

# The Anatolian Hieroglyphic Signs L 41, L 172 and L 319 = L 416

**H. Craig Melchert**

University of California, Los Angeles

I am pleased and honored to join in this tribute to Massimo Poetto, a highly esteemed colleague and friend of long standing, much of whose scholarship has focused on advancing our understanding of the Luvian language and the Anatolian hieroglyphs. I offer him the following remarks as part of an ongoing extended discussion in which he himself has played a significant role.

Hawkins and Morpurgo Davies (1975: 130-132) showed that there is strong evidence for signs L 172 and L 319 (previously read *tì* and *tí*) having *a*-vocalism, though conceding that some uses do point to *i*-vocalism. They also crucially noted that certain words are written exclusively with these two signs and never with the signs *ta*, *tá*, or *tà*, suggesting that they represent something other than a dental stop. In his edition of the SÜDBURG inscription Hawkins (1995: 114-117) demonstrated that sign L 416 is the Empire period forerunner of L 319 and argued for a value *li* based on its appearance in seal impressions in the name \*172-\*416-*mi* matching cuneiform <sup>1</sup>*a-la'-li-me-eš* and in the YALBURT place name *pi-na*-\*416 (crediting our honorand with both identifications).<sup>1</sup> However, for various justified reasons Hawkins left open the matter of the vocalism of L 172 and L 319/L 416 and the precise nature of the consonant(s) they represent.

Hawkins (2000: 30) in fact adopted *ta*<sub>4</sub> and *ta*<sub>5</sub> as the transliterations for L 319 and L 172, although still admitting the possibility of *i*-vocalism and duly noting that both are used differentially from *ta*, *tá*, and *tà*, suggesting some difference in consonantism. However, Poetto (1993: 14-15 and 2002) already used explicitly *tí/a<sub>x</sub>* and *tí/a<sub>5</sub>*, and I likewise adopted *ta/i<sub>4</sub>* and *ta/i<sub>5</sub>* (Melchert 2003: 180-181). Hawkins (2005: 289-290) presented further evidence for Empire period L 172 as (*a*)*la* and L 416 as (*a*)*li* based on correspondences with cuneiform spellings in seal impressions, but the context did not permit him to address the issue of how to reconcile these values with putative Iron Age *ta*<sub>5</sub> and *ta*<sub>4</sub>. A dramatic advance in our understanding of the problem complex of the hieroglyphic dental signs

---

<sup>1</sup> Since confusion of the signs <la> and <ad> in Hittite cuneiform is frequent, the reading *la*<sup>1</sup> for *ad* and assignment to the well attested name <sup>1</sup>*Alalimi*- requires no discussion.

was made by Rieken (2008), who showed that sign L 41 (*tà*) is *not* interchangeable with signs *ta* and *tá*, but instead (unlike the other two!) consistently represents the outcome of prehistoric intervocalic *\*d*, which is also subject in Iron Age Luvian to rhotacism (interchange with [r]). She did, however, concede a very few examples where *tà* represents /l/ (Rieken 2008: 643).

Rieken and Yakubovich (2010), building on existing and new evidence, offered a synthesis in which they argued for the values *ala* and *ali* for Empire period L 172 and L 416 and for *lá/i* and *la/i* for Iron Age L 172 and L 319, contrasting with L 41 (*tà*) representing the result of intervocalic *\*d*. They attributed the rare Iron Age instances of L 41 (*tà*) for *\*l* and of L 172 and L 319 (*lá/i* and *la/i*) for *\*d* to a merger of /d/, /l/ (and /r/) into a flap [r]. However, not all of their synchronic and diachronic analyses of individual lexemes were equally persuasive, and the apparent equivalence of LOCUS-*\*319/\*172-t*° ‘place’ with Lycian *pddât(a)*- ‘place’ posed grave difficulties. I have therefore publicly and privately expressed grave doubts that *tà* is fundamentally different from *ta/i<sub>4</sub>* and *ta/i<sub>5</sub>* except in having fixed *a*-vocalism and questioned the claimed consistent difference in the Empire period between L 172 with *a*-vocalism and L 416 with *i*-vocalism of the second vowel.

However, further research and new evidence have significantly changed the picture. First, it has been clear for some time that first consonant of the noun ‘name’ in Luvian and Lycian is an [l] (Rieken – Yakubovich 2010: 203 and *passim* against Melchert 2003: 181 and elsewhere).<sup>2</sup> Second, a new occurrence of the ethnic adjective for P/Walastin in a fragment from TELL TAYINAT spelled *wa/i-la-s[â]-ti-ni-za*(REGIO) identified by Weeden (2015) removes any doubt about the reading of the variants *wa/i-la/i-sâ-ti-ni-za-sa*(REGIO) in MEHARDE, § 2, (VIR<sub>2</sub>)*pa-lâ/i-sâ-ti-[nî]-za-sa* in ALEPPO 6, § 1, and *wa/i-lâ/i-sâ-ta-ni-za~wa/i-lâ/i-si-ti-ni-za* in ARSUZ 1 and 2, § 1 (cf. Hawkins 2009: 171-172, Hawkins 2011: 41 and 51, and Dinçol *et al.* 2015: 60-65). Third, revised readings of the EMİRGAZİ altars have now shown that all uses of sign L 41 (*tà*) in the Empire period reflect *\*d* (Hawkins, forthcoming).<sup>3</sup> Fourth, the new join to the Milawata Letter recognized by Mark Weeden confirms <sup>URU</sup>*p[î]<sup>1</sup>-na-li-(ya)* “(and) Pinali” in KUB 19.55 + KBo 18.117 LEdge 1 as the cuneiform equivalent of hieroglyphic *pi-na-<sup>\*</sup>416* (Weeden 2012: 64).<sup>4</sup>

<sup>2</sup> The unique spelling <sup>1</sup>*â-sa-tú-wa/i-la-ma-za-* in KARKAMIŞ A27u, line 2, for usual <sup>1</sup>*â-sa-tú-wa/i-la/i-~lá/i-ma-za-* is confirmatory. I still regard /alaman-/ as dissimilated from a preform *\*anaman-* from a weak stem *\*h<sub>1</sub>ǵh<sub>3</sub>-m(e)n-*, but that point is entirely irrelevant for the present issue.

<sup>3</sup> In particular, the aberrant use word-initially in <sup>†</sup>*tà-na* (EMİRGAZİ, § 25) does not exist: read REL+*ra/i-pa-wa/i-tà* “or it” with usual /-ada/ (Hawkins, forthcoming). I am much indebted to David Hawkins for sharing his improved readings of the text ahead of publication. Forms of ‘to take’ spelled with the hieroglyphic sign <tà> may and by a broad consensus now are read as logographic CAPERE (see Yakubovich 2008a: 21-24 with reference to Morpurgo Davies).

<sup>4</sup> Since this place name is unlikely to be Indo-European, the discrepancy in vocalism between *Pinali* in Luvian (which had no contrasting /e/ phoneme), *Pinale* in Lycian, and *Pinara* in Greek is unproblematic (*pace* Melchert 2003: 181, note 12).

Finally, Yakubovich (2015a) has presented convincing evidence that the Luvian word for ‘place’ is *al(l)ant-*. BOYBEYPINARI 2, § 12 reads: *ni-pa-wa/i-tá á-\**172-*za* (SA<sub>4</sub>)*sa-ni-ti* “Or overturns it (a statue) in its place.”<sup>5</sup> Hawkins (2000: 339) suggests an emendation to LOCUS<sup>1</sup>-*ta<sub>5</sub>-za*, based on other occurrences of this topos (see Hawkins 2000: 100), but there is no motivation whatsoever for the presumed error. The two signs *á* and LOCUS look nothing alike, nor is there another instance of *á* anywhere in the vicinity. The attested *á-\**172-*za* cannot without an entirely *ad hoc* emendation be reconciled with the traditional reading *\*pidant-* for Luvian ‘place’, which was based virtually entirely on the presumption that the word must be cognate with the Lycian. In view of the other evidence for a value *lá/i* we are compelled to posit *\*al(l)ant-* as the attested Luvian word.<sup>6</sup> With the disappearance of the alleged †*pidant-* ‘place’, evidence for Iron Age use of L 172 for intervocalic *\*d* (always *da* with *a*-vocalism) in words of clear meaning and origin is reduced to a handful of examples, all of late occurrence (Rieken – Yakubovich 2010: 215), while conversely that for L 41 as *la* consists of the three examples cited by Rieken (2008: 643) and that of ÇINEKÖY, § 8 LOCUS-*tà-tà-za* ‘places’ (dat.-loc. plural) for *\*al(l)al(l)anz(a)*.<sup>7</sup> These few “reverse spellings” in both directions are compatible with a late partial merger of [l] and the result of intervocalic *\*d*, and of both with [r]. We must therefore in analyzing words of less than certain meaning and origin operate with the primary value *da* for sign L 41 (realizing that this stands for a phonetic reality other than a voiced stop). We should likewise assume basic *l* consonantism for signs L 172 and L 319/L 416, recognizing alternating *a/i*-vocalism for Iron Age L 172 (*lá/i*) and L 319 (*la/i*), but respectively *la* and *li* for the Empire period.

The alleged disyllabic values *ala* and *ali* for L 172 and L 416 in the Empire period are an entirely different matter. Such an interpretation was first broached by Hawkins (2005: 289) and fully developed by Rieken – Yakubovich (2010: 200-201). However, the evidence consists entirely of names (personal, divine, and geographic) attested in Empire period cuneiform with initial *A(l)-la-* or *A-li-* whose renderings in hieroglyphs have respectively initial L 172 and L 416. There is no direct evidence anywhere for a Luvian appellative written in cuneiform with initial *a(l)-lV-* and in hieroglyphic with initial L 172 or L 416 (on the hypothetical Luvian verb *\*alali(ya)-* see below). Rieken and Yakubovich were careful

<sup>5</sup> My translation is forced by idiomatic English. With Yakubovich I take the Luvian to be grammatically an accusative: “it, with respect to its place.”

