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Solar and Sky Deities in Anatolian

H. Craig Melchert

It is a pleasure and honor to join in this much deserved tribute to Kazuhiko Yoshida, a friend of a quarter century, in recognition of his scholarship, his outstanding role as teacher and mentor, and not least his unfailing personal generosity to one and all. Kazu is especially known for his studies of the Anatolian and Indo-European verb, but his interests are by no means confined to this area. The following contribution builds on one of his analyses involving nominal morphology.

K. Yoshida (2000:182) persuasively argued that Hittite šiwat- ‘day’ (to be read [sjiwat-], Luvian Tiwad- ‘Sun-god’, and Palaic Tiyaz ‘Sun-god’ all continue an original “amphikinetic” paradigm *dyéw-ot-, *dy-ut-, leveled already in Proto-Anatolian to *dyéw-ot-, *dyew-ot-. From this Luvian generalized the strong stem, leading to [tiwad-] with a “lenited” or voiced stem-final stop (rhotacized in Iron Age Luvian also to [tiwar-]). Hittite on the other hand generalized the weak stem, where raising of the unaccented short *e led to *djiwot-, and affrication, deaffrication, and devoicing produced via *dzjiwot- and *zjiwot attested ši-i-wa-at-² [sjiwat-] with “unlenited” or voiceless stem-final stop.¹

Yoshida’s arguments for non-initial accent in Hittite and his interpretation of the spelling ši-i- in Old Script as representing [sji-] are well founded. The latter is supported by similar Old Script spellings for [sjuː]- ‘god, deity’ < *dyeu- ši-i-uš (KBo 3:22:47) and ši-i-ú-uš (KUB 35.93 rev.¹ 4). The former is confirmed by the plene spelling in the endingless locative ši-wa-a-at at KBo 21:49 iv 8 (Old Hittite/New Script). His account requires only one modest amplification. The amphikinetik accent on the endings in the weak stem could not be realized on the nom. sg. *dyew-ot-s nor on the renewed endingless locative *dyew-ot.²

¹Rieken (1999:101) derives šiwat- and other Hittite and Luvian common gender nouns in -att- from a putative PIE “proterodynamic” type with ablaut R(é)-ot-, R(zero/e)-ét-, but the evidence cited for such a type is better explained otherwise (see below with reference to Nussbaum 2017). For a very different reconstruction see Kloekhorst 2008:766–7.
²Some PIE “amphikinetik” nouns with suitable semantics were “holokinetic,” with an endingless locative with ablaut R(zero)-S(é): compare *dhíghem, locative singular of ‘earth’, attested with renewed ending in Sanskrit kṣámi (Schindler 1967:201). We might therefore expect a matching *diw-ét (see further below).
The attested accent pattern *dyew-ót- is most economically explained by analogy with the productive class of Hittite abstract/result nouns in -att-. Per Nussbaum (2017:246–9), the latter class reflects a PIE type of denominal t-stems which formed either endocentric substantivizations (‘the X one’) or abstracts. In examples formed to thematic bases we find either reflexes of *-(C)e-t-, as illustrated by Latin divis, divit- ‘wealthy’ from divus ‘shining’, or *-(C)ot- after the *-(C)o- that predominated in the thematic base. We may cite as one Hittite continuant of the latter nahšaratt- ‘fear, awe’ from a virtual *neh₂s-rót- derived from a *nahšara- < *neh₂s-ró- ‘afraid’ attested in Old Irish nár ‘shy, modest’ (cf. Rieken 1999:115).  

The deverbal stems in -att- are a secondary development, based on the ambiguity of an example like kartimiyatt- ‘anger’, which may have been derived either from an adjective *kartimiya- ‘pertaining to anger’ < *kartima- ‘anger’ or from the denominative verb kartimiya- ‘be(come) angry’ (see for the basic derivation Oettinger 2001:457).  

