

Hittite and Hieroglyphic Luvian *arba* ‘away’: Common Inheritance or Borrowing?

H. Craig Melchert

University of California, Los Angeles
melchert@humnet.ucla.edu

Abstract

Yakubovich (2010), in arguing convincingly that Hittite borrowed its enclitic reflexive particle from Luvian, emphasizes that this contact-induced change in the pronominal system was due not only to close and prolonged contact between speakers of the two languages, but also to the structural (in this case genetic) similarity of the respective systems (2010: 197ff.). Most discussion by Yakubovich and others has focused on Luvian influence on Hittite, prehistoric and in the Middle and New Hittite period. While a few lexical borrowings from Hittite into Luvian have been acknowledged, the question of Hittite-induced changes in Luvian grammatical morphemes has received little or no attention. I will argue that the likewise very similar systems of “local adverbs” and “preverbs” in the two languages led to a borrowing *from* Hittite *into* Luvian in this set of grammatical morphemes. While fine details assure a borrowing in this case, overall facts make borrowing far less likely in a second case to be considered. The very similarity of the respective systems makes it hard to determine whether the latter represents common inheritance or parallel independent developments possibly made more convergent by contact.

Keywords

adpositions; local adverbs; Hittite; Luvian; preverbs

1. Hittite and Luvian Contact: General Context

The following study takes as its object two languages of the Anatolian sub-branch of Indo-European: Hittite, the chief administrative language of the Hittite Empire, attested in extensive cuneiform documents from the ancient capital Hattusha and a few other sites in Anatolia from the 16th through the 13th centuries BCE, and Luvian, attested in limited (mostly ritual) texts in

* The author is indebted to Ilya Yakubovich for making available to him in advance of its appearance the much revised and expanded publication version of the paper Yakubovich originally presented at the 8th International Congress of Hittitology, Warsaw, Poland, September 6, 2011. The author also thanks three anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments.

cuneiform in Hittite context and in Anatolian hieroglyphs, in a few texts dating from the last centuries of the Hittite Empire and more extensively in texts after its fall (11th to 7th centuries BCE).

Recent years have witnessed a growing realization that the influence of Luvian on Hittite is both earlier and more profound than previously thought. The older view of such influence having occurred only after 1400 BCE in the “Empire” or New Hittite period represented by Otten (1953: 3), Güterbock (1956a: 138), and Kammenhuber (1971: 80, 94, 97 et alibi) has been superseded by proposals for extensive prehistorical lexical borrowing (Starke 1990: passim and Melchert 2005) and for even more extensive influence during the Empire: e.g. Rieken (1994 and 2006), Oettinger (1999: 43–47) among others.

The study of linguistic contact between Luvian and Hittite received a dramatic new impetus from the findings of Yakubovich (2010). In Chapter 1 (see especially pp. 68–73), he demonstrated that the traditional contrast of Hieroglyphic and Cuneiform Luvian as distinct dialects should be replaced by another. There was on the one hand “Empire Luvian”, a koiné promulgated from *the Hittite capital Hattusha* (my emphasis—HCM) for official purposes during the late Empire period, attested in the scattered “Luvianisms” appearing in New Hittite cuneiform texts, in Hieroglyphic Luvian inscriptions of at least the last two Hittite kings, and continued after the fall of the Empire in the hieroglyphic inscriptions of various Iron Age rulers who presented themselves as “heirs” of the Empire. On the other hand, there was “Kizzuwatna Luvian”, another koiné reflected in rituals with running Luvian incantations originating in Cilicia, but attested in second-millennium cuneiform texts imported to Hattusha. Yakubovich further showed (2010: Chapter 3), based on evidence from the reflexive pronoun, that Luvian had significant prehistoric impact on the *grammar* of Hittite, implying a far more profound contact than that presupposed by lexical borrowings. He also properly emphasized (2010: 197–205) that not only the degree of contact, but also the structural similarity of the two closely genetically related languages played a decisive role in the borrowing of a grammatical morpheme.