<sup>6</sup> I do not find Yakubovich’s etymology (2015a) of *alla-* ‘place’ reflecting an *\*arla-* at all convincing, but the etymology of *alla(nt)-* is distinctly a *cura posterior*. Contrary to a previous assumption, the verb (LOCUS)*pitahaliya-* is irrelevant to the identification of the Luvian word for ‘place’ (Melchert 2011: 75-77).

<sup>7</sup> The existence of a stem *al(l)al(l)a-* beside *\*al(l)awa-* and *\*al(l)ant-* is supported by the example [LOCUS]-*la/i-lá/i* (nom.-acc. pl.) at KARKAMIŞ A31+, § 6 (see Oreshko, forthcoming, with a different formal analysis).

to point out that only \*172-\*416-*mi* beside <sup>1</sup>*a-la<sup>1</sup>-li-me-eš* on a digraphic seal impression (Nişantepe 3, Herbordt 2005: 114) is strictly proven, but most of the identifications are incontestable, and all highly plausible.

However, the divine name *Allanzu* (written as \*172-*zu(wa)* in #45 at YAZI-LIKAYA),<sup>8</sup> daughter of Hebat, is certainly non-Luvian. The formal equation of \*172-*tara/i-ma*(URBS) (KÖYLÜTOLU YAYLA) with cuneiform <sup>URU</sup>*A-la-tar-ma* (cf. Hawkins 2005: 431) is attractive, but the location of the latter in the area of Isuwa and Pahhuwa (del Monte – Tischler 1978: 6-7) makes a Luvian origin for the name unlikely.<sup>9</sup> The affiliation of the element *Ali-* in personal names has been a longstanding problem (Laroche 1966: 345): of the four relevant here, \*172-SARMA = *Ali-Šarruma* (Hawkins 2005: 252) is definitely Hurrian (likewise *Ali-ḫešni*), but \*416-LEO = *Ali-UR.MAḪ* (*Ali-walwi*) and \*416-VIR.ZI/A = *Ali-ziti* would appear to be Luvian, while \*416-*mu-tá* = *Ali-mutta* is ambiguous (as is *Ali-wašu*): see the discussions by Laroche (1966: 345) and Hawkins (2005: 286 and 289-290). However, a major problem has arisen in relating *ali-* to the Luvian adjective *ala/i-* (Rieken – Yakubovich 2010: 201) and comparing it with Luvian *ura-* ‘great’: Rieken and Yakubovich (2016) have now made persuasive arguments that in all clear contexts the Luvian adjective *ala/i-* means ‘distant’, not ‘high, steep’. This sense seems unlikely as a first element in the personal names in *Ali-*.<sup>10</sup> In view of other evidence for hybrid Hurrian-Luvian personal names one must provisionally assume the same here: compare beside entirely Hurrian names such as <sup>m</sup>*A-na-ni-<sup>d</sup>U* (*Anani-Teššub*) and <sup>1</sup>*A-na-ni-ḫé-bi* (RŠ 16.145 and 16.158)<sup>11</sup> the mixed names *á-na-ni-BOS* (*Anani-mu(wa)-*) and *á-na-ni-LEO* (*Anani-walwi*) on Nişantepe bullae 18 and 19 (see Herbordt 2005: 117 and Hawkins 2005: 248-249, the latter for both the readings and the Hurrian pedigree of *anani*).

The decidedly foreign profile of the names in question is of importance, because there is considerable evidence that Luvian aphaeresized (surely unaccented) initial *a-* in adapting foreign words, both names and appellatives.<sup>12</sup> This was already noticed by Laroche (1956a: 143), apropos of the equation of hiero-

<sup>8</sup> Elucidated by Laroche 1969: 89.

<sup>9</sup> A putative ‘high-nail’ (*ala-tarma-*), rather fanciful in any case, is now excluded by the disappearance of the Luvian adjective <sup>†</sup>*ala/i-* ‘high’ – see immediately below. On the identification of the city *Alatarma* in KÖYLÜTOLU YAYLA see further Hawkins 2006: 62-63.

<sup>10</sup> Since one would expect the adjective *ala/i-* with “*i*-mutation” to appear in compounds as *ala-* in any case, one might suppose rather a contracted form of a Luvian \**alya-* < \**alyo-* ‘other, foreign, isolated’, which Rieken – Yakubovich (2016) have shown surely existed, but these meanings are also not very suitable in the personal names cited.

<sup>11</sup> Nougayrol 1955: 169 and 62.

<sup>12</sup> I must continue to insist on my conclusion (Melchert 2010) that there is no credible evidence for aphaeresis in native Luvian words, since most alleged examples involve accented vowels, where deletion is unthinkable, and even late spellings of words in /a-/ without *a-/á-* are continuants of the earlier practice of “initial-*a*-final” and still alternate with variants with written *a-/á-*.

glyphic *Ma-na-ma-su* on a cylinder seal from Ugarit with the Akkadianized form <sup>m</sup>*A-ma-an-ma-aš-šu/i* in cuneiform of an Egyptian name containing Amun (Laroche 1966: 29). However, he characterized the phenomenon only vaguely as “Anatolian” and the other very heterogenous material he cited has no evidentiary value.<sup>13</sup> Further evidence for the process and its attribution to Luvian has since accumulated.

We have one certain and one highly plausible example in appellatives. Whatever the word’s ultimate source, Luvian <sup>GAD</sup>(*a*)*lālu-* ‘cape, veil’ (or the like) reflects a *Wanderwort* seen in Hurrian *alāli* and Ugaritic *all* (Neu 1996: 314, note 22, with refs.). The Luvian status of the word found in Hittite contexts (of Hurro-Luvian rituals) is assured by the nom.-acc. singular form <sup>GAD</sup>*alalu=ša* (IBoT 2.129 Ro 16 etc.) with the particle =*ša*. A thorough treatment of the word is given by Trémouille (1996: 92-94), who properly insists on the reality of the variants <sup>GAD</sup>*lālui* and <sup>GAD</sup>*lāluwaz*. The frequent plene spelling of the second syllable supports the presumption that the initial *a-* was unaccented. While its ultimate origin likewise remains unknown, the Hurro-Luvian profile of <sup>NINDA</sup>(*a*)*lāttari-* (Hoffner 1974: 149-150) points to another loanword with the same development (NB the plene spelling <sup>NINDA</sup>*a-la-a-at-ta-ri-in* at KUB 25.48 iv 8). The five attestations with initial *la-at-<sup>o</sup>* (*HW*<sup>2</sup> 1.57) confirm the reality of the aphaeresized variant.

There are also further examples in names of persons and places. Cuneiform <sup>m</sup>*A-ki-<sup>d</sup>U* is matched in RŠ 19.78 by hieroglyphic *Ki-TONITRUS* in the seal (Laroche 1956b: 136, n. 7). The new inscriptions ARSUZ 1 and 2 attest a name borne by a king (father of the author of the text) and by the scribe who incised the text, spelled in all but one instance <sup>1</sup>*ma-na-na-* (stem form <sup>1</sup>*ma-na-na* ARSUZ 2, § 1 and ARSUZ 1 and 2, § 28, genitive or genitival adjective <sup>1</sup>*ma-na-na-si* ARSUZ 1, § 18). However, ARSUZ 2, § 18 has rather <sup>1</sup>*a-m[a]-n[a-<sup>o</sup>]*. The name is not analyzable as Luvian, and the location of the inscriptions makes a derivative from the name of Mt. Amanus likely. In any case, we have here another example of aphaeresis in a foreign name.<sup>14</sup> It is also very likely, though obviously not assured, that the attested form *Tawagalawa* of Greek *Ete(w)okle(w)e:s* (KUB 14.3 i 3 etc.) reached the Hittites through the mediation of Luvian speakers.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>13</sup> The very consistent spelling *á-na-ni* on the Nişantepe bullae 14-19 (Herbordt 2005: 116-117) suggests that the unique *na-ni* on one side of the Alacahöyük seal versus usual *á-na-ni* on the other (Alp 1950: 14) is due to the limited space left by the accompanying figure, not aphaeresis.

<sup>14</sup> That the scribe also knew and could choose to write the original form with *A-* is not surprising (compare the appearance of the goddess Allanzu four times in Iron Age texts as (DEUS)*á-la-zú-wa-* (ANCOZ 1, § 4, ANCOZ 9, § 2, ÇİFTLİK, § 10, and KULULU 5, § 1) versus the spelling in YAZILIKAYA. Even English speakers with limited control of Spanish may choose to approximate the vowels of Madrid or Toledo (without necessarily attempting to reproduce the consonantism) or totally Anglicize the city names.

