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*Tubar(i)-: a divine epithet reflected in Luwic onomastics

This article extends and discusses a study by M. Valério (2015), which deals with several groups of personal names from southern Anatolia. It is proposed here to reconstruct one onomastic stem, *tubar(i)-, common to several names from different language corpora belonging to the Luwic sub-group (Luwian, Carian, Pisidian) and Greek epigraphic sources from southern Anatolia (from Caria to Cilicia). This prolific element is associated with various divine names or epithets in compounds, which suggests that it corresponded to a divine title. Its meaning can be reconstructed as "battle companion, comrade-in-arms", originally qualifying various deities whose role was to guard their protégé on the battlefield.
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1. Introduction

For a long time, the Lycian place-name Tyberissos has been associated with the name of a Lycian hero, Τούβερις, indirectly referenced in a local myth documented by Stephanus of Byzantium. In a complementary study to the present article, I sought to ascertain the validity of this connection — whether Τούβερις was genuinely linked to the toponym or if it was a derivative form originating from it. During this investigation, I uncovered an onomastic stem *tubar(i)- attested in numerous Luwic anthroponyms, which appear not only in Luwian-, Carian-, or Pisidian-language records, but also in Greek sources from southern Anatolia. The extensive scope of these forms precluded a comprehensive analysis within the previous article, primarily dedicated to the toponym Tyberissos. Hence, the primary goal of the current work is to delve into this deeper exploration.

The present contribution lists and analyses all the names containing the stem *tubar(i)- across various corpora from southern Anatolia (§ 2). It further proposes a correlation between this onomastic stem, on the one hand, and Carian names in °δυβρ-/°δύβρ- as well as °νδυβερι-/°νδο/(υ)βα/ε/ηρα- (in Greek transmission), on the other hand. While these names were dealt with separately in Valério 2015, it is argued that [d] in the latter group is an allophone of /t/ in the position after [n] or [r] (§ 3). After examining a few anthroponymic compounds where *tubar(i)- appears as the first member (§ 4), the paper provides an overview of all personal names formed using this morpheme, categorizing them based on the accompanying element.

1 This paper has been written under the auspices of the Alexander von Humboldt Fellowship, which enabled my extended academic stay at the University of Marburg. At various stages of its development, it greatly benefited from the comments of Ignasi-Xavier Adiego, Alcorac Alonso Déniz, H. Craig Melchert, Enrique Nieto Izquierdo, Diether Schürr, and Ilya Yakubovich, to all of whom I am grateful. Ilya Yakubovich deserves additional thanks for his stylistic advice and the Russian translation. However, I am solely responsible for any errors that may be found.

2 For a discussion about the heronym and a full analysis of the toponym, I refer to Réveilhac forthc. a. The reader should be aware that sections 5, 6 and 7 of the present article are adaptations of passages already included in the article on Tyberissos. These paragraphs are, in fact, key points in the argumentation, which I feel justified in repeating for the sake of clarity.
It becomes apparent that, in the majority of instances, *tubar(i)- is linked to a theonym or a divine epithet, possibly functioning itself as a substitute for a divine name (§ 5). The article endeavours to establish that this stem originally represented a divine title, later adopted as a divine hypostasis. This title might have initially meant “battle companion, comrade-in-arms”, referencing the protective roles of tutelary deities on the battlefield — a concept echoed in Hittite and Luwian texts concerning various deities (§ 6). The concluding section compares this interpretation with instances of Lyc. B tuburiz, mentioned three times on the Xanthos Stele, albeit within obscure contexts (§ 7).

2. The onomastic stem tubar(i)-

While the Lycian hero Τούβερις is only known from late Greek sources, the stem *tubar(i)- is far better attested. Numerous personal names from southern Anatolia contain elements akin to the heronym conveyed by Stephanus of Byzantium. These potential candidates, found in various sources such as Hieroglyphic Luwian, Carian, Pisidian, and Greek inscriptions, are presented in Table 1. It is important to note that, at this stage, the comparison is purely formal and establishes an initial working hypothesis that needs further investigation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region (language of attestation)</th>
<th>Personal name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Anatolia (Hieroglyphic Luwian)</td>
<td>/TuPar(i)/- (tu-pari, nom. sg.)</td>
<td>Hattusa (Böğazköy)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>BoHa 19, no. 467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D-týbr-</td>
<td>Thebes</td>
<td>?6th-5th c. BCE</td>
<td>E.Th 2.1; Adiego 2007: 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dybr-</td>
<td>Thebes</td>
<td>?6th-5th c. BCE</td>
<td>E.Th 5.1; Adiego 2007: 97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kša-týbr-</td>
<td>Thebes</td>
<td>?6th-5th c. BCE</td>
<td>E.Th 2.2; Adiego 2007: 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kud-týbr-</td>
<td>Thebes</td>
<td>?6th-5th c. BCE</td>
<td>E.Th 9; Adiego 2007: 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt (Carian)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caria (Greek)</td>
<td>Σαγγο-τβηρις</td>
<td>Arlisseis</td>
<td>354 BCE</td>
<td>I.Carie hautes terres: 91.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lycia (Greek)</td>
<td>*Εμα-τοβορις (gén. Εματοβοριος)</td>
<td>Tios</td>
<td>1st c. BCE</td>
<td>TAM II: 550.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pisidia (Pisidian)</td>
<td>T[β]εοκ?-</td>
<td>Solufar</td>
<td>2nd-3rd c. AD</td>
<td>N 15; Brixhe 2016: 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pisidia (Greek)</td>
<td>Πεοτα-τουβαρις</td>
<td>Termessos</td>
<td>Imp.</td>
<td>I.Termessos Suppl. IV: 145.1, 2-3; 146.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Personal names potentially formed with the stem *tubar(i)-

The name /TuPar(i)/- attested in Hattusa in hieroglyphic transmission might be a direct match of Τούβερις’s underlying name, but its isolated character hardly allows us to go any further. Another simple name, dating to the Roman period in Pisidian records, is T[β]εοκ-, although unfortunately incomplete. Its restauration, based on Cilician compounds of Greek transmission in Tβεοκ° (see Section 4 below), gains additional support from the Carian name Σαγγο-τβηρις. To progress further, it is imperative to examine compound names, primarily in Greek transmission, which tend to be more understandable than those from Carian sources.
The vocalism of ῥτῷβος in Ερμα-τοβος reflects a specific evolution found in Lycian, also observable in the toponym Tuburehe(i)- contrasted with its Greek equivalent Τυβερσσας. The latter is likely adapted from a more archaic dialectal form (as suggested by Réveilhac forthc. a). 3 While the first element of Ερμα-τοβος is easily identifiable as the name of the Moon-god Arma (cf. Erinime-neveli-, Αμα-Πιας etc.), that of Περτα-τοβος is less apparent. However, the same base might be present in the Lycian place-name Παρταησσός 4 and the probable Lycian title partallta- (TL 35.14 and 16) of uncertain meaning, which does not significantly aid in its comprehension. Should one accept the equivalence between the Lycian name Παρταησσός and the divine epithet CLuw. Paratatess(i)-, a title found twice for the Storm-god with a likely meaning of “of Impurity” (based on CLuw. paratt(a)- “impurity”), 5 the hypothetical Lycian stem-form *parta- might have been directly used to form compounds, similarly to Luw. /piha/- “brightness, splendour” (Piha-muwa-, Piha-nan(i)-) compared to *pihaššali- “of brightness, splendour” (Pihašša-muwa-, Pihašša-walwi-).

In the name Σαγγο-τβης, a syncope in the second member’s first syllable is plausible, as it is well attested in Carian for unaccented vowels (Adiego 2007: 241–242). The isolated first element, Σαγγο-, is also found in the simple personal name Σαγγως (KPN § 1369; Halicarnassus, 5th c. BCE). Although its nature and meaning require further clarification, a speculative hypothesis can be put forward: if the themonym Ṣalupiya- (van Gessel 1998: 370), documented once in a Hittite cult inventory, 6 indeed corresponds to a compound (Satname?), the first element being the name of the Hurro-Hittite goddess Ṣalu-, wife of Kumarbi (Laroche 1946: 57; van Gessel 1998: 370), then a similar analysis might apply to Ṣanhupiya-, referring to a deity honoured in the northern regions of the Hittite Empire (van Gessel 1998: 371; Taracha 2009: 102). Thus, a hypothetical themonym Ṣanḫu- could be inferred from Ṣanhupiya- and linked to Σαγγως and Σαγγο-τβης.