Aside from a few suggested lexical loans from Hittite into the two forms of Luvian, there has been very little investigation of possible influence of Hittite on Luvian. In light of Yakubovich’s proposal that Empire Luvian was first spread from Hattusha under the aegis of the late Hittite kings,¹ we should

¹ A separate question is whether Empire Luvian was a koinéized version of the Luvian spoken in Hattusha. Unfortunately, we do not have and are not likely ever to have textual evidence of the kind needed to answer this question.

consider seriously the possibility that there was also influence from Hittite on Empire Luvian. I will investigate one such case in what follows, but we will see that a definitive solution is made difficult by the very similarity of the grammatical subsystems involved: which, if any, matching forms and functions are borrowed? Or are they all due to common inheritance?

2. Case Study: Hittite and Empire Luvian “ARHA” ‘away’

2.1. Hittite *awan arḫa* and Empire Luvian *wali-na-ha*

One of the defining features of both Hittite and Luvian is their system of so-called “local adverbs”, which define basic spatial relations and occur syntactically as free-standing adverbs, preverbs, and adpositions (in Hittite exclusively postpositions, but in Luvian as both prepositions and postpositions).

	Hittite	Empire/Iron Age Luvian ²	Kizzuwatna Luvian
‘in(to)’	<i>anda</i>	<i>a-ta/tá</i> /a:nda/	<i>āntalānda</i>
‘in’	<i>andan</i>	<i>á-ta-na</i> /andan/	<i>andan</i> (?)
‘back’	<i>āppa</i>	<i>á-pi-(i)</i> /a:pil/	<i>āppa</i>
‘behind’	<i>āppan</i>	<i>á-pa-na</i> /a:pan/	<i>āppan</i>
‘down’	<i>katta</i>	INFRA- <i>ta</i> /tsanta/ ³	<i>zanta</i>
{‘below’	<i>kattan</i>	INFRA- <i>(na)-na</i> /a:nnan/	<i>ānnan</i> }
{‘with’	<i>katta(n)</i>	CUM- <i>ni/ní</i> */a:nni/	-----}
‘forth’	<i>p(a)rā</i>	<i>pa + ra/i-(i)</i> /pri:/	<i>p(a)rī</i>
‘in front’	<i>pēran</i>	<i>pa + ra/i-na</i> /parran/	<i>parran</i>
‘up’	<i>š(a)rā</i>	SUPER + <i>RA/I</i> (ending unclear)	<i>šarra</i> (??)
‘above’	<i>šēr</i>	SUPER + <i>RA/I</i> /sarri/	<i>šarri</i>

Those adverbs indicating direction (‘in(to)’, ‘back’, ‘down’, ‘forth/out’, ‘up’) function primarily as preverbs which limit the directionality of the verb (like English verbal particles), while those expressing location (‘in’, ‘behind’, ‘below’, ‘in front’, ‘above’) appear either as free-standing adverbs or as adpositions. Hittite *katta(n)* and Luvian */a:nni-/ ‘with, beside’, whose sense not only is locational, but also necessarily implies an associated noun phrase,

² The Anatolian hieroglyphs employ a mixed logographic and syllabic system, like cuneiform. By convention, logograms are transliterated into (upper case) Latin, and syllabic signs into lower case italics. The serious limitations of the hieroglyphic system make it advisable to give in slant bars also tentative phonological interpretations of the spelled forms.

³ See for Luvian *zanta* ‘down’ and **ānni* ‘with’ Goedegebuure (2010).

typically function only as postpositions. For a special exception in combination with the adverb meaning ‘away’ see section 2.2 below.

If we make due allowance for different respective sound changes and minor adjustments in the endings, all of the Hittite and Luvian local adverbs are direct cognates, except for the words for ‘below’ and ‘with’ (marked by braces in the list above), which have quite different sources. The systems match closely enough that speakers of the one language surely found it fairly easy to learn the other, but the degree of similarity could also have led to interference.

The specific problem to be discussed here is that of the Empire Luvian adverb conventionally rendered as “*ARHA*”, meaning ‘away’ and functioning primarily as a preverb limiting the directionality of a motion verb (but see below on further uses). The transliteration is conventional, because the word is written consistently as a logogram: in the Empire period the sign used is identical with that for FINES ‘boundary (territory), limit’. Thereafter (in texts of the Iron Age) in use as an adverb the sign for *ha* is added below that for ‘boundary’. The reading as *ARHA* is based entirely on a supposed equation with the Hittite adverb (likewise mostly preverb) *arḫa* ‘away’.⁴ The latter is widely agreed to reflect a grammaticalization of what was originally an allative singular case form of the Hittite word for ‘boundary (territory)’. Thus ‘away’ is historically ‘*to the boundary’ (Puhvel 1984: 134–135 with references).