<sup>15</sup> I decline to cite in this connection the pair *á-wa/i+ra/i-ku-sa* of KARATEPE 1, § 2 and *wa/i+ri-i-ka-sá* of ÇİNEKÖY §§ 1-2. Even if, as is likely, these represent the same name (if not the same

There is similar evidence for place names. The name of Assyria is attested in KARKAMIŠ A24a2+3, § 7 as (acc. sg.) *a-sú+ra/i*(REGIO)-*ya-na-*'(URBS), and the ethnic adjective in KARKAMIŠ A15b, § 19 as (abl.-inst.) *a-sú+ra/i* (REGIO)-*wa/i-na-ti*(URBS) and in KARKAMIŠ A24a2+3, § 6 as (nom. sg.) *a-sú+ra/i*[(REGIO)]-*wa/i-ni-[sá]*(URBS). These texts from the end of the ninth century have already given up the practice of “initial-*a*-final”, but spell this place name with initial *A*.<sup>16</sup> However, in ÇİNEKÖY § 6 the land is written as *su+ra/i-ya-sa-ha*(URBS) and in § 5 the ethnic adjective likewise appears as *su+ra/i-wa/i-ni-sa* and *su+ra/i-wa/i-za*. Gander (2013: 283 with note 18) correctly insists that the reference is to Assyria, not Syria, but in view of the practice after the demise of “initial-*a*-final” of not writing initial /*a*-/ at all he expresses serious doubts about the reality of the aphaeresis. In doing so, however, he overlooks one crucial fact: while ÇİNEKÖY (8th century) indeed shows simple *wa/i-ta* (§ 3) for a clause-initial sequence of /*a*=*wa*=/ plus clitic /*=ta*/ alongside *a-wa/i* (§ 10) and the quite unusual *wa/i-a* (§ 9), unlike some other late texts it does not use abbreviated forms such as *mi-i* for /*ami*/ ‘my’ (dat.-loc. sg.) or *sa-tu* for /*a:stu*/ ‘let be’ (inv. 3rd sg.). It writes fully *á-mu* ‘I’ (§ 9), *á-mi-ya-ti* ‘my’ (abl.-inst.) (§§ 2 & 9), and *á-sa-tá* /*asanta*/ ‘were’ (pret. 3rd pl.) (§ 8). In view of these examples we must take the spellings *su+ra/i-<sup>o</sup>* as showing genuine aphaeresis in an adapted foreign place name.

It has been suggested by Yakubovich (2010: 152, note 93) and Hajnal (2011: 248 with refs.) that the ÇİNEKÖY form *hi-ya-wa/i-* also shows genuine aphaeresis (< *Ahhiyawa*) in an adapted foreign name, and Yakubovich cites as support for the reality of the aphaeresis the LÚ.MEŠ *hi-ya-ú-wi-i* located in Lukka mentioned in letters of circa 1200 BCE from a Hittite official Penti-Šarruma and the Hittite king, surely Šuppiluliuma II, to Ammurapi, king of Ugarit (see for the texts and ample references Gander 2013: 284-286).<sup>17</sup> Gander’s objections to this on linguistic grounds (2013: 286) are unfounded. I must agree with Gander that the various proposals that these refer directly to Mycenaean Greeks seem far-fetched (Singer 2006: 251-252; Bryce 2010: 50-52, *et al.*). Since the letter is to the king of Ugarit, it is more probable that these men are inhabitants of Cilicia on a trade mission to Lycia. However, Gander’s conclusion that the early date precludes a derivation of *Hiyawa* from *Ahhiyawa* – because *Ahhiyawa* is attested spelled as such in texts of Tuḫaliya IV, as in the famous erased occurrence in the

---

individual), there is simply too much controversy regarding the name’s origin and analysis to present this as evidence for aphaeresis.

<sup>16</sup> It is unlikely that the dative-locative plural *su+ra/i-za-ha*(URBS) at KARKAMIŠ A 6, § 6 refers to Assyria (*pace* Tekoğlu – Lemaire 2000: 980). See the discussion with references by Hawkins (2000: 126). One would expect for ‘Assyrians’ rather †*su+ra/i-wa/i-na-za*.

<sup>17</sup> The reality of *Hiyawa* is now assured by the new occurrence *hi-ya-wa/i-ha*(REGIO) “also the land *Hiyawa*” in ARSUZ 1, § 13, a text of the late tenth century still showing “initial-*a*-final” (Dinçol *et al.* 2015: 64-65).

Sunassura Treaty at KUB 23.1+ iv 3 – ignores the fact that the references by Tuthaliya are to the western power of the Mycenaean Greeks, not the land of Hiyawa, and that the aphaeresis in foreign words is specifically Luvian. The linguistic derivation of *Hiyawa* from *Ahhiyawa* is quite in order. The problem with it is chronological. One may or may not believe in the presence of Greeks in Cilicia at the end of thirteenth century, but it seems hard to avoid reading the city <sup>URU</sup>*Hi-ya-*[ ] in the Annals of Arnuwanda I (KUB 23.21 ii 6) in the immediate context of *Adaniya* and [*Si*]nuwanda as anything except *Hiyawa* (Gander 2013: 287-289 with refs.). This would require that the Greeks be in Cilicia by the late fifteenth/early fourteenth century (see the acknowledgement by Yakubovich 2010: 151-152, note 92 and 2015b: 39). No restoration is ever assured, but this text at the very least must give one pause about *Hiyawa* < *Ahhiyawa*.

The spelling *TANA-sa-pa-wa/i-mu*(URBS)/(REGIO) in ARSUZ 1 and 2, § 11 could represent a genuine aphaeresized variant /Dana-/ versus /Adanawa-/ seen in *á-TANA-wa/i-ya*(URBS) (dat.-loc. sg.) in KARATEPE 1, § III and the spellings of the ethnic adjective /Adanawann(i)-/ as *á-TANA-wa/i-n°* (KARATEPE 1, *passim*). The putative /Dana-/ would be the source for the Phoenician *dnnym* (beside *'dn* = /Adana-/). However, since the source of the value *dana* in sign L 429 is unknown, a logographic spelling for /Adana-/ cannot be excluded (Dinçol *et al.* 2015: 67).<sup>18</sup>

Even if we leave aside the debatable examples, there is solid evidence for aphaeresis in Luvian adaptations of foreign appellatives and names. Six of the seven alleged examples cited by Rieken – Yakubovich (2010: 200) following Hawkins for word-initial L 172 and L 416 as having the values *Ala-* and *Ali-* thus have no probative value. There is also a serious problem with such readings in terms of the structure of the Anatolian hieroglyphic syllabary, which consists of V and CV signs. Aside from “rebus spellings,” both habitual (L 14 *PARI*, L 216 *ARHA*) and *ad hoc* (SPHINX for *awita* in KARKAMIŞ A4b, § 2; Hawkins 2000:

<sup>18</sup> The cooccurrence of (*A*)*TANA-sa...*(URBS)/(REGIO) in ARSUZ 1 and 2, § 11 and *hi-ya-sa-ha*(REGIO) “also the land Hiyawa” *ibid.* § 13 is fatal for the proposal by Oreshko (2013) that sign L 429 should be read *hiya* (with Hawkins 2015 *contra* Yakubovich 2015b: 39 and 2015c: 57-58). *Pace* Yakubovich the “also” in § 13 definitively precludes an equation of (*A*)*dana* and *Hiyawa* in ARSUZ. The attempt of Oreshko (2015: 123-124) to read *h[i-ya-wa/i-s]a* in ARSUZ 2, § 11 equating to (*A*)*TANA-sa* in ARSUZ 1 is quite impossible. Whatever the partial initial sign in ARSUZ 2 represents – and as per Hawkins (2016: 26) a collation is needed – it cannot be a *hi*, as the photo (Dinçol *et al.* 2015: 62) and Oreshko’s own drawing (2015: 124, top) clearly show (the visible portion is quite distinct from *hi*, easily available for comparison in *hi-ya-w[a/i]* and *hi-nu-wa/i-ha* in the next line). A stem *Adanawa-* beside *Adana-* is also trivial (cf. Hajnal 2011: 250-251 with refs.): as established by Carruba (1979: 94-95), the suffix *\*-wo-* is used in Hittite and Lycian to form an adjective referring to the territory of a city state, which by ellipsis of the word for ‘land’ becomes virtually synonymous with the city name (note the alternation of URBS and REGIO in ARSUZ 1 and 2). In the tenth century the city state of Adana and the land of Hiyawa may have been quite distinct. Whether the action boasted of by Azatiwadas in KARATEPE 1, § V made them coterminous two centuries later is an open question.

80-81), there are no inherent disyllabic signs. Signs marking the presence of /r/ such as L 134 *ara/i* and L 290 *hara/i* cannot be compared, since it is well established that the second vowel is not inherent, and they also stand for /ar/, /har/, etc. Signs with a value /ala/ and /ali/ would thus be unique. Their credibility is further diminished by the fact that they appear to “lose” the alleged first vowel by the earliest texts of the Iron Age. Rieken – Yakubovich (2010: 201) acknowledge this problem, but attribute it (2010: 217-218) to a partial break in the transmission of scribal tradition due to the political events of the twelfth century, comparing other changes in sign use between the Empire period and the Iron Age. This account cannot be excluded, but recent discoveries have shown that there is far more continuity and gradual evolution during the transition period than previously thought (Dinçol *et al.* 2015: 61-62). The structural isolation of the putative /ala/ and /ali/ remains suspect.

Much thus hinges on the case of the remaining personal name *Alalimi* = \*172-416-*mi*, which undeniably has the superficial appearance of a Luvian participle. Rieken – Yakubovich (2010: 200, note 2) indeed declare that it represents the participle of an unattested Luvian verb \**alali(ya)*- ‘to wish, desire’ cognate with Hittite *ilāliya-* with the same sense and related to Iron Age Luvian (COR)*á-lu/a/i-na-za-* ‘to be covetous’ (KARATEPE 1, § 66, *recte* § 65) and (“COR”) *á-lu/a/i-na-ma-* ‘covetousness’ (KARATEPE 1, § 71). The analysis is given as if self-evident, and no argumentation is offered, but in fact this account is fraught with problems in every aspect: orthographic, phonological, morphological, and semantic.

