

THE -ŠEPA THEONYMS IN THE HITTITE PANTHEON*

Livio Warbinek - University of Verona

The Hittites worshiped some secondary deities bearing the ending in -šepa, whose features are far from being thoroughly investigated. The discussion will cover both the linguistic and the contextual analysis of every god, taking them into consideration both as single entities and as a group.

Keywords: Anatolian -šepa gods; Hittite “spirits”; divine “circle”; Hittite pantheon

1. INTRODUCTION

In the research on the Anatolian theonyms of the II millennium BC, the divine names ending in -šepa (and its allomorph -zepa) are of particular interest, both from the linguistic perspective and for the analysis of their functions and position within the Hittite pantheon. The subject has been reconsidered recently by Mouton,¹ but the history of studies goes back to Laroche’s first gathering of what he called «Noms féminins en -še/īpa-».² It is commonly accepted that -šepa was used in the names of a “spirit, demon, genius”,³ with the -zepa variant normally occurring after stems in nasal or dental,⁴ even though cases of assimilation of the /n/ may have occurred.⁵ Variations in vocalism are apparent and hence immaterial, as the sign ZI can be read ze as well as zi, so that these theonyms have been transcribed -zipa so far (e.g. Šuwanzipa, Daganzipa), but here we would rather use the transcription -zepa, which appears to be the best choice, as the allomorphic change has no reason to have involved the vowel.⁶

Generally, the female gender (e.g. HEG A, 84 s.v. *aška-*, «^dAška-šepa (weiblicher?) Genius des Tores») has been taken for granted, sometimes invoking an alleged alternation between determinatives ^d and ^f.⁷ However, this alternation is neither consistently attested nor

* This paper is a result of TeAI “Teonimi e pantheon nell’Anatolia Ittita”, a project funded by the Italian Ministry of University, F.A.R.E. programme and carried out at the University of Verona, which owes a huge debt to Kammenhuber’s Zettelkästen on Hittite divine names. I would like to thank Prof. F. Giusfredi and Dr. V. Pisaniello, who supported me throughout this work, and Prof. H.C. Melchert, who provided me with precious advice to carry out the linguistic analysis. Of course, any mistakes are my own.

¹ Mouton 2014.

² Laroche 1946-1947, 67-68.

³ Laroche 1946-1947, 67 firstly translated «génie, démon». See Goetze 1953, 266 «spirit, demon»; Čop 1960, 3 «Geist, Genius, Dämon»; Steiner 1971, 548a «Dämon, Geist»; Lebrun 1980, 50-51 «génie, démon»; Haas 1994, 299 «Geist, Numen, Dämon»; Hoffner - Melchert 2008, 61 «spirit(?)»; CHS Š3, 381 «genius, spirit of...»; HEG Š2, 990 «Geist, Genius, Beschützer»; Mouton 2014, 19 «génie, esprit, démon».

⁴ Laroche 1945-1946, 3-4, 10-11; 1946-1947, 67; Čop 1960, 3; Lebrun 1980, 50; de Martino 1983, 76; Haas 1994, 299; Kloekhorst 2008, 812; Hoffner - Melchert 2008, 47; HEG T1, 35; HEG Š2, 992-993; Brosch 2014, 39.

⁵ See below Ḫalazepa (KUB 38.26 obv. 23’, rev. 15’, 22), Ḫilazepa (HT 26, 5), Ḫuwarpazepa (YH 2005/1, obv. 7’), Gulzazepa (KUB 43.62 iii 12’), Taršazepa (KBo 4.13 iii 24).

⁶ Kloekhorst 2008, 812-813. See also CHD Š3, 381 and below § 3.

⁷ «female deification [...] usually show a determinative ^d or ^f» (Kloekhorst 2008, 812).

proven for every single divine name. In fact, there are also cases of alternations between the determinatives DINGIR and 𐎶UR.SAG.⁸

From a linguistic point of view, these theonyms are all subordinative compounds, but the exact morphological structure strongly depends on the semantic interpretation of the element *-šepa*.⁹ This, however, is debated: the element could be interpreted as a *noun*, but it is never attested on its own.¹⁰ Otherwise, it could be a *suffix*, which «creates, in one of the Anatolian languages, adjectives of appurtenance».¹¹ The discussion about *-šepa* concerns, obviously, also its origin: Goetze was inclined towards a Palaic or «Kanishite» one,¹² Gurney for a Luwian one,¹³ Kammenhuber preferred to look for it in Hittite,¹⁴ whereas Haas leaned towards a Hattic interpretation: «Dem hethitischen Suffix *-šepa/-šipa* entspricht in der Bedeutung das hattische Morphem (-)šail, das in *puru=šail*, “Erdgenius” (gebildet von *fur*-“Erde”) oder in Götternamen *Tuḫušail/Tuḫašael* enthalten ist».¹⁵ While most of these views are now outdated, the topic is far from being solved, and I will discuss it in more detail below (§ 3).

The *-šepa* element is also attested in other classes of proper names. In personal names, cases in which it would be prefixed are probably to be excluded because of unexpected consonantal patterns (Šippaziti,¹⁶ son of Arma-Tarhunta, in turn a son or grandchild of Zida;¹⁷ Zipani,¹⁸ king of Kaneš), while in two cases the suffixation appears to work roughly as in theonyms: Kurkasiba¹⁹ and almost certainly Uppatišipa,²⁰ Larger is the evidence with geographical names for which no traces of divinization exist,²¹ where the element is again always suffixed: ^{URU}Anašepa, ^{URU}Anzipa, ^{KUR}Iqašipa, ^{URU}Kašipa, ^{URU}Tinišipa.²²

⁸ Below, Ašgašepa, Ḫalalazepa and § 4.

⁹ See CHD Š3, 382; HEG Š2, 990; Hoffner - Melchert 2008, 61-62; Brosch 2014, 37 and below § 3.

¹⁰ CHD Š3, 381-382. For the discussion on GE₆-za ^dšepa, see below § 2 s.v. Išpanzašepa.

¹¹ Goetze 1953, 266.

¹² Goetze 1953, 266.

¹³ Gurney 1977, 16. See also Cammarosano 2021, 86.

¹⁴ Kammenhuber 1961, 184-185.

¹⁵ Haas 1994, 299 with nn. 41 (KUB 36.89 rev. 10) and 42 (KBo 17.19 ii 6, *passim*). So Soysal 2004, 306, 324.

¹⁶ NH 1156. See HEG Š2, 992.

¹⁷ According to the so-called Apology of Ḫattušili III (CTH 81).

¹⁸ NH 1548.2. See KBo 3.13 i 11.

¹⁹ Personal name from Kültepe, see CHD Š3, 382 with reference to Kt 88/k 1050:11 (Bayram 1991, 300-301).

²⁰ Theophoric *hapax* of ABoT 2.121 obv. 7, see Akdoğan 2010, 58-59; CHD Š3, 382. The textual context (CTH 528) of a cult inventory text dealt with offering towards gods (^dŠuwi(n)ta immediately before ^mUppatišipa) and so Uppatišipa might have been a member of the cult personnel. In any case, three features can be taken for granted about this personal name: the male gender, the *-šepa* written probably with the sign ŠI (rather than ŠE), and the Luwian etymology from *ubati*- “donation, (land) grant, demesne” with defective writing of the stop or *uppa*- “to carry” (CLL 242-243; Starke 1990, 195-198; Kloekhorst 2008, 921-923). On the so-called “*ubati*-men” LU^{MES} *upatiyaš*, a group of people who could held land, see Beal 1992, 539-549. However, while the presence of the masculine determinative point to a personal name, it must be noticed that the context of the occurrence is not unproblematic: as the subjects of all other verbs -before and after the occurrence- are generic plurals, and as the typical titles of the officials or priests mentioned in CTH 528 (e.g. SANGA) are not present, it is not entirely certain that Uppatišipa is indeed the name of a man performing an offering and not the name of a god who receives an offering together with ^dŠuwi(n)ta.

²¹ Apart from the *-šepa* deities with geographical determinatives (below § 4.).

²² These toponyms are dealt with separately from divine names, according to the textual context: they are clearly towns rather than gods, see Mouton 2014, 20, n. 8; CHD Š3, 382, and respectively: RGTC 6/2, 5; RGTC 6, 25 and 6/2, 8; RGTC 6, 137; RGTC 6, 189 and 6/2, 71; RGTC 6, 425.

In the next pages, we will first try to update the evidence for *-šepa* divine names, since some of these are not listed or discussed in recent publications.²³ Second, we will provide a linguistic analysis of these theonyms according to the latest research. Third, we will carry out a contextual analysis, underlining the main features of the different deities. Finally, we will investigate the issue of whether *-šepa* divine names did or did not reflect a proper “circle”.