K. Yoshida (2000:177, 182) assumes that Sanskrit dyít-, dyut- ‘light, brilliance’ (feminine) belongs to the same amphikinetic paradigm as the Anatolian words for ‘day’ and ‘Sun-god’, but does not pursue the issue of their differing semantics or the further details of the derivation of *dyéw-ot-, *dy-ut- from *dyéu-, *diw- ‘day-lit sky’. These issues are addressed by Rau (2010:309–10), who likewise assumes that the Sanskrit and Anatolian words continue a single PIE amphikinetic t-stem *dyéwot-, *dyut-. He can explain the generalization of the weak stem in Sanskrit as patterned on t-extended root nouns such as stú-t- ‘praise’ and semantically comparable root nouns such as rúc- ‘light’ and bhr´¯aj- ‘id.’. His formal derivation of this t-stem from the hysterokinetic u-stem *dyéu-, *diw- ‘day-lit sky’ (for which see Rau 2010:313–8) and explanation of the differing semantics of the Sanskrit and Anatolian reflexes are less compelling.

Rau first argues that *dyéw-ot-, *dy-ut- is a secondary amphikinetic t-stem with possessive semantics, but then defines the word as ‘the one/thing connected with the day-lit sky, day’—suggesting rather an appurtenance meaning. A genuine possessive sense works well for the Anatolian, where *(the one) possessing the daylit sky, day-light’ is a reasonable source for ‘Sun-god’ and ‘day’. However, in its total of three occurrences in the Rigveda dyít-, dyut- refers always to a thing, the quality of light or brilliance that is itself possessed. In RV VI.2.6c it belongs to the Sun, in IX.454.1a

---

1The endingless locative of ‘day’ in Hittite is robustly attested (some 40 times, from Old to New Hittite). It is possible that this salient member of the paradigm, inherited from Proto-Anatolian already with the strong stem ablaut *dyew-ót replacing PIE *diw-ót, contributed to generalization of the accent on the -att- syllable, but it seems doubtful that it alone was the determining factor.

2Norbert Oettinger (pers. comm.) suggests that *Nakkili(y)att-/Nakkili¯et and *Šuw¯aliyatt- may be examples of endocentric *-ot-

3The objections of Rieken (1999:110 n. 510) and Kloekhorst (2008:457) to this derivation are unfounded. Middle Script spellings with single -m- show that the New Script geminate spellings are not linguistically real, and lah˘h˘iya-‘traveler, campaigner’ from lah˘h˘a- ‘trip, campaign’ via an adjective *lah˘h˘iya- ‘pertaining to a trip’ or from lah˘h˘iya(i)- ‘to travel, go on campaign’ shows another example of a similar ambiguity (the assumption of a root noun lah˘h˘ by Kloekhorst 2008:510 solely because of the formation of the verb is circular).
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it is by a comparison with Agni an attribute of Soma, and in X.99.2a it is ascribed to a deity eventually revealed to be Indra.\(^6\) Nor are Rau’s comparanda for development of a noun ‘light, radiance’ from a possessive adjective entirely persuasive. There is no evidence that Rigvedic *dyumnánt- is ever anything but an adjective ‘brilliant, shining’, and the noun *dyummá- ‘radiance’ is a substantivized neuter adjective. The feminine gender of *dyút-, *dyut- suggests rather an abstract ‘brilliance, luminosity’.