To begin with, the personal name <sup>m</sup>*Alalimi-* is now very well attested in cuneiform. Leaving aside fragmentary non-diagnostic examples, we find in Hittite context: <sup>m</sup>*A-la-li-mi* KBo 4.10 Vo 32, 16.83 iii 12, 22.214 vi 3, KUB 11.21 Edge 1, 22.68:13, 40.84 iv 3, <sup>m</sup>*A-la-li-m*[*i(-)*] 56.14 i 13, <sup>m</sup>*A-la-li-mi-iš* KUB 21.38 Ro 32, 26.63:11, 31.68:41, 56.19 ii 28, and 60.102:8, <sup>m</sup>*A-la-li-me-iš* KBo 51.123:12 and <sup>m</sup>*A-la-li-im-me-iš* KUB 13.35 iii 42. To these we may add *a-la-li-mi* RŠ 17.319:3 and 33 and *a-la-li-mu* *ibid.* 33 (Nougayrol 1956: 182-184). The 16:1 ratio of *-i-mi/e-* vs. *-im-me-* justifies interpreting the one geminate example as another instance of hypercorrect New Script *-Vm-mV-* for a real *-VmV-*: compare NS *du-um-me-e-ni* for /tume:ni/, etc. (Hoffner – Melchert 2008: 19).<sup>19</sup> The spelling of participles in cuneiform Luvian shows a very different pattern, with a ratio of circa 100:90 for *-mm-:-m-* (Melchert 2014a: 207).<sup>20</sup> We must conclude

<sup>19</sup> That the Ugarit spellings with single *-m-* are to be taken seriously is shown by the contrast with the geminate spellings <sup>l</sup>*ta-ap-ra-am-mi* (RŠ 17.337: 2 and 12) and <sup>l</sup>*tap-ra-am-mi* (RŠ 17.231: 8 and 15) (Nougayrol 1956: 168 and 238). The name *Taprammi-* clearly is Luvian, either a participle ‘ruling’ to the verb *tapar(iya)-* ‘to rule’ or a denominative adjective ‘powerful’ directly from the base \**tabar-* < \**dhob-ro-* (cf. Melchert 2003: 18 with refs. to Eichner and Starke, and 2014a: 207).

<sup>20</sup> I have suggested (Melchert 2013: 40-41, cited by Yakubovich 2010: 93) that the first element of the name <sup>m</sup>*Piyama-(a)radu-* (attested nearly twenty times with *-ya-ma-*) is the participle ‘given’,



that *Alalimi-* is unlikely to contain the Luvian participial suffix.<sup>21</sup> I do emphasize that if this orthographic discrepancy were the only difficulty with the analysis of *\*alali(ya)- = ilāliya-*, it would not alone be compelling counterevidence.

However, there is also an extremely serious phonological obstacle to the presumed equation. Hittite *ilāliya-* ‘to desire, want’ is attested with various direct objects with positive and negative connotations and in an erotic sense in translation literature (see *HW*<sup>2</sup> 4.37-41). It is attested at least three times with plene spelling of the second syllable. The verbal stem can hardly be anything except a denominal derivative of a noun *\*ilali-* ‘desire wish,’ belonging to the small set of Hittite denominative stems in *-(a)li-* such as *\*hašt(a)li-* ‘hero’ (com.) and *kurtāli-* ‘basket’ (nt.), *pahhūnali-* ‘brazier’ (nt.), for whose differentiation from stems in *-alli-* see the discussion by Rieken (1999: 48 and 434).

It is hard to determine whether the noun *\*ilali-* ‘desire, wish’ is attested in the name of the deity <sup>d</sup>*Ilali-* in Hittite context at KUB 48.99: 14<sup>22</sup> and Luvian context at KUB 35.111 iii 9, in the personal name <sup>m</sup>*Ilali-* (Hittite context in HKM 57:1) and *I-la-li-sa<sub>8</sub>* (Luvian context in KULULU 4, § 1), and in the *Ilāliyant*-deities attested in Luvo-Hittite context and the Palaic *Ilaliyant(ika)*-deities.<sup>23</sup> The brusque dismissal of any connection with Hittite *ilāliya-* by Laroche (1966: 288, note 27) now appears in a different light in view of current knowledge about “Cappadocian” names, and the suggestion of Hattic origin is gratuitous. It is noteworthy that <sup>d</sup>*Ilali-* appears in a mythical passage in the company of *Pirwa-* and <sup>d</sup>MUNUS.LUGAL-*a-* the ‘Queen’-goddess (Hitt. *Ḫaššuššara-*), where it is clear that <sup>d</sup>*Ilali-* is one of the ‘young men’ (*māēš*) of *Pirwa-*. Whether the name *Pirwa-* (also readable as *Perwa-*) is Indo-European in origin (\*‘he of the rock/crag’) remains an open question (cf. Rieken 1999: 137 with refs.). The base *\*gulza-* of Palaic *Gulzannika-* ‘fate goddesses’ is definitely Indo-European (see Yakubovich 2014: 285 with refs.) and likewise so is *ulili-* ‘greenery; turf’ (or similar) from which the *Uliliyantika*-deities are derived (Poetto 1973: 25-26). This does not guarantee that the same is true for the *Ilaliyant(ika)*-deities, but there is no compelling reason against relating them to the attested verb (Laroche *loc. cit.* could certainly be right that the *-ant-* stem is denominal ‘having *ilali-*’ rather than a

---

but the analysis is by no means assured, and the spelling suggests rather a compound ‘gift-devotee’ of the type ‘gift-horse’, with the Luvian suffix *-ma/i-* that forms substantives (Melchert 2014a: 208).

<sup>21</sup> The problem of the single *-m-* may have led Laroche (1966: 330) to deny that *Alalimi-* is a participle and to compare it with the denominative stems in *Tiwat-ami-* and *Ura(n)t-ami-*, but the suffix in the latter clearly is *-ama/i-* with an appurtenance sense ‘of, belonging to’, not simple *-ma/i-* (see Melchert 2014a: 208-209) or *-ima/i-*.

<sup>22</sup> This text is written entirely in Hittite (*pace* Starke 1985: 253-254, which see for a transliteration), so no Luvian context may be inferred.

<sup>23</sup> The appearance of the divine and personal name in Luvian contexts cannot be used as a strong argument against a possible Luvian *\*alali(ya)- = Hittite ilāliya-*. Nothing precludes Hittite names appearing in Luvian contexts, just as undeniably Luvian names appear in Hittite contexts.

participle). While the personal name could be theophoric, it may also simply be a use of the noun to express that a child was the fulfillment of a wish (as implied by the Rieken – Yakubovich [2010: 200] interpretation of *Alalimi-* as ‘desired, wished for’).

The presumed adjectival base *\*ila-* is likely unattested, since the extant Hittite noun *ila-* (com.) refers to a disease or symptom of the heart (*HW*<sup>2</sup> 4.36-37).<sup>24</sup> A Hittite stem *\*ila-* ‘desiring, seeking’ may represent an *\*i-ló-* or *\*el-ó-*. One could posit as the source an unenlarged PIE root *\*h<sub>1</sub>ai-* ‘desire, seek’ seen in the established *\*ais-* with the same meaning (see *LIV*<sup>2</sup> 260, whose *\*h<sub>2</sub>eis-* is merely a default reconstruction for a root with *a*-vocalism not securely attested in Anatolian). However, this purely mechanistic analysis is too speculative to carry any weight in choosing between a preform *\*i-ló-* or *\*el-ó-*. If the preform of the Hittite is *\*i-ló-*, a Luvian derivative *\*alali(ya)-* obviously is excluded. The absolutely consistent single spelling of the first *-l-* also precludes a preform *\*él-o-*, since by “Čop’s Law” the Luvian outcome would have a geminate *-ll-* and the name would appear in cuneiform as †*Allalimi-*.<sup>25</sup> We are thus left only with the possibility of a preform *\*el-ó-*. The question then is: would this result in Luvian *ala-* or *ila-*?

Suggestive examples for a change of pretonic short *\*e* to Luvian *i* as in Hittite have been proposed, but probative evidence has been elusive. The irrelevance of (LOCUS)*pitahaliya-* has already been dealt with above (note 6). Other putative cases of Luvian *i* from pretonic *\*e* could represent *\*ē-*: the negative prefix *ni-* or *irha-* ‘boundary’ and derivatives. Despite its enduring popularity (recently Höfler 2012: 80-82 with refs.), the idea that Iron Age Luvian (CAELUM)*tipas-* ‘heaven, sky’ reflects a hypothetical pre-PIE weak stem *\*nebh-és-* with an accent attested nowhere else supposes an extreme archaism that defies belief. We are dealing with an “acrostatic” paradigm *\*nebh-(e)s*, *\*nebh-(e)s-* (Zucha 1988: 141, Rieken 1999: 188-189, Oettinger 2015: 261-264), of which Iron Age Luvian *tipas-* reflects the strong stem and Kizzuwatna Luvian *tappaš-* the weak stem. Words with a sequence *-wit/d-* (e.g., *huit(u)wal(i)-* ‘alive, living’, etc.) raise the issue of whether Luvian, again like Hittite, may show a development of *\*e > i* between *\*w* and a following dental obstruent (Melchert 1994: 262). Kizzuwatna Luvian *wida-* ‘watery’ < *\*wēd-ó-* ‘water’ is open to both alternative possibilities. The very plausible, though not strictly provable, interpretation of Iron Age Luvian *ti-na-ta-za* (/tinatan=t<sup>s</sup>a/) as ‘tithe’ (Hawkins 2000: 470) reflecting an ordinal

<sup>24</sup> One may suggest with due reserve a possible sense ‘burning sensation, heat’ < virtual *\*i-ló/éh<sub>2</sub>-* to the root *\*(h<sub>1</sub>)ai-* ‘be(come) hot’ attested in Hittite *a-ari* ‘id.’ and *inu-* ‘heat, make warm’. One is tempted with Carruba (1970: 57) to see in Palaic *ilaš*, which occurs in the immediate context of <sup>d</sup>*Ilaliyantaš*, the true base of *ilaliya-*, but the fragmentary context makes this unverifiable and effectively useless.

<sup>25</sup> A different accent pattern in the Luvian from that in Hittite cannot be dismissed out of hand: compare Hittite <sup>d</sup>*Innarawant-* versus Luvian <sup>d</sup>*Annarummi-* ‘the mighty/violent (ones)’ (the latter based on *ānnari-*) < *\*en-h<sub>2</sub>nor-o-*.