2. OVERVIEW

^dḪUR.SAG Ašgašepa occurs in multiple sources,²⁴ occasionally with the determinative ḪUR.SAG.²⁵ According to some occurrences, Ašgašepa was worshiped in Ḫatti and in Karaḫna,²⁶ where its temple may have been located.²⁷ The agreed-upon linguistic analysis explains the theonym with the Hittite *āška-* “gate(way)”,²⁸ thus leading to the common interpretation of Ašgašepa as a spirit of the gate.²⁹ The evidence we collected never shows Ašgašepa with a determinative ⁱ; however, according to Goetze’s analysis of KBo 3.8 iii 4ff.³⁰, where *IŠTAR* seems to occur in the place of Ašgašepa, the deity may be interpreted as female.³¹ Finally, Ašgašepa often occurs together with other gods (including Kamrušepa, Pirwa, Maliya, Ḫilašši), with whom she formed a heterogeneous divine group connected with Kaneš (Below, § 4.1). In one of these occurrences, «singt ein Sängler in luwischer Sprache zu Ehren des Paares Pirwa und Aškašepa»,³² thereby providing a possible hint for a Luwian connection, the importance of which, however, should not be overestimated.³³

^{ḪUR.SAG/KUR}Halalazepa is attested only in one source,³⁴ with the determinatives ḪUR.SAG (obv. 23’, rev. 15’) and KUR (rev. 22).³⁵ The respective context, however, clearly refers to a deity, more precisely a divinized mountain. Linguistically, its peculiarity depends on the lack of *-n-* before the *-zepa*: *ḫa-la-(a)-la-<AN>-ze-pa-*.³⁶ The meaning of the Luwian adjective

²³ Van Gessel 1998; HEG Š2, 990-992; Mouton 2014.

²⁴ KBo 1.1 rev. 46; KBo 1.2 rev. 23; KBo 4.13 i 14[, ii 16, iii [35], iv 20, 45, vi 9; KBo 7.38 r.col. [8]; KBo 10.20 iii 23; KBo 19.128 ii 5, 38; KBo 22.39 iii 23; KBo 30.56 iv 20; KBo 34.260, 4; KBo 38.50 iii 23; KBo 41.129 obv. 5; KBo 42.5 obv. 3; KBo 46.304, 2; KBo 45.27 obv. 10; KUB 2.13 iii 17’, iv 12; KUB 6.45 i 54; KUB 6.46 ii 19; KUB 8.82+ rev. 13; KUB 10.20 iii 23; KUB 10.92 v 19; KUB 25.32 i 11; KUB 26.11 i 13; KUB 26.39 iv 14; KUB 28.108, 9; KUB 34.69+70 i 22; KUB 35.2 i 8; KUB 38.19 obv. 8; KUB 54.61, 3; KUB 56.45 ii 5; KUB 58.62 v [1]; KUB 60.45 obv. 9; IBoT 2.75 iv 9; VSNF 12.1 rev. 17; VSNF 12.28 iii 9. See also KBo 14.142 i 13 “^dAr-ga-pa”, Wegner 2002, 273. Finally, in KUB 58.15 iv 5’ and KBo 24.118+ vi 13 // KUB 50.82, 8 Ašgašepa is reported without any determinative.

²⁵ The divinized mountain Ašgašepa appears in KBo 12.135 vi 6’, vii 3’; KUB 1.17 v 29’. For the very mountain see RGTC 6, 47-48 («Möglicherweise im Lande Pala zu suchen»); RGTC 6/2, 15; and according to Haas (1994, 614, n. 492), it may be identified with the volcano Erçiyes Dağı.

²⁶ Respectively: KUB 6.45 i 54; KUB 6.46 ii 19 and KUB 25.32 i 11.

²⁷ KBo 10.20 iii 23, see Van Gessel 1998, 52.

²⁸ Kloekhorst 2008, 221-222, 812; HED I, 212-5; HEG A, 84; HEG Š2, 990; Brosch 2014, 37.

²⁹ Laroche 1946-1947, 67; Goetze 1953, 266; Čop 1960, 1; Lebrun 1980, 50; Haas 1994, 299; CHS Š3, 381; HEG Š2, 990; Mouton 2014, 23.

³⁰ One of the Goetze’s «Kanishite lists» (Goetze 1953, 264).

³¹ Goetze (1953, 265) supported the interpretation of Ašgašepa as a «female and Ištar-like figure».

³² Haas 1994, 414, referring to KUB 35.2+ I 8’-11’. See also Starke 1985, 354-357.

³³ Kammenhuber 1976, 50; Archi 2004, 11, 15, 24; 2010, 32.

³⁴ KUB 38.26 obv. 23’, rev. 15’ (Br.), 22, a local cult in the still unidentified town of Mikuya, see Cammarosano 2018, 236-237, 240-241.

³⁵ RGTC 6, 68. See also Haas 1994, 462, 497 and HEG Š2, 992.

³⁶ Starke 1990, 492, n. 1804.

ḫalāl(i)- (possibly, ultimately a Semitic loanword) “pure”, seems to hint to a connection with “purity”.³⁷

^dHantašepa³⁸ was worshiped by means of «wooden statuettes with blood-shot eyes and blood-red robes». ³⁹ However, this theonym has received different interpretations. Kammenhuber first proposed to explain Ḫantašepa as the “Spirit of the Forehead”,⁴⁰ based on Hittite *ḫant*- “forehead”.⁴¹ Mouton, following Otten, tends on the contrary to exclude this analysis.⁴² An alternative and possibly better explanation, for which we thank Craig Melchert (*pers. comm.*), is to go back to the Hittite adverbial *ḫanti*, “facing”, with the confrontational meaning of “opposing”.⁴³ This would make the deity a warlike or threatening one, which would in turn fit quite well with its association with the spears ^{GIŠ}ŠUKUR^{III.A} and the War-god Šanta.⁴⁴

^[x]Hanzuwašepa is a frequently overlooked *hapax* of KBo 41.110 obv. 5, with the determinative lost in the initial gap of the line (most likely ^d).⁴⁵ However, the photo does not entirely exclude the possibility of another sign before the ḪA.

^dHilanzepa occurs in few sources⁴⁶ and is generally derived from *ḫīla(n)* “courtyard, halo”,⁴⁷ as the core part of the temple.⁴⁸ Ḫilanzepa is mentioned in a Palaic ritual for the Hattian-Palaic god of vegetation Ziparfa together with ^dKamrušepa.⁴⁹

^dHu(wa)riyanzepa⁵⁰ of Šamuḫa,⁵¹ whose name is likely connected to the Hittite-Luwian verb *ḫurai-ḫuwarai*- “to sprinkle (with a purifying essence)”.⁵²

^dHuwarpazepa represents a *hapax* in a text from Yassihöyük⁵³ and, formally, presents the assimilation or loss of the nasal before the *-zepa* morph. Since ^{GIŠ}*ḫuwarpi* is a healing plant

³⁷ Starke 1990, 492, n. 1804; Melchert 1993, 46; Mouton 2014, 24.

³⁸ KBo 17.1 i 22, 28, 38 + ABoT 4a obv. 7, 8, 13 + ABoT 3 i 17 + ABoT 4 iv 2 + ABoT 5 ii 1; KBo 17.3 i 18]; KBo 17.4 ii 6]; KBo 18.14 l.e. 5; KBo 30.33 ii 5; KUB 44.56 obv. 9. Possible additional references may be KUB 25.35, 6; ^d*Ḫa-an-da[-* and Emar VI 471 obv. 19: *Ḫa-an-da-ze-ma* (see Arnaud 1985-1986, 455).

³⁹ Popko 1995, 83, in relation to the magical ritual KBo 17.1+ i 21-25 (CTH 416). See also Haas 1994, 503.

⁴⁰ Kammenhuber 1961, 185-186. See also HW2 H/3, 173; Haas 1994, 473; CHS Š3, 381; Kloekhorst 2008, 812; Brosch 2014, 37.

⁴¹ See Starke 1990, 125-132; Kloekhorst 2008, 287-288; HED III, 89-96; HEG H, 149-53; HW2 H/3, 161-162.

⁴² Mouton 2014, 26.

⁴³ HW2 H/3, 187; Kloekhorst 2008, 287.

⁴⁴ Respectively, KBo 17.1+ i 22 (see Otten - Souček 1969, 20-21) and Emar VI 471 obv. 19: ^d*Ḫa-an-da* ù ^d*Ḫa-an-da-si-ma* (see Arnaud 1985-1986, 455).

⁴⁵ [^d]*Ḫa-an-zu-wa-še-pa-aš*, according to Groddek 2001, 110.

⁴⁶ KBo 19.152 ii 10]; KBo 22.185 ii 4]; KBo 27.77, 7; KUB 35.165 rev. 17 (x2); KUB 41.26 i 23]; KUB 54.94 r.col. 13; HT 26, 5.

⁴⁷ Haas 1994, 281, 299; Kloekhorst 2008, 342-343; Mouton 2014, 23; HEG H, 241-3, HEG Š2, 991; HED III, 305-307; HW2 III/2, 581b-586a.

⁴⁸ Laroche 1946-1947, 67; Goetze 1953, 270; Čop 1960, 1; Lebrun 1980, 51; Haas 1994, 263, 281, 299, 611; CHS Š3, 382; Taracha 2009, 51; Mouton 2014, 21; Brosch 2014, 37.

⁴⁹ Čop 1960, 1; Haas 1994, 438-439, 614; Mouton 2014, 23. See below § 4.1.

