian,” *Babel und Bibel* 2 (= *Memoriae Igor M. Diakonoff*, 2005), 233–243.
- Vernet, E. and M. Vernet**
2014 “On the Hittite and Luwian Origin of Some Common Nouns in Cappadocian Old Assyrian Texts: a New Examination,” Unpublished paper presented at the 9th International Congress of Hittitology, Çorum.
- Watson, W.G.E.**
2004 “A Botanical Snapshot of Ugarit. Trees, fruit, plants and herbs in the cuneiform texts,” *AuOr* 22, 107–155.

West, M.L.

1994 "Some Oriental Motifs in Archilochus," *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 102, 1–5.