‘tenth’ < \**dekmt*+ is a promising candidate for the change, but the details of the morphology and the rest of the phonology are too complex for this example alone to bear the weight of proving pretonic \**e* to *i* in Luvian.

I am therefore deeply indebted to Ilya Yakubovich for the suggestion (pers. comm.) that Iron Age Luvian (“SOLIUM”) *is(a)nu(wa)*- ‘to seat, settle’, (“LECTUS”) *is(a)n(a)*- ‘couch’, *istarla*- ‘chair’, and (“THRONUS”) *istarta*- ‘throne’ reflect derivatives of \**h<sub>1</sub>es*- ‘to sit (down)’ with precisely a change of pretonic \**e* > *i*.<sup>26</sup> The most thorough treatment of this set of words is by Starke (1990: 416-418 with refs.), who adduced the crucial adjective *istardalla/i*- ‘throne-like’ attested in Hittite context at KBo 20.75 Vo 14 (nom.-acc. pl. neuter *istardalla* modifying ‘chairs’). As he indicates, this is derived from an unattested \**istar*- ‘seat’ (or similar) containing the “instrumental” suffix \*-*tro*-. The shape of the stem reflects the word-final change \*-*Cr/los/m#* > \*-*Car/ls/n#* > -*Car/l#* described by Melchert (1993: 106). In further derivatives one finds competing reflexes -*Car*/-*Cra*- (Melchert 1993: 107), and one cannot exclude that the orthographically ambiguous hieroglyphic words had variants /*istrala*-/ and /*istrata*-/. As per Starke (1990: 418), /*istarta*-/ ‘throne’ is a substantivized secondary derivative in -*ta*- with the suffix \*-*to*-, reasonably productive in Anatolian (Melchert 1999: 369-372). Likewise /*istarla*-/ represents a substantivized secondary derivative in -*la*- (suffix \*-*lo*-) for which one may compare *hūdarla/i*- ‘slave, servant’ (modifying Starke 1990: 360). Starke’s reconstruction (1990: 418) of the base \**istar*- as \**h<sub>1</sub>éh<sub>1</sub>s-tro*- is impossible, since a tautosyllabic sequence \**eh<sub>1</sub>* leads to Luvian *ā* (Melchert 1994: 245 and *passim*). A lengthened grade \**h<sub>1</sub>ēs-tro*- (Melchert 1994: 272), conceivable when proposed, is also now highly unlikely.

The reason is that there is no evidence whatsoever for a lengthened grade in the Luvian reflexes of ‘to sit’. As first noted by Hawkins (1981: 151), the preterite third plural (SOLIUM) *á-sa-tá* (/asanta/) “they sat” at KARKAMIŠ A11b+c, § 10 shows that the Iron Age *hi*-verb ‘to sit, dwell’ (pres. 3sg. SOLIUM+*MI-sá-i* at KARATEPE 1 Hu, § LIV) has *a*-vocalism, as does its derivative (“MENSASOLIUM”/“SOLIUM”) *á-sa*- ‘seat’. Oettinger (2011: 167) and Melchert (2014b: 254) both still claimed that the Luvian forms in /*is*-/ must reflect \**ē*, but this assumption contradicts their own overall analysis, which precisely contrasts medio-passive full-grade \**h<sub>1</sub>és-o(r)* “sits down” with an active “Narten present” active originally \**h<sub>1</sub>ēs-ti*, *h<sub>1</sub>és-ṛti* “sits, is sitting”. As per Starke (1990: 418), the Iron Age Luvian *hi*-present is a renewal of the medio-passive, and its *a*-vocalism supports the claim by Oettinger (2011: 168) that Kizzuwatna Luvian =*ti*...*asa[r]* “sits down” matches late Hittite =*za eša*- ‘to sit down’, showing *full-grade* vocalism.<sup>27</sup> However, the attested single -*s*- of *aša[r]* for expected \**ašsar* < \**h<sub>1</sub>és-o(r)*

<sup>26</sup> I hope that my friend and colleague will forgive my considerable effrontery in using the suggestion against another of his own analyses. Likewise independently Kloekhorst (2008: 254-255).

<sup>27</sup> The true evidence against a reduplicated \**h<sub>1</sub>éh<sub>1</sub>s-o(r)* is not the Luvian derivatives in /*is*-/, but Hittite medio-passive *eš*- with single -*s*-, since \**h<sub>1</sub>éh<sub>1</sub>s-o(r)* would have led to †*ešša(ri)* (Melchert

by “Čop’s Law” should be attributed to the influence of  $\bar{a}\check{s}$ -,  $a\check{s}$ - ‘to be’, which is also attested occasionally in Hittite (*ašanta* “they sit”).<sup>28</sup> The Iron Age verbal stem is /a(:)ssa-/. We would expect the secondary derivatives in \*-to- and \*-lo- to be accented on the suffix (and note *hu-u-tar-la-a-an* at KUB 35.136 iv 16 with plene spelling of the last syllable), so attested /istarta-/ and /istarla-/ < pre-Luvian  $*h_1es-tro-tó$ - and  $*h_1es-tro-ló$ - based on  $*h_1és-tro$ - would be regular if pretonic short  $*e$  led to  $i$ . Since the medio-passive  $*h_1és$ - had fixed full grade, it would also be regular that the transitive *nu*-verb would have been formed as  $*h_1es-néu$ -, leading by the same change to /isnu-/ ‘to seat, settle’. The morphology of (“LECTUS”) *i-sà-na*- ‘couch’ (probably a collective *plurale tantum*) attested only in the dative-locative plural is multiply ambiguous. It could represent /isna-/ or /isan(a)-/ and reflect either an *n*-stem or a *no*-stem. We would expect root accent in an *n*-stem, but Hittite *išnā*- ‘dough’ <  $*y(e)s-nó$ - and *paltana*- ‘shoulder’ <  $*p_l\check{t}h_2-(e)no$ - (cf. Kloekhorst 2008: 403 and 628), allow for a pre-Luvian  $*h_1es-nó$ - or  $*h_1es-éno$ -.<sup>29</sup> The evidence for pretonic  $*e > i$  in Luvian means that not only the orthography but also the phonology of *Alilimi*- argues against its interpretation as a participle ‘wanted, desired’ from a putative stem  $*alali(ya)$ - cognate with Hittite *ilāliya*-.

Except for transparent cases (Victor, Bonita, etc.) the meaning of personal names is a matter of inference, but *Ilali*- cited above suggests that ‘desired, wanted’ for *Alalimi*- would be semantically plausible. Rieken – Yakubovich (2010: 200) cite in support of such a sense the Iron Age Luvian (COR)  $\acute{a}$ -lu/a/i-na-za- ‘to be covetous’ (KARATEPE 1, § LXV) and (“COR”)  $\acute{a}$ -lu/a/i-na-ma- ‘covetousness’ (KARATEPE 1, § LXXI), whose meanings are based on the corresponding Phoenician *hmd* ‘to desire, covet’ and *hmdt* ‘desire, cupidity’. Yakubovich (2015b: 42-48) has presented multiple arguments for Phoenician as the primary language of the Karatepe Bilingual and the Luvian as translated from it. However, there are also more than a few examples to show that we are dealing with an adaptation, not a mechanical translation, and the present context of §§ LXII-LXXII is no exception. First, the Luvian adds vividness by presenting both repetitions of the description of a violator destroying the gate built by Azatiwadas and replacing it with another and deleting Azatiwadas’ name and replacing it with his own as direct speech of the violator – this is totally absent in the Phoenician. Second, the Phoenician consistently speaks of “tearing out” the original gate (*ys*’), while the Luvian says rather “builds (i.e. fills) in” (*a-ta* AEDIFICARE+*MI*-(*ri*+)*i*). The objective reality is the same (Azatiwadas’ gate is obliterated).

1994: 78-79). The spelling *e-eš-ša-an-ta-ri* at KBo 2.14 iv 12 (along with two others) has no probative value in the face of over a hundred spellings of the prevocalic stem as *eš*- (Neu 1968: 25-27).

<sup>28</sup> The “explanation” by Melchert (2014b: 255) was manifestly a total lapsus, since geminates cannot be expressed in hieroglyphic orthography!

<sup>29</sup> The only two plene spellings of ‘shoulder’ are conflicting (dat.-loc. sg. *paltanī* and dat.-loc. pl. *paltānaš*), but the root zero grade in the Hittite and all cognates points to non-initial accent.

rated), but the expression is quite different. Third, the Phoenician in § LXIX reads *w-yp‘l l-š‘r zr* “and shall make another gate for himself” (see Bron 1979: 117 and Younger 1998: 21), while the Luvian has *wa/i+ra-la-ya-wa/i* “PORTA”-*la-na i-zi-i-wa/i* “I shall make my own gate.”<sup>30</sup> Finally, while the Phoenician for § LXV says directly *yhmd ‘yt h-qrt z* “desires/covets this city” with a transitive verb and direct object, the Luvian uses an intransitive construction with the dative-locative: *ni-pa-wa/i-sa* (COR)*á-lu/a/i-na-za-ya* “CASTRUM”<sup><v></sup>-*ni-si za-ti* “or he is covetous towards/envious of this fortress.”<sup>31</sup>

One wonders why, if there were a Luvian verb *\*alali(ya)-* ‘to desire’, the translator did not use it to render directly the Phoenician. Be that as it may, there is also a significant morphological problem: any such Luvian verb cognate with Hittite *ilaliya-* would likewise need to be denominative to a stem *\*alali-*. It is far from obvious how one is to relate /alan(n)a(t<sup>3</sup>a)-/ and /alan(n)ama/i-/ (reading thus) to the putative *\*/alaliya-/*. In principle, of course, the attested verb and its nominal derivative could be based on the ultimate *\*ala-* underlying *\*alali-*, but the formal connection between /alan(n)a-/ and *\*/alali(ya)-/* is thereby weakened considerably. It is much more straightforward in formal terms to read /alun(n)a(t<sup>3</sup>a)-/ and /alun(n)ama/i-/ – with the primary value of the sign *lu/a/i* (Hawkins 2000: 28 and 2005: 428) – and derive them from /alun(n)a/i-/ ‘hostile, inimical’, substantivized also to ‘enemy’.<sup>32</sup> A meaning ‘envious, jealous’ alongside ‘hostile, inimical’ is hardly surprising. Latin *inuidēre*, originally ‘to cast the evil eye on’, and its derivatives are used from the earliest Latin for both ‘ill will, spite, hate’ and ‘envy, jealousy’ (*OLD* 1054-1055), and the reflexes of the root *\*h<sub>1</sub>erh<sub>2</sub>s-* cover ‘anger, resentment’ as well as ‘envy’ both in the Hittite reflexes and their cognates (*HED*: 172-173). The intransitive syntax of the verb is consistent with a stem *alun(n)a(za)-* ‘become hostile, resentful, envious’ comparable to Empire Luvian *kappila(zza)-* ‘become hostile, bellicose’.

