

NUGAE LUVICAE

This article represents an extended review of *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscription* by J. D. Hawkins.¹ The publication of this monumental work provides an appropriate occasion for re-examining the meaning of certain problematic Luwian lexemes and constructions.

At some point in the mid-second millennium BC the inhabitants of Southern Anatolia invented a hieroglyphic writing system of their own. The iconic, self-explanatory character of many hieroglyphic signs contrasted with the arbitrary nature of the cuneiform symbols borrowed from Mesopotamia, which could never be understood by an illiterate person. Hieroglyphic script seems to have been originally used at the Hittite court only for very short texts, such as legends on royal seals, but in the last decades of the Hittite Empire (late 13th century BC) it appears also on monumental inscriptions. This innovation was apparently accompanied by the Luwianization of the area of Hattusa: in each case where linguistic identification is possible the language of hieroglyphic inscriptions is Luwian, not Hittite. After the collapse of the Hittite Empire cuneiform writing fell out of use in Anatolia, and, therefore, Neo-Hittite chancelleries also adopted hieroglyphic script for the purpose of writing Luwian. Hieroglyphic Luwian (HLuw.) remained the only written language in Anatolia for several centuries, until the conquest of Neo-Hittite states by Assyria and possibly the spread of alphabetic writing brought an end to the hieroglyphic scribal tradition. This happened shortly after 700 BC.

Three “Rosetta stones” are to be highlighted in connection with Hieroglyphic Luwian. The seal of Tarkasnawa, King of Mira, inscribed in hieroglyphs and in cuneiform, allowed A. H. Sayce to give the correct interpretation

¹ This book is abbreviated as CHLI throughout the article. The second volume of CHLI, containing the facsimile edition of the Karatepe bilingual and the analysis of its Phoenician text, is not discussed in the present review.

of the ideograms for King (REX) and Land (REGIO) in 1880. This was the beginning of Hieroglyphic Luwian Studies.² The extensive Luwian and Phoenician bilingual of Kara-Tepe discovered by the expedition of H. Bossert in 1947 provided a solid confirmation of many hypothetical readings that were advanced by Luwian scholars in the twenties and thirties, mainly on structural and etymological grounds. This helped to establish the study of “Hittite hieroglyphs” as a universally accredited philological field. The discovery of short Luwian and Urartian bilingual inscriptions on Altın-Tepe pithoi prompted the re-evaluation of phonetic values of several important Hieroglyphic Luwian signs (Hawkins—Morpurgo-Davies—Neumann HHL). The “New Readings” helped to establish a very close genetic relationship between Cuneiform and Hieroglyphic Luwian, which, in its turn, allowed the use of more Cuneiform Luwian data for understanding Hieroglyphic Luwian facts and vice versa.

There is no doubt that the publication of the book under review represents a step forward of no less significance than those outlined above. For the first time in the history of the field we have got an updated edition of all the Iron Age HLuw. monuments. The collapse of the Hittite Empire was chosen as a convenient starting point since those few royal inscriptions that predate it had been published separately by the same author (Hawkins, *StBoT Beih.* 3 (1995)). The edition of each inscription is accompanied by archeological information, exhaustive references to previous scholarship and philological comments. The inscriptions are grouped according to the Neo-Hittite political unit they represent and then considered in a rough chronological order. The introduction to each group contains the concise history of the respective state in the Iron Age. The total number of inscriptions and fragments discussed in the book nears 300. The impressive appendix to CHLI contains, among other things, a list of Hieroglyphic Luwian monuments according to their present location, an updated ideogram list (based on Laroche, HH), and an alphabetical list of ideograms transcribed into Latin.

It is impossible to abstain from laudatory remarks when discussing the accurate presentation of Luwian data in CHLI. Prof. J. D. Hawkins devoted more than twenty years of his life to the painstaking work of copying the hieroglyphic inscriptions and trying to make sense of broken or seemingly unintelligible passages. The testimony to this travail is provided by the second volume of CHLI that contains the photographs of most inscriptions discussed and the drawings of nearly all of them. Prof. Hawkins is also the principal creator of the modern Luwian transliteration that is almost universally accepted in the academic community, in spite of the occasional gripes of some American scholars about the use of Latin for ideograms. As far I can judge, the

² It is worth mentioning that the name of Tarkasnawa (Hier. *TARKASNA*-wa/i) appearing on this seal was correctly read only several years ago (Hawkins—Morpurgo-Davies 1997).

transliterations provided in the first two volumes are of exemplary quality³ and the same can be said about the cross-references to relevant forms.⁴ In some cases the transliteration adopted in CHLI appears to be overly conservative (e.g. certain rather obvious ideograms are cited by numbers and not transcribed into Latin)⁵ but one can certainly understand a scholar who prefers to be too cautious rather than too daring dealing with a language that is still poorly understood.