There is also a formal difficulty in positing an amphikinetic *t-stem with possessive semantics as an ordinary secondary derivative of a *dy-éu-, *di-w- ‘day-lit sky’. It has long been noticed that internal derivation by amphikinesis, secondary derivation by “vrdhil,” and some secondary substantivation by “accent shift” all exhibit Schwebeablaut: *h₂dēus-os-, *h₂dēus-s- ‘(goddess of) dawn’ < *h₂wē´s- ‘to dawn, grow bright’, *dēiw-ó- ‘belonging to heaven, the day-lit sky’, hence ‘divine’ and ‘deity’ < *dy-éu-, *dī-w- ‘day-lit sky’, *bhērh₂-g-ê-ch₂ ‘birch’ (Lithuanian bēržas, Old Norse bjork, etc.) < *bhērh₂-g-ê ‘gleaming’ < *bhērh₂-g - ‘to gleam’ (LIV\(^2\) 92).\(^7\) We have no reason to believe that this pattern is not inherited from Proto-Indo-European and therefore would expect it to apply also in Anatolian.\(^8\) We would predict *dēiw-ot-, *dyut-’, from which the Luvian and Palaic could be derived, but hardly the Hittite, since the affrication of the initial stop would be inexplicable.

The stem shape *dyew-ot- points rather to a delocatival derivative from the full-grade endingless locative *dyéu ‘in daylight’ (note Latin diù ‘by day’) of the base noun *dy-éu-, *dī-w- ‘day-lit sky, day’.\(^9\) However, it is questionable whether a *t-stem built on a case form would show ablaut and accent alternation (compare non-ablauting deinstrumental *śl₃/h₂/₁-th₃-t ‘health’ seen in Latin salús, salūt- < *śl₂/₁/h₁ ‘with wholeness, hale’ < *śl₂/₁-h ‘wholeness’). A possessive adjective based directly on a locative ‘in daylight’ is also not entirely straightforward in semantic terms. It seems more reasonable to suppose a non-ablauting delocatival *dyéu- t- ‘brightness, (day)light’, from which an amphikinetic/holokinetic possessive adjective ‘having brightness, light’ was internally derived. One may compare cases like Latin masculine sól ‘sun-(god)’ < *s(ê)h₂-wöl ‘(the one) possessing the sun-orb’ < *séh₂-w₁, *s₂h₂-wén-s ‘sun-orb’ seen in Sanskrit neuter sūvar and Avestan huuara, xémgry.\(^10\) For an example based on a

---

\(^6\)Gelder (1951:3-94 and 3.39) translates the first two as ‘Glanz’, but renders the poet’s asyndetic figure dyutá vi dyutā in the third with ‘mit Leuchten, mit Blitzen’ (3.311). Jamison and Brereton (2014:775, 1278) likewise choose ‘brilliance’ for the first two, but opt for ‘with his flashing, with his lightning’ for the last (ibid. 1557).

\(^7\)See for recent extensive discussion Ozoliņš 2015:40–85 and 137–43 and Steer 2015:33–5, 49–50, and all of Chapter 5. Since the respective derivational processes are functionally quite distinct, it is unclear how the superficially similar formal feature arose. A phonetically motivated origin (LIV\(^2\) 394 n. 8 with references) seems unlikely.

\(^8\)Such an expectation is independent of whether one accepts the analysis by Steer (2015:43–60) that Hittite negna- ‘sister’ and negma- ‘brother’ are examples of the pattern in secondary substantivation by accent shift.

\(^9\)I am much indebted to Alan Nussbaum for suggesting this possibility to me and invaluable discussion of various alternative scenarios with relevant comparanda. I am responsible for the choice and formulation of the analysis presented here.

\(^10\)Such masculine or feminine internal derivatives can also be regarded as endocentric: “individuating” or “personifying.” Schindler (1975:65–4) entertains both possibilities, but his cited example of an adjective, late
non-neuter abstract one may cite ‘Ἀγάρω ‘(the one) possessing swiftness’ < ἀγαρί- ‘swiftness’ (see Rau 2009:52–3 n. 52). The isolated fixed full-grade *dyéu-t- was assimilated in pre-Sanskrit to root nouns like ríc-, ruc- ‘light, brilliance’ and bhráj-, bhráj- ‘glint, glow(ing)’ per Rau.