In sum, the chances that the personal name *Alalimi-* represents the participle of a hypothetical Luvian verbal stem *\*alali(ya)-* ‘to desire’ are vanishingly small. Its true source may never be determinable, but its shape strongly suggests that it is built on a reduplicated base *\*Al-al(i)-* of a type well attested in Anatolia (for

<sup>30</sup> Both the attributive word order and the context preclude “shall make the gates my own” (Hawkins 2000: 57). Since the violator has filled in the original gate, he cannot reuse it, but must make his own somewhere else – an act which of course much more thoroughly obliterates Azatiwadas’ legacy than remodeling his.

<sup>31</sup> There are further examples to show that the Phoenician can be used only as a guiding, not determining, factor in interpreting the Luvian. The fundamental sense of Luvian (LINGERE)*hasa-* is clearly ‘satiation, satiety’, an action/result noun to the same root as Palaic *has-* ‘to be(come) satiated’, not ‘luxury’ or ‘favor, prosperity’ (*pace* Goedegebuure 2007: 328-329). The common denominator is ‘abundance’, which fits all occurrences. The determinative (an animal’s head with protruding tongue) makes sense only with a basic meaning ‘satiety’ (originally of food or drink).

<sup>32</sup> This alternative is entertained by Rieken – Yakubovich (2016), but I am informed (pers. comm.) that the authors have now reverted to their earlier interpretation, based on the Phoenician.

which see Laroche 1966: 233-234). It cannot in any case alone bear the burden of establishing an otherwise unmotivated and structurally suspect reading of the Empire period signs L 172 and L 416 as *ala* and *ali*. These signs should be read on the basis of all available evidence as *la* and *li*.

This finding has major implications for the Luvian word ‘enemy’. Yakubovich (2008b: 2-5) argued persuasively that (VIR<sub>2</sub>)\*416-*wa/i-ni-sa*<sup>33</sup> in YALBURT is not a title of the Hittite king (Hawkins 1995: 26-28 and 114-117), but a Luvian neuter noun in the nominative-accusative with the virtually obligatory particle /=sa/ – that is, a stem in /-id-/ with regular loss of word-final stop before addition of the particle (Yakubovich 2008b: 16 after Rieken).<sup>34</sup> In YALBURT 7, § 2b, 11, § 2, 12, § 3 and 13, § 1 the word (VIR<sub>2</sub>)\*416-*wa/i-ni-sa* clearly refers to people of cities or lands against whom Tuthaliya was fighting. Yakubovich (2008b: 4) plausibly inferred that in context it means “enemy army.”<sup>35</sup> However, his attempt to assign this meaning to the occurrence in block 13, § 4ab was *ad hoc*, requiring that ASINUS/MULUS represents “stood” and that “stood” alone has the sense “stood against, resisted.” In any case, new evidence has now made the interpretation impossible. Our honorand already recognized the parallel of block 13, §§ 2-4 with the narrative on the EMİRGAZİ block §§ 7-10 and the join of block 13 with block 3 (Poetto 1993: 62-64). Hawkins – Morpurgo Davies (2010: 110, note 16) saw that instead of an unexpected disjunctive *ni-i(a)-pa-wa/i* we should read the passage as: *a-wa/i-mu* |\*416-*wa/i-ni-sa* 4xMILLE CENTUM ASINUS/MULUS-*ni-i(a)-pa-wa/i* ||NEG-*wa/i a-sa-tá*. Weeden (2014: 54 with notes 130-131 and refs.) correctly realized that we are facing another example of the topos from Hittite *res gestae* where the Hittite king boasts of his (or one of his generals’) military success despite having less than optimal resources: “I had 4100 troops, but there were no

<sup>33</sup> Our honorand first recognized that sign L 386 is not in the oldest texts a word divider, but a “determinativo onorifico” for various personages (Poetto 1993: 28), now read in this use as VIR<sub>2</sub> (Hawkins 2000: 27 and in detail 2011: 51).

<sup>34</sup> Additional evidence for this interpretation appears in YALBURT block 7, § 1: *a-wa/i ni-pi+ra/i*(REGIO) \*430-*sa<sub>5</sub> tu-pi* “And I struck the entire land of Nipira.” Here \*430-*sa<sub>5</sub>* represents /po:na(da)=sa/ (for the reading of L 430 and its postposed syntax in the Empire period see Hawkins 1995: 25-26). Since both Kizzuwatna Luvian and Iron Age Luvian routinely show the particle on attributive adjectives, we may have ordinary agreement. However, in an Empire text we may also be facing the original appositional syntax “the land Nipira, the whole (of it).”

<sup>35</sup> Identification of \*416-*wa/i-ni* as ‘enemy’ had already been made independently by Woudhuizen (1994-1995: 182-183). The use of the determinative VIR<sub>2</sub> refutes Yakubovich’s claim that the word is an abstract. It is rather a derivative in /-id-/ referring to a collectivity. Compare Istanuvian Luvian [URU]N*erikki=ša* ‘the territory of Nerik’ (KBo 14.121 iii 3), as analyzed by Starke (1985: 177-178). The collective sense is also seen in Lycian *mahanahid-* ‘priesthood’ and *przzid-* ‘first rank, elite’ (Melchert 2004: 36 and 52). The collective noun is derived (likely via an adjective in *-iya-* attested in SÜDBURG, § 5) from the base \*416-*wa/i-n(i)-* attested in SÜDBURG, which notably never is marked as referring to persons and is the true abstract.

mules/asses.”<sup>36</sup> Despite Weeden’s caution, the alternative “There were to me 4100 enemy and countless mules/chariotry” is not viable. The negative alone cannot express “countless,” and the previous clause is a *possessive* sentence. Enemies in the Hittite annals ‘arise’ for the king (and others): LÚ.KÚR *kuiški ANA* <sup>q</sup>UTU-ŠI *arāi* “(if) some enemy arises for His Majesty” (KBo 4.3 ii 4) and [LÚ.]KÚR=*wa=mu kuiški arāeš* “An enemy has arisen for me” (of Targasnalli in KBo 5.4 Vo 27). They also may enter into battle against the king: *nu=mu LÚ.KÚR 3 AŠRA zaḥḥiya tiyat* “The enemy entered into battle against me in three places” (KUB 14.3 i 23) or come against him in battle (*[n=aš=m]u zaḥḥiya menahḥanda uet* “He came towards/against me in battle” at KBo 3.4 ii 59). They also routinely commence hostilities against him (*ku/ūruriyahḥ-*). Nowhere, however, in more than three hundred Hittite references to the enemy is the Hittite king said to ‘have’ an enemy. We must conclude with Weeden that (VIR<sub>2</sub>)\*416-*wa/i-ni-sa* means ‘troops, army, infantry’, a sense that fits all occurrences – however the word is to be read.<sup>37</sup>

Elimination of a sense ‘enemy’ for (VIR<sub>2</sub>)\*416-*wa/i-ni-sa* and necessarily for its base \*416-*wa/i-n(i)-* relieves me of refuting in detail the proposed derivation of the genuine Iron Age Luvian word for ‘hostile; enemy’ from an alleged Empire Luvian \**aliwann(i)-* (Yakubovich 2008b: 15-17).<sup>38</sup> I note only that while the required second syncope of \**alwann(i)-* to *alunn(i)-* is well supported for Luvian, the first of \**aliwann(i)-* to \**alwann(i)-* is not.<sup>39</sup> However, the semantically attractive derivation of Iron Age Luvian /*alun(i)-*/ from the root \**al-* ‘other’ (Yakubo-

<sup>36</sup> In addition to the passage from the “Apology” of Hattušili III cited by Weeden, see also *ibid.* § 6 (KUB 1.1 ii 20-24) and the description of the success of the general Hutupiyanza in P(a)lā in the Annals of Muršili II (KBo 5.8 ii 27-30). See further KBo 5.8 i 1-2.

<sup>37</sup> Since every other occurrence of (VIR<sub>2</sub>)\*416-*wa/i-ni-sa* in YALBURT followed by a place name means “the troops of X,” it is also hard to avoid reading (VIR<sub>2</sub>)\*416-*wa/i-ni-sa* LINGUA+CLAVUS-*tu-sa*(URBS) in YALBURT 2, § 2 as “the troops of X.” I fully agree with Yakubovich (2008b: 6) that (VIR<sub>2</sub>)\*416-*wa/i-ni-sa* must be the subject of the clause (*contra* Hawkins 1995: § 2 *et al.*), because the motion verb ‘to come’ for obvious semantic reasons never occurs with a reflexive particle in Hittite (several hundred examples) or Luvian (more than thirty instances), so \**a-wa/i-mu* excludes “I came...” Whether the reference is to movement by Hittite troops or those of an enemy city depends on the validity of the widespread but entirely unproven reading of the city name as Hattuša (cf. Hawkins 1995: 72-73; Poetto 1998: 112 and Oreshko 2016: 61 reject the reading). For the former compare the proposed campaign in the oracular inquiry KUB 22.25+ Vo 22-23: *nu=šši=kan ANŠE.KUR.RA*<sup>MES</sup> *ERIN*<sup>MES</sup> *ŠUTT*<sup>HILA</sup>=*ya EGIR panza* [... -*a*]nzi “(But His Majesty is in the fortified camp of the father of His Majesty), and the chariotry (lit. horses) and the š.-troops, having returned to him, rest<sup>9</sup> [there]” (cf. von Schuler 1965: 182-183). However, until the entire structure of the clause has been elucidated, one cannot exclude reference to a maneuver by enemy troops against the king (thus Oreshko).