In evaluating the status of Empire Luvian “*ARHA*”, it is crucial to note that the noun ‘boundary’ is clearly to be read as /irha/i-/ in Iron Age Empire Luvian:⁵ (FINES)*i + ra/i-[bi]-z[a/i]* /irhinsi/ (nominative-accusative plural) (TELL AHMAR 1, §5a), (“FINES”)*i + ra/i-ha/há-za* /irhants/ (dative-locative plural) (KARATEPE, §§XIX and XXX); FINES+*RAI-bi*-NEG₂ /irhin/ (accusative singular) (TOPADA, §8). The same reading for Empire Luvian in the Hittite Empire period is assured by the related word *irḫatta-* ‘row, series’ in Hittite contexts (KUB 20.74 vi 9, 25.32 + 27.70 ii 16 etc.), whose sense and morphology betray that it is Luvian.

The entire question of the Luvian word for ‘away’ has been renewed due to the brilliant analysis by Yakubovich (forthcoming) of the previously enigmatic

⁴ The transliteration in italics but in upper case is intended to reflect that the apparent phonetic value is inferred, and not based on a true syllabic spelling.

⁵ All citations of hieroglyphic texts of the Iron Age are from Hawkins (2000). Logograms transliterated in parentheses represent “determinatives” that mark the semantic class of a word, but have no phonetic value. The vertical line | represents a word divider. CONJ = conjunction, PART = particle.

Iron Age Empire Luvian word *wali-na-ha* as the equivalent of Hittite *awan arḫa* ‘away (from)’. The word is attested just twice, in (1) and (2) below. An example of the Hittite combination is given in (3).

(1) İSKENDERUN §6 (late 9th century; Hawkins 2000: 259)

<i>za-pa-wali</i>	¹ <i>la + rali + a-ma</i>	<i>á-tali₅-ma-za</i>	<i>ni-sa</i>		<i>wali-na-ha</i>
/za-pa-wal/	/Larama/	/alamanza/	/nis/	/	/wanaha/
this-CONJ-QUOT	Larama	name	PROH		away

| *la-si*
/lasi/
you.take

‘Do not take away this name Larama.’

(2) HAMA 4 §8 (9th century; Hawkins 2000: 405)

<i>za-ti-pa-wali-ta</i>	SOLIUM- <i>sa-</i> '	REL- <i>i-sà</i>
/zadi-pa-wa-ta/	/asa/	/k ^w is/
this.DAT.LOC.SG-CONJ-QUOT-PART	seat.DAT.LOC.SG	who.NOM.SG

(DEUS)*pa-ha-la-ti-sà á-ma-za-ha á-tali₅-ma-za wali-na-ha* “CAPERE”-*ia*
/Pa'alatis/ /amanza-ha/ /alamanza/ /wanaha/ /lay/
Pa'alatis.GEN.SG my-and name away takes

‘Whoever takes away from this seat Ba'alati's and my name...’

(3) KUB 13.2 ii 16-17 (Instructions for officials)

<i>ḫaniššuar-ma-kan</i>	<i>kuit</i>	<i>awan katta mummietta</i>	<i>n-at</i>
plaster-CONJ-PART	which	down falls	CONJ-it

<i>kuttas</i>	<i>awan arḫa</i>	<i>daškandu</i>
walls.DAT.LOC.PL	away	let.them.take

‘Let them keep taking away from the walls the plaster that is falling down.’

Originally, Hittite *awan* expressed the reference point from which the motion ‘away’ is viewed, similar to *peran arḫa* ‘away from in front’ and *āppan arḫa* ‘away from behind’. In the Middle Hittite Instruction for the Royal Bodyguard *awan arḫa pāi-* appears to mean ‘pass beside, in contrast with *peran arḫa pāi-* ‘pass in front of’ and *āppan arḫa pāi-* ‘pass behind’ (see Melchert, 1996: 135). But *awan*, which *never* occurs except in combination with a following directional adverb, in nearly all instances merely “reinforces” the latter. Note that in the Luvian example (1) there is no indication of the place from which

something is taken, just as in the first clause of the Hittite example (3), where *awan katta* means simply ‘down’ (with no overt mention of the walls). That is, *awan* cannot be functioning here as a real postposition, and there is serious reason to doubt that it ever does so by the time of our attested texts. One of the clinching arguments for the equation of the Luvian with the Hittite is then that the /wan/ of /wanaha/ likewise cannot be a postposition.