A case where the author's conservative position seems to be unjustified is that of the *pá* sign (*462). This traditional transliteration is based only on one questionable identification, as recognized by the author himself. On the other hand, C. Melchert (AHP) was able to produce at least six plausible etymologies that show that Hieroglyphic Luwian words with the *pá* sign have Hittite and Cuneiform Luwian cognates with an /m/ sound, and correctly, in my opinion, suggested a new transliteration *ma_(x)*. Prof. Melchert (pers. comm.) adds that the original value of this sign was likely to be *mara/i* since in all the cases but one the syllabogram *mara/i-* is accompanied by a thorn. Although Melchert's etymologies are mostly accepted by Hawkins, the transliteration *ma_x* is not adopted in CHLI: 37 on the grounds that there are no alternations between *ma* and *ma_x* in the same lexeme. The author hypothesizes instead that the sign in question represents something *akin* to *ma* and tentatively suggests that it might be *ba*. No sound laws that governed the would-be conditioned development */m/ > /b/ in HLuw. are suggested.

A very cautious approach is adopted with regard to translation. Whenever the author is not sure about the meaning of a particular word, he indicates it by italicizing the translation and/or by putting a question mark next to it. The words without translation are tentatively transcribed and written in the capital letters. This generates monsters like "cause to *live* (?) the *WASINASAHI (?) and the HUMIRA *dead* from ZIKUNA" (ASSUR, letter *f+g*, § 6), but one can hardly blame the author for faithfully reflecting the current state of our knowledge of Luwian. In a number of cases the translation of minor texts is not even attempted and the discussion of individual intelligible pieces is reserved for the comments.

If the content of a passage is clear, the author frequently favours a very literal translation, even at the expense of not being idiomatic. The merit of this approach lies in the possibility of noticing certain peculiarities of Luwian syntax without recurring to the text itself, although in some cases CHLI is not

³ KARKAMIŠ A6 § 11: (~~"PES2+PES"~~) → ("PES₂.PES"), KARABURUN § 14: ~~SCRIBA-la-sa~~ → SCRIBA-la-sá and ASSUR c § 11: ~~VIA-wa/i-ni~~ → VIA-wa/i are the only *lapsi calami* I have managed to notice.

⁴ But note ANCOZ 7, § 4 (p. 357): ~~BULGARMADEN § 11~~ → BULGARMADEN § 7. Appendix 3 (HH no. 462), reference X on p. 36: ~~KARATEPE 57~~ → KARATEPE 48.

⁵ Thus I would replace *149.SCALPRUM with HORDEUM.SCALPRUM in ISKEN-DERUN § 1.

consistent in reflecting or suppressing the idiosyncrasies of the Luwian language in the translation (cf. below on the split possessive construction). The author's task was rendered more difficult by the fixed word order of English; one almost has to regret that Latin was not chosen for translation, as for the ideograms. It is certain that, as long as new inscriptions are found and old problems are solved, both the faithfulness and the idiomaticity of Luwian translations will be constantly improving, but it is equally certain that CHLI will remain the basic reference source for these improvements for many decades.

I am not qualified to pass upon the merits of the historical and archeological part of CHLI, but I did greatly benefit from reading it. I found especially interesting the author's discussion of the period that immediately followed the collapse of the Hittite Empire. It appears from the data presented that Southern Anatolia and Northern Syria entered the Iron Age without a violent break in cultural tradition comparable to the destruction of Hattusa. The seal impression of Kuzi-Tesub, the son of the last Karkamisean vice-roy Talmi-Tesub (LIDAR, pp. 574—575), as well as the rock inscriptions GÜRÜN, KÖTÜKALE and İSPEKÇÜR from the Malatya area (pp. 295—304) belonging to the grandsons of Kuzi-Tesub show that the Karkemisean dynasty continued to occupy a prominent position in the area in the 12th century. The archaic inscriptions of KARADAĞ and KIZILDAĞ (pp. 433—437) belonging to Hartapu the son of Mursili, the Great King may imply the same thing with regard to the Tarhuntassan dynasty.⁶

What follows are grammatical and lexical notes concerning individual problems of the Hieroglyphic Luwian dialect. I feel obliged to stress the fact that I should not have been able to produce them without recurring to a comprehensive body of data, such as the book under review. The increase in the number of Luwian scholars after the publication of CHLI will no doubt become one of the factors that will promote the due appreciation of this book.

SPLIT POSSESSIVE CONSTRUCTION

One of the instances where the translation of CHLI can be immediately improved are the sentences with the split possessive construction. A selection of HLuw. examples illustrating this linguistic phenomenon is given below:⁷

- (1) *wa/i-tú-ta-*' (PANIS)*tú+ra/i-pi-na* (LIBARE)*sa₅-ra/i-la* || *-ta-za-ha* NEG₃-sa ARHA | *tà-ti-i* **'From him** may they not take up bread and libation' (KARKAMIŠ A11a § 27, p. 96).

⁶ Cf. the discussion in Hawkins, StBoT Beih. 3 (1995): 63—65 and Bryce, Kingdom: 386—387.

⁷ I keep the original translation of CHLI in all citations, reserving all my disagreements for the comments. Here and below the words or phrases discussed and their translations in CHLI are set in bold face.