<sup>38</sup> I cannot pursue here the complex problem of the real sense of \*416-*wa/i-ni* in SÜDBURG and its relationship to the derived stem meaning ‘troops’ in YALBURT. I will soon treat these issues in full elsewhere (Melchert, forthcoming).

<sup>39</sup> Nor does the plausible derivation of Hittite *alwanza-* in *alwanzahḥ* ‘to bewitch’ etc. from the root \**al-* ‘other’ via \*‘to alienate’ (Yakubovich 2008b: 17) provide any support, since the Hittite is more economically derived directly from a base \**al-wo-* with Rieken – Sasseville 2014: 306.

vich 2008b: 16, Rieken – Yakubovich 2010: 204-205, and Rieken – Yakubovich 2016) is unaffected by the disappearance of Empire Luvian  $\dagger$ *aliwann(i)*- ‘enemy’. The rhotacized variant  $\acute{a}$ -*ru-ni-i-zi* (SULTANHAN § 9) and  $\ast$ *a-la/i-la/i/u-ni-sa* (BABYLON 1, §§ 11-12) with its redundant double spelling of the /l/ point unmistakably to a stem /alun(i)- ~ arun(i)-/. As per Rieken – Yakubovich (2010: 205 and 213), there is other evidence that signs L 172 and L 319 could represent *u*-vocalism,<sup>40</sup> so neither the assumption of an *ad hoc* merger of Iron Age Luvian vowels after a flap (Yakubovich 2008b: 14) nor an alleged loss of  $\ast$ *w* in a sequence  $\ast$ *VlwV* (Rieken – Yakubovich 2016) is necessary.<sup>41</sup> The attested stem /alun(i)-/ may be derived directly from the “property concept” root  $\ast$ *al*- ‘other, alien’ with the suffix  $\ast$ -*uno*- seen in Hittite *ekuna*- ‘cold’ < virtual  $\ast$ *yeğ-uno*- (the suffix is likely attested in Istanuvian Luvian  $\ast$ *aruna*-, base of the denominative verb *arunā(i)*- of unknown meaning).<sup>42</sup>

## References

Alp, Sedat

1950 *Zur Lesung von manchen Personennamen auf den hieroglyphenhethitischen Siegeln und Inschriften = Hitit hieroglif mühür ve kitabelerindeki bazı şahıs adlarının okunuşları hakkında*, Ankara (Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Çoğrafya Fakültesi Yayınları 65. Hititoloji Enstitüsü Yayınları 1).

Bron, François

1979 *Recherches sur les inscriptions phéniciennes de Karatepe*, Paris (Centre de recherches d’histoire et de la philologie de la 4e Section de l’École Pratique des Hautes Études: Hautes Etudes Orientales 11).

<sup>40</sup> The reading of  $\acute{a}$ -\*319 in TOPADA §§ 32-33 and of  $\acute{a}$ -\*172 in TELL TAYINAT 2, frag. 2a, § 4 as /aru/, matching TOPADA § 31  $\acute{a}$ -*ru* “highly, to a high degree” (Rieken – Yakubovich 2010: 213) is now made more likely by the elimination of  $\dagger$ *ala/i*- ‘high, steep’ (Rieken – Yakubovich 2016), which precludes the possibility of use of a near-synonym /ala/ instead of /aru/ for “highly.”

<sup>41</sup> The latter is made unlikely by the stability of  $\ast$ -*VlwV*- in Kizzuwatna and Empire Luvian (derivatives of  $\ast$ *halwa*- ‘excited, angry’, *mammalwa*-<sup>1</sup> ‘to crush’, *malwara*- ‘?’). There are also further examples for the occasional use of a sign normally with *a/i* vocalism being used for /u/: *tara/i-sa* and *tara/i-sà* for /taru=sa/ ‘statue’ (NİĞDE 1 and İVRİZ 1, § 3). See also the plausible suggestion of Heiner Eichner *apud* Hutter-Braunsar (2016: 173) that (PANIS)*tu/tú+rV-pi*- should be read /turuppa/i-/, matching *tūruppa*- in Hittite and *durupu* in Emar. A syncope in the Luvian (Laroche 1988: 114) cannot in principle be excluded, but is entirely gratuitous. In the case of *la/i* and *lá/i* the sporadic use for *u*-vocalism would have been modeled on the multivalence of Iron Age *lu/a/i*, whose *a/i* values are due reciprocally to *la/i* and *lá/i*.

<sup>42</sup> Whether or not Hittite LÚ.KÚR-*na*- ‘enemy’ is a cognate (or prehistoric loanword from Luvian) is and will likely remain indeterminable. Likewise Kizzuwatna Luvian *a-lu-ú-ni*- [ ] in KUB 35.16 iii 9 = 35.17 iii 5 may or may not be ‘enemy’.



Bryce, Trevor

2010 The Hittite Deal with the Ḫiyawa-Men, in: Yoram Cohen – Amir Gilan – Jared L. Miller (eds.), *Pax Hethitica: Studies on the Hittites and Their Neighbours in Honour of Itamar Singer*, Wiesbaden (StBoT 51), 47-53.

Carruba, Onofrio

1970 *Das Palaische: Texte, Grammatik, Lexikon*, Wiesbaden (StBoT 10).

1979 Commento alle nuove iscrizioni di Licia, in: Onofrio Carruba (ed.), *Studia mediterranea Piero Meriggi dicata*, Pavia (StMed 1), 75-95.

del Monte, Giuseppe F. – Johann Tischler

1978 *Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der hethitischen Texte*, Wiesbaden (RGTC 6).

Dinçol, Belkis – Ali Dinçol† – J. David Hawkins – Hasan Peker – Aliye Öztan – Ömer Çelik

2015 Two New Inscribed Storm-god Stelae from Arsuz (İskenderun): ARSUZ 1 and 2, *AnSt* 65, 59-77.

Gander, Max

2013 Aḫḫiyawa, Ḫiyawa, Que: Gibt es Evidenz für die Anwesenheit von Griechen in Kilikien am Übergang von der Bronze- zur Eisenzeit?, *SMEA* 54, 289-309.

Goedegebuure, Petra

2007 The Hieroglyphic Luwian Demonstrative Ablative-Instrumentals, in: Alfonso Archi – Rita Francia (eds.), *VI Congresso Internazionale di Ittitologia, Roma, 5-9 settembre 2005*, Rome (*SMEA* 49), 319-334.

Hajnal, Ivo

2011 Namen und ihre Etymologien – als Beweisstücke nur bedingt tauglich?, in: Christoph Ulf – Robert Rollinger (eds.), *Lag Troia in Kilikien? Der aktuelle Streit um Homers Ilias*, Darmstadt, 241-263.

Hawkins, John David

1981 Kubaba at Karkamiš and Elsewhere, *AnSt* 31, 147-176.

1995 *The Hieroglyphic Inscription of the Sacred Pool Complex at Hattusa (SÜDBURG)*, Wiesbaden (StBoT Beih. 3).

2000 *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions*. Vol. 1. *Inscriptions of the Iron Age*, Berlin – New York (UISK 8.1).

2005 “Commentaries on the Readings” and “Commentary on the Sign List”, in: Suzanne Herboldt, *Die Prinzen- und Beamstensiegel der hethitischen Grossreichszeit auf Tonbulln aus dem Nişantepe-Archiv in Hattusa*, Mainz (BoHa 19), 248-303 and 426-436.

2006 Tudḫaliya the Hunter, in: Theo P. J. van den Hout (ed.), *The Life and Times of Ḫattušili III and Tudḫaliya IV: Proceedings of a Symposium Held in Honour of J. de Roos, 12-13 December, 2003, Leiden, Istanbul (PIHANS 103)*, 49-76.

- 2009 Cilicia, the Amuq, and Aleppo – New Light in a Dark Age, *NEA* 72/4, 164-173.
- 2011 The Inscriptions of the Aleppo Temple, *AnSt* 61, 35-54.
- 2015 Addendum to ‘Phoenician and Luwian in Early Iron Age Cilicia’ by Ilya Yakubovich, *AnSt* 65, 54-55.
- 2016 Adana(wa) vs. Ahhiyawa: a rejoinder to R. Oreshko, *N.A.B.U.* 2015/3 (74), *N.A.B.U.* 2016/1: 26-27.
- forthcoming *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions. Vol. 3. The Hittite Empire Inscriptions and Recently Discovered Iron Age Inscriptions.*
- Hawkins, John David – Anna Morpurgo Davies
- 1975 Hieroglyphic Hittite: Some New Readings and Their Consequences, *JRAS* 1975/2, 121-147.
- 2010 More Negatives and Disjunctives in Hieroglyphic Luwian, in: Ronald Kim – Norbert Oettinger – Elisabeth Rieken – Michael Weiss (eds.), *Ex Anatolia Lux – Anatolian and Indo-European Studies in Honor of H. Craig Melchert on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, Ann Arbor – New York, 98-128.
- Herbordt, Suzanne
- 2005 *Die Prinzen- und Beamtensiegel der hethitischen Grossreichszeit auf Tonbullen aus dem Nişantepe-Archiv in Hattusa*, Mainz (BoHa 19).
- Höfler, Stefan
- 2012 *Untersuchungen zum Ablaut der neutralen s-Stämme des Indogermanischen* (University of Vienna M.A. thesis), Vienna.
- Hoffner, Harry A. Jr.
- 1974 *Alimenta Hethaeorum*, New Haven (AOS 55).
- Hoffner, Harry A. Jr. – H. Craig Melchert
- 2008 *A Grammar of the Hittite Language, Part I: Reference Grammar*, Winona Lake, IN (Languages of the Ancient Near East 1).
- Hutter-Braunsar, Sylvia
- 2015 Review of: Annick Payne, *Hieroglyphic Luwian – An Introduction with Original Texts*, 2nd Revised Edition, *Or.* NS 84, 171-176.
- Kloekhorst, Alvin
- 2008 *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*, Leiden – Boston (IEED 5).
- Laroche, Emmanuel
- 1956a Documents hiéroglyphiques hittites provenant du palais d’Ugarit, in: Claude Schaeffer, *Ugaritica* 3, Paris (Mission de Ras Shamra 8), 97-160.
- 1956b L’inscription hittite d’Alep, *Syria* 33, 131-141.
- 1966 *Les noms des hittites*, Paris.
- 1969 *Les dieux de Yazılıkaya*, *RHA* 27, 61-109.