In the Carian corpus, the identification of a similar element is supported by D-týbr-, where the first element can be traced back to *Ida-. This connection is evident in other Carian and Lycian forms such as Car. D-quaq- → Ιδα-γυνος or D-uosol-/Id-uosl- → Ιδ-υσσωλλος. 7 Similarly, in Kša-týbr- one can isolate the stem Kša-, which is potentially linked to the group of Luw. *hassa/- “hearth” (inferred from CLuw. haššanitt(i)- “hearth”), Hitt. ḫasša- “hearth” and Lyc. xaha- “id.”. An alternative hypothesis is to link it to the element found in the patronymic of Thales, Εξα-μυης, 8 and in Εξα-βως/Αξα-βως. 9 The combination of the element Εξα- with -μυης (← muwa- “power, drive”) 10 hints at a possible association with a deity, although a de-

3 This evolution proceeds from a progressive assimilation, favoured by the presence of the bilabial fricative rendered by (b). There is also a matching phenomenon of regressive assimilation -e-u- > -u-u-, as in the case of urublije- “monument” as opposed to erublije-, attested once and probably derived from the verb eruwc- “to build” (Martínez Rodríguez 2019: 221).

4 This place name is documented in the Life of Saint Nicholas of Sion (Anrich 1913: § 57.16–17); the saint lived in Lycia under Justinian and his hagiography was written shortly after his death (Anrich 1917: 536). On the value of this Byzantine text for the study of local toponymy, see Robert 1955: 197–208.


6 About this text (CTH 510), see Cammarosano 2015: 221.

7 The same element is found in Carian in forms such as D-biks- or D-bkm- (Adiego 2007: 334) and in Lycian in the simple name Ειδα (KPN § 451-2) and in compounds such as Ida-maxxa- → Ιδα-μαξας or Idazzala- → Ειδα-σαλας (vs. Zalla- → Σαλας or Ειδα-σαλας); see Réveilhac 2018: 501-502.

8 D.L. 1.22, 29. Sud. s.v. Θαλλης; St.Byz. s.v. Μαρτινους.

9 Εξα-βως: Balboura, 2nd c. BCE; Αξα-βως: Pisidia, 2nd c. BCE.

10 On this lexeme, see now Valério 2023.
finitive etymology remains uncertain at this stage. Regarding Kud-tubr-, the element Kud-might mirror Luw. */huda-/ “haste, swiftness”, documented in Hittite as Glossenkeilwort in the form hūda- and as a derivational base in CLuw. hūtarlānn(i)- and hutarlı(ya)-, and Lyc. *xuda-“haste”, deduced from the agent noun xddazā- “slave” and the personal names Xudalīje(je), Xudalija- and Xudara- (Rieken & Sasseville 2022). However, accepting this link requires assuming an evolution PLuw. *hu > Car. ku, in addition to the established change into qu (e.g. *Tarhunt- > Trqūt-, *huha- “grandfather” > quq-), which demands further supporting evidence. If this hypothesis were correct, Kud- might represent an epithet that is close in meaning to Hittite nuntar in nuntaraš 4LAMMA “Tutelary Deity of Swiftness” (see van Gessel 1998: 694 for the attestations).

Yet, it is crucial to examine the connection between the elements týbr- and tubr-, whose vocalism differs. To consider them as potential variants of the same morpheme, it is necessary to assume an effect of i-umlaut triggering the fronting of [u] > [y] in týbr-. PLuw. *[tubari-] > PCar. *[tyberi-] > Car. [tybr-]. Such a phenomenon is known in Carian (as well as Lycian) for other vowels, as seen in ted- “father” (cf. Lyc. tede/i-) vis-à-vis Luw. /tad(i)-/ “id.” or in en-mother (cf. Lyc. ène/i-) vis-à-vis Luw. /ann(i)-/ “id.” (Adiego 2007: 259). Adiego (2007: 257) suggested that the same pattern accounts for the ethnic suffix -i(yn)- (e.g. khbdyn- “Caunian”) derived from PLuw. *-wanna/i- (cf. Luw. /-wanna/i-, Lyc. B -wîne/i-, Lyc. A -îne/i-). Melchert (2021: 108) gives arguments against the conditioned fronting of [u] in [y] that can be countered: 1) ybt need not correspond to the preterite “(he) offered” (< *uboto, cf. Lyc. ubote), but could just as plausibly represent the present in *-ti “(he) offers” (as already proposed by Adiego 2007: 259); 2) the analysis of týn as the infinitive of a form related to Luw. /tuwa-/ relies on the overall interpretation of the inscription CHa 1, which is not based on communis opinio (other hypotheses exist, see Adiego 2007: 283–284); 3) the final morpheme (better than “suffix”) ¿eym- in Paraeym- probably represents a participial stem in *-mmah- subject to i-mutation, as suggested by the name Ὠῥὸδ-ημοὺς (vis-à-vis Αρτ-ημος), which would justify the fronting of [u] → [y].

Efforts have been taken to establish connections between the aforementioned names to other names from the Carian corpus and the Greek corpus in Asia Minor. The most comprehensive exploration on this subject, to the best of my knowledge, is found in Valério 2015, which builds upon earlier research concerning the Linear A du-pu-re and the Hittite t/labarna- (Valério 2007). In this contribution, several pages are devoted to Carian names in °DUbr-, 13 Lycian names in ὦδόβεοι- and Cilician names in ὦδο(υ)βα/ε/ηρας-, as well as Lycian Tubure/i- ὦφορωι (Valério 2015: 333–339). Acknowledging the challenge posed by the interpretation of the personal names from the Carian sources, the paper eventually arrives at the conclusion that reducing all the concerned personal names to a singular and variable element *DUbr- is unfeasible. Valério 2015 suggests instead the stem *()-yb(y)r-, associated with the alleged element *(*)ubéo- identified in Neumann 2007: 399. Following Neumann’s proposal, Valério cautiously attempts to link this virtual element with the group of Hitt. warri- “to help” and HLuw. /warri(ya)-/ “id.”, albeit acknowledging a major phonetic challenge: such a hypothesis would require admitting not a proto-form *warri- but **uwarri- > *uweri- (Valério 2015: 335). This sug-

11 The development must have been as follows: *-wanni (common gender direct case) > (*-wni > *-uni- > -yin- (in the Egypto-Carian system)/yun-. In addition to the rule [a] → [e] / (C)_C[i], there would therefore also be [u] → [y] / (C)_C[i] or, to subsume both, a more general phonological rule V[thick] → [back] / (C)_C[i].

12 It is tempting to see the element *eym- → ἦμος / Ἠμος as a cognate of the stem found in the Lycian personal names Lwénei- and Un-uwemei-: it would then represent the participle of a verb probably meaning “to look (favourably)” (CLuw. awa- “to see”; Lyc. A and B uwe- “to look favourably”; Lyd. ow- “id.”, according to Sasseville 2020: 289–290).

13 Where D = voiced or voiceless dental, and U = [u] or [y].
gestion is also based on the assumption that an intervocalic *w can be strengthened into [β]. However, similar to the situation in Lycian, there is a lack of such a phonetic process in Carian.\(^{14}\)

One argument put forward to advocate the Carian anthroponymic (and lexical) stem *[^y]b[y]r[^r]- is the existence of the simple personal name in the genitive Ybrsś (C.Hy 1, 7-8). Nevertheless, unlike the previous forms, it represents an s-stem. This anthroponym finds a plausible avatar in the name Ὀβραςις attested in Cilicia (LGPN 5b; Olba, 1st c. BCE), easily aligning with the larger group of personal names in uppara-/ο(υ)πρα-/ο(υ)βρα- (Houwink ten Cate 1961: 162–164; Melchert 2013: 44). It is conceivable that the [y] might have arisen due to the i-mutation affecting the suffix *-assali- (as seen in Ὀβραςις). After excluding Ybrsś from the equation, a Carian stem (*[^y]br[^r]- (with U = [u] or [y]) emerges, showing similarity to ὀτοβορίς/ ὀτύβορίς/ ὀτήρις, or even to the Luwian name /TuPar(i)/, and the Pisidian name Τ[β]ορίς.

The case of Car. Dýbr- presents a more complex challenge. The initial (d) might have emerged from an interchange with (t), following the neutralization of the two underlying phonemes in the initial position, if one follows a plausible hypothesis that /d/ and /b/ may have undergone a devoicing in this position in Carian.\(^{15}\) Another possibility is that it could be secondarily derived from the allomorph ὀτυβρ- found after [n] or [r], as in Ar-τυβρ- (see Section 3 below). A third solution could be regarding this name as a compound D-γbr-, where the element *Ida-, previously identified in D-τybr-, is associated with the stem *γbr- found in Ybrsś, which I propose to connect to the uppara-/ο(υ)πρα-/ο(υ)βρα- group. To explain the initial [y], one might refer to rarer forms where this same stem seems to have a final -i, such as the names Ὀβρι-μοτής/ Ὀβρι-μοσής (Pisidia). However, a caveat must be expressed: all the compounds in this group display the element uppara-/ο(υ)πρα-/ο(υ)βρα- as the first member, with the notable exception of Κινδυ-οπρας/ Κιδ-ουβρης. While this doesn’t necessarily refute this interpretation conclusively, additional unambiguous parallels would be required to reinforce it.