Whether one derives the Anatolian reflexes and Sanskrit dyut-, dyut- ‘light, brilliance’ from one paradigm or two, Proto-Anatolian *dyéw-ot-, *dy-ut- surely meant both ‘Sun-god’ and ‘day’. In Luvian, a new word /xalliya-/ ‘day’ (attested in cuneiform balliya- and hieroglyphic ba-li-ya-) resulted in Tiwad- being restricted to the sense ‘Sun-deity’. However, the word was used not only for the inherited male Sun-god of heaven, but also for the Anatolian Sun-goddess of earth: šarri . . . *UTU-za . . . tiyammašši *UTU-za ‘the Sun-god above . . . the Sun-goddess of earth’ (KUB 35.45 ii 25–7).11 Palaic Tiffany is attested only as the Sun-god, but we do not know the word for ‘day’ or the status of the Sun-goddess of earth in Palaic.

In Hittite the adoption of Hattian Eštan as Ištanu- not only for the Hattian Sun-goddess of heaven, the supreme goddess of the Hattian pantheon, but also for the male Sun-god of heaven and the Sun-goddess of earth (e.g. n[epi]šaš *UTU-uš at KBo 17.7 + IBOT 3.135 obv. 7, taknaš *UTU-uš ibid. obv. 8, Old Script) led to narrowing of the sense of šinwat- to ‘day’.12 The Hittites even used *UTU-u- (Ištanu-) to refer to Luvian Tiwad- (see KBO 14.95+ iv 12, cited in Steitler 2017:384).

The derivation of Proto-Anatolian *dyéw-ot-, *dy-ut- ‘Sun-god’ and ‘day’ from *dy-eu-, *di-w- ‘day-lit sky, day’ must be pre-Proto-Anatolian and most likely is inherited from Proto-Indo-European, because it is now confirmed that the base *dy-eu-, *di-w- had changed its sense to only ‘god, deity’ already in Proto-Anatolian. Neu (1974:125), following a suggestion of Bin-Nun (1975:147–50), proposed to equate the *ši- of *ši-i-uš-mi-iš and *ši-šuš[m-(mi-in)] in the Anitta text with *UTU-u-, the solar deity of the “foundation ritual” attested in KUB 29.1. Neu concludes (1974: 127–8) that in the Anitta text *ši- (sic!) is not yet an appellative ‘god, deity’, but is still the name for the inherited Indo-European male “Lichtgott.” Only with the later borrowing by the Hittites of Hattian Eštan in the form Ištanu- for their male solar deity was šitu- free to become the generic term for ‘god, deity’.13

However, while Bin-Nun is consistent in regarding the sun deity of both the

---

11 Hittite *šinwat- never means ‘Sun-god’ (contra K. Yoshida 2000:175), but refers to the deified ‘Day’ (written also *UD and *UMU); see D. Yoshida 1996:338–40.

12 This analysis was followed by among others Watkins (1995:8).
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Anitta text and the foundation ritual as the inherited Indo-European male solar deity, Neu himself (1974:126) argues correctly that the sun deity of the foundation ritual appearing in KUB 29.1 i 17–26 is the Hattian Sun-goddess (= the Sun-goddess of Arinna), supreme goddess of the Hattian pantheon who stands beside the male storm-god of heaven. See further Klinger 1996:141–3 and the exhaustive demonstration in Steitler 2017:31–175. There is thus no justification for equating šu- of the Anitta text with the sun deity of the foundation ritual of KUB 29.1.

Starke (1979:56–65) argued cogently for the šu- of ši-uš-mi-iš and ši-uš-su[m-(mi-in)] in the Anitta text as an appellative, but his identification of ‘my god’ and ‘our god’ with the deified throne dais Halmaššuit did not win widespread acceptance. Singer (1995:345–8) solved the difficulty by interpreting ši-i-ul-mi-iš as /sju:smis/ ‘their god’, referring to Halmaššuit as the patron deity of the Hattian population of Hattusha, who delivered the city to the conquering Anitta, in contrast with ‘our god’, Anitta’s patron god of Neša. Singer could offer close parallels from other Hittite texts for the concept that successful conquest of an enemy city required the cooperation of its deities. This highly persuasive analysis has been justly accepted by among others Hoffner (1997:183) and Gilan (2011:359–61). Hittite ši- is attested only as an appellative ‘god, deity’.