The equivalence of *wali-na-ha* with *awan arha* is manifestly correct, but I cannot accept the remainder of Yakubovich’s analysis, namely, his conclusion that /wanaha/ is native Luvian and that the Luvian adverb ‘away’ had the shape /a:ha/. First, there is no evidence for aphaeresis in native Empire/Iron Age Luvian words (see Melchert 2010). On the other hand, the spelling of foreign names beginning /Ala-/ and /Ali-/ in hieroglyphs on Empire period seals with the initial signs *tali₄* and *tali₅* (which represent a sound that results from both *d and *l in medial position) suggests aphaeresis when these names were rendered in Luvian: *Alatarma* = *tali₄-tarali-ma*, *Ališarruma* = *tali₅-SARMA*, and others. Contra Rieken and Yakubovich (2010: 200–201), none of the personal names is assuredly Luvian and most clearly are not. One may compare also the famous *Tawagalawa* in Hittite context for Greek *Eteokle(w)-ēs*, a name likely known to the Hittites through Luvian. It is now generally agreed that Hieroglyphic Luvian *Hi-ya-wali* /Hiyawal/ referring to Cilicia reflects aphaeresized /Ahhiyawa/ (see Taracha 2006: 144–145 with references). The same phenomenon is surely also reflected in the loanwords ^{NINDA}(a)*lattari-* and ^{GAD}(a)*lalu-*, which appear in Hittite contexts with and without the initial *a-*, the latter being the Luvian version (see for the first Puhvel, 1984: 32 and for the second Trémouille, 1996: 92–94).

Second, the spelling of Empire/Iron Age “ARHA” with the *very same* sign as ‘boundary’, which clearly contained /-r-/ (see above), precludes that the native adverb had the shape /a(:)ha/. In Luvian as in Hittite, loss of postvocalic pre-consonantal /r/ is sporadic, never regular. Yakubovich himself (forthcoming) argues plausibly that the replacement of Old Hittite *arha-* ‘boundary’ by *irha-* from Middle Hittite onwards represents a phonetic adaptation based on the transparently cognate Luvian word. To my knowledge, this well-attested Luvianized Hittite *irha-* never shows loss of the /r/, and there is no reason to think that its Luvian model did either. It is true that the use as a preverb represents a grammaticalization, but the hieroglyphic writing with the same sign used for the source noun confirms that the connection was still transparent for speakers.

Third, Yakubovich’s claim that “*the assumption that the Luvian local adverb ARHA, which occurs more than two hundred times in hieroglyphic texts, is accidentally missing in the cuneiform corpus is, in my opinion, beyond the limits of*

credibility” is entirely specious. No one would claim that the absence of this adverb in Kizzuwatna Luvian is “accidental”. But as described above, ‘away’ is not like the other local adverbs inherited from Proto-Anatolian, but results from a grammaticalization of the allative case form of the noun meaning ‘boundary’. There are several significant differences in the grammar of the forms of Luvian (see Yakubovich 2010: 26–68, revising and expanding the list in Melchert 2003: 171–172). Absolutely nothing requires that Kizzuwatna Luvian participated in this innovation of Hittite and Empire Luvian. The question of just how the latter came to share this innovation is one of the main issues addressed in this paper.

Fourth, and most crucially, Yakubovich’s arguments that Kizzuwatna Luvian *āḫḫa* ‘when; as’ means rather ‘away, forth’ are simply not persuasive. In KBo 4.11 Vo 46, the clause-initial *ahḫa* could be a fronted preverb ‘away’ construed with the verb *awi(e)nta* ‘they came’, instead of a clause-initial conjunction ‘when, as’, but the latter is decidedly more likely.⁶ In the variant of KUB 35.102 + 103 iii 11, where *ahḫa* is in second position and separated from the verb *awita* ‘came’ by the subject *zitiš* ‘man’, a conjunction is even more likely (as per Watkins, 1968: 58–60).⁷ In KUB 9.6 + 35.39 iii 27 *āḫḫa* is clearly functioning as a comparative ‘as, like’, and the context makes the same usage likely in KUB 35.89: 17. The only example where the alleged preverb would stand immediately in front of the verb is KBo 29.6 Ro 13: *a-ah-ḫa-ta du-u-wa-at-ta ḫa-at-ta-a[z-]*, which Yakubovich renders as ‘He/you put them? away...’. However, this interpretation requires that not only the preverb, but also the finite verb *dūwatta* appear first in the clause. Of the more than 180 examples of *ARHA* + verb in the hieroglyphic texts, the verb is fronted in the sentence only in the KARATEPE bilingual, where interference from Phoenician is surely responsible for this otherwise aberrant word order. In addition, while ‘put away’ seems fine from the viewpoint of modern European languages, such a collocation is extremely unlikely in Luvian. Hittite *dai-* ‘put, place’ is never construed with *arḫa* ‘away’ in hundreds of attestations, and of