- (2) [...] || (-) *wa/i-ti-ta-*´ *á-ta₅-ma-[za]* [...] *-sa [x]-x-[x]-x* || VAS-*tara/i-i-na* (PES) *u-pa-i pa-sa-na-*´ DOMINUS-*na-ni<(x)>* PRAE-*na* ‘[(He) who] **his** name [or/and **his**] image shall bring before his lord...’ (IZGIN 2 § 8, p. 316).
- (3) *si-pi-ia-pa-wa/i-ta ni-ia-sá-na* *hara/i-na-wa-ni-sa*(URBS) (DEUS) *ku-AVIS-ia ku-ma-pi ta-wa/i INFRA-ta á-za-tu* ‘**For Sipis Nis’s son** may the Haranean (god) *together with* (?) Kubaba swallow down (**his**) eyes’ (KARABURUN § 10, p. 481).
- (4) *wa/i-tu-u [á-ta_{4/5}-ma-za ARHA]* DELERE-*nú-tu-u* ‘Let them destroy **his** name’ KULULU 5 § 10, p. 486)
- (5) | *wa/i-ru-ta* | (DEUS) *sà-ta-si-i-zi* || | (DEUS) *pá[?]+ra/i-wa/i-i-zi* | (“*256) *tà-sá-za* | *a-ta* | “CRUS”-*tu* ‘**For him** may Santas’s marwainzi gods attack the memorial’ (KULULU 2 § 6, p. 488).

All the five examples are taken from the final blessing/curse formulae and have similar contexts. Examples (2) and (4) show that the English possessive phrase can correspond to the Luwian construction where the possessor is promoted to the syntactic position of an indirect object (e.g. Let them destroy his name → Let them destroy for him the name).⁸ In my opinion, the same syntactic transformation is patent in examples (1), (3) and (5), which can be translated as follows:

- (1) Let them not take up **his** bread and libation.
- (3) May the Haranean (god) *together with* (?) Kubaba swallow down the eyes of **Sipis Nis’s son**.
- (5) May Santas’s marwainzi gods attack **his** memorial.

This translation can be supported by the following examples where possessive pronouns appear in similar contexts, either together with an indirect object pronoun (double possessive construction) or without it:

- (6) *a-wa/i* | *á-pa-sá* (“CAPUT^l”) [*ha+ra/i*]-*ma-[hi-na]* ARHA DELERE(-)[*x[?]*]-*nu-tu-*´ ‘And may they destroy **his** head’ (KARKAMIŠ A4a § 14, p. 152).
- (7) *á-pa-ti-pa-wa/i á-ta₅-sa* (DEUS) *ku-AVIS á-pa-si-i-na* “VAS”(?) *-ni-na* (“*476”) *ta-wa/i-sa* || *-ha-na* PRAE-*na* || TONITRUS(?) *-wa/i-nú-wa/i-tu* ‘**For him** may ATA Kubaba cause to ... **his** TAWASHA- person(?)’ (BOYBE-PINARI 2 § 20, p. 337).

⁸ This transformation is common cross-linguistically. Cf. e.g. Russian *я сломал себе руку* or Italian *Mi sono rotto la mano* ‘I broke my arm’, literally ‘I broke the arm to myself’. In some languages this transformation is limited to the cases of inalienable possession, but (1) and (4) indicates that Luwian does not have this constraint. The same is true for Hittite, where the split possessive construction is also abundantly attested (Luraghi, Hittite: 23). The formal feature associated with inalienable possession in Late Hittite and Hieroglyphic Luwian is case attraction (see the examples below).

One can envisage two practical strategies of translating the Luwian split possessive constructions. One can either render them into English verbatim in each case, or consistently replace them with the standard English possessive construction. The following examples make me think that the second approach is better:

- (8) *á-pa-pa-wa/i-*’ (NEUS)*ni-ka+ra/i-wa/i-sá* CANIS-*ni-i-zi á-pa-si-na* | CA=PUT-*hi-na* | ARHA EDERE-*tú* ‘For him may Nikarawas’ dogs eat up his head’ (KARKAMIŠ A6 § 31, p. 125).⁹
- (9) *á-ta-ha-si-zi-pa-wa/i-na* || DEUS-*ni-zi za+ra/i-za* ARHA *a+ra/i-tu* ‘Let the gods of ATAHA- eat up his heart’ (KULULU 5 § 11, p. 486).

Here we are dealing with the split (9) and double (8) possessive constructions complicated by case attraction. The pronoun indicating the possessor assumes the accusative ending under the impact of the direct object (Let the gods eat his heart → Let the gods eat him, the heart). The phenomenon of case attraction in Late Hittite and its association with inalienable possession is well known.¹⁰ In Hieroglyphic Luwian case attraction also seems to be limited to the cases of inalienable possession.

The translation of (8) offered by Hawkins is neither literal nor idiomatic. A more literal translation of the kind ‘May Nikarawas’ dogs eat him up, his head’ would be almost incomprehensible and is not attempted by the author. It is therefore better to follow the pattern of example (9) and render all the stylistic varieties of the Luwian possessive constructions by their standard and idiomatic English equivalent.

ATARI- ‘PERSON, SELF; SOUL’

The word written *á-tara/i-i-*, VAS-*tara/i-i-* (vel sim.) is not consistently translated in CHLI. In the following cases the translation ‘image, figure’ has been chosen.