Steitler (2017:178–9) also justifiably criticizes Neu’s premise that Proto-Indo-European *dyeu- (now to be analyzed with Rau as *dy-éu-), whose true meaning was ‘day-lit sky’ (as both a place and its deification), would have come to refer to a solar deity. The Proto-Indo-European designation for the sun was, as discussed above, *séh₂-w₁, *sh₂-wén-s, and the name of the Sun-god was derived from it, internally (*s(é)h₂-wol ‘(the one) possessing the sun-orb’ > Latin sól) or by suffixation (e.g. *suḥ₂-l-o- > Sanskrit śíra-, *seḥ₂-wel-iy- > Homeric Greek ἅέλιος): see NIL 606–11. Per Steitler, it is Proto-Anatolian *dyiw-ot-, *dy-ut-, not *dy-éu-, *dīw-, that replaces the reflexes of *sęb₂-w₁ as the designation for the Sun-god in Proto-Anatolian, and the subsequent replacement of *dyew-ot-, *dy-ut- by Ištanu- in Hittite is unrelated to the change of meaning of *dy-éu-, *dīw- from ‘day-lit sky, day’ to the generic term for ‘god, deity’.

There is further evidence to confirm that *dy-éu-, *dīw- already meant generically ‘god, deity’ in Proto-Anatolian. We already knew of Lydian ciw- ‘god’ and ciwval(i)- ‘divine’ (Gusmani 1964:92–3). Since the only sure source of the nasal transliterated as Greek nu in Lydian is original word-final nasal (see Melchert 1994:339), the development by which the accusative singular *dyún (or ciwval) came to be used as a stem (as in Hittite genitive singular ši-ú-na-āš, dative-locative singular ši-ú-ni etc.) is also already Proto-Anatolian.14

---

14Steitler errs only in entertaining the notion that application of *sęb₂-w₁ to the sun might be a post-Anatolian innovation. Lydian ciwval- refers to a cutting tool, not ‘lamp’ (CHD Ş:486–7), so there is no evidence for reflexes of the very archaic word ‘sun’ in Anatolian (correctly Pinault 2017:144–6).

15This development recalls the Greek stem Ze- built on the inherited accusative singular Ζήν < *dýéım. Contra Watkins 1974:104, Lydian shows that the Anatolian accusative *dýún (a trivial analogical renewal of *dýéım after the nominative) likewise became the base for the oblique stem.
Yakubovich (apud Steitler 2017:189 n. 606) has suggested that the epithet of the Luvian Sun-god EN-ya tiwaliya (KUB 35.45 ii 18 and duplicate) is not ‘lord of the sun’ (Melchert 1993:237, following Starke 1990:147), but rather ‘divine lord’ (so hesitantly already Weitenberg 1984:178). This analysis is illuminating and convincing formally and semantically. First, we would not expect an alternation of -d- with -l- in Luvian of the second millennium. Second, addressing Tiwad, the Luvian Sun-god, as ‘lord of the sun’ seems oddly redundant and leaves the discourse-initial preceding three broken signs in KUB 35.48 ii 18 unexplained.† Third, the sequence … kKiian memai tiwaliya dIŠAR […] at KUB 15.35 i 21 now reads more naturally as ‘[ ]’ speaks as follows: divine Ishtar[…]’, not ‘Isthar of the sun’. As Steitler (2017:189) correctly concludes, the adjective tiwaliya- ‘divine’ shows that *tiw- also entered Luvian with the sense ‘god, deity’, although it is replaced as the generic term by the innovative /mas(sa)n(i)-/ in all forms of attested Luvian.