⁶ While we cannot, as intimated earlier, simply assume that the syntax would be identical in the two forms of Luvian, it is yet another contraindication for Yakubovich’s analysis that the ten examples of clause-initial *ARHA* in Iron Age Luvian are *all* marked by the focus conjunctions *-pa* (change of topic) or *-ha* ‘also’.

⁷ Yakubovich (forthcoming) claims that *ahḫa* cannot be the subordinating conjunction ‘when’ because that would mean that a subordinate clause with a preterite verb is linked with a main clause in present tense (in this instance a nominal sentence). But such combination of a “historical present” in a main clause with preterite in a preceding subordinate clause is trivial: compare in Hittite KBo 5.6 i 3–4 and i 23–24 (Güterbock, 1956b: 90–91).

the 180 examples in Hieroglyphic Luvian there are only two quite dubious purported examples.⁸

It is symptomatic that Yakubovich cannot point to a single instance where the alleged preverb *āhḫa* ‘away’ occurs in its *expected* position before a clause-final finite verb (where more than 140 of the Hieroglyphic Luvian examples do appear). This absence stands in stark contrast with the evidence assembled by Goedegebuure (2010: 301ff.) for *zanda* as the Kizzuwatna Luvian adverb for ‘down’, which does include preverbal position as well as others.

Finally, there is no trace whatsoever of *awan* in either form of Luvian. One would expect /*awan/* or /*wan/* to occur in combination with other directional adverbs, as it does in Hittite. If /*wan/+a:ha/* were native Luvian, and /*a:ha/* were the native form of ‘away’, one would also expect the combination to be recognized as such, and spelled accordingly: (*a*)-*wali-na ARHA* or the like. The spelling *wali-na-ha* suggests that for the Luvian scribe the sequence was not analyzable. I conclude that the sequence *awan arḫa* was borrowed into Empire Luvian from Hittite as a unit meaning ‘away (from)’. In the process it underwent the usual aphaeresis of foreign words with initial *a-*, and at least in the only two examples we have the postvocalic /*r/* of Hittite (which need not have been identical in its phonetics with that of Luvian) was also omitted.

2.2. Adverb “ARHA” in its Entirety a Loanword from Hittite into Empire Luvian?

If Hittite *awan arḫa* was borrowed (to a very limited extent!) into Empire Luvian, we may further ask whether the adverb *arḫa* was itself a loanword in the same direction. It is conceivable that the grammaticalization of ‘to the boundary’ to ‘away’ took place only in Hittite, and that the adverbial usage was borrowed from there into Empire Luvian, but not into the further removed Kizzuwatna Luvian.

I cite first parallels in usage that might argue for a borrowing. Both Hittite and Empire Luvian show a further development from a preverb with a physical sense ‘away’ to a “terminative” value: e.g. Hittite *warnu-* ‘burn’ (tr.) and *arḫa warnu-* ‘burn up/completely’ beside Iron Age Luvian *ARHA* (“FLAMMAE”) *ki-nu-* ‘burn up/completely’; *ēd-lad-* ‘eat’ and *arḫa ēd-lad-* ‘eat up’ beside Iron Age Luvian *ad-* ‘eat’ and *ARHA ad-* ‘eat up, devour’. Most

⁸ Hawkins (2000: 371 and 381) reads with a question mark SUPER + *nali ARHA PONERE*?-*wali* [] in TELL TAYINAT 2 frag. 11 and *ARHA* | *PONERE-w[ali-?]-ta*[] in TULEIL 1. Based on his own drawings and photos, both examples are questionable.

striking is that Hittite *ḫarnink-* ‘destroy’ only acquires a redundant *arḫa* from Middle Hittite onward (the period of most intense Luvian influence); Iron Age Luvian shows likewise *ARHA DELERE-nu-* ‘destroy’. But such a development is typologically trivial, and there are also some differences: only Iron Age Luvian has *ARHA wal(iy)a-* beside simple *wal(iy)a-* ‘die’, while Hittite *akk-* ‘die’ never appears with *arḫa* (though admittedly *ḫark-* ‘perish’ does). Note also that in the case of *arḫa ḫarnink-* and *ARHA DELERE-nu-* the implied direction of influence would be the usual one of Luvian to Hittite, not Hittite to Luvian.