3. An allomorph after [n] and [r]

So far, I have intentionally omitted several names in ὀ(ν)-DUlt(V)r(αi)l-,\(^{16}\) due to their specific examination in Valério 2015. The names concerned are listed in Table 2.

This list does not include the Lycian name group Xİта́бure → Κενεβορις/Κενεβορις/ Κενεβορις, of which Καθόμορις represents an additional variant with nasal reduction (see below, in this section) and vowel labialisation next to [b] or [β]. These forms mirror a compound Xİтабъūre- (cf. Lyc. B xİтабъa- and Luw. /ura-/ “great”), similar to HLuw. MAGNUS.REX in structure and meaning (Yakubovich 2017: 46; Réveilhac 2018: 437).

\(^{14}\) The outcome of PAnat. *w in Carian is certainly not clear, but it is likely to produce [w] or [u] in certain sequences: e.g. muo- vis-à-vis Luw. /mawa-/ “four” (Adiego 2019a: 18–20, 25–26; followed by Simon in Bauer et al. 2022) and kēouš, if it reflects an earlier *hantsas-, as is reasonable to assume (see Simon 2022a for a detailed discussion). The data are more numerous for Lycian: PAnat. *arowa- “freedom” > Lyc. arawa-, PAnat. *grω- “ox” > Lyc. ωωω-, PAnat. *dawV- “to place” > Lyc. tuwe-. Pace Sasseville 2021: 177, it is methodologically problematic to rely on the Lycian B form xİтaba- to demonstrate the strengthening of intervocalic *w into [β] in Lycian B given that its exact meaning and formation are unknown. It is on the basis of this argument that I reject the connection sometimes made between the name of Tyberissos and HLuw. /tuwaris(a)/ (Réveilhac forthc. a).

\(^{15}\) Cautiously in Adiego (2007: 246). However, this seems to be confirmed by the group of names based on the root *βήρ-, such as Pikre-, Pik(a)rm- etc.

\(^{16}\) Here, U = rounded vowel going back to *u, and V = any vowel. The unorthodox notation of this sequence has a purely conventional and practical function, in order to group together different linguistic and graphic variants of the same stem.
### Table 2. Personal names in \(^{(n)}\)-Ub(V)r(a/i)-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region (language of attestation)</th>
<th>Personal name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caria (Carian)</td>
<td>Smδýbr-(^{17})</td>
<td>Halicarnassus</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>C.Ha 1; Adiego 2007: 114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Σδούbr-</td>
<td>Krya</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>C.Kr 1.2; Adiego 2007: 158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caria (Greek)</td>
<td>Ξεμεδυβερος</td>
<td>Caunos</td>
<td>354 BCE</td>
<td>I.Carie hautes terres : 90.18 (Ξεμεδυβερος); 91.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lycia (Greek)</td>
<td>Ερμανδυβερος (gen. Ερμανδυβερος)</td>
<td>Phellos</td>
<td>2nd–1st c. BCE</td>
<td>SEG 53: 1696.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ερμανδυβερος</td>
<td>Limyra</td>
<td>Imp.</td>
<td>Wörrle 2012: 71. 4; 73.1; 3; 81.5; SEG 54: 1406.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ξανδυβερος</td>
<td>Typallia</td>
<td>Imp.</td>
<td>Peterschen and von Luschan 1889: 149, no. 180.8; SEG 6: 624.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Περετενδυβερος</td>
<td>Arykanda</td>
<td>Imp.</td>
<td>I.Arykanda: 143.2; 59; 128.5.; 136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pisidia (Greek)</td>
<td>Μινδυβηρας (Μινδυβηρας)</td>
<td>Selge</td>
<td>1st c. AD</td>
<td>Bean and Mitford 1970: 201a.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isauria</td>
<td>Ξανδυβηρας (gen. Ξανδυβηρου)</td>
<td>Iotape</td>
<td>Imp.</td>
<td>CIG: 4413d.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Σακσκυνδυβερος</td>
<td>Isaura Nea</td>
<td>Imp.</td>
<td>Sterrett 1888: 181.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ινδοβηρας</td>
<td>Kestros</td>
<td>1st-2nd c. AD</td>
<td>Bean and Mitford 1970: 167.2; 168.2; 182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ινδοβηρος</td>
<td>Lamos</td>
<td>Imp.</td>
<td>Bean and Mitford 1970: 193.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cilicia</td>
<td>Μανδουβιρας (gen. Μανδουβιρου)(^{18})</td>
<td>Diokais-area/Olba</td>
<td>Byz.</td>
<td>I.Westkilikien Rep: 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Μοτονδοβερος (gen. Μοτονδοβερου)</td>
<td>Olba</td>
<td>1st c. BCE</td>
<td>I.Cilicie: 11 A II.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ρονδοβερος (gen. Ρονδοβερου)</td>
<td>Olba</td>
<td>1st c. BCE</td>
<td>I.Cilicie: 11 A II.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ρονδβερας</td>
<td>Olba</td>
<td>2nd c. BCE</td>
<td>Heberdey and Wilhelm 1896: 155 A II.34; 69; 84; 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{17}\) In the form Smδýbrs, which appears at the beginning of the inscription, the final -s can theoretically belong to the stem of the name (cf. Ybrsś in C.Hy 1a) or represent an inflectional suffix. The analysis depends closely on the interpretation of the inscription in which the form occurs and on the value of the s-case itself. On these thorny issues, see especially Adiego 2007: 283–284 and Melchert 2021: 111–112.

\(^{18}\) Nominative Μανδουβιρος in LGPN 5b. But in view of the other occurrences in the region, one would rather expect a final -ας.
After refuting the existence of a *DUbr- stem in Carian, Valério (2015: 335–338) offered an alternative account. He suggested that the alleged stem *νδόβηρα‑νδόβηρα‑ and its variants should be interpreted as a reflection of Lyc. *ntuweri-, which is inferred from the hapax ntuweriha, found on one of the faces of the Xanthos Pillar (TL 44b.57): se=deuβ : zxxazα : se ntuweriha : ade “he made a gift to the fighters and ἵτ.”. The Lycian term is analysed as a substantive derived from a substantive *ntuweri-, which consists of the prefix ἰτε- “in, within” and *wερι‑ “help” (cf. Hitt. warr- “to help”, HLuw. /warriya-/) with e > u in contact with w. This etymology finds support in the Hittite expression anda warišša- “to come to one’s aid”. The concept of “assistance, help” (vel sim.) that emerges from this etymology fits well the context of the aforementioned Lycian passage and would not be unjustified in theophoric personal names such as Εὐμανδύβερις/Εὐμανδοβερις, interpreted as possessive compounds “Who has the assistance of X”, where X represents a theonym like the Moon god Arma. Without disputing the meaning of the Lycian leexeme, the details of its formation are of major importance for the present purpose. Nteweriha is an action noun derived from the verb *ntuweri-, which is structurally comparable to Hitt. (anda) warišša- (Sasseville 2023; contra Neumann 2007: 253–254): on this basis, it would be necessary to reconstruct ntuweriha- (Lyc. A), *ntuwerisa- (Lyc. B), or even *ntuwarisa- (PLyc.) stems, which can hardly be aligned to the onomastic stem. Additionally, a significant phonetic challenge arises: the glide [w] is never rendered by a (β) in Greek onomastics, but rather surfaces as ῥωνδόβερις, or as a hiatus after ῥονδόβερρας. Let us begin by interpreting the simpler compounds:

- Εὐμαν‑δύβερις/Εὐμαν‑δύβερις ← /Arman(t)/- (Moon-god), thus a variant of Εὐμας‑τοβορις;
- Ταρκυ‑δύβερις ← /Tarthun(t)/- (Storm-god), with syncope of the initial vowel in the second member (as seen in Ρονδόβερας below);
- Ρον‑δύβερις/Ρον‑δύβερας ← /Run(ta)/- (Protective Stag-god).

The devil’s advocate could argue that the proposed segmentation in these theophoric compounds is unverifiable, given that all three theonymic stems end in -nt-. The case of Περτενδύβερις might be, however, less ambiguous, if the first member indeed reflects Lyc. (A and B) perepi “further(more)” (perhaps to be understood as divine epithet), as in Περτεννυμις (vis‑à‑vis Νυμις ← nēn/ei‑) and Περτεννυμις (vis‑à‑vis Ονεμις).