Steitler (2017:193) also correctly cites Palaic tiunaš as evidence for the pan-Anatolian sense of *dy-É₂, *diw- ‘god, deity’, but the details must be revised. Soysal (2016) has now confirmed the idea of Otten (1968–9:112), followed by Watkins (1978:308), that in context Palaic ti–ū-na-āš refers to a bull being offered to Zarpāš. In KBo 19.153 iii 16 it is announced to the god as an offering (tiunaš tiunaš[i]) just like the ram ibid. iii 4 (šameriš šameriš). In KBo 19.52+ i 19–21 a bull is explicitly led in, and one may following Soysal (2016:315) restore the next two lines as [‘nam-na-āš/an-š]a-an la-a-na-an ti–ū-na-āš [ba-zi-ša-a]h-hi ‘[Next] I call it tiuna by name’.²⁰

Soysal (2016:316–7) rightly compares nom. sg. tī-i–ū-ni-īš and dat.-loc. sg. [tī]–i–ū-ni at KBo 47.7 obv. 6 and 13, a ritual in Middle Script but with Old Hittite grammatical features. The context points to a horned animal, and Soysal reasonably infers a relationship to the Palaic word for ‘bull’. He assumes that tiuni- is Hittite, attributing the i-stem to Luvian influence. However, the mention of Adaniya (Adana) in obv. 13

---

†It is the merit of Steitler (2017:385–6 n. 1200) to have solved this issue. Careful inspection of online photos shows that we must read the signs as [‘] UTU-ta, that is, the expected vocative of Tiwad: thus ‘Tiwad, divine lord’.

‡The first example shows that the epithet can follow, so it remains uncertain whether we should read [ ]× tiwaliya ‘U Ḥarralpili[…]’ in KBo 8.69.3 as ‘divine Storm-god of Harapsili’. The broken context leaves tiwaliya in KBo 14.91:8 unanalyzable. The plant name tiwali⁴⁴ in a list (KBo 13.248 i 7) probably belongs here, but its formal analysis is unclear.

³The word tiwišša, the name for a ‘plant of the Sun-god’ (KBo 39.8 iv 17 = KBo 2.3 iii 40), more likely reflects rhotacized *tiwiadīya- ‘(that) of the Sun-god’ (Melchert 1993:237 after Popko and Starke) than rhotacized tiwaliya- ‘divine’ (contra Yakubovich 2010:35), who elucidates the “precocious” rhotacism in a fifteenth-century text).

⁴One cannot with Steitler (2017:387 n. 1206) interpret [EZEN, MEŠ Š][A]A UTU-liya umluša at KUB 17.19:9 as ‘of the Sun-god of Lušna’. As he points out (2017:179 n. 571), the spelling of tiwaliya with “UTU may be merely a “rebus spelling.” We should assume rather an epithet ‘the Divine One of Lušna’, comparable to the frequent “MUNUS.LUGAL umluša the Queen of X”.

²⁰Soysal’s adducing of the same naming construction in the Story of Appu at KUB 24.8+ iii 14 is compelling, but despite his claim that Carruba’s restorations are too long for the lacunae, Soysal’s are, based on both the autograph and the photo, too short. I therefore restore a form of ḫalzišša- as in the Appu passage.
and 15 suggests rather a Luvianism in Hittite; for the Luvian associations of Adana compare KUB 30.31 iv 7 and 27 (designated a ritual of Kizzuwatna in the colophon iv 46).

Given the status of the bull as a holy animal and symbol of the Storm-god (Soysal 2016:315) and the phrasing ‘I call it tiuna by name’, we may plausibly interpret the word as an epithet ‘(the one) of the god, the divine (animal)’. Palaic tiunas could represent a freestanding genitive of the word for ‘god’ or a hypostasized a-stem. Since Hittite halzai- in the sense ‘call someone something’ takes a consistently accusative object (van den Hout 1992:287–92), a freestanding genitive is more likely in KBo 19.32+ i 20–1. On the other hand, Luvian tiuni- as attested must be a hypostasized tiun(i)-.21 In Luvian we are surely dealing with a “transferred epithet,” since the synchronic word for ‘god’ is the innovative /mas(sa)n(i)-/. Since we do not know the Palaic word for ‘god’, the precise status of the Palaic epithet tiunas referring to a bull is uncertain.22 In any case, both Palaic and Luvian likely reflect at least indirectly the same Proto-Anatolian oblique stem *dyun- seen in Hittite and Lydian.