Both languages show a combination of the locative adverb ‘with, beside’ plus ‘away’ where the first is virtually meaningless:

(4) KARKAMIŠ A6, §§27-28 (end of 9th century, Hawkins, 2000: 125)

<i>zi-i-pa-wali</i>	“SCALPRUM”- <i>su-wali-ti-i</i>
/zin-pa-wa/	/assuwadi/
these.ABL.PL-CONJ-PART	stones.ABL.PL
“SCALPRUM”- <i>su-na-’</i>	NEG ₃ - <i>i</i> CUM- <i>ni</i> ARHA <i>tà-ia</i>
/assun/	/ni/ /a:nni/ /arha/ ⁹ /lay/
stone.ACC.SG	whether beside away takes
<i>ta-sà-pa-wa/i-’</i>	<i>ta-si</i> NEG ₃
/tasan-pa-wa/	/tasi/ /ni/
stele.NOM.ACC.SG-CONJ-QUOT	stele.DAT.LOC.SG or
CUM- <i>ni</i> ARHA <i>tà-ia</i>	
/a:nni/ /arha/ /lay/	
with away takes	

‘Whether he takes away a stone from these stones or takes away a stele from a stele...’

(5) KUB 20.78 iv 70020(monthly festival)

LÚ^{GIŠ}BANŠUR 1 NINDA.GUR₄.RA^{NINDA} *zippulaššaz kattan arḫa dāi*
 man of table 1 leavened loaf z.-bread.ABL.PL beside away takes

‘The “table-man” takes away one leavened loaf from the z.-bread(s).’

One must note that **ānni* (CUM-*ni*) ‘with’ in the first clause of the Luvian and *kattan* ‘with’ in the Hittite cannot be a postposition, since the respective

⁹ As discussed below, one could also read /irha/.

nouns /zin assuwadi/ and *zippulašaz* are in the ablative, not the dative-locative expected with the postposition ‘with’. The second Luvian clause uses a dative-locative /tasi/ to express place from which (a usage also found in Hittite), but it is highly doubtful that **ānni* is a postposition there either. In both languages ‘away from beside’ has been “bleached” to simply ‘away from’. However, the Luvian expression could be calqued on the Hittite even if “ARHA” ‘away’ is native.

Both show the development of the preverb ‘away’ to a postposition with the ablative, though this adnominal use of *arḫa/ARHA* is infrequent:

(6) TELL AHMAR 2 (late 10th-early 9th century; Hawkins, 2000: 228)
*wal/i-ta-*a* | “CAELUM”-*ti* *ARHA* (DEUS)TONITRUS-*za-sa*
 /a-wa-ta/ /tappasadi/ /arha/ /Tarhunzas/
 CONJ-QUOT-PART heaven.ABL from Tarhunzas.NOM.SG

| (LOQUI)*tá-tara/i-ia-tú*
 /tatariyatu/
 let.him.curse

‘From heaven let Tarhunza (the Storm-god) curse them.’

(7) KUB 5.24 + i 25-26 (Oracular Inquiry, New Hittite)

namma-ma-za DINGIR-LUM ANA MUNUS.LUGAL *kē[z]*
 further-CONJ-REFL god.NOM.SG queen.DAT.LOC.SG these.ABL.PL

UN. MEŠ-*az* *arḫa* ŪL *kuitki karpiššanza* *n[u* KIN SIG₅]-*ru*
 people.ABL.PL from not at.all angry.NOM.SG CONJ sign let.be.unfavorable

‘But (if) further you, the god, are not at all angry at the queen apart from (on account of) these people, let the sign be favorable.’

It is difficult to say just how trivial or non-trivial this grammaticalization is.