⁵⁰ KBo 20.101 rev. 14; KBo 22.192 rev. 9; KBo 34.156 l.e. 2]; KBo 45.29 iii edge 7]; KBo 45.55 rev. 4]; KUB 5.7 obv. 17; KUB 20.4 i 13, 16; KUB 44.2, 3]; KUB 44.3, 5]; KUB 44.13 iv 3; KUB 51.79 obv. 10; KUB 58.18 vi 1]; IBoT 2.19 rev. 1]; IBoT 2.30 obv. 7].

⁵¹ See RGTC 6, 338-341; McMahan 1991, 271; HEG Š2, 991; Mouton 2014, 24.

⁵² CLL, 81; HED III, 397-398; HEG Š2, 991; Kloekhorst 2008, 308-309; Mouton 2014, 24.

⁵³ YH 2005/1, obv. 7': [EZE]N₄ ^dHuwarpazepa[...], from Yassihöyük, probably ancient Taḫurpa. See RGTC 6, 380-381; Mouton 2014, 26; Fales 2016, 148b.

or a natural essence (cream),⁵⁴ *Ḫuwarpazepa* may be a healing spirit connected to such a substance. Therefore, a correlation seems possible between *Ḫuwarpazepa* and the previous *Ḫuwariyanzepa*.

^(d)*Išpanzašepa* occurs in a few texts,⁵⁵ and one of the attested forms is characterized by a partly logographic writing GE₆.⁵⁶ Thanks to the correspondence between Hittite *išpant-* and GE₆ “night, darkness”,⁵⁷ it is generally accepted that this can be interpreted as a deity of the night.⁵⁸ The reading of KBo 11.32 obv. 34 as “GE₆-*za* ^d*šepa*”, which would be the only piece of evidence for seeing *šepa* both as an independent theonym and as a non-suffixed noun,⁵⁹ is however debated. Here Mouton’s interpretation appears to be the quite promising: the scribe erroneously added a space, so that the right reading should be “GE₆-*za-an-še-pa*” for *Išpanzašepa*.⁶⁰ If the presence of the nasal, probably to be explained as a hypercorrection, appears problematic, one could alternatively hypothesize that the scribe wrote the determinative in the wrong position, and that the third sign is a misplaced DINGIR rather than a syllabogram. As we will discuss later, according to Taracha, *Išpanzašepa* was part of the «circle of the Kanessite deities».⁶¹

^d*Iwanzepa* is recorded in just three sources.⁶² There is no further information on it.⁶³

^d*Kam(ma)rušepa* is the most attested⁶⁴ among the *-šepa* deities (if one excludes the occurrences of *Daganzepa* that are not proper instances of the theonym). It has been interpreted as an Old Hittite spirit from Kaniš/Neša. As its Hittian syncretic counterpart

⁵⁴ CLL, 81; HW2 III/2, 823.

⁵⁵ KBo 11.32 obv. 34 // KBo 43.75, [4] // KUB 43.30 rev. 8; KUB 20.24 iii 2; KUB 58.83 i 13. For ^d*Išpant*, see van Gessel 1998, 204.

⁵⁶ KBo 11.32 obv. 34, see Kloekhorst 2008, 502.

⁵⁷ HED II, 431-435; HEG I, 409-411; Kloekhorst 2008, 404.

⁵⁸ Laroche 1946-1947, 67; Čop 1960, 1; Steiner 1971, 548a; Lebrun 1976, 241; 1980, 51; Starke 1990, 130; Haas 1994, 299; Popko 1995, 73; Yoshida 1996, 87; CHS Š3, 381; HED II, 431; HEG Š2, 991; Kloekhorst 2008, 812; Taracha 2009, 51; Mouton 2014, 20; Brosch 2014, 38.

⁵⁹ See CHD Š3, 382. According to this interpretation, Puhvel (HED II, 431) pointed out how that could also be **išpant+šepas* as a fused spelling of an appositional structure: «Night, the Daimon».

⁶⁰ Mouton 2014, 20, n. 7.

⁶¹ Taracha 2009, 52 and below § 4.1.

⁶² KBo 24.122, 18; KBo 39.105, 8’ and KUB 17.20 ii 28. See Haas 1994, 258, n. 45 and Groddek 2004, 141, where it should be read *I-wa-an-z[e-pa-* instead of Groddek’s *I-wa-an-ti[-pa-* (KBo 39.105).

⁶³ See Mouton 2014, 24. There is, however, a possible correlation with the hieroglyphic rock inscription in the village of Malpınarı, which reports (§ 11) *iwa-x-si-x*, epithet of the Sun-god. For the Malpınarı text, see Kalaç - Hawkins 1989, 108. Another possible comparandum might be Hittite *ewan-*, a kind of grain, which however is consistently spelled with /e/, see Kloekhorst 2008, 263.

⁶⁴ KBo 3.8 ii 26[, iii 16, 17; KBo 8.73 ii 1; KBo 9.127 i 12; KBo 11.14 ii 25 // KBo 13.145 obv. 9[; KBo 11.22 iii 5; KBo 12.89 ii’ 9’; KBo 12.100 obv. 12; KBo 20.82 i 9[; KBo 22.71 i 4’] // KUB 14.13 i 9; KBo 29.25 ii 8’[; KBo 37.1 obv. ii 7, 10, 22, 26; KBo 39.255 rev. 5; KBo 45.214 obv. 13; KUB 12.26 ii 1, 3, 16; KUB 17.8 iv 1, 3, 20, 21[; KUB 17.10 ii 35, iii 3, 7; KUB 17.15 iii 12; KUB 17.34 i 5; KUB 28.4 obv. r.col. 15b, 25b; KUB 33.28 iii 2[; KUB 33.52 iii 9; KUB 34.63, 15; KUB 35.88 iii 9, 14(x2); KUB 35.89, [12]; KUB 35.90, 5; KUB 35.103 obv. 3[; KUB 35.107 iii 8, 9; KUB 35.108 iv 6; KUB 36.43 i 3 +KBo 9.127 l.col. 12; KUB 41.7 i 2; KUB 43.23 rev. 37’; KUB 48.34, [9] +KUB 57.105 iii 10[, 11, 15, 41; VSNF 12.11 ii 17; VSNF 12.33 iii 1[; VBoT 119, 6[.

^dKataḫzifuri⁶⁵ shows, she was worshiped in Liḫzina, Taniwanta, Tanizila and Pala⁶⁶ as a deity of magic rituals.⁶⁷ According to KBo 9.127+ KUB 35.107,⁶⁸ Kamrušepa's husband was a ^dUTU (Tiwad⁹), which makes this deity a female one. Their son was the Tutelary god of the town of Tauriša,⁶⁹ which results in the formation of a divine triad.⁷⁰

Much has been said about Kamrušepa's name, its linguistic *milieu* and the religious context of her cult. Laroche already described her as a deity of health connected to horses, who belonged to the group of Pirwa and Aškašepa.⁷¹ Haas interpreted the word *kam(m)ara-* "mist, smoke",⁷² as a synecdoche for "fireplace, house", and the deity as «Rauchgenius» or «Hausgöttin», and consequently «Schutzpatronin von Haus und Herd».⁷³ The name of Kamrušepa's counterpart Kataḫzifuri was long supposed to be a Hattic compound from *kataḫ* "queen" and *zifuri* "great".⁷⁴ However, already Haas suggested that *kataḫ* is not related to Hattian *kataḫ-* "queen",⁷⁵ and Soysal argued that *šaḫ/taḫ* rather means «böse» [...] «mit dem Nominalpräfix ka- determiniert»,⁷⁶ concluding that «der Name Kataḫzifuri läßt sich demnach in zwei Bauelemente gliedern: *ka=taḫ+zi=pur=i* "das Böse (möge) unter dem Land (sein)».⁷⁷ As, in our view, the match between the two deities is a later syncretism, it will be treated as mostly irrelevant for the investigation of the origin of the Hittite name.

^dGulzanzepa⁷⁸ appears in only one tablet, KUB 43.62 iii 8', 12',⁷⁹ where Išpanzašepa, Kamrušepa, Miyatanzepa and Daganzepa are also present.⁸⁰ The name Gulzanzepa derives

⁶⁵ On this identification see Goetze 1953, 265; Lebrun 1980, 51; Klengel 1988, 105; Haas 1994, 438-441; Popko 1995, 88; Hutter 2003, 230; Taracha 2009, 58: «In bilingual texts, Kamrušepa of the Hittite version corresponds to Hattian Kataḫzifuri»; Soysal 2010, 1049; Mouton 2014, 26; Brosch 2014, 38. The Kataḫzifuri's occurrence are, for instance, KBo 13.106 i 9, 8 // KUB 9.11 +IBoT 3.98; KBo 13.215 rev. 14'; KBo 13.217 ii 1', iii 6'; KBo 17.35 iii 8'; KBo 19.152 i 22; KBo 19.156 rev. 7'; KBo 20.59, 8, 13]; KBo 21.82 i 26; KBo 44.197 r.col. 2]; KBo 45.261 rev. 22]; KBo 45.262, 13; KUB 2.4 iv 17' // KUB 41.26 i 19; KUB 17.28 ii 18; KUB 25.33 i [10, 13]; KUB 32.117 obv. 14, rev. iii +KBo 19.156 rev. 7'; KUB 35.165 obv. 16, rev. 13, 14; KUB 41.39 obv. 5; KUB 48.23 rev. 4; KUB 56.17 obv. 4, rev. 1; KUB 57.57, 7; VSNF 12.20 v 18]; VSNF 12.21 iii 19', 22'; VSNF 12.144 obv. 9; IBoT 2.71 iv 18; HT 26, 15'.