This hypothesis could also shed light on the formation of other anthroponymic compounds, although the identification of their first member is not always straightforward. As for

---

19 See already the embarrassment of Schürr (2013: 28) to account for the formation of several Carian names.
20 This was the analysis adopted in Réveilhac 2018: 490–491. Compare with the numerous Anatolian compounds of the type X‑maw‑ “Who has the might of X” (Houwink ten Cate 1961: 166–169; Laroche 1966: 322–324; Melchert 2013: 33–34).
21 The Cilician data in -ας suggest that *tubara‑ replaced *tubar(i)- in Cilicia.
22 Another possibility, suggested to me by Ilya Yakubovich, would be to see in the first member the cognate of Car. armon “interpreter”, then perhaps used as a divine epithet.
Mındanbaş and its likely variant Manvūbaš, the first member can receive two interpretations. One interpretation would be to regard Muν- and Maν- as variants of Mṇu-, reflecting the name of the Moon-god Men, with one variant displaying iotacism — a common feature in the imperial period in Anatolia — and the other retaining the older vocalism (Sittig 1911: 153–155; Masson 1990: 327–328). The worship of Men is well-documented in certain Anatolian regions, particularly in Roman Pisidia, where Mındanbaš is attested. If this interpretation holds, Manvūbaš/Manvūbaš could stem from a secondary adaptation of the group of Αμαντοβαρας/Αμαντοβαρας/Εμαντοβαρας, substituting Men’s name for that of Arma, which is also a Moon-god. An alternate analysis would be to see the first member as a *mında- element, supported by other anthroponyms: Lyc. Mǐntetel(/i)-, Mëndēc (LGPN 5b; Lycia, Olympus, 3rd c. AD), Mëndēc (see KPN § 920), Mëndēc (LGPN 5b; Cilicia, Kestros, 1st-2nd c. AD), or Mṇdēw (LGPN 5b; Milyas, Soklai, 4th-5th c. AD). The stem of these names may be tentatively related to Lyc. miṇte/i- (cf. Gk. μινδής, μενδής), denoting a local authority sometimes linked to deities (cf. mahāi miṇtehi “of the gods of the miṇte/i-”; TL 58.5), or alternatively to Lyc. mēte- “damage, harm” (cf. Hitt.-Luw. mantalla/i- “poisonous, slanderous”, Lyd. mētr(i)-/mēt(i)- “harm”).

The first element of Ξανδυβερις and Ξανδοβηρας has been associated by Neumann (2007: 144–145) with Lyc. B ἔξαθα- (TL 44d, 44), potentially underlying the Greek name of the city of Ξανθός (otherwise called arīma- in Lycian A), although this remains uncertain. The same stem appears in the Pamphylian anthroponym Ξανδαροιζας (LGPN 5c; Kibyra Mikra, imp.), which can be segmented as Ξανδα-φοις thanks to the comparison with Pou̲ţaς (Cilicia)/Pou̲ţaς (Lycia)/Pou̲ţaς (Pisidia). Based on this, it is tempting to place the morpheme boundary between Ξαν-, on the one hand, and-βερις/-βηρας, on the other. However, factoring in Εμαν-βερις/Εμαν-βηρας vis-à-vis Εμανβηρας, Τακκουν-βερρας vis-à-vis Τακκουνβηρας, and Ρων-βερρας/Ρων-βηρας vis-à-vis Ρωνβηρας, it is conceivable that the first element in Ξαν-βερις/Ξαν-βηρας vis-à-vis Ξανδα-φοις shows variation */ksanta/- */ksanta-. This stem might tentively correspond to HLuw. /hasta/- “abundance”: it would reflect a derived possessive adjective *has-ant(i)- “having abundance”, to be linked to the Palaic adjective hasawant-, used as a divine epithet of the Hattian deity Kamama (van Gessel 1998: 216), who belongs to the group of the protective 4KAL deities (Laroche 1973: 85-86). Also belonging to the 4KAL group, the Luwian god Runitya is also presumably hidden behind Pouţaς: in the compound Ξανδα-φοις, the Luwian protective deity too appears to be associated with abundance.

The names from Cilicia Ινδοβαρας and Ινδοβηρας contain a first element that can be linked to several simple names from the same region, namely Ινδας, Ινδης, or even Ινδους (see LGPN 5b: 213–214). These names have a root that resembles the Luwian adverb inta “below”. This adverb is known in Cuneiform Luwian as an epithet of the Sun-god Tiwad, invoked in association with his celestial counterpart [sarr]i Tiwats-, meaning “Tiwad above”.

23 See also the Pamphylian onomastic element Meina-, Meina- representing the name of Men (Brixhe 1976: 29 and 136).
24 On the cult of Men in Pisidia, see especially Labarre 2010. Note that the divine name may have been converted into a personal name in Pisidian, as indicated by several attestations of Mṇu- in the Pisidian corpus.
25 Despite the doubts expressed by Zgusta (KPN: 317, fn. 219), there is no need to resort to a Thracian interpretation of this name (as a variant of the well-known Brvēdēc).
26 Procopius of Caesarea, De bellis, 7.36.26, as the name of an Isaurian.
27 Perhaps Ξανθα, attested in an Athenian inscription (IG II² 7926, 2nd c. BCE) as the name of a Galatian from Ancyra, should also be added, but this remains uncertain (KPN § 1060).
28 See Sasseville 2022, for a discussion about the Palaic word, with references.
29 I thank Ilya Yakubovich, who suggested this connection.
(KUB 32.10+ obv. 12'; Yakubovich and Mouton 2023, vol. 1: 209). This duality between a solar deity "above" and a solar deity "below" is likely explained in KBo 29.3+ ii 25–26, where the Sun-god (of Heaven) is associated with the living, while the Sun-goddess of the Earth is associated with the dead (Mouton 2023: 128). The root ḫw- likely reflects the epithet "below", which has replaced the divine onomastic sequence ḫinda Tiwad/. Therefore, ḫw-dīyaṣ/ ḫw-dīyaṣ is based on a formula meaning "(Tiwad) Below tubar(i)-".

In the case of Zeqemēdibēre ... ade (Lycia), rightly interpreted as derived from the divine name Ζερμουνδις (Schättler 2013: 28). The latter is documented on various votive stelae from Central Lycia, indicating one...

30 Pace Valério (2015: 335), who regards the pair Zeqemēdibēre/Zeqmoun dias as a hint that there was a stem Zeqm-, possibly extended into Zeqemēdibēre, without however succeeding in offering a comprehensive explanation. Adiego (2019b: 147, fn. 2) prefers not to include the name Zeqmoun dias in his study of names in -zarma-, -sarma-, -zialma-

31 The meaning of zarma- is inferred from the graphic alternation attested for the personal name iyarrazalma-/ iyarra-PAP-. (Laroche 1966: nos. 430 and 433), since the sumerogram PAP/PAB is used in Hittite texts as the equivalent of paš- "to protect".

32 Nevertheless, Adiego (2019b: 157–159) prefers to remain cautious about the origin of the stem -zialma-, which could also reflect the Luwian contracted variant Sarma- of the divine name Sarruma-, following the analysis of Houwink ten Cate 1961: 134–136.

33 Indeed, it cannot be ruled out that the element zarma- is verbal, in which case all the names X-zarma- with X = divine name would be Satznamen meaning "X, protect (him)!". Such an explanation would then shed light on forms such as HLuw. /Taru-hazalma-/ Τροκό-ιαμάς, Ρω-ιαμάς and Ια-ιαμάς (cf. Luwian personal names of the type /Tharu-zalma/-). 

34 Cf. fn. 17 above.

35 On the place of this divine name in southern Anatolian onomastics, see Houwink ten Cate 1961: 136–137.

or several places of worship dedicated to this deity. It has been suggested elsewhere (Réveilhac forthc. c) that the divine name Σομενδις/Σομενδις should be seen as an ancient epiclies corresponding to CLuw. *zammant(i)-/zammant(i)-, also used as a Glossenkeilwort in Hittite contexts. Literally meaning “having the zam(ma)n-”, this adjective, mostly employed in ritual contexts, could convey the active meaning of “damaging” or the passive meaning of “damaged”, both possibly referring to the supernatural impact on the patient in purification rituals. The name Σεμενδής likely denotes a possessive derivative in *-assali-, implying “Belonging to Soumendis / the zammant(i)- deity”, 37 while Smδγρ‑ might reflect the sequence *Zammant(i)- tubar(i)‑.