- 1988 Observations sur le rituel anatolien provenant de Meskene-Emar, in: Fiorella Imparati (ed.), *Studi di storia e filologia anatolica dedicati a Giovanni Pugliese Carratelli*, Florence (Eothen 1), 111-117.
- Melchert, H. Craig
- 1993 A New Anatolian ‘Law of Finals’, *JAC* 8, 105-113.
- 1994 *Anatolian Historical Phonology*, Amsterdam – Atlanta (Leiden Studies in Indo-European 3).
- 1999 Two Problems of Anatolian Nominal Derivation, in: Heinrich Eichner – Hans Christian Luschütsky (eds.), *Compositiones Indogermanicae in memoriam Jochem Schindler*, Prague, 365-375.
- 2003 Language, in: H. Craig Melchert (ed.), *The Luwians*, Leiden – Boston (HdO I/68), 170-210.
- 2004 *A Dictionary of the Lycian Language*, Ann Arbor – New York.
- 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*, Tel Aviv, 147-158.
- 2011 Enclitic Subject Pronouns in Hieroglyphic Luvian, *Aramazd* 6/2, 73-86.
- 2013 Naming Practices in Second- and First-Millennium Western Anatolia, in: Robert Parker (ed.), *Personal Names in Ancient Anatolia*, Oxford (Proceedings of the British Academy 191), 31-49.
- 2014a Anatolian Nominal Stems in *\*(C)o-*, in: Norbert Oettinger – Thomas Steer (eds.), *Das Nomen im Indogermanischen: Morphologie, Substantiv versus Adjektiv, Kollektivum – Akten der Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 14. bis 16. September 2011 in Erlangen, Wiesbaden*, 205-214.
- 2014b “Narten formations” versus “Narten roots”, *IF* 119, 251-258.
- forthcoming Empire Luvian \*416-*wa/i-ni* and Related Problems (to appear in a forthcoming Festschrift).
- Neu, Erich
- 1968 *Interpretation der hethitischen mediopassiven Verbalformen*, Wiesbaden (StBoT 5).
- 1996 *Das hurritische Epos der Freilassung I: Untersuchungen zu einem hurritisch-hethitischen Textensamble aus Hattuša*, Wiesbaden (StBoT 32).
- Nougayrol, Jean
- 1955 Textes accadiens et hourrites des archives est, ouest et centrales, in: Claude F.-A. Schaeffer, *Le palais royal d’Ugarit* 3, Paris (Mission de Ras Shamra 6), 1-280.
- 1956 *Textes accadiens des archives sud (archives internationales)* = Claude F.-A. Schaeffer, *Le palais royal d’Ugarit* 4, Paris (Mission de Ras Shamra 9).

Oettinger, Norbert

2011 Indogermanisch \**h<sub>1</sub>es-* ‚sitzen‘ und luwisch *asa[r]*, *MSS* 65, 167-169.

2015 Der Flexions[t]yp idg. \**séh<sub>2</sub>-ur* ‚saure Flüssigkeit‘, \**néb<sup>h</sup>-s n.* ‚Gewölk‘, *IF* 120, 255-267.

Oreshko, Rostislav

2013 The Achaean Hides Caged in Yonder Beams: the Value of Hieroglyphic Luwian Sign \*429 Reconsidered and a New Light on the Cilician Ah-hiyawa, *Kadmos* 52/1, 19-33.

2015 Once Again on the Reading of Hieroglyphic Luwian Sign \*429: the Evidence of the Newly Published ARSUZ Inscriptions, *N.A.B.U.* 2015/3, 123-125.

2016 *Studies in Hieroglyphic Luwian: Towards a Philological and Historical Reinterpretation of the SÜDBURG Inscription*, PhD diss., Freie Universität Berlin.

forthcoming The Luwian Word for ‘Place’/‘Precinct’, *MSS* 72/1.

Poetto, Massimo

1973 Su alcuni termini botanici etei, *RIL* 107, 25-32.

1993 *L'iscrizione luvio-geroglifica di YALBURT. Nuove acquisizioni relative alla geografia dell'Anatolia sud-occidentale*, Pavia (StMed 8).

1998 Review of Hawkins 1995, *Kratylos* 43, 108-116.

2002 Nuovi sigilli in luvio geroglifico V, in: Piotr Taracha (ed.), *Silva Anatolica – Anatolian Studies Presented to Maciej Popko on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, Warsaw, 273-276.

Rieken, Elisabeth

1999 *Untersuchungen zur nominalen Stammbildung des Hethitischen*, Wiesbaden (StBoT 44).

2008 Die Zeichen <ta>, <tá> und <tà> in den hieroglyphen-luwischen Inschriften der Nachgroßreichszeit, in: Alfonso Archi – Rita Francia (eds.), *VI Congresso Internazionale di Ittitologia Roma, 5-9 settembre 2005 (SMEA 50)*, 637-648.

Rieken, Elisabeth – David Sasseville

2014 Social Status as a Semantic Category of Anatolian: The Case of PIE \**-uo-*, in: H. Craig Melchert – Elisabeth Rieken – Thomas Steer (eds.), *Munus amicitiae Norbert Oettinger a collegis et amicis dicatum*, Ann Arbor – New York, 302-314.

Rieken, Elisabeth – 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*, Tel Aviv, 199-219.

2016 Zur Derivationsgeschichte der Wurzel \**al-*, paper presented at „Zurück zur Wurzel – Struktur, Funktion und Semantik der Wurzel im Indo-

- germanischen”, 15. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Vienna, 12.-16. September 2016.
- Singer, Itamar  
2006 Ships Bound for Lukka. A New Interpretation of the Companion Letters RS 94.2530 and RS 94.2523, *AoF* 33, 242-262.
- Starke, Frank  
1985 *Die keilschrift-luwischen Texte in Umschrift*, Wiesbaden (StBoT 30).  
1990 *Untersuchung zur Stammbildung des keilschrift-luwischen Nomens*, Wiesbaden (StBoT 31).
- Tekoğlu, Recai – André Lemaire  
2000 La bilingue royale louvito-phénicienne de Çineköy, *CRAIBL* 144, 961-1007.
- Trémouille, Marie-Claude  
1996 Une «fête du mois» pour Teššub et Ḫebat, *SMEA* 37, 79-104.
- von Schuler, Einar  
1965 *Die Kaskäer – Ein Beitrag zur Ethnographie des alten Kleinasien*, Berlin (UAVA 3).
- Weeden, Mark  
2012 KBo 18.117: A Further Join to the “Milawata Letter”, *N.A.B.U.* 2012/3, 63-65.  
2014 State Correspondence in the Hittite World, in: Karen Radner (ed.), *State Correspondence in the Ancient World from New Kingdom Egypt to the Roman Empire*, Oxford, 32-63 and 215-222.  
2015 The Land of Walastin at Tell Tayinat, *N.A.B.U.* 2015/2, 65-66.
- Woudhuizen, Fred C.  
1994-1995 Luwian Hieroglyphic Monumental Rock and Stone Inscriptions from the Hittite Empire Period, *Talanta* 26-27, 153-217.
- Yakubovich, Ilja  
2008a Hittite-Luvian Bilingualism and the Development of Anatolian Hieroglyphs, in: Nikolaj Kazansky (ed.), *Colloquia Classica et Indogermanica IV – Studies in Classical Philology and Indo-European Languages*, N. St. Petersburg (Acta Linguistica Petropolitana 4/1), 9-36.  
2008b The Luwian Enemy, *Kadmos* 47, 1-19.  
2010 *Sociolinguistics of the Luvian Language*, Leiden – Boston (BSIEL 2).  
2014 The Luwian Deity Kwanza, in: Aram Kosyan – Yervand Grekyan – Arsen Bobokhyan (eds.), *The Black & the White – Studies on History, Archaeology, Mythology and Philology in Honor of Armen Petrosyan in Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, Yerevan (*Aramazd* 8/1-2), 282-297.  
2015a Luwian *arla-* ‘place, post’ and its derivatives, paper presented at “Hrozný and Hittite: The First Hundred Years”, Prague, 11-14 November, 2015.  
2015b Phoenician and Luwian in Early Iron Age Cilicia, *AnSt* 65, 35-53.

The Anatolian Hieroglyphic Signs L 41, L 172 and L 319 = L 416

2015c Adanawa or Ahhiyawa? Reply to the Addendum by J. D. Hawkins, *AnSt* 65, 56-58.

Younger, Lawson

1998 The Phoenician Inscription of Azatiwada – an Integrated Reading, *JSS* 43/1, 11-47.

Zucha, Ivo

1988 *The Nominal Stem Types in Hittite* (Oxford University Ph.D. dissertation), Oxford.