⁶⁶ Respectively, RGTC 6, 247-248, 394, 297-298.

⁶⁷ Especially in purification rituals. See Klengel 1988, 105; Haas 1994, 152, 438, 881-882; Klinger 1996, 155-156; Hutter 2003, 231; Soysal 2010, 1052-1053, n. 27; Mouton 2014, 26. Taracha 2009, 115 goes even further «(Kamrušepa) was a goddess of magic, a divine midwife [...] the divine counterpart of the Anatolian Old Woman».

⁶⁸ Obv. 11'-13', rev. iii 8'-10' Starke 1985, 241, 243; Steitler 2017, 388-389 (ll. 18'-20'), 392-393.

⁶⁹ Haas 1994, 97, 446; Popko 1995, 88; Hutter 2003, 225; Steitler 2017, 399-401. For ^{URU}Tauriša see RGTC 6, 415-416.

⁷⁰ Haas 1994, 478; Steitler 2017, 399.

⁷¹ Laroche 1946-1947, 67. See also Cop 1960, 1, 7; Lebrun 1980, 51, 228.

⁷² Already noted by Goetze 1953, 266, n. 21. See also Hutter 2003, 230; Brosch 2014, 38.

⁷³ Haas 1994, 261. See also HEG Š2, 991; Hutter 2003, 230; Taracha 2009, 115, Soysal 2010, 1053, n. 32; Mouton 2014, 26.

⁷⁴ Laroche 1946-1947, 29; Goetze 1953, 265.

⁷⁵ Haas 1994, 438, n. 138, followed by Klinger 1996, 155, n. 112.

⁷⁶ Soysal 2010, 1055.

⁷⁷ Soysal 2010, 1056-1057. See also Soysal 2020, 135b.

⁷⁸ Logographic GUL-zanzipa according to the still debated hypothesis by Waal 2014, 1021.

⁷⁹ Although partially in the gap, the second attestation, iii 12': "[x ^dGul]-za-ze-pa-an" does not record the -n- before -zepa.

⁸⁰ See Starke 1990, 462-463, n. 1685.

from the verb Luwian *gulz-* “to engrave, to carve, to write, to mark”,⁸¹ which is directly linked with the idea of a “marked fate”.⁸² Consequently, Starke translated Gulzanzepe as «Genius, der Kenner der Schicksalzeichen ist».⁸³

^dMiyatanzepe is well attested⁸⁴ and unanimously interpreted as a spirit of the growth,⁸⁵ from *mai-/miya-* “to grow”, with the Hittite verbal noun *miyatar* meaning “growth, proliferation, abundance”.⁸⁶ Miyatanzepe seems to be a male god (in KUB 43.27 he is referred to as “King” in a very confusing context),⁸⁷ worshiped in Malita, Parmašhapa, Šapakurwanta and Šapita.⁸⁸

^dŠuwanzepe is a theonym⁸⁹ that Laroche interpreted as derived from a toponym, «génie de Šuwana (ville)»,⁹⁰ a hypothesis which may be only partly correct, since Šuwanzepe would rather owe its name to the city ^{URU}Šuwanzan(a), perhaps with a contraction and simplification of the middle consonantal cluster.⁹¹ Therefore, Šuwanzepe could be interpreted simply as a “Spirit of Šuwanzan(a)”. However, a different interpretation is possible: the name could represent a “Spirit of the *šuwa*(-vessel)”. Indeed, a Hittite or Luwian substantive *šuwa-* might work as the basis for both the divine name Šuwanzepe, as well as for the city name ^{URU}Šuwanzan(a)⁹², which may or may not have been part of the derivation.⁹³

^(MUNUS)Dagānzepe⁹⁴ represents a very peculiar case. It is obviously linked with the Hittite stem *tēkan/takn-* “earth”,⁹⁵ but the segment *dagan* is not the stem or nominative of the word, which makes the morphological pattern different from other cases. Craig Melchert (*pers.*

⁸¹ This reflects either Luwian *gulza-* (Kloekhorst 2008, 492-493) or Luwian *kwanza-*, depending on the acceptance or rejection of the proposal by Waal (2014, 1022) that the sign GUL was indeed logographic. See Hitt. *gulšš-*, HEG K, 627-630; HED K, 239-244; Archi 2013, 6; Waal 2014, 1016-1024.

⁸² From *gulzi/a-* “sign”, HEG K, 627. See also Kloekhorst 2008, 492; Archi 2013, 6; Waal 2014, 1025.

⁸³ Starke 1990, 463, n. 1685. See also Mouton 2014, 24.

⁸⁴ KBo 11.47 i 9; KBo 14.98 ii 9[; KBo 17.89 iii 5 + KBo 34.203 ii 7 // KUB 42.108; KBo 19.128 ii 8, [46]; KBo 20.31 obv. [16]; KBo 21.26 rev. 12[; KBo 23.92 ii 19; KBo 34.26, 9[; KBo 34.28 iii 2[; KUB 12.21, 8[; KUB 17.8 i 12[; KUB 17.10 iii 31 + KUB 33.1, 6; KUB 20.4 v 7[; KUB 30.42 iv 7; KUB 33.24 ii 15[; KUB 33.59 iii 12[; KUB 43.27 rev. 1, 2[; IBoT 3.8 obv. 3[; HT 44 obv. 14; HT 14 // KBo 46.100 rev. 5: *Mi[-...;* KBo 7.46 iv 13': *Mi-ya[-*. According to Otten (1971, 32) the ideographic writing of Miyatanzepe may be ^dGIR. See also Lebrun 1980, 51.

⁸⁵ Laroche 1946-1947, 68; Čop 1960, 1; Steiner 1971, 548a; Lebrun 1980, 51; Starke 1990, 491-492, 505, n. 1858; Haas 1994, 299; CHS Š3, 381; HEG Š2, 990; Mouton 2014, 20; Brosch 2014, 38.

⁸⁶ HEG M, 92; HEG Š2, 990; HED 6, 6-11; Kloekhorst 2008, 540-541; Mouton 2014, 20; Brosch 2014, 38.

⁸⁷ KUB 43.27+ rev. 3: “*baruwapša* LUGAL-uš ^dMiyatanzepe”. See Popko 1995, 73.

⁸⁸ According to KUB 38.6 i 15, 23, iv 11, 21. See van Gessel 1998, 309 and respectively RGTC 6, 257, 305, 346, 348.

⁸⁹ KUB 6.45 ii 22; KUB 6.46 ii 62-3; KUB 12.35, 10; KUB 57.108 iii 7.

⁹⁰ Laroche 1946-1947, 68. See also Čop 1960, 1.

⁹¹ RGTC 6, 371; KUB 6.45 ii 22-3. See Goetze 1953, 266; HEG Š2, 992; Mouton 2014, 25, nn. 65-66. Note, however, that the divine name is spelled with Ú, while the city name is spelled with U, which would point to two different vowels and certainly complicates the problem.

⁹² For an analysis of the *-anzan-* class see Melchert 2003.

⁹³ HEG Š2, 992; Brosch 2014, 38; Warbinek 2021, 112-113.

⁹⁴ KBo 3.38 obv. 3; KBo 8.110, 2; KUB 43.30 iii 5 // KBo 43.75, [1]; KUB 58.30 iii 5; KUB 58.38 i 11, 23-24; Bo 3895 l.col. 10. This is the divine occurrence that we have on Daganzepe as a theonym, whereas the word *daganzipa-* as a noun occurs frequently elsewhere. See, for instance, the phrase *danku(w)ai-daganzipa-* “dark earth”, HEG T1, 35.

⁹⁵ HEG T1, 34-36; HEG T2, 292; Kloekhorst 2008, 812. See also Goetze 1953, 266; Steiner 1971, 548a.

comm.) suggested to posit an endless locative *dagān* “on the ground”,⁹⁶ with the implication that this compound would not be a genitival compound, an interpretation that we shall not try to defend in a general fashion but seems to have been implicitly assumed in much of the literature dedicated to the group of theonyms under discussion.⁹⁷ Another unique feature of this theonym is its lack of determinatives, which makes the task of distinguishing the occurrences as a divine figure from the occurrences in which it simply means “earth” only possible through contextual analysis. Indeed, while there are no occurrences with a DINGIR, both the role she plays in some of the texts that mention her and her relationships with other members of the pantheon clarify that we are dealing with a very important goddess.⁹⁸ In KBo 3.38 obv. 3 ^{MUNUS}Daganzepa, is the daughter of the Sun Goddess (DUMU.MUNUS ^dUTU).⁹⁹ In KUB 43.30 iii 5; KUB 58.38 i 11, 23-[24]; Bo 3895 l.col. 10, Daganzepa - with no determinative - appears as *annaš daganzepaš*, before the name of Mezzulla (see also the discussion on Wurunšemu below).¹⁰⁰

^dTaršanzepa occurs twice in one source with a DINGIR,¹⁰¹ whereas undetermined *taršanzipa-* is frequently attested.¹⁰² ^{GIŠ}*tarša* was, in all likelihood, a kind of table or a divinized temple element.¹⁰³ While the compound was built on this primitive word, de Martino convincingly argued that *tarša(n)zipa* as a whole was also used as the name of a “room divider”, perhaps inside the temple,¹⁰⁴ reason why it could have been divinized.