- (10) | *á-mi-i-na-pa-wa/i(-)u¹-mu¹* (“VAS”) *a-tara/i-i-na* | “SCALPRUM”(-)*i-ara/i-za i-zi-i-ha* ‘and I made my own *image*...’ (KARKAMIŠ A15b § 11, p. 131).
- (11) *wa/i-mu-ta á-[...]-x-sa [...]-x-sa* VAS-*tara/i-zi* | *a-ta* | LITUUS+*na-tà* ‘For me my? [...] looked upon the *images* (and me he made the [Country] Lord)’¹¹ (KARKAMIŠ A26f § 2, p. 170).

⁹ For the double possessive construction in Hittite cf. e.g. CHD, L—N: 312, d’ with ref.

¹⁰ Cf. HEB², I § 213 and Luraghi 1990: 317—320 for the description of this phenomenon in Middle and Late Hittite.

¹¹ Here and below the parenthesized and italicized part of the translation indicates the relevant context not cited in Luwian. The translation of contexts can be approximate and render only their general sense.

- (12) | **“VAS”-tara/i-pa-wa/i-na** NEG₂-’ | REL-*i-ha a-tá* | CRUS+RA/I-nu-wa/i-ha ‘(I established his name with Tarhunzas,) but I did not set him up (as) any **figure**’ (ALEPPO 2 § 11, p. 236).
- (13) | *wa/i-mi-i á-mi-na* (**“VAS”-á-tara/i-i-na** | *á-pa-ara/i* | BONUS-*li-ia-nu-wa/i-ha* ‘(I captured the city, (of) the men I cut off the feet but the children I made eunuchs to us) and thereby I exalted my **image** for myself’ (MARAŠ 4 § 15, p. 257).
- (14) | *‘a’-wa/i* | *‘á’-mi-na* | *‘FEMINA’-ti-na* | **VAS-tara/i-na** | NEG₃-*wa/i* REL-*sa*¹² *a-ta ‘x’-pa-ha*²¹ ‘who did not [ded]icate my [wom]anly(?) **image**’ (MARAŠ 2 § 2, p. 273).
- (15=2) [...] || (-)*wa/i-ti-ta-*’ *á-ta₅-ma-[z]a* [...] *-sa* [x]-x-[x]-x || **VAS-tara/i-i-na** (PES)*u-pa-i pa-sa-na-*’ DOMINUS-*na-ni*⟨x⟩ PRAE-*na* ‘[(He) who] his name [or/and his] **image** shall bring before his lord...’ (IZGIN 2 § 8, p. 316).

In the following cases the same word is translated as ‘person’ or ‘soul’:

- (16) *wa/i-sa-*’ *mu-*’ *ka-tu-wa/i-ia kar-⟨ka⟩-mi-si-za*(URBS) REGIO.DOMINUS-*ia* **“VAS”-tara/i-na** POST-*ni a-tá* BONUS-*li-ia-ta* ‘but for me, Katuwas the Kar(ka)mišean Country-Lord he exalted the **person**’ (KARKAMIŠ A 2, § 5, p. 109).¹²
- (17) | *a-wa/i* | *á-pa-si-na* | *ha-sa-mi-na* | *pá²+ra/i-ta-mi-i-na* | ARHA | *á-za-tu* | *á-pa-si-ha* | **á-tara/i-i-na** ‘may it eat up his HASAMI- PARATAMI- and his (own) **person**’ (KULULU 1 § 12, p. 443).
- (18) *wa/i-mu-ta* (LITUUS)*á-za-mi-na* **VAS-tara/i-na** *a-ta tu-tá* ‘and they put into me a beloved soul’ (KULULU 4 § 4; p. 445).
- (19) | *a-wa/i á-mi-ia-za* || DOMINUS-*na-za* ¹IUDEX-*la* **VAS-la-ti-i-**’ SUB-*na-na* SARMA+RA/I+MI-*ia-za-ha*. ‘Under my lords (and) (the) Labarna(??) with (my) soul I ...ed’. (KULULU 4 § 5, p. 445).
- (20) *wa/i-ta_x á-pa-sa-na* **VAS-tara/i-na** *a-pa-sa-ha* DOMUS-*na-zi/a* (DEUS) TO=NITRUS-*hu-sa* (DEUS)*SARMA-ma-sa* (DEUS)*198-[*sa*] (DEUS)BOS.*206.PANIS-[*sa-ha*] AR[HA] *ha+ra/i-t[ú-u]* ‘may Tarhunzas, Sarrumas, god X and Y *smash* his person and his house’ (TOPADA § 38, p. 454).¹³

Emboldened by the comparison between *apasan* VAS-tarin *apasan-ha* DO=MUS-nanza in (19) and the Hitt. phrase *eš-ša-ri É-ZU* ‘(his) form (and) his house’, Hawkins believes that the original meaning of HLuw *at(a)ri-* (c.) was ‘image, figure’ (p. 460). In view of the gender mismatch and the problematic correspondence Hitt. /s/ ~ Luw. /t/, Hitt. *eš(ša)ri* (n.) ‘form, image, figure’ does

¹² Cf. a parallel sentence KARKAMIŠ A 2 § 3.

¹³ Cf. a parallel sentence TOPADA § 36.

not impose itself as a cognate of HLuw. *at(a)ri-* (c.). It is therefore necessary to examine closely examples (10—15) in order to see to what extent the translation of HLuw. *at(a)ri-* as ‘image, figure’ is synchronically warranted.

In fact, it is not. Example (10), containing the double accusative and the split possessive construction, can be roughly translated as ‘I made my person (*atari-*) into a stone object (“SCALPRUM”(-)*i-ara/i-za*)’.¹⁴ Example (11) is difficult because it is the only occurrence of *at(a)ri-* in plural and the context is fragmentary, but something like ‘He looked at the persons of my X and Y (*and made me the Country Lord*)’ is in no way worse than the translation given. For the example (12), with its split possessive construction complicated by case attraction, I can suggest ‘(I established his name with Tarhunzas) but I did not set up his person.’ It is likely that ‘person’ here is a metaphor for a statue, but it is precisely a metaphor, like ‘name’ can be a metaphor for inscription.¹⁵ Example (13) contains a double possessive construction and can be safely translated ‘and thereby I exalted myself’ (note the parallelism with (16)). Example (14) is useless since we do not understand the verb of this clause and the translation ‘[ded]icated’ is strictly *ad hoc*. For the example (15) I should rather envisage something like ‘He who shall bring his name and ... person before his lord’, meaning simply ‘whoever shall come before his lord’. To sum up, the meaning ‘person, self’ for *atari-* is clearly borne out by examples (10) and (14) and is at least equally plausible in the rest of the examples.

On the other hand, the examples (16)—(20) cannot be re-interpreted with *atari-* meaning ‘statue, figure’. The citations from the curse formulae (17) and (20) are especially instructive; while the destruction of one’s statue is certainly a deplorable event, it is definitely not as serious as to require divine intervention for its completion. The closest cognates of *atari-*, Lycian *atra-/atla-*¹⁶ and Carian *ot₂r-* also mean ‘person, self’. The suggestion that HLuw. *atari-* is to be assigned the same basic meaning ‘person, self’ is not new¹⁷ and I do not think that the data collected in CHLI contradict this hypothesis.¹⁸

¹⁴ Van den Hout 2002, with a reference to a personal communication of Petra Goedegebuure, connects “SCALPRUM”(-)*i-ara/i-za*, transcribed as *iriyanza* ‘carving’ with HLuw. *iti-* ‘delete, carve out’.

¹⁵ As the author himself remarks, “while this clause is not difficult to analyse and translate, its general meaning remains elusive” (p. 238). Consequently, the interpretation suggested above is conjectural.

¹⁶ Melchert, LL: 8.

¹⁷ See e.g. Stefanini 1979: 597, fn. 7.

¹⁸ For further details on this lexeme the reader is referred to van den Hout 2002. Among the other exciting conclusions of this article, one can mention the identification of *tari-* ‘self’ as an apheretic variant of *atari-*, the re-interpretation of the ideogram VAS as COR, and the identification of (COR) *tan(i)-* ‘soul’ as an individual lexeme, etymologically unrelated to *atari-*.

Going a step further, one can discuss the impact of these synchronic conclusions on the Indo-Hittite etymology of *atari-*. On the one hand, one could compare Gk. ἤτορ ‘heart, seat of passion, feeling, desire’, which is one of the suggestions of Hajnal, *Lyk.Vocalismus*: 244—245. It is especially attractive since it allows to regard *azami-* *atari-* in (18) and the Homeric idiom φίλον ἤτορ ‘beloved heart’ as vestiges of an Indo-Hittite poetic figure. Alternatively, one can think of a root connection with Hitt. *atteš* (pl. tantum) ‘soul’ established in Kassian, *Zi*: 80—81, where it is tentatively compared with Ved. *ātmán* ‘breath, soul, self’ and West Germanic **āðm-* ‘breath, spirit’ (NHG. *Atem* ‘id.’). If any of the two etymologies is correct, then ‘soul’ must be the primary meaning of Luw. *atari-*.

√*WAS* ‘TO BE RESPECTFUL, FAVOURED’

It is a well known fact that the HLuw. *wasu* ‘≈ well’ can be compared with CLuw *wāsu-* ‘id.’¹⁹ The cognate adjective is absent from Hittite, but Pal. *wāsu-* ‘well(?)’²⁰ guarantees its Common Anatolian status, while Ved. *vāsu-* ‘good’ and Gath. *vohu-* ‘id.’²¹ proves its Indo-Hittite antiquity. This HLuw. adverb occurs exclusively in blessing formulae in the idiomatic expression *wasu awi-* ‘to come well, to come favorably’ (CHLI: 444).

Now, Luwian also features a related verbal root √*was* that appears in the following contexts:

- (21) *wa/i-mu tara/i-zi/a REX-ti-zi/a CUM-ni wa/i₆-sa₇-ta_x* ‘Three kings **were friendly** to me (namely, Warpalawa, Kiyakiya and Ruwata the ...)’ (TOPADA § 4, p. 453).
- (22) | *a-wa/i-ta* | *á-mi-i* | DOMINUS-*ni-i* || *wa/i+ra/i-pa-la-wa/i-ia-’* | REX-*ti-i* | (**“BONUS”**)*wa/i-sà-za-ha* ‘To my lord Warpalawas the King **I was good** (and he gave me the divine mountain Muti)’ (BULGARMADEN § 2, p. 523).
- (23) *wa/i-ta* DOMINUS-*na-za-’* *á-mi-ia-za* **BONUS-si-ia-za-ha** ‘and **I was dear** for my lords (and they made me governor)’ (KULULU 4 § 6, p. 445).
- (24) *wa/i-ta á-mi-ia-ti* | (IUSTITIA)*tara/i* || *-wa/i-na-ti* (DEUS)TONITRUS-*hu-ti-i tara/i-ma-za-ha* DEUS-*ni-za* | *za-ti* **BONUS-si-ia-za-ha** ‘Because of my justice **I was dear** to Tarhunzas and all the gods there’ (AKSARAY § 5, p. 476).
- (25) *wa/i-mi-ta_x tù-pa-sa₆-ti wa/i₅-sú-ha* ‘(My lord Tarhunzas, Sarrumas, god X and god Y ran before me) and **I succeeded** (?) by battle (?)’ (TOPADA § 18, p. 453).

¹⁹ Melchert, CLL: 266.

²⁰ Carruba 1970: 78.

²¹ EWA, II: 534.

- (26) *wa/i-ta* | (DEUS)TONITRUS-*hu-ti* | *za-ri+i* | **(BONUS)***wa/i-su-wa/i-i*
 ‘Here **I am good** to Tarhunzas, (*he grants me to take over the territories*)’
 (BOHÇA § 2, p. 479).²²

Verbal forms in the examples above display a remarkable variety of stems and it is therefore necessary to discuss the stem-formation of \sqrt{was} - before we proceed to its semantics. The pertinent analysis in Morpurgo-Davies—Hawkins 1979: 392—395 and Starke, StBoT 31: 353—354 was inconclusive, partly because the authors did not avail themselves of examples (23) and (24). These examples have been grouped together with the rest in the Corpus (p. 523), but this was apparently not an appropriate place to discuss morphological intricacies.

The forms (23) and (24) clearly represent a stem *wasiya*- extended by an iterative suffix *-za-*. In example (22) we are dealing with the thematic stem *was*- extended by the same suffix (an athematic stem *was* + *za* would have given **waza-*) and the Occam’s razor prompts the thematic stem *was*- also in (21). The athematic stem *was-* is, however, attested in a closely related Cuneiform Luwian dialect (Neu, StBoT 5: 192, cf. Starke, StBoT 31: 352 with fn. 1244)²³. In addition, the alternation of *-ya-* and thematic verbal stems is an unusual phenomenon from the point of view of Anatolian grammar, whereas the alternation of *-ya-* and athematic verbal stems is common (Watkins, IGr., III: 31; Lehrman, IHRédux: 211 ff.). I suspect, therefore, that *was*- represents a secondary thematisation of **was-* based on the 3 pl. active, 3 sg./pl. stative or another form with a suffix vowel.²⁴ Finally, somewhat more problematic examples (22) and (23) represent either a deadjectival stem **wasuya-* > **wasuwa-* > **wasu-*, or the result of the merge of **wasu-* ‘good’ with either *a-* ‘to do’ or *i-* ‘to go’. In any case, this is a secondary stem, although its meaning could undergo the influence of the verb attested in (21)—(24).

Thus we wind up with the reconstructed Luw. **was-/wasiya-* and can now proceed to establishing its meaning. Parallel examples (22), (23) and (26), and especially example (24), all prompt the translation ‘to be dear (to), to be favoured (by)’; on the other hand, examples (22), (23) and (26) also admit the translation ‘to be respectful, obedient’ if we regard them as describing *do ut des* relationships.²⁵ The sentence (21), taken from the account of a military victory

²² Cf. a parallel sentence BOHÇA § 4.

²³ The segmentation of this stem as *wassā-ri* (Melchert, CLL: 262) is most likely false. The statives in *-āri* are well attested in Hittite and Luwian (Oettinger, Stamm.: 514—515, 564) and *wastari* (1×) provides a direct evidence for the existence of an athematic *was-* in Cuneiform Luwian.

²⁴ A similar thematization occurred to the Luwian copula that, according to Prof. Morpurgo-Davies (pers. com.), simplified its Early Luwian paradigm *asti/santi* to *sati/santi* in Late Luwian.

²⁵ The translation ‘to be good’ occasionally used by Hawkins is apparently based on etymological considerations.

implies that Warpalawa, Kiyakiya and Ruwata were allies of Wasusarma, so the translation ‘to be friendly’ is the best option, indeed. Only in (25) is the translation ‘to succeed’ preferable, but here the presence of a reflexive particle *-mi* could alter the meaning of the verb in question.

The double meaning of HLuw. *was-/wasiya-* ‘to be dear, favoured’, but probably also ‘be friendly, respectful, obedient’ (vel sim.)²⁶ may reflect an original voice opposition. Here the comparison with Anat. * $\sqrt{as(s)}$ - would be appropriate. The verb *as-/assiya-* is used mainly in the medio-passive in Hittite and its basic meaning is ‘to be dear’ as e.g. in KUB 34.7 IV 37 ^DUTU-*i-kan kuis āssiyattari* ‘he that is dear unto the sun-god’. In Luwian, however, the cognate verb *aza-* (**as+za-*) is used with active endings and means ‘to love, like’, as e.g. in KARKAMIŠ A11a § 7 (p. 95).²⁷ Returning to \sqrt{was} , we know that CLuw. *was-* was used with medio-passive or stative endings and meant ‘to be pleasant, favourable’. If the second meaning ‘to be friendly, to respect’ indeed existed in Luwian, it is possible that it was expressed by the active voice of $\sqrt{was-}$. There is, however, no way to prove it, since the attested HLuw. forms are voice-neutral.²⁸ But even if we set voice distinctions aside, the notions of ‘respect’ and ‘favour’ are not identical.

The importance of $\sqrt{as(s)}$ - for our discussion goes beyond a mere typological comparison. In fact, \sqrt{was} - in Luwian frequently functions as a semantic equivalent of $\sqrt{as(s)}$ - in Hittite, which can be illustrated by the following table:

Hitt. <i>as-/assiya-</i> ‘be dear, be favoured’ (HW ² : 401; HED, A: 189—190)	Luw. <i>was(a)-/wasiya-</i> ‘1. be dear, 2. respect(?)’ see above for examples
Hitt. <i>assiyant-</i> ‘dear, beloved’ (HW ² : 401—403; HED, A: 190)	Luw. <i>wasam(m)i-</i> ‘dear, beloved’ (CHLI:147)
Hitt. <i>assu-</i> ‘dear, favoured, good; well’ (HW ² : 492—526; HED, A: 196—299)	Luw. <i>wasu-</i> ‘good; well, favourably’ (Melchert, CLL: 266; CHLI: 444)
Hitt. <i>as(sa)nu-</i> ‘favour, treat (<i>versorgen</i>)’ (HW ² : 372—384; HED, A: 192—196)	Luw. <i>us(a)nu-</i> ‘to bless, treat’ (CHLI: 60) ²⁹

²⁶ Cf. CHLI: 523.

²⁷ See Laroche, HH: 15 and Meriggi, Glossar: 36 for more attestations of this verb that they transcribe as *asi-*, according to the “Old Readings”. For the etymological connection with Hitt. cf. Puhvel, HED, A: 204, who, however, kept the old transcription *asi-* as a variant after the new reading *aza-* was firmly established.

²⁸ I am not aware of any forms outside 3 sg. pres. in HLuw. that can be interpreted as morphologically distinct medio-passive endings.

²⁹ The meaning ‘to treat’ for *usanu-* is borne out by the context of KARATEPE § 14, which I translate ‘And I treated my lord’s house well’. This is closer to the Phoenician text ‘I have established the house of my lord in goodness’ than the translation ‘And I blessed(?) my lord’s house well’ offered in CHLI: 50.

The morphological relationship of various derivatives of $\sqrt{as(s)}$ in Hittite is thoroughly discussed in HED, A: 204—206. Puhvel comes to the conclusion that this is a verbal root, while *ass-u-* represents an old deverbative adjective. This adjective, in its turn, served as a derivational base for the transitive verbal stem *as-n-u-*, according to the model introduced in Tucker 1981: 26—27. The same thing, *mutatis mutandis*, can be said about \sqrt{was} in Luwian. Thus Luw. *wasu* ‘good, well’, in spite of its well attested Indo-Hittite connections, is a secondary formation within Luwian. There is therefore no reason to extrapolate the semantic component ‘good’ into the basic verb or its derivatives without the *-u-* suffix, even if ‘to be good’ may seem to be a common semantic denominator between ‘to respect’ and ‘to be favoured’.

Having in mind this conclusion, let us consider one more group of derivatives of Luw. \sqrt{was} , as presented in CHLI: ³⁰

- (27) *a-wa/i* | *za-a-zi* “PORTA”-*la/i/u-ni-si-i-zi* (DOMUS.SUPER)*ha+ra/i-sà-tá-ni-zi* ¹*á-na-ia mi-i-’* | BONUS-*sa-mi-i* FEMINA-*ti-i* | (BONUS)*wa/i-sa₅+ra/i-ti-i* *pa-ti-i-’* | (ANNUS)*u-si-i* AEDIFICARE-*MI-h[a]* ‘these upper floors of the gates for Anas my beloved wife **with goodness** in that year I built’ (KARKAMIŠ A 11b+c § 34, p. 104).
- (28) *mu-pa-wa/i-tu-’* | *za-ia* (DEUS)TONITRUS-*sa* DEUS.DOMUS-*tà* **BONUS-sa₅+ra/i)-ti-i** *za-la* *261.PUGNUS-*ru-ha* ‘and I myself *thereupon constructed* (?) these temples of Tarhunzas for him **with goodness**’ (KARKAMIŠ A 2+3 § 9, p. 109).
- (29) *wa/i-mu-ta-’* TONITRUS.*HALPA-pa-wa/i’-ni-sa* || (DEUS)TONITRUS-*sa* | **BONUS-ti-i** | *HWI-ia-ta* ‘For me Halabean Tarhunzas ran **with favour**’ (BABYLON 1 § 2, p. 392).
- (30) *wa/i-mu-u* | *za* (“STELE”) *wa/i-ni-za á-mi-zi* INFANS-*ni-zi* **BONUS-sa-tà-ti** CRUS-*nu-ta* || ‘This stele my children erected **in goodness** for me’ (TILSEVET § 5, p. 179).
- (31) (DEUS)TONITRUS.CAELUM DEUS-*na* *430 (**BONUS₂**)*wa/i-sà-ti* RE-*GIO* *430 (*273)*mu(wa)-tá* REL ‘**by the goodness** (of) the celestial Storm God (and of) every god, (he) who conquered every country’ (KIZILDAĞ 4 § 2a-b, Hawkins, StBoT Beih. 3 (1995): 105).

Examples (27—29) illustrate the usage of HLuw. *wasar(V)*- cognate with CLuw. *wassar* ‘favour’. ³¹ Examples (30) and (31) contain rare nouns formed from the same \sqrt{was} . Judging from contexts, they were synonymous with *wasar(V)*-. It is likely that at least some of these formations are deverbative nouns. ³²

³⁰ For more occurrences of HLuw. *wasar(V)*- see Laroche, HH: 89 and Meriggi, Glosar: 152.

³¹ Melchert, CLL: 262.

³² Starke, StBoT 31: 352—353 believes that CLuw. *wassar* is a deadjectival formation and reconstructs **h₁wosro-* ‘angenehm’, which is not attested in any Anatolian language.

The translation ‘goodness’, chosen in CHLI in many cases, requires some fine-tuning for the reasons stated above. In (29), (31) and possibly (27) we are dealing with an attitude of a superior towards his inferior, so the translation ‘favour’, supported by a cuneiform Luwian parallel, is preferable. In (28) and (30) the situation is the opposite, so the translation ‘respect’, or even ‘reverence’ is more *à propos*.³³ In these cases our choice has little impact on our understanding of the general sense of each clause. The same cannot be said about the clause below taken from the inscription of Yariri, the tyrant (*tarwani*-) of Karkamiš:

- (32) *wa/i-ta ta-ni-mi REX-ti SERVUS-ta₄-ti-i-zi | a-ta (BONUS)wa/i-sa₅+ra/i-nu-ha* ‘and for every king I caused to **benefit**(?) the subjects(?)’ (KARKAMIŠ A 6 § 7, p. 124).

The predicate of this sentence is expressed by the transitive verb *wasar(a)nu*- formed from the noun *wasar(V)*- ‘favour; respect’. Depending on the meaning of *√was* we choose, two different interpretations are possible. If we start with ‘favour’, and have the split possessive construction in mind, we wind up with the translation ‘I treated favourably the subjects of every king’. This can refer to the ambassadors of Egypt, Babylon and other foreign countries that “heard the name of Yariri” (§ 4—6 of the same inscription). If we begin with ‘respect’, the translation ‘for every king I made the subjects obedient’³⁴ is possible. This can refer to the king-making activities of Yariri, in tune with the following § 8—12 where the investiture of the young king Kamani is described. We do not know, however, about similar services done by Yariri to other kings.³⁵

The analysis of derivatives confirms the hypothesis that Luw. *√was* has two basic meanings ‘to be respectful’ and ‘to be favoured’ (med.). The interchange between the semantics of ‘favour’ and ‘respect’ is common cross-linguistically: thus Lat. *favēre* and Czech *hověti* ‘to favour’ are cognate with Old Norse *gá* ‘to respect’ and Church Slavic *благотворѣти* ‘to revere’ (Фасмер, I: 422). Only external comparison can help us to answer which of the two is likely to be the original meaning of the root.

In fact, the comparative evidence is available in the Gathas of Zarathushtra. Several years ago Prof. M. Schwartz turned my attention to the likely connection between Gath. *vohu*- ‘good’ and *vahma*- ‘praise, glorification’.³⁶ Since

Whatever the historical situation might be, the range of meanings of *wassar* makes me to regard it as a synchronic derivative of *wass-āri* ‘to be favoured’.

³³ Cf. Starke, StBoT 31: 351.

³⁴ Similarly Laroche, HH: 89.

³⁵ I cannot agree with the forced interpretation of Starke, StBoT 31: 352 ‘I caused my subjects to make it (-ata, i.e. my name) agreeable to every king’. The sentential particle -ta is common with sentences containing dative complements and does not require re-interpretation. The contention of Starke that every causative verb requires double accusative (ibid., fn. 1243) is unfounded.

³⁶ Bartholomae, AIW gives the following meaning for this word: ‘1. betend, anbetend, Beter; 2. Gebet, Anbetung; Lob, Preis’. The scrutiny of Gathic contexts shows, however,

-ma is a synchronic deverbative suffix in Avestan (one can compare Av. *staoma-* ‘praise’ vs. $\sqrt{\text{staw}}$ ‘to praise’ or *maēśma-* ‘urine’ vs. $\sqrt{\text{maiz}}$ ‘to urinate’) one can posit Ir. $\sqrt{\text{wah}}$ ‘to praise, glorify’, cognate with Luw. $\sqrt{\text{was}}$ ‘*to respect’. The non-attestation of finite forms Ir. $\sqrt{\text{wah}}$ ‘to praise’ can be explained by the existence of at least three homonymic roots in Iranian: ‘to dwell’, ‘to be dressed’ and ‘to dawn’. Based on Iranian and South Anatolian evidence, one