Nevertheless, it is essential to exercise caution in the last two cases. If a second member *γυρ‑ is acknowledged in Car. Dγρ‑ (see Section 2 above), then it could also potentially be found in Σοδγρ‑ and Smδγρ‑. These two names, therefore, remain equivocal, although, as noted earlier, the prevalence of compounds with οππαρα‑/ο(υ)πρα‑/ο(υ)βρα‑ as the first member makes the interpretation with *tubar‑- more plausible in my perspective.

Moreover, the voicing of [t] into [d] extends beyond the position after [n(d)] and likely encompasses the position after [r, as observed in Lycian, evident in examples like Natr-bbijemeli‑ (→ Απολλό‑δοτος) compared to Mahane‑pijeme/i‑ → Μανα‑τιμ[i]ς and πιε‑ “to give” (Réveilhac 2021: 566). This pattern appears in variants of the same name, as depicted in Table 3 below.

| Egypt (Carian) | Ardybyr‑ | Memphis | 76th–5th c. BCE | E.Me 52; Adiego 2007: 72 |
| Caria (Greek) | Βρδμβερος | Halicarnassus | 5th–4th c. BCE | SEG 43: 713C.2; 9; 36 |

Table 3. Two variants of a personal name in Ḍ‑dybVra‑.

In the Carian name Ardybyr‑ → Βρδμβερος, the first member can also be found in A[r]bijarm‑ vs‑a‑vis Pik(a)rm‑. This element is ambiguous and might correspond to: 1) an adverbial element meaning “high” (cf. Luw. /aru‑); 38 2) the Carian appellative er‑ “companion” and Lycian өeri‑ “id. (?)” (cf. Hitt. arâ‑); 39 3) a divine name, reflecting 4Aral‑ found in the Hittite documentation (KBo 52.56 ii 14; cf. van Gessel 1998: 45).

4. The stem *tubar‑i‑ as first member in compounds

Houwink ten Cate (1961: 159) proposed an interpretation of Τβερασητας, Τβερημωσις, Ρωνδβερρας, and Ταρκυνδβερρας, presenting them as compound names containing an element akin to Luw. *tupara‑ “ruler”. Nevertheless, Valério (2015: 342) rightfully dismissed this interpretation, based on the comparison with Luw. *uppara‑ which became Ο(υ)πρα‑ in Hellenistic forms, implying that one would expect *tupara‑ > **TVβρα‑. Valério suggested viewing the first member of Τβερασητας and Τβερημωσις as a reflection of a Proto-Anatolian element

37 Like in the Lyc. B personal name Masasali‑ “Belonging to the god(s)”.
38 See also Houwink ten Cate (1961: 172–173), where the adverbial element er‑i‑ is identified in several names, although some of them actually display another adverbial element, hri, such as Αρμοας/Ερμοας, reflecting Hrûmnu‑ and having Σεμιμας as a Lycian B avatar (Réveilhac 2018: 486).
39 For the Carian form, see Simon 2016–2017. The Lycian өeri‑, which is not assured, could be the second member of a possible compound tidere/i‑ “collacteus”, with in the first member *tide‑ “teat” (see Melchert 2004: 66; and Neumann 2007: 360–361, with discussion and references). Adiego (2022: 83) suggests interpreting the Cilician names Τάρκυνμας and Τάρκυνως as Satznamen reflecting a clause with a vocative *Tarhu, ar‑ “Tarhunt, (be) his comrade!” but could it also be *Tarhu, ar‑ “Tarhunt, raise (him)!”. 
*d(u)warā- “long-lasting” (< PIE * dweh₂-rō- “long”) or a Luwian adjective *tuwala- (cf. Hitt. tuwala- “distant”) > *t(u)warā- (Valério 2015: 344–345). While this proposal is ingenious, its foundation is tenuous due to the absence of additional lexical or anthroponymic data. Moreover, the semantic aspect is not as apparent as suggested by the author. The proposed translations “Man of long-lasting might” and “Long-lasting man” for Τβερημωσις and Τβηρασητας respectively are not conclusive, since compounds with a second member *muwa- and *ašetās are usually theophoric, which suggests the need for a divine element (name or epithet) as the first element.

The association of two Carian forms with this small group of names from Cilicia, Τβερημωσις, Ρων-δβερρας, could either be a pan-Luwian or a regional (post-Luwian) feature. Consequently, the interpretation of these anthroponyms could be as follows:

— Τβαρα-μοτας < */Tubara-muwatat-i̯ “Tubar(i)- (of) Conquest” or “Having the Might of Tbar(i)" (cf. HLuw. /muwatat-);
— Τβερη-μωσις < */Tubara-muwaṣṣa/i- “Mighty Tbar(i)"- or “Tubar(i)- of Might” (cf. HLuw. /muwaṣṣa/i-);
— Τβερη-ασητας < */Tubara-assattat/i̯ “Tubar(i)- (of) Peace” or “Having the peace of Tbar(i)"-” (Luw. in Hittite transmission *ašṣattat)."}\n
5. Synthesis on the compounds with *tubar(i)-

So far, I have endeavoured to demonstrate the existence of the stem *tubar(i)- in southern Anatolian onomastics. This stem, which has sometimes undergone phonetic variations, clearly appears in compounds as a second member after a first member ending in a vowel (e.g. Εμμα-...
I have argued that this same stem displays an allomorph with initial [d] when it comes after a first member ending in [n] (e.g. Ερμαν-δοβερις/Ερμαν-δυβερις) or [r] (e.g. Ar-dybyr/-Αρ-δυβερος). I have also suggested identifying *tubar(i)‑ as the first member of (rarer) compounds, in full for Τοβορ‑ορας (Caria), but with syncope in a few Cilician names (e.g. Τβαρα‑μοτας). If one accepts this argumentation, it is possible to make use combinatorial analysis in order to interpret the meaning of the stem under discussion. Below one finds a summary of the compounds with *tubar(i)‑, ordered according to the associated stem type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal name</th>
<th>Divine name</th>
<th>Deity's function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ar-.dybyr-</td>
<td>Aρ-δυβερος</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-tybr-</td>
<td>Ida-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ερμα‑τοβορις</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ερμα‑δοβερις</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ερμα‑δυβερις</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ραν‑δοβερος</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ραν‑δεβερος</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σαγγο‑τβηρις</td>
<td>*Sanhu‑ (cf. *Sanhupiya‑)?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?Σοδυρ‑</td>
<td>Sanda‑</td>
<td>War-god</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ταρκυν‑δεβερος</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Type 1, X‑tubar(i)‑, where X = divine name → “(Deity) tubar(i)‑”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal name</th>
<th>Divine epithet</th>
<th>Epithet’s class and meaning</th>
<th>Parallels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ζερμου‑δυβερος</td>
<td>*zarmant(i)‑</td>
<td>Participle/adjetive: “protecting”?</td>
<td>Ζερμουνδις</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ιν‑δοβιρας</td>
<td>Luw. /inda/</td>
<td>Adverb: “below”</td>
<td>Ινδας Ινδης Ινδις</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ιν‑δοβηρας</td>
<td>Luw. /inda/</td>
<td>Adverb: “below”</td>
<td>Ινδας Ινδης Ινδις</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Κσα‑tybr‑</td>
<td>Luw. /huda‑/</td>
<td>Substantive: “haste, swiftness”</td>
<td>Κουδες?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Κου‑tub‑</td>
<td>Luw. /huda‑/</td>
<td>Substantive: (official institution)</td>
<td>Κου‑tub‑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Λον‑δοβιρας</td>
<td>Lyc. miîte/i‑ or môte‑?</td>
<td>Substantive: “harm, damage”</td>
<td>Λον‑δοβιρας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Λον‑δοβηρας</td>
<td>Lyc. miîte/i‑ or môte‑?</td>
<td>Substantive: “harm, damage”</td>
<td>Λον‑δοβηρας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Μοτον‑δοβερας</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Μοτον‑δοβερας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ξαν‑δοβιρας</td>
<td>Ξαν‑δοβηρας</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ξαν‑δοβιρας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ξαν‑δοβηρας</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ξαν‑δοβηρας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Περτου‑δυβερας</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Περτου‑δυβερας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Περτου‑δυβερας</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Περτου‑δυβερας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Περτο‑τουβαρις</td>
<td>CLuw. parat(a)‑</td>
<td>Substantive: “impurity”</td>
<td>Παρατατσα‑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Περτο‑τουβαρις</td>
<td>CLuw. parat(a)‑</td>
<td>Substantive: “impurity”</td>
<td>Παρατατσα‑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Περτο‑τουβαρις</td>
<td>CLuw. parat(a)‑</td>
<td>Substantive: “impurity”</td>
<td>Παρατατσα‑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?Σοδυρ‑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Σομενδις Σομενδις</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Type 2, X‑tubar(i)‑, where X = divine epithet → “([Deity +] divine epithet) tubar(i)‑”
Tubar(i)-: a divine epithet reflected in Luwic onomastics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal name</th>
<th>Divine epithet</th>
<th>Epithet’s class and meaning</th>
<th>Parallels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|               |               |                            | Οβρ-ασητας/  
|               |               |                            | Τμρ-ασητας   |
| Tbr-idbδ-     | ?             | ?                          | Place-name Ιδεβησσος? |
| Τβαρα-μοτας   | *muwatta-     | Substantive: “conquest”    | Ουρα-μουτας  
|               |               |                            | Αρσι-μουτας  
|               |               |                            | Οβρα-μουτας   |
| Τβερη-μουσας  | *muwassali-   | Adjective: “mighty” or “of might” | Πγρα-μουσας  
|               |               |                            | Ουρα-μουσας   |
| Τοβορ-ορας    | *ura/i-       | Adjective: “great”         | Tiwata-ura-  |