^dUrunzepa is recorded only in KBo 57.48, 9’ and Bo 3891, 8’¹⁰⁵ but might be an adaptation of ^dUrunzimu/^dWurunšemu.¹⁰⁶ This, in Hattian, contains the morph *-šemu*, most likely “mother”, which in Soysal’s view could be interpreted as the ultimate origin for the Hittite morph *-šepa*.¹⁰⁷ Therefore, given the Hattian *wur-* “earth, land”,¹⁰⁸ ^dWurunšemu would indicate a divine Mother of the Land.¹⁰⁹ Whether this mother-deity is, at any stage, to

⁹⁶ Neu 1980, 8-10, 13; HEG T1, 36; HEG T2, 293; Kloekhorst 2008, 812.

⁹⁷ See Laroche 1946-1947, 68; Čop 1960, 1; Lebrun 1980, 51; Haas 1994, 299; Klinger 1996, 146-147; CHS Š3, 381; HEG T1, 36; HEG Š2, 992; Brosch 2014, 38.

⁹⁸ Mouton 2014, 20-21, 27.

⁹⁹ KBo 3.38 (2BoTU) obv. 2-3: “[^{MU}]NUS *Da-ga-ze-pa-aš-ša* DUMU MUNUS ^dUTU NINDA.GUR₄[.RA? ...]x[.]” See Laroche 1946-1947, 68; van Gessel 1998, 431; Klinger 1996, 146. CHD Š3, 382 puts it among personal names.

¹⁰⁰ Kloekhorst 2008, 502; HW2 A, 72a; HED II, 431 s.v. *ispant-*. See Popko 1995, 70; Klinger 1996, 147; Mouton 2014, 20-22; Steitler 2017, 62.

¹⁰¹ KBo 4.13 iii 24, v 8. The reading ^dHaššanzepa is incorrect, see Otten 1971, 40; Brosch 2014, 37; HW2 H, 410a; CHS Š3, 381.

¹⁰² De Martino 1983, 75-76.

¹⁰³ Laroche 1946-1947, 68; Čop 1960, 3; de Martino 1983, 85-90; Popko 1978, 65-66; HEG Š2, 992; Brosch 2014, 38; Mouton 2014, 24.

¹⁰⁴ «*divisorio* o, meglio, *paravento*» (de Martino 1983, 85-90). See also CHS Š3, 381: «platform, stage».

¹⁰⁵ See Soysal 2010, 1054, n. 34 and Groddek 2011, 27. Possibly, also KUB 42.87 iv 12[; KUB 53.25 obv. 9[.

¹⁰⁶ (*Uru(n)zimu*): KBo 8.85 obv. 8; KBo 17.59 rev. 5[; KBo 20.25 i 3; KBo 25.22, 5; KUB 36.89 obv. 3, rev. 5; KUB 42.87 iv 12[; (*P/Wuru(n)šemu*): KBo 37.29 iv 10; KBo 37.165, 8; KUB 1.17 i 25, 28, 34, 42, ii 2, 3, 23, iii 58; KUB 28.6 obv. l.col. 12a; KUB 28.64 obv. 10; KUB 28.104 iii 9; KUB 36.89 rev. 5. The former form is the old script of the latter, see Haas 1994, 421, n. 13; Steitler 2017, 59-64; CHD Š3, 382. See also ^dUruntemu, KUB 36.89 obv. 25, 31, 39, rev. 10, 34[; 51 (van Gessel 1998, 542).

¹⁰⁷ Soysal 2010, 1054; Steitler 2017, 61 with discussion.

¹⁰⁸ Steitler 2017, 61.

¹⁰⁹ Haas 1994, 421, 423; Yoshida 1996, 315; Klinger 1996, 146-147; Soysal 2010, 1054, n. 34; Steitler 2017, 61; Cammarosano 2021, 77. In Nerik, she was the mother of the Storm-god, see Haas 1994, 599.

be connected in any way to the Hittite spirit ^{MUNUS}Daganzepaš, who, as previously stated, is connected to Earth but is also the daughter of the Sun Goddess, remains quite problematic.¹¹⁰

^[d]Zikkanzepa is a *hapax* in KUB 58.33 iii 20, a ritual pertaining to the cult in Nerik.¹¹¹ In van Gessel and KUB 58,¹¹² Zikkanzepa does not have the determinative ^d; however, the photo shows an erasure where the sign AN was probably written. Zikkanzepa has been reasonably described as a «hethitische Stelengottheit»¹¹³ from the sacred stone ^{NA4}huwasi = Akkadian *sik(k)ānu(m)* = Log. ^{NA4}ZI.KIN = Hurrian *zikkani* (KUB 32.50 obv. 20), from which the form *zikkān-zepa* would be derived.¹¹⁴

3. THE LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF *-ŠEPA*

While the group has been described as a consistent one from the religious-historical point of view, the formal analysis of the names of the *-šepa* divine figures presents issues that will ultimately show a rather heterogeneous pattern of development.

All names in the group are compounds, but, at least in the case of Daganzepa, one should refrain from hastily assuming a genitival structure in which *-šepa* would be the head (which would lead, for *X-šepa*, to an interpretation as “*šepa* of the *X*”). In order to examine them in a detailed fashion, we will start by discussing the common head, the morph *-šepa*.¹¹⁵ While further contact-induced development can have occurred at a later stage, these two options (compound – genitival structure) describe the first step of the development of the names, so we can safely proceed to examine the two options.

To derive *šepa-* from Indo-European, it would be necessary to identify a root and its compositional morphology. The simple root **seh₁p-* could, in this case, be a reasonable candidate semantics-wise: it is the basis for Latin *sapio*,¹¹⁶ which would represent a decent *comparandum* if the meaning of *šepa-* in Hittite was, indeed, “genie” vel sim. However, Brosch’s «Wahrnehmung» > «Erscheinung»¹¹⁷ is semantically unlikely, as the root would probably point to the agent ((s)he who knows) rather than the patient ((s)he who is perceived). Phonologically we might easily posit **seh₁p-o-* or **seh₁p-eh₂*. Both would regularly yield *seba* (graphically ŠE-PA by Sturtevant’s Law) in Hittite. A root **sebh-* would not pose any problems, either but it would be related to kinship, which seems an unlikely semantic match.¹¹⁸ Another very promising etymology could employ a root **seib^h-* in relation to “magic making”,¹¹⁹ and certainly -considering their contexts- the *šepa* deities dealt with magic (Kamrušepa), purification (Ḫalalazepa, Ḫuwariyanzepa, Ḫuwarpazepa), and perhaps with the issue of fertility/abundance linked with the *terra mater* (Miyatanzepa, Šuwanzepa, Daganzepa, Urunzepa). In fact, it is quite unsurprising that these divinities had magical

¹¹⁰ Steitler 2017, 62 discussing Popko 1995, 70; Klinger 1996, 146-147.

¹¹¹ See Haas 1994, 507; van Gessel 1998, 580-581; Trabazo - Groddek 2005, 84.

¹¹² Van Gessel 1998, 580; KUB 58, IX-X, 15.

¹¹³ Haas 1994, 507.

¹¹⁴ Haas 1994, 507; Mouton 2014, 25. On the Hurrian form, see Haas - Wilhelm 1974, 125.

¹¹⁵ See also HEG Š2, 993.

¹¹⁶ Brosch 2014, 35.

¹¹⁷ Brosch 2014, 39.

¹¹⁸ See also HEG Š2, 993.

¹¹⁹ Čop 1960, 5-7 with notes.

faculties, and it does not necessarily imply that their name contained a reference to those faculties.

So much for the hypotheses of inheritance. The other option is the one defended by Soysal, who proposed that Hittite *šepa-* is, in fact, a loanword from Hattian *šemu* “mother”.¹²⁰ While the *m:p* correspondence would be typologically quite unproblematic, the *a*-thematization would require assuming that the noun was forced into the *a*-stem upon adaptation to Hittite. In his original proposal, Soysal based his idea only on the correspondence between the Hattian form Wurunšemu and the “Hittite” corresponding form Urunzepa,¹²¹ which is no compelling argument, as this single case could be explained as an instance of folk etymology that leads to the secondary ascription of Wurunšemu to the *šepa*-group. However, the stage of adaptation of the *šemu* element into an *a*-stem might be further testified by the existence of the name *Ḫa-an-da-ze-ma* in a late ritual from Emar,¹²² where the change of /*m*/ to /*p*/ had not occurred.

Of course, other factors may have intervened by the age and in the decentered area of this late occurrence, but it certainly makes it more difficult to entirely dismiss the Hattian hypothesis. The question, hence, is: since it is unwise to fully dismiss it, do we want to generalize it, and assume that all *šepa*-deities were in fact, originally, Hattian *šemu*-deities?