It is thus clear that already in Proto-Anatolian *dy-éu-, *diw-’ (with its secondary oblique stem *dyün-) had changed its meaning to ‘god, deity’. Just how and why this semantic shift took place remains difficult to determine. For the reasons given by Steitler (2017:178–9) cited above, it cannot be attributed to the presence of *dyéw-or-, *dy-ut-’ ‘sun-god, day’, since the latter functionally replaced reflexes of *sēh₂-w˚l ‘sun’, not those of ‘day-lit sky’.

While a definitive answer is not possible, the shift in sense of *dy-éu-, *diw-’ is surely closely related to the fact that Anatolian is one of the sub-branches of Indo-European where reflexes of the root *nebh-, which originally meant ‘to become cloudy, damp’ (LIV² 448), came to be used for ‘sky, heaven’, including as the abode of celestial deities. At least Hittite nepišt⁻, Kizzuwatna Luvian tappaš⁻ and Iron Age Luvian /tibas⁻ all mean ‘sky, heaven’.23 We cannot be assured that the replacement of *dy-éu-, *diw-’ by an s-stem from *nebh⁻ occurred already in Proto-Anatolian, but nothing stands in the way of such an assumption.24

Furthermore, there is some evidence that ‘heaven’ was conceived of as a sentient being: in the evocatio ritual KUB 15.34 iv 32 we find n-uš attaś nepišanza EGIR-an tarna ‘May you, father heaven, release them!’ (the male deities being evoked). Since the Storm-god and Sun-god of heaven are also addressed as ‘father’, one cannot put undue weight on the epithet ‘father’. Nevertheless, attaś nepišanza has as much right to be cited as a continuant of Proto-Indo-European *dyeu ph₂:ter as attaś 4UTU (cf. Watkins 1995:8).

21I assume that the Luvian word would be synchronically a consonant stem with “i-mutation.” The attested forms in Hittite context may belong to a genuine i-stem.

22Yakubovich (2003:118–9 n. 40) has now shown that Palaic nārba⁻ means ‘guest’, not ‘god’.


24The sense of Lycian tabahaza is unclear (see Neumann 2007:336–7 with references), and we do not know the word for ‘sky, heaven’ in Palaic or Lydian.
H. Craig Melchert

There is also the intriguing matter of the deity *Nipas, attested in the Old Assyrian Kültepe (Kaniş) texts (see Kryszat 2006:113–4). Considerable caution is in order, since we know little more than that he was a major deity standing beside the goddess An(n)a. However, unless one wishes to remain with a null hypothesis, it is hard to avoid inferring that the name reflects a form of our word for ‘heaven, sky’. Kloekhorst (2008:604) reasonably assumes that it reflects a neuter s-stem, *nébhos (per Kryszat, a reading *Nepas is permissible, though one must stress that it is motivated only by the desired etymology). However, one may also suppose, analogous to the generalized *dyewot- and similar cases, that the name of the deity is another possessive amphikinetic stem *nébhos- ‘(the one) possessing heaven’, thus the deification of ‘heaven, sky’.25

However, even if one allows for the Proto-Anatolian replacement of *dy-éu-, *di-w- ‘by an s-stem reflex of *nēbb- not only in its sense ‘day-lit sky, day’, but also in its deified form as the god of the day-lit sky, this replacement merely helps to motivate a semantic shift of the former. The reason for the specific change to ‘god, deity’ remains to be found.
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