Table 6. Type 3, tubar(i)-X, where X = divine epithet → “[Deity +] divine epithet) tubar(i)-” (same as Type 2) or “[Deity+] tubar(i)- (divine epithet)”

It quickly emerges that this stem is associated with various theonyms, but also with other lexemes belonging to different grammatical classes (nouns, adjectives or adverbs, when their identification is assured), used as likely divine epithets. On this basis, two hypotheses are conceivable:

1) *Tubar(i)- is a theonym, as compounds of types 2 and 3 seem to suggest, and Τοβερις, indirectly attested as the name of a local hero or deity in Lycia, would reflect this theonym. In this case, type 1 compounds (thoymen + *tubar(i)-) would be dvandvas combining two divine names, in line with what we already find in Anatolian onomastics: in cuneiform sources, e.g. *SIN=U (Laroche 1966: no. 138) “Moon-god (and) Storm-god”; in Hieroglyphic Luwian, e.g. /Sanda-tiwad(i)-/ (TÜNP 1.1; Hawkins 2000: 155) “War-god (and) Sun-god”; and in alphabetical documentation, e.g. Αρμαρώνζας (LGPN 5b), “Moon-god (and) Protective Stag-god”. However, apart from Stephanus of Byzantium’s late and indirect attestation, there is no other testimony of this word as a theonym in the various corpora, suggesting rather a secondary use as a divine name. Furthermore, the only avatar of this stem in the lexicon of a Luwic language, that is Lyc. B tuburiz, is in all likelihood an appellative used in the plural (see Section 7 below).

2) *Tubar(i)- is originally a divine epithet, associated with various deities in compounds of type 1. In type 2, therefore, the divine epithet used as first element would be a hypostasis, i.e., it would replace a divine onomastic sequence theonym + epithet. A similar process is frequently attested elsewhere, cf. pihassa/i- “luminous; (subst.) lightning”, first used as a characteristic of the Storm-god (van Gessel 1998: 791) before constituting a hypostasis (e.g. Piḥassa-muwa- “Having the Might of [the Storm-god of] Lightning”) or Lyc. *xttbile/i- “destroyer” (cf. xttai(i)- “to harm, to damage”), associated with the Moon-god in anthroponymic compounds (e.g. Εψυ-κτυβέλις/Εψυ-κτυβέλος/Εψυ-κτυβελίς), to finally replace the whole divine onomastic formula in the personal name Κτιβαλας “(Moon-god) The Destroyer” (Adiego 2022: 84-86). In type 3, finally, the elements are reversed in relation to type 2, since *tubar(i)- is used as first member, in association with another epithet: either the meaning of such a compound is equivalent

---

47 The claim that the stem tubar(i)- refers to a deity finds independent support in the fact that it serves as the base for the place name Tyberissos, according to a mode of formation that finds parallels in Anatolia: see Réveilhac forthcoming.

48 On these personal names, see in particular Laroche 1966: 282; Zehnder 2010: 58–59; Melchert 2013: 36; Yakubovich 2013: 103–104.
to type 2 or, which seems more likely to me, *tubar(i)- is to be interpreted here as a hypostasis and stands in for a formula theonym + *tubar(i)-. This would then constitute the intermediate stage between its use as an epithet and its use as a divine name, which is attested later in Lycia in the form Τούβερις.

6. A warlike epithet?

The only attestation of the stem under discussion in the lexicon comes from Lycian B, in the form tuburiz, unfortunately mentioned in passages that are far from clear. As a result, it is necessary first to consider the semantics of the anthroponymic compounds listed in the previous section before attempting an etymological analysis of *tubar(i)-.

The association of *tubar(i)- with elements of such diverse nature suggests that it must not be a specific divine epithet: the underlying lexeme rather represents some kind of generic divine title or designates a quality compatible with different deities. In this respect, the previously listed names can be compared with the numerous Luwian and Lycian compounds having nan(n)(i)- “lord, leader” as second member, particularly as several of these compounds have an identical first member: Ερμα-τοβορις/Ερμαν-δοβερις/Ερμαν-νυβερις vs. Hier. /Arma-nan(n)(i)-/ Lyc. Eρμαν-νυβερις etc.; Ταρκυν-δεβερας vs. Ταρκυν-δεβερας. In order to precisely define the meaning to *tubar(i)-, it is beneficial to compare it with the matching lexical items and attempt a morphological analysis. The relevance of a Luwic lexical group containing the seme [STRIKE] becomes immediately apparent:

— HLuw. /tub(a)/ “to strike down”; /tub(ai)/ “to strike repeatedly”; /tubas/- or /tubassa/- “battle”;
— CLuw. dūpi-/dūpai- “to strike, touch, punish”;
— Lyc. A and B tube/i- “to strike down”; tube- “attack, battle (?)”.

These words, which are based on a Proto-Anatolian stem going back to the PIE root *(s)teup- “to strike”, reflect two types of semantic development (see Sasseville et al. 2023):

1) [STRIKE] > [PUNISH; DESTROY]. This semantic value is attested in Luwian and Lycian in the context of curse formulae to designate the divine punishment to which any desecrator is exposed. Thus, in Hieroglyphic Luwian:

KULULU 5 (= Hawkins 2000, p. 485–486):

§ 4 za-ti-za-pa DOMUS-na-zá kwali-sá a+ra/i-na CUM-ni i-zí-i-ri+i
[...]
§ 8 wali-tu-ta za-zi DEUS-ní-zi wali-la “PES”-tu
§ 9 wali/-na tu-pa-tu
§ 10 wali-tu-u [á-lai/-ma-zá ARHA] DELERE-nú-tu-u

“(he) who will cause AR(A)NA to these houses, [...] for him may these gods come mortally! Let them strike him down, let them destroy his name…”

49 On this noun, see the discussion in Oreshko 2014. Contra Réveilhac (2018: 479–480), the translation by “lord, leader” on the basis of the connection with CLuw. nana- “to lead” (compare Latin dux) seems now plausible to me. It is also implicitly adopted in Adiego (2019b: 158). Nevertheless, the precise connection between this noun and the name of the “brother” poses a challenging issue that cannot be addressed within the scope of this present paper.
In this passage, the formula *wali-na tu-pa-tu (w=an tubantu/ “let them strike him” is integrated into a network of divine threats. Similar formulae can also be found in Lycian epitaphs. Here are a few examples:

TL 72.2+3-4 (bilingual):

*mēne mahātī: tubēttī: nelez[i]*

“the gods of the agora will destroy him”

TL 80.3-4:

*mēne [Trq]as tubīdi se Malīja hrixiwama*

“Trqqūnt and Malinya the Supervisor will destroy him”

TL 93.3:

*mēne Trqas tubīdi se mūhāi huwedri:

“Trqqūnt and all the gods will destroy him”

2) [STRIKE] > [ATTACK; FIGHT]. This meaning is admittedly less certain than the previous one, since it is generally inferred from the warlike context for both Lyc. A *tube-* (TL 29.10; TL 44b.56) and HLuw. *tū-pa-sā-ti /tubas(s)adi/, which is a hapax:

TOPADA § 17-18 (= Hawkins 2000: 451-461):

*wali-mu ā-mi-sā / DOMINUS-mi-sā (DEUS)TONITRUS-zīl/a-sās (DEUS)SARMA-sā (DEUS)L198-sā (DEUS)BOS.L206.PANIS-sā-ha PRAE-nā L179-i-ta, / wali-mi-ta, tū-pa-sā-ti wali-sū-ha*

“my lord Tarhunt, Sarruma, Ea and (god) X ran before me, and I succeeded by battle”

The form of the noun here is ambiguous, since it could theoretically correspond to a neutral stem /tubas/- derived from the verb or to an adjective /tubassa/i- derived from of a PAnat. stem *tub(a)-* “strike, attack”.

To this little dossier one can add Τουβασσις,\(^{50}\) a Carian divine name of Greek transmission, which could originally be an epithet equivalent to the Luwian form. If the latter is indeed to be assigned to the stem /tubassa/i/, as argued in Simon 2016, who believes that Τουβασσις can be interpreted as “(God) of Smiting” or “(God) of Fighting”. A similar semantic ambiguity exists for a related Luwian term known from Hittite sources, namely the abstract *dupattarr-*(gen. adj. acc. *dupattamaśšin*), only used as an epithet of the Storm-god: does the epithet designate a god who strikes with lightning, one who fights, or even one who protects from smiting?\(^{51}\) All are theoretically possible. Indeed, on the one hand, the *Annals of Muršili II* relate how the Storm-god defeated the king’s enemy by striking the land of Arzawa with his lightning;\(^{52}\) on the other, it is common for gods to assist their protégé in battle. This applies not only to the Storm-god, but to all protective deities, as is shown clearly in the *Annals of Hattušili I*,

---

\(^{50}\) Gen. *Τουβασσιος*: Kazil et al. 2015: 379, 389.15.

\(^{51}\) See the full discussion, with references, in Simon 2022b.

where the Sun-goddess of Arinna is reported to have “run before” (πλέκαν ἡώαῖσ) the king on the battlefield, thus ensuring the surrender of the enemies. The common motif of the deity “running before” on the battlefield is also found in the hieroglyphic Luwian inscription from TOPADA mentioned above.

In the case of tubar(i)-, the semantics of the stem *tub(i)- is also ambiguous, but can possibly be clarified by its formation. There are two possibilities:

1) either an adjectival derivation in -rali- < *‑ro- on a reconstructed stem *tub‑ “strike” or “battle”, but this type of denominational formation seems unproductive in the synchrony of the Anatolian languages, although it does exist;

2) or a compound *tub‑ar(i)- “companion of tuba-”, with the second member *ar(i)-, virtual Luwian equivalent of Hitt. arâ- c. “friend, companion”. Such a formation would then be comparable to Lyc. A tidere/i- “collacteus/-a, foster brother/sister”, whith *tide- “teat, breast” (cf. Hitt. tėta(n)-, CLuw. tātan- < PIE *dʰəh₁‑i‑j- “to suckle”) as first member. For such a compound, the meaning “battle, fight” is then much more relevant than “strike”, so *tub‑ar(i)- would designate the “battle companion, ally (σύμμαχος), comrade-in-arms”.

From a semantic perspective, this second hypothesis sheds light on the numerous uses of the epiclesis alongside various deities, each representing distinct entities tasked with accompanying a protégé in warfare. It has been observed that the intercession of tutelary deities is mentioned several times in Hittite and Luwian texts. This suggests that anthropomimic compounds containing *tubar(i)- resonate with this divine function, encompassing both a martial and protective role.

A typological parallel is possible with the Greek texts, where warlike epicleses are not exclusive to Athena or Ares, as illustrated by some inscriptions. For example, the votive inscription from the Cyrenaean Paniskos I.Pan du desert: 3 (Wadi Bir el-Aïn, Egypt, Ptolemaic period) displays a coherent network of warlike epicleses applied to several deities (Mother of Gods, Ares, Zeus, and Pan), who are asked by the dedicator to take part in the military expedition he is about to lead (see Bonnet & Galoppin 2021: 7–11).

It is not rare to find military or political titles used as divine epithets in Anatolian and Near Eastern languages. In some instances, these titles even replaced the original theonym. The transformation of the epithet tubar(i)- into a divine name is suggested by anthropomimic compounds of type 3 (as discussed in section 5 above), where the stem is used as the first


“The Great King, the Tabarna, beloved of the Sun-goddess of Arinna — she placed him on her lap — she took me by the hand and ran before me in battle. In the city of Ninašša I went to battle, and when the men of Ninašša saw me facing them, they reopened the city gates.”

54 Note the possible existence of a *‑ro- derivation in the Hittite hapax tupran (c./n. acc.) “ Herzklopfen (?)” (Oettinger 2001: 461, fn. 15), which could reflect a primary PIE derivation *(s)tup‑ro- “striking” (cf. lat. stuprum “disgrace, violation etc.”).

55 A similar analysis is cautiously proposed by Billing 2023 for the Lyc. A hapax tuweeri (TL 84.5), whose meaning is unclear. According to the author of the eDiAna entry — and quite convincingly, in my opinion — it could be a compound *tuwe‑eri- litt. “companions of the offering” (cf. Lyc. B tuwe/i- “offering” and *ere/i- “companion”, perhaps in tidere/i-).

56 The reader can find a survey of well-known examples (such as Bel “Lord” first associated with the Babylonian god Marduk, before he became the object of a specific cult until Late Antiquity) in Yakubovich 2021: 239–240, which also convincingly suggests that the theonym Ἐνυάλιος constitutes a borrowing from a Lydian epiclesis ἐνυάλιο‑ to be reconciled with the Hittite (probably borrowed from Luwian) annawali‑ annau-li- “co-ranked, peer, colleague”.
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member along with a divine epithet. Additionally, indirect evidence for this evolution comes from the mention of Τούβερις as a local hero or deity in Lycia by Stephanus of Byzantium.

7. Lyc. B tuburiz

In the Lycian B lexicon, a direct reflection of *tubar(i)‑ is evidenced by the term tuburiz, occurring three times in the poem from the Xanthos Pillar (TL 44c.53; c.57; d.31–32), engraved on the funerary monument of a ruler of Xanthos (TL 44c.32–d.71). This text, flanked by a lengthy Lycian A inscription (TL 44b.1–c.19) and a Greek epigram (TL 44c.20–31), remains the most cryptic one among the three inscriptions due to the scarce attestation of Lycian B: beyond it, only one other text, the poem of Antiphellos (TL 55), is known in this language. Despite multiple studies dedicated to TL 44c.32–d.71, the precise content of this text remains ambiguous, making it unrealistic to use it alone as definitive evidence for the proposed hypothesis. However, it is crucial to ensure that the context in which tuburiz appears is compatible with the proposed meaning.

Prior research has primarily associated tuburiz with the toponym Tuburehel(i)-/Τυβεριοσός, with limited advance beyond this link, as noted in Neumann 2007: 385. Among recent contributions, there exist two conflicting interpretations. Schürr (2016: 174, 190–191), inspired by a suggestion by Zimmermann (2003: 293), draws a parallel between the poetic formula \textit{tr̃miliz : tbiplẽ : tr̃plẽ : tuburiz} (TL 44c.51–52) and the relationship between the mythical figures Τούβερις and Τέρμερις indirectly reported by Stephanus of Byzantium. This connection leads Schürr to conclude that tubur(i)- refers to Tyberissos as an ethnonym. Nevertheless, the association between \textit{tr̃miliz} and Τέρμερις, forming the basis of this parallel, is approximate and, thus, fragile.

Offering an alternative perspective, Sasseville 2021 proposes to identify a lexical network in the poem associated with offerings made by the ruler to appease enraged deities. By considering context and etymological parallels, Sasseville suggests three offerings: \textit{waxssa}‑ “bread” (cf. Hitt. \textit{NDwageššar “bread bites”}), \textit{mur(i)}‑ “bunch” (cf. Hitt. \textit{muri‑ “bunch, grape”}) and tubur(i)- “vine” (cf. HLuw. /tuwaris/- “vineyard”). While this proposal provides a comprehensive and coherent interpretation supported by etymology, it remains challenging in a context where circular arguments can arise. The analysis leans heavily on the assumption that \textit{waxssa}‑ designates the “bread”, which is contentious and, in my opinion, highly uncertain. Additionally, the link between tubur(i)- and HLuw. /tuwaris(a)/ is, in my view, phonologically unacceptable (see fn. 14 above). Overall, the interpretation remains open to alternative viewpoints.

Addressing all the issues raised by this text is unfeasible at the present stage. Instead, it is possible to offer a few hypotheses regarding the occurrences of tuburiz. As observed, the Xanthos poem is part of a coherent text group lauding the military deeds and piety of a ruler, likely Gergis-Xeriga. Notably, the Greek epigram connects the king’s achievements closely with the divine world, attributing his conquests to Athena “destroyer of cities”, acknowledging divine rewards, offering numerous tributes to Zeus, and culminating with the erection of a stele in dedication to the Twelve Gods. The Lycian A section also implies a votive inscription, mentioning several identifiable deities. One can make an educated guess that the Lycian B poem

\footnote{Apud Neumann, ibid., V. Ševoroškin points out to the similarity of tubur(i)- with the supposed second member of anthroponyms of Greek transmission such as Λούβερις, Ερματοβορις or Περπενδυβερις, without, however, making the connection explicit.}
addresses a comparable subject, which is supported by the use of theonyms (e.g. *Natri*-, *Trqqnīt*-, heronyms (*Zrppedun*-) and military terms (e.g. *laxa*—“military campaign”) within the text.

Regarding *tubur(i)*-, it solely appears in the plural form *tuburiz* (nominative or accusative):

a) *trnīmiliz* : *tbiplē* : *tuburiz* : *pduradi* : *xuzrωwɛtiz* (TL 44c.52-53);

b) *murēnɛdi* : *tuburiz* : *uple<s>iz* (TL 44c.57);

c) *mgi̱riniz zıtʊwetiniz* : *uplezis waxxɔsɔdiz* : *tuburiz* (TL 44d.29-31).

In each instance, *tuburiz* is associated with adjectives such as *trnīmîle/i*—“Lycian” and *xuzrωwāt(i)*—“who has xuzr-”. Both in b) and c) *uplese/i*- appears: this possessive adjective has not yet found a satisfactory translation but its stem is well rooted in local onomastics, as illustrated by the names ᪛ταλίς (Lycia, Kibyratis and particularly Pisidia), ᪛ταλέσι (Cabalis, Pisidia), ᪛πιλεκοσινός (Pisidia), ᪛πιλεκολίς (Kibyratis), ᪛ρτιμ-οπλής (Cabalis), and ᪛μακομ-οπλής (Kibyratis, Pisidia). 59 The other terms remain equally obscure: the noun *waxssa*- in c), here in the ablative-instrumental (as *murēnɛdi* and perhaps *pduradi*), is also a well-known element used in the regional onomastics: Lyc. *Waxsepeddimagi*-/ *Waxsebe*-; Car. *Uksmu/-Waksmu*, *联通/-Usqsi*-; ᪛νακαοʊουάς/cheduledpisia, *υναζαώς (Isauria, Cilicia), *υναζαώς (Isauria).

Comparing a) (extended to the following lines) to a passage in Lycian A is allowed by common place-names displayed in both sections:

Lyc. A (TL 44b.47-56)


He has left peace 60 in the precinct of Peace and to the gods of Peace in Xanthos, in Tymnessos, in Kerthhi, in Kandyba. (There) a temple is a building: Lycia had not (yet) made them. Everywhere he erected sanctuaries to the local Trqqnī (Storm-god) (and) to his twelve personal celestial gods, sanctuaries in Aphrodision (?) in Xanthos, Tymnesian sanctuaries, Kandibyan sanctuaries and in Kerthhi he made a monument to Handa (War-god) of Battle for his family and his līhebe.

Lyc. B (TL 44c.51-54)


The mention of three cities, Tymnessos (Lyc. B *Tuminesi*; A *Tuminehi*), Kandyba (Lyc. B *Xāzbī*; A *Xākbī*) and Kerthi (Lyc. B *Kridesi*; A *Kerθθi*) in both passages justifies a comparison, although their contents are not identical. 61 Despite a lack of comprehension for several terms, I propose the provisional translation:

58 This form probably reflects the anthroponymic conversion of the genitival adjective *uplese/i*.-
59 KPN § 1097. The exact references of the anthroponyms are listed in LGPN 5b (Lycia) and 5c (Kibyratis-Cabalis, Pisidia). Note also the strong presence of Greco-Anatolian *nɔms d’asɔnɔn* based on the similarity of the indigenous stem with Greek names: e.g. ᪛ταλόν (73 individuals in southern Anatolia vs. 10 in the rest of the Greek world covered by the LGPN), ᪛πιλεκοσινός (Pisidia), ᪛πιλεκολίς (Pisidia), ᪛ρτιμ-οπλής / ᪛ρτιμ-οπλής (Pisidia). On the question of Greco-Anatolian *nɔms d’asɔnɔn*, see most recently Réveilhac in press.
60 The meaning “peace” for Lyc. *ahata* and Lyc. B *asata-* has recently been challenged by Melchert forthc., suggesting “good fortune” instead. However, the traditional meaning is defended in Réveilhac forthc. b.
61 According to Craig Melchert (pers. comm.), the division of the sequence must be considered. Indeed, the symbol ชะ likely serves to separate prosodic units, making it unclear whether the three toponyms should be linked.
Three times in the country he pre- twelve (divine) protectors during the expedition and he carries (?) as utakija- of the designated properties Lycian tubur(i)-s xuzravêt(i)-s in double, in triple in Kandyba, in Tymnessos (and) a statue of the god Handa in Kerthhi.

The formula qûnatbisu [...] zrûtêni “twelve times... a divine protector” might be understood as a poetic expression akin to Lyc. A qûnâkba: xrsättêni: elbi “to his twelve personal gods”, thus indicating the Twelve Gods protecting the king, hence a translation “twelve divine protectors”. As for the group Trûnliliz: [...] tuburiz [...] xuzravêtiz, it might correspond to another poetic periphrase referring to the same deities, i.e. literally “the Lycian (divine) allies who have xuzr-”. Syntactically, this group would be on the same level as hîtawû (acc. sg.), likely derived from the Lycian theonym Hâta- (< Sanda-), which would therefore exceptionally retain the initial aspirate typical of Lycian A (in order not to distort the divine name), with the -wa- suffix (< -wo- + *-h2)62 and therefore literally meaning “that which is like Handa”, a poetic turn corresponding to Lyc. A tukedri [...] Hâlhae “statue of Handa”.

Overall, while subject to speculation, this analysis attempts to unify tuburiz within both martial and religious themes, showcasing its relevance in varying contexts.

8. Conclusions

The study yields several significant conclusions. Firstly, the existence of a Proto-Luwic stem *tubar(i)- is affirmed through personal onomastics, indirectly evidenced in the place names Tuburehe(i)‑/Tuûsè quo(o)çäs and the divine name or heronym Τούβερις. This stem manifests diversely in various languages, with variations such as /TuPar(i)‑/ in Hieroglyphic Luwian, °tubr‑/°tybr‑ in Carian, τ[β]ερ‑ in Pisidian, °τοβορις in Greek from Lycia, °τουβαρις in Greek from Pisidia, and °τβηρις in Greek from Caria.

Moreover, a broader range of personal names reveals alternative forms of this onomastic stem: in Carian names as °δubr‑/°δýbr‑ and °δþbr‑ and in Greek-transmitted names as °δυβερ‑/°δο(ν)βας/ηνα and °δυβερος. The initial dental of *tubar(i)- undergoes voicing assimilation when in contact with the final [n] or [r] of the first member in these instances. This comprehensive explanation unifies and interprets multiple personal names that were previously explained through distinct and sometimes speculative processes.

Furthermore, the element *tubar(i)- appears as the first member in some compounds, albeit less frequently and often in syncopated forms: Tbr° and Τοβορ° in Caria, Tβερ°, Τβαρα° and Τβερη° in Cilicia.

An overview of these occurrences, detailed in Sections 2 to 4, reveals that this stem is consistently associated with a theonym or a divine epithet. Through the combinations in anthroponymy, it is suggested that *tubar(i)- represents a divine title, which evolved into a divine hypostasis and then into a divine name or heronym, as implied by Stephanus of Byzantium’s account about Τούβερις.

62 The -wa- suffix, attested in several Anatolian languages (Hittite, Luwian, Lycian, and Carian), was used to form words denoting a social category (Rieken & Sasseville 2014). However, it originally had an “equitative” function, which can still be seen in certain nouns such as prîna-wo-, lit. “that which is like a house (prîna)-”, hence “tomb-house, mausoleum” (Rieken & Sasseville 2014: 310).
Etymologically, *tubari*- likely relates to the Luwian /tub(a)-/ “to strike” and Lycian tube- “battle”. It might be a compound /tub-ar(i)-/ meaning “battle companion, comrade-in-arms”. This concept echoes Hittite and Luwian texts describing deities engaging in battles alongside their protégés.

Finally, *tubari*- finds a direct avatar in the Lycian B lexicon, with tubariz. This word potentially holds the meaning of “(divine) allies” in the poem on the Xanthos Pillar, considering the martial and religious context, although this interpretation remains uncertain.

The prominence of *tubari*- in Luwic onomastics suggests its use in defining and designating deities, evident in personal names across Luwian, Lycian, Carian, and Pisidian collections, Greek inscriptions from southern Anatolia, the heronym Τούβερις from indirect sources, and the place name Tyberissos (see Réveilhac forthc. a).
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