A third way, which we would like to suggest here, may consist in combining the Hattian solution and the Indo-European one, by assuming that the passage from Hattian *šemu* to Hittite *šepa* was not a case of borrowing with imperfect phonetic adaptation, but rather a sort of semantic calque or partial folk etymology, with an existing Anatolian word, **šepa-* (starred because only attested as a bound morph) used as a sort of translation of Hattian *šemu*. This solution would allow us to maintain the correspondence, but also to explain why some names, e.g. Daganzepa, might be older and originally Indo-European, and may have served as a model for the formation of new ones. This would also allow us to interpret Kamrušepa as a fully-fledged Anatolian divinity, which was indeed later syncretized with the Hattian Kataḫzifuri and did not have a corresponding *šemu*-deity in Hattian.

As far as the linguistic evidence is concerned, and according to the first element of the attested compounds, the *-šepa* deities can be etymologically grouped as follows:

- with clearly Luwian first element: Ḫalalazepa, Gulzanzepa;
- with clearly Hittite first element: Ispanzašepa, Miyatanzepa, Daganzepa;
- with an Anatolian first element (Hittite, Luwian or Palaic) that cannot be ascribed to a specific language: Ašgašepa,¹²³ Ḫantašepa, Ḫilanzepa,¹²⁴ Ḫu(wa)riyanzepa, Ḫuwarpazepa, Iwanzepa, Kamrušepa, Taršanzepe, Šuwanzepa;
- with a Hattian first element: Urunzepa (Hittitized form of Hattian Wurunšemu);

¹²⁰ Soysal 2010, 1054; Steitler 2017, 61.

¹²¹ Soysal 2010, 1054, n. 34.

¹²² Emar VI 471 obv. 19 (ME 110). See Arnaud 1985-1986, 455.

¹²³ The first element *aška* “gate” does not have a certain etymology. If Kloekhorst’s analysis (2008, 222) is correct and the root is **h₂os-ko-*, the word *aška-*, certainly attested in Hittite, could have existed in Luwian as well.

¹²⁴ According to Kloekhorst (2008, 343) the element *hila-* admits no satisfactory etymology in any Indo-European language of the area. From a morphological point of view, since the Akkadian *hilani* is in all likelihood non-Semitic, it is impossible to identify the language of origin of the morph, which may have been present, and virtually identical, in Hittite, Luwian and Palaic.

- with a Hurrian first name: Zikkanzepa (Hittitized form of Akk. *sik(k)ānu(m)*,
NA⁴ZI.KIN);
- an uncertain theonym: Ḫanzuwašepa.

This yields a final consideration, before we conclude the formal analysis. Whatever the correct solution to the problem of the *origin* of the *-šepa* morph, the first members of the compounds exhibit some degree of variation. They can all be described as belonging to the cultural *milieu* of Hittite Anatolia, but they do not all stem from a single language.

4. CONTEXTUAL AND FEATURE ANALYSIS

According to Laroche¹²⁵ the divine names with the *-šepa* morph are a «série homogène» and have often been treated as such.¹²⁶ However, there are no sources where all the *-šepa* gods are listed together. Furthermore, as the linguistic analysis clearly shows, their features and origins seem quite heterogeneous.¹²⁷ The collected evidence (17 *šepa*) clearly shows the following outcome:

- only 3 (18%) theonyms occur with other determinatives (instead of ^d), 2 of which with ḪUR.SAG;
- only 3 (18%) theonyms can be certainly recognized as female deities, plus probably Ašgašepa;
- only 1 (6%) theonym can be surely ascribed to a male god.

More specifically, Ašgašepa occasionally occurs with the determinative ḪUR.SAG;¹²⁸ Ḫalalazepa presents the determinatives ḪUR.SAG and KUR;¹²⁹ Daganzepa never occurs with the determinative ^d and only once (KBo 3.38) with determinative MUNUS.¹³⁰

As for gender, Ašgašepa never display a female determinative but, as already mentioned, Goetze convincingly showed based on a textual variant that it is a female deity. Kamrušepa is clearly a female deity – although her name never occurs with the determinative ^f – as she is the wife of Tiwad and mother of the Tutelary god of the town of Tauriša.¹³¹ Miyatanzepa seems to be a male god as he is referred to as “King” in KUB 43.27 rev. 3.¹³² Daganzepa was surely a female deity.¹³³ Wurunšemu connects quite clearly with the concept of “mother” (Hattian *-šemu*, in connection with ^dUTU Arinna).

¹²⁵ Laroche 1946-1947, 67.

¹²⁶ For instance, Lebrun (1980, 50) collected them as «dieux protecteurs», i.e. ^dLAMMA. See also Mouton 2014.

¹²⁷ In this respect, the linguistic variety of these theonyms fits good with the main property of the State Pantheon of Ḫatti, a pantheon where gods with different ethnic backgrounds coexisted. For instance, Schwemer 2008, 147-148; Taracha 2009, 82-95; Cammarosano 2021, 63-64.

¹²⁸ RGTC 6, 47-48; RGTC 6/2, 15. According to Haas (1994, 614, n. 492), it may be identified with the volcano Erçiyas Dağı.

¹²⁹ RGTC 6, 68.

¹³⁰ KBo 3.38 (2BoTU) obv. 2-3: “[^{MU}]NUS *Da-ga-zi-pa-aš-ša* DUMU MUNUS ^dUTU NINDA.GUR₄[.RA? ...]x[.” See Laroche 1946-1947, 68; van Gessel 1998, 431; Klinger 1996, 146.

¹³¹ Haas 1994, 478; Steitler 2017, 399.

¹³² Popko 1995, 73.

¹³³ MUNUS in KBo 3.38 obv. 3; *annaš* in KUB 43.40 iii 5; KUB 58.38 i 11, 23-[24]; Bo 3895 l.col. 10.

As for geographical evidence related to *-šepa* theonyms, when we consider both the places of worship and the places of origin of the deities in the broad sense, their distribution is as follows (see fig. 1): Ašgašepa was worshiped in Ḫatti and Karaḫna; Ḫalalazepa is a *hapax* in a Local Cult of the unidentified town of Mikuya; Ḫu(wa)riyanzepa is stated in Šamuḫa; Ḫuwarpazepa represents a *hapax* from Yassihöyük, probably ancient Taḫurpa; Iwanzepa might be reported in the Malpınar inscription; Kamrušepa was worshiped in Liḫzina, Taniwanta, Tanizila and Pala; Miyatanzepa was worshiped in Malita, Parmašḫapa, Šapakurwanta and Šapita; Šuwanzepa is stated in Šuwanzana.

Concerning textual typology, these deities occur in texts of several and different genres: cult inventories,¹³⁴ catalogs,¹³⁵ festivals,¹³⁶ rituals,¹³⁷ Festriviale,¹³⁸ treaties,¹³⁹ oracles,¹⁴⁰ myths,¹⁴¹ prayers,¹⁴² and other.¹⁴³

4.1. The “circle” of Kaniš

What emerges from the previous data is that the divine names with *-šepa* do *not* belong to a homogeneous group of gods, even though scholarship keeps treating them as a whole.¹⁴⁴ Whether we consider etymology, gender, geographical or textual evidence, it is not sensible to treat them as a coherent group, and this is true also for the so-called “circle”.

The term circle is frequently used in scholarship for a group of deities, often linked to a town or a prominent god.¹⁴⁵ For the deities whose names contain the *-šepa* element, the most notable case of circle is the group including Ašgašepa,¹⁴⁶ Išpanzašepa¹⁴⁷ and Kamrušepa.¹⁴⁸

¹³⁴ For instance, Ḫalalazepa in the Local Cults of KUB 38.26 (CTH 526).

¹³⁵ For instance, Miyatanzepa in KUB 30.42 (CTH 276).

¹³⁶ For instance, Ašganšepa in KUB 2.13, Monatsfest (CTH 591); Taršanzepe in KBo 4.13, AN.TAḪ.SUM (CTH 625); Ḫuwarianzepa in KUB 20.4, KILAM (CTH 627); Kamrušepa in KBo 11.22, *Gemischte Feste* (CTH 656).

¹³⁷ For instance, Kamrušepa in KBo 13.145, ritual of Ḫantitaššu (CTH 395); Zikkanzepa in KUB 58.33, a ritual about the cult in Nerik (CTH 678); Ḫuwarianzepa in KUB 58.18, Ritual for the Sea (CTH 722).

¹³⁸ For instance, Ḫuwarianzepa in KBo 45.55, cult of Arinna (CTH 666); Ašgašepa in KUB 10.92, cult of Teššub and Ḫebat (CTH 706); Ḫantašepa in KBo 17.1, Old Hittite ritual (CTH 416).

¹³⁹ For instance, Ašgašepa in KBo 1.2, Šuppiluliuma treaty with Šattiwaza of Mitanni (CTH 51), and in KUB 8.82+, Tuḫaliya's treaty with Šauškamuwa of Amurru (CTH 105).

¹⁴⁰ For instance, Ḫuwarianzepa in KUB 5.7, MUŠEN-ḪURRI oracles (CTH 574); Ašgašepa in KBo 24.118 (CTH 568).

¹⁴¹ For instance, Kamrušepa in KBo 8.73 (CTH 370); Miyatanzepa in KUB 33.24 (CTH 325); Ḫantašepa in KUB 44.56 (CTH 457).

¹⁴² For instance, Kamrušepa in KUB 14.13, prayer by Muršili II (CTH 378), Šuwanzepa in KUB 6.45, prayer by Muwattalli II (CTH 381).