On the other hand, there are reasons to doubt that the Empire Luvian adverb ‘away’ is a loanword from Hittite. If the Empire/Iron Age Luvian adverb had the reading /arha/ and was borrowed from Hittite, why would the scribes of examples (1) and (2) not have recognized that /wanaha/ contained it? And there remains the fact that Luvian “ARHA” is spelled with the same sign as ‘boundary’, which clearly had the vocalism /irha/i-/. Note also that CUM-*ni* = **ānni* ‘with, beside, for’ is spelled just twice in all of Iron Age Luvian as CUM-*na*. One instance (KARATEPE §XV; Hawkins, 2000: 50) stands immediately before the verb *i-zi-i-há* (hence **ānni iziḫa*, where a pronunciation [a:nnitsiḫa] with merger of the two *i*’s is plausible). Thus CUM-*na* would represent spoken **ānn*. The one other example of CUM-*na*

is in KARKAMIŠ A15b §21, where it stands immediately before a verb written *ARHA-sa-ta*, where a sense ‘arrayed (for me)’ would fit the context (cf. the sense ‘series, row’ for Empire Luvian *irhatta-* above). Hawkins (2000: 161) prudently considers both vocalisms in reading the verb. Again, a sequence **ānni irhasata* would present the same conditions as **ānni iziha*. I consider this argument merely suggestive, however, not compelling.

A further consideration is raised by the reasonable query of an anonymous reviewer as to how we are to explain in sociolinguistic terms why most contact-induced changes in the present case of the Hittite Empire were from Luvian to Hittite, whereas I am alleging that this one is from Hittite to Luvian. Yakubovich (2010: 414–416) characterizes the contact in this period as a case of imposition, involving effects of Luvian on the phonology and morphosyntax of Hittite. The few other likely cases of Hittite effects on (Empire) Luvian involve loanwords of a particular type—namely royal titles like *labarna* (special title of the Hittite king) and *hassussara-* ‘queen’—and collocations. For the latter I would cite the use of the Luvian verb /mūwā-/, which meant something like ‘master, control’, plus the reflexive particle /-ti/ to mean ‘conquer (a country)’, surely calqued on Hittite *-za taruḥ-*, frequent in the annals of the Hittite kings. This use of /-ti mūwā-/ is limited to the YALBURT inscription of the late New Hittite king Tuthaliya IV and the KIZILDAĞ 4 inscription of Hartapu, which apes Hittite royal phraseology (see for the examples Hawkins, 1995: 124).¹⁰ It is noteworthy that in the Iron Age Luvian inscriptions the verb used for this action is /hattaliya-/ ‘smite’. Thus while my claim that the particular idiom *awan arha* was imitated in Empire Luvian /wanaha/ is consistent with this overall pattern, the fact that the preverb *ARHA* is fully integrated into the Empire and Iron Age Luvian system of local adverbs makes its borrowing from Hittite unlikely, in the light of our overall picture of the sociolinguistic situation as described by Yakubovich.

There remains the complication that if we assume that the Empire Luvian adverb ‘away’ was /irha/ with *i*-vocalism like the word for ‘boundary’ (or even /irhi/ with renewal of the ending), then how do we conceive the grammaticalization *‘to the boundary’ > ‘away’? Did it happen just once and was inherited in both Hittite and Luvian? In that case, how do we explain the difference in vocalism between Hittite *arha* and the supposed Luvian /irha/? Or did the grammaticalization happen twice, independently in the two languages? There

¹⁰ It is true that *-ti mūwā-* is also attested in Kizzuwatna Luvian, but there the context is quite different, referring to overcoming various afflictions with “new” body parts: for the passages see Starke (1985: 83 and 86).

is no consensus on the prehistory of the noun for ‘boundary’ (compare Melchert, 1994: 29 and 84; Kimball, 1999: 166; and Kloekhorst, 2008: 246–247), and a review of the vexed question here would not lead to any conclusive new result. I prefer to leave the matter open.

In sum, the borrowing of *awan arḫa* as a fixed expression from Hittite into Empire Luvian is consonant with other similar loans and calques in the same direction and explains its formal peculiarities. Due to the ambiguities of the Anatolian hieroglyphic writing system, the vocalism of Empire/Iron Age “ARHA” ‘away’ remains indeterminate. This uncertainty plus the strong structural similarities and transparent shared lexicon in the two closely related languages leave open the question of whether we are dealing with a single grammaticalization or two parallel developments, in the latter case possibly with the degree of functional matching enhanced by convergence.

References

- Goedegebuure, Petra. 2010. The Luwian adverbs *zanta* “down” and **ānmi* “with, for, against”. In Aygül Stiel (ed.), *Acts of the VIIth International Congress of Hittitology: Çorum, August 25-31, 2008*, 299–318. Ankara: T.C. Çorum Valiliği.
- Güterbock, Hans. 1956a. Notes on Luwian studies. *Orientalia NF* 25:113–140.
- Güterbock, Hans. 1956b. The Deeds of Suppiluliuma. *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 10: 59–68, 75–85, 90–98, 107–119.
- Hawkins, John David. 1995. *The Hieroglyphic Inscription of the Sacred Pool Complex at Hattusa (SÜDBURG)*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Hawkins, John David. 2000. *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions. Volume I. Inscriptions of the Iron Age*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Kammenhuber, Annelies. 1971. Das Verhältnis von Schriftduktus zu Sprachstufe im Hethitischen. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 29: 75–109.
- KBo = Figulla, H., et al. (eds.). 1916–. *Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi*. 54 vols. to date. Berlin: Mann; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Kimball, Sara. 1999. *Hittite Historical Phonology*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- Kloekhorst, Alwin. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden - Boston: Brill.
- KUB = Figulla, H., et al. (eds.). 1921–. *Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi*. 60 volumes to date. Berlin: Staatliche Museen zu Berlin; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Melchert, H. Craig. 1994. *Anatolian Historical Phonology*. Amsterdam - Atlanta: Rodopi.
- Melchert, H. Craig. 1996. Review of Hans G. Güterbock and Theo P. J. van den Hout, *The Hittite Instruction for the Royal Bodyguard* (Chicago, The Oriental Institute, 1991). *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 55: 134–135.
- Melchert, H. Craig. 2003. Chapter Five: Language. In H. Craig Melchert (ed.), *The Luwians*. Leiden - Boston: Brill.
- Melchert, H. Craig. 2005. The problem of Luvian influence on Hittite. In Gerhard Meiser and Olav Hackstein (eds.), *Sprachkontakt und Sprachwandel*, 445–459. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

- Melchert, H. Craig. 2010. Spelling of initial /a-/ in Hieroglyphic Luwian. In Itamar Singer (ed.), *ipamati kistamati pari tumatimis. Luwian and Hittite Studies presented to J. David Hawkins on the Occasion of his 70th Birthday*, 147-158. Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University.
- Oettinger, Norbert. 1986. Anatolische "Kurzgeschichten". *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung* 99: 43-53.
- Otten, Heinrich. 1953. *Luwische Texte in Umschrift*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Puhvel, Jaan. 1984. *Hittite Etymological Dictionary. Vol. 1: Words beginning with A. Vol. 2: Words beginning with E and I*. Berlin - New York - Amsterdam: Mouton.
- Rieken, Elisabeth. 1994. Der Wechsel -a-/i- in der Stammbildung des hethitischen Nomens. *Historische Sprachforschung* 107: 42-53.
- Rieken, Elisabeth. 2006. Zum hethitisch-luwischen Sprachkontakt in historischer Zeit. *Altorientalische Forschungen* 33: 271-285.
- Rieken, Elisabeth, and Ilya Yakubovich. 2010. The new values of Luwian signs L 319 and L 172. In Itamar Singer (ed.), *ipamati kistamati pari tumatimis. Luwian and Hittite Studies presented to J. David Hawkins on the Occasion of his 70th Birthday*, 199-219. Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University.
- Starke, Frank. 1985. *Die keilschrift-luwischen Texte in Umschrift*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Starke, Frank. 1990. *Untersuchung zur Stammbildung des keilschrift-luwischen Nomens*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Taracha, Piotr. 2006. Mycenaean in Anatolia and Ahhiyawa of Hittite texts: A Reassessment. *Archeologia* 57: 143-149.
- Trémouille, Marie-Claude. 1996. Une « fête du mois » pour Teššub et Ḫebat. *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici* 37: 79-104.
- Yakubovich, Ilya. 2010. *Sociolinguistics of the Luwian Language*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Yakubovich, Ilya. Forthcoming. The reading of Luwian *ARHA* and related problems. *Altorientalische Forschungen*.