¹⁴³ For instance, Kamrušepa in KUB 28.5 (CTH 727), in KUB 35.88 (CTH 765), in KUB 43.34 (CTH 820).

¹⁴⁴ For instance, Goetze 1953, 262; Haas 1994, 612-615; Taracha 2009, 58-59. The heterogeneity of this group of gods has already been underlined by Kammenhuber 1976, 50. See also Archi 2004, 11; id. 2010, 32.

¹⁴⁵ For instance, «the gods of Huwaššanna's circle in Hupišna» (Hutter 2003, 273-274); «deities belonging to the *kaluti* [list] of the Hurrian Storm-god» (Taracha 2009, 102); «Kreis des Wettergottes (von) Manuz(z)i» (Haas 1994, 402).

¹⁴⁶ Laroche 1946-1947, 67; Otten 1971, 32; Haas 1994, 413; Popko 1995, 89; Taracha 2009, 28-30, 58.

¹⁴⁷ Taracha 2009, 52.

¹⁴⁸ Laroche 1946-1947, 67; Haas 1994, 412, n. 3, 439; Popko 1995, 88; Taracha 2009, 30; Mouton 2014, 26; Soysal 2020, 135b.

This putative circle¹⁴⁹ has been defined in several ways according to the prominence of a deity («cercle de Pirwa»¹⁵⁰) or of a town («Pantheon von Neša/Kaniš»,¹⁵¹ «Gruppe/Kreis der Gottheiten/Götter von Kaniš»¹⁵²), while the texts refer specifically to the “Gods of Kaniš” DINGIR^{MEŠ(-aš)} URU^{Kaniš}.¹⁵³

In our view, these naming issues already show how vague the very definition of a circle is. The “circle of Pirwa” puts too much emphasis on the role of a single deity, based on limited and circumstantial evidence. The references to Kaniš are quite suitable, but positively generic. Moreover, what are the limits and boundaries of a “circle”? Were these gods part of a pantheon on their own? Or is the group a subset of something else, or a later religious construct? At the present stage of research, only the so-called *kaluti* lists organized around the Hurrian Teššub and Hebat can be safely defined as “circles”, whereas those questions cannot be answered with certainty for any other divine groups.¹⁵⁴

Still on the subject of the *-šepa* deities, even if we assume that the gods of the putative circle did belong together, only three¹⁵⁵ out of 17 would be represented, and they are also quoted in other texts outside those of the circle, so it would be risky to assume that they had an original connection with the geographical area of interest.

This leads us to another, broader question. Were the *-šepa* divinities part of a larger group within the Hittite pantheon of the “Thousand Gods of Ḫatti”, or did they originate in many different, albeit perhaps similar, contexts? According to Mouton,¹⁵⁶ the structure of the divine «Monde Autre» has the shape of a pyramid: at the top are the main gods; below are the second-rate gods; then the spirits, the tutelary and evil gods; at the bottom are the ancient-departed kings. Following this reasoning, the *-šepa* spirits are secondary deities on the same level as ^dLAMMAS’.¹⁵⁷ This could be generally valid, but this representation is the picture of a palimpsest that returns a synchronic and flat picture of what was, in all likelihood, the result of a diachronic process of stratification. As is the case of the different Tutelary gods, the *-šepa* deities should not be grouped together axiomatically, because if the available evidence offers a sufficiently clear picture, this picture highlights as many differences as there are similarities.¹⁵⁸

¹⁴⁹ According to different texts, this group includes: Pirwa, ^dMUNUS.LUGAL (Ḫaššušara), Kamrušepa, Ašgašepa, Maliya, Šiwat, Šuwaliat, Ḫašammili, Išpant (Išpanzašepa), ^d7.7.BI, Ḫalki, Ilaliya, Tarawa. See Goetze 1953, 264-266; Haas 1994, 412-413, 614; Popko 1995, 89; Taracha 2009, 28-30, 58.

¹⁵⁰ Laroche 1946-1947, 67.

¹⁵¹ Otten 1971, 32; Haas 1994, 413; Mouton 2014, 26; Soysal 2020, 135b.

¹⁵² Haas 1994, 281, 413, 439; Klinger 1996, 157.

¹⁵³ See the attestations listed in Archi 2010, 32-33. Popko 1995, 88-89; Taracha 2009, 30, 52, 133; and Cammarosano 2021, 84, correctly use the definition of «Kanesite gods/deities».

¹⁵⁴ For *kaluti* see HEG K, 471-472; HED K, 33-35; Kloekhorst 2008, 130; Taracha 2009, 118. Since there is no Hittite word for “circle”, we should keep in mind that the concept is a scholarly definition, which will require further investigation.

¹⁵⁵ There is also Ḫilanzepa, who took part in a Palaic ritual for the god of vegetation Ziparfa together with Kamrušepa (Haas 1994, 438-439; Mouton 2014, 23), however, it seems to refer to a Palaic context, rather than a Kanesite one, if Taracha (2009, 144) is right when he states: «she [i.e., Kamrušepa] formed with the Storm-god referred to as Ziparwa the chief pair in the Palaic pantheon». Differently, Klengel 1988, 105.

¹⁵⁶ Mouton 2014, 19, 27.

¹⁵⁷ As already expressed by Lebrun 1980, 50-51.

¹⁵⁸ Mouton 2014, 27.

5. CONCLUSION

In the Anatolian pantheon of the “Thousand Gods of Ḫatti”, theonyms with Hittite, Luwian, Hattian, Hurrian, and even Semitic etymology can be found. Different morphs are often combined, as the *-šepa* compounds clearly show. For this reason, the classification of a deity as “Hittite”, “Luwian”, “Hattian” or “Hurrian” is quite complex and possibly misleading.¹⁵⁹

Although most of the *-šepa* divine names can be traced back to a Hittite-Luwian etymology, they cannot be regarded as a homogeneous group: they are preserved in different texts, take part in different events, and show different features. Most of them are female, but at least one is a male; they can be related to divinized objects or landscape markers, but not necessarily. Some must have had a partly Hattian origin, while others (at least Daganzepa) were originally Hittite, and a fair amount were probably modeled at a later stage and bear mixed names. All in all, the best way to describe them is as the product of the many different components of the mixed-culture of Late Bronze Age Anatolia, which developed over time, resulting in a palimpsest that cannot be easily disentangled based on the available documentation.

ABBREVIATIONS

ABoT	K. BALKAN, <i>Ankara Arkeoloji Müzesinde bulunan Boğazköy Tabletleri</i> , Istanbul 1948.
CHD	<i>The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago</i> , Chicago 1980ff.
CHS	<i>Corpus der Hurritischen Sprachdenkmäler</i> , Roma 1984ff.
CTH	E. LAROCHE, <i>Catalogue des textes hittites</i> , Paris 1971.
CLL	H. MELCHERT, <i>Cuneiform Luwian Lexicon</i> , Chapel Hill 1993.
HED	J. PUHVEL, <i>Hittite Etymological Dictionary</i> , Berlin - New York - Amsterdam 1984ff.
HEG	J. TISCHLER, <i>Hethitisches Etymologisches Glossar</i> , Innsbruck 1977ff.
IBoT	<i>Istanbul Arkeoloji Müzesinde bulunan Boğazköy Tabletlerinden Seçme Metinler</i> , Istanbul - Ankara 1944-1954.
KBo	<i>Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi</i> , Leipzig 1916-1923, Berlin 1954ff.
KUB	<i>Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi</i> , Berlin 1921ff.
NH	E. LAROCHE, <i>Les noms des Hittites</i> , Paris 1966.
RGTC 6	G.F. DEL MONTE - J. TISCHLER, <i>Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der hethitischen Texte</i> , Wiesbaden 1978.
RGTC 6/2	G.F. DEL MONTE, <i>Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der hethitischen Texte. Supplement</i> , Wiesbaden 1992.
VBoT	A. GÖTZE, <i>Verstreute Boghazköi-Texte</i> , Marburg 1930.
VSNF 12	L. JAKOB-ROST, <i>Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköy im Vorderasiatische Museum</i> , Neue Folge, Mainz 1997.

¹⁵⁹ A question already well stated by Cammarosano (2021, 63-64) «A god who was originally rooted e.g. in the Hattian culture underwent transformations along his life through the Hittite centuries [...] both “from below” and “from above”».

REFERENCES

- AKDOĞAN, R.
2010 *Hethitische Texte in Transkription. Ankara Arkeoloji Müzesinde Bulunan Boğazköy Tabletleri II (ABoT 2) (Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie 32)*, Wiesbaden 2010.
- ARCHI, A.
2004 The Singer of Kaneš and his Gods: M. HUTTER - S. HUTTER-BRAUNSAAR (eds.), *Offizielle Religion, lokale Kulte und individuelle Religiosität (Alter Orient und Altes Testament 318)*, Münster 2004, pp. 11-26.
2010 The Heptad in Anatolia: *Hethitica* 16 (2010), pp. 21-34.
2013 The Anatolian Fate-Goddesses and their Different Traditions: E. CANCIK-KIRSCHBAUM - J. KLINGER - G.G.W. MÜLLER (eds.), *Diversity and Standardization. Perspectives on social and political norms in the ancient Near East*, Berlin 2013, pp. 1-26.
- ARNAUD, D.
1985-1986 *Mission archeologique de Meskene-Emar. Recherches au pays d'Astata. Emar VI, 1-3: Textes sumériens et accadiens (Recherche sur les Civilisations, Synthèse 18)*, Paris 1985-1986.
- BAYRAM, S.
1991 Taşınmaz Mallar Hakkında Yeni Kültepe Vesikalari: *Belleten* LV/213 (1991), pp. 297-314.
- BEAL, R.H.
1992 *The Organisation of the Hittite Military (Texte der Hethiter 20)*, Heidelberg 1992.
- BROSCH, C.
2014 Zum den Wurzeln **seuh₃*- und **seh₁p*- im Anatolischen: *Studia Etymologica Cracoviensia* 19 (2014), pp. 35-41.
- CAMMAROSANO, M.
2018 *Hittite Local Cults (Society of the Biblical Literature. Writing from the Ancient World Series 40)*, Atlanta 2018.
2021 *At the Interface of Religion and Administration: The Hittite Cult Inventories (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 68)*, Wiesbaden 2021.
- ČOP, B.
1960 Beiträge zur indogermanischen Wortforschung 3: *Sprache* 6 (1960), pp. 1-8.
- DE MARTINO, S.
1983 La funzione del *tarsa(n)zipa* nelle cerimonie culturali ittite: *Hethitica* 5 (1983), pp. 75-94.
- FALES, F.M.
2016 Yassihöyük (Yozgat) B: *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie Lieferung* 15/1-2 (2016), pp. 148-149.
- GOETZE, A.
1953 The Theophorous Elements of the Anatolian Proper Names from Cappadocia: *Language* 29/3 (1953), pp. 263-277.
- GRODDEK, D.
2001 Fragmenta Hethitica dispersa XI: *Altorientalische Forschungen* 28/1 (2001), pp. 108-119.
2004 *Hethitische Texte in Transkription KBo 39 (Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie 11)*, Dresden 2004.
2011 *Hethitische Texte in Transkription KBo 57 (Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie 36)*, Wiesbaden 2011.
- GURNEY, M.
1977 *Some aspects of Hittite religion*, Oxford 1977.
- HAAS, V.
1994 *Geschichte der hethitischen Religion (Handbuch der Orientalistik)*, Leiden 1994.

- HAAS, V. - WILHELM, G.
1974 *Hurritische und luwische Riten aus Kizzuwatna. Hurritologische Studien I (Alter Orient und Altes Testament - Sonderreihe 3)*, Kevelaer - Neukirchen-Vluyn 1974.
- HOFFNER, H.A. - MELCHERT, H.C.
2008 *A Grammar of the Hittite Language*, Winona Lake 2008.
- HUTTER, M.
2003 Aspects of Luwian Religion: *Handbuch der Orientalistik I/68* (2003), pp. 211-280.
- KALAC, M. - HAWKINS, J.D.
1989 The Hieroglyphic Luwian Rock-Inscription of Malpınar: *Anatolian Studies* 39 (1989), pp. 107-112.
- KAMMENHUBER, A.
1961 Nominalkomposition in den altanatolischen Sprachen des 2. Jahrtausends: *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 77 (1961), pp. 162-218.
1976 *Orakelpraxis, Träume und Vorzeichenschau bei den Hethitern (Texte der Hethiter 7)*, Heidelberg 1976.
- KLENGEL, H.
1988 Papaja, Kataḫzipuri un der *eja*-Baum. Erwägungen zum Verständnis von KUB 56.17: *Eothen. Studi sulle civiltà dell'Oriente antico* 1 (1998), pp. 101-110.
- KLINGER, J.
1996 *Untersuchungen zur Rekonstruktion der hattischen Kultschicht (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 37)*, Wiesbaden.
- KLOEKHORST, A.
2008 *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon (Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series 5)*, Leiden.
- LAROCHE, E.
1945-1946 Hittite -nš-/-nz-: *Revue Hittite et Asiatique* 7/45 (1945-1946), pp. 3-11.
1946-1947 Recherches sur les noms des dieux hittites: *Revue Hittite et Asiatique* 7/46 (1946-1947), pp. 7-139.
- LEBRUN, R.
1976 *Samuha, foyer religieux de l'empire hittite*, Louvain-la-Neuve 1976.
1980 *Hymnes et prières hittites*, Louvain-la-Neuve 1980.
- MCMAHON, G.
1991 *The Hittite State Cult of the Tutelary Deities (Assyriological Studies 25)*, Chicago 1991.
- MELCHERT, H.C.
1993 *Cuneiform Luvian Lexicon (CLL)*, Chapel Hill 1993.
2003 Hittite Nominal Stems in -*anza-*: E. TICHY - D.S. WODTKO - B. IRLINGER (eds.), *Indogermanisches Nomen Derivation, Flexion und Ablaut. Akten der Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Freiburg 19-22 September 2001*, Bremen (2003), pp. 129-139.
- MOUTON, A.
2014 Terre divinisée et autres «génies» de l'Anatolie hittite: *Semitica et Classica* 7 (2014), pp. 19-29.
- NEU, E.
1980 *Studien zum endungslosen „Lokativ“ des Hethitischen (Vorträge und kleinere Schriften 23)*, Innsbruck.
- OTTEN, H.
1971 *Ein hethitisches Festrival (KBo XIX 128) (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 13)*, Wiesbaden.

- OTTEN, H. - SOUČEK, V.
1969 *Ein althethitisches Ritual für das Königspaar (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 8)*, Wiesbaden.
- POPKO, M.
1978 *Kultobjekte in der hethitischen Religion (nach keilschriftlichen Quellen)*, Warsaw 1978.
1995 *Religions of Asia Minor*, Warsaw 1995.
- SASSEVILLE, D.
2020 *Anatolian Verbal Stem Formation. Luwian, Lycian and Lydian*, Leiden - Boston 2020.
- SCHWEMER D.
2008 Fremde Götter in Ḫatti. Die hethitische Religion im Spannungsfeld von Synkretismus und Abgrenzung: G. WIELM (ed.), *Ḫattuša - Boğazköy. Das Hethiterreich im Spannungsfeld des Alten Orients 6. Internationales Colloquium der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft 22–24 März 2006, Würzburg*, Weisbaden 2008, pp. 137-158.
- SOYSAL, O.
2004 *Hattischer Wortschatz in hethitischer Textüberlieferung (Handbuch der Orientalistik I/74)*, Leiden - Boston 2004.
2010 Zum Namen der Göttin Katazhipuri mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des Kasussystems des Hattischen: L. KOGAN - N. KOSLOVA - S. LOESOV - S. TISHCHENKO (eds.), *Babel und Bibel 4. Annual of Ancient Near Eastern, Old Testament, and Semitic Studies. Proceedings of the 53e Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale. Vol. 1, Part 2 (Papers of the Institute of Oriental and Classical Studies XXX)*, Winona Lake 2010, pp. 1041-1058.
2020 Rev. of: Ch. Steitler 2017 (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 62): *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und vorderasiatische Archäologie* 110/2 (2020), pp. 131-138.
- STARKE, F.
1985 *Die keilschrift-luwischen Texte in Umschrift (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 30)*, Wiesbaden 1985.
1990 *Untersuchungen zur Stammbildung des keilschriftluwischen Nomens (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 31)*, Wiesbaden 1990.
- STEINER, G.
1971 Gott: *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie Lieferung III* (1971), pp. 532a-575a.
- STEITLER, Ch.W.
2017 *The Solar Deities of Bronze Age Anatolia (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 62)*, Wiesbaden 2017.
- TARACHA, P.
2009 *Religions of Second Millennium Anatolia (Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie 27)*, Wiesbaden 2009.
- TRABAZO, G.J.V. - GRODDEK, D.
2005 *Hethitische Texte in Transkription KUB 58 (Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie 18)*, Wiesbaden 2005.
- VAN GESSEL, B.H.L.
1998 *Onomasticon of the Hittite Pantheon. Part I*, Leiden - New York - Köln 2014.
- WAAL, W.
2014 Changing Fate. Hittite Gulš-/Gul-š-, ^Dgulšeš/^DGUL-šeš, Cuneiform Luwian gulzā(i)-/Gulzā(i)- Hieroglyphic Luwian REL-za and the Kuwanšeš Deities: P. TARACHA (ed.), *Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Hittitology, Warsaw, 5-9 September 2011*, Warsaw 2014, pp. 1016-1033.

- WARBINEK, L.
2021 Šuwašuna: some Remarks on an Anatolian Theonym: *Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires* 2021/2 Nr. 46 (2021), pp. 111-114.
- WEGNER, I.
2002 *Hurritische Opferlisten aus hethitischen Festbeschreibungen. Teil II: Texte für Teššub, Hebat und weitere Gottheiten (Corpus der hurritischen Sprachdenkmäler 1/3-2)*, Roma 2002.
- YOSHIDA, D.
1996 *Untersuchungen zu den Sonnengottheiten bei den Hethitern (Texte der Hethiter 22)*, Heidelberg 1996.



Fig. 1 - Geographical diffusion of the occurrences of the *-šepa* theonyms (based on the Map 1 by Michele Cammarosano 2018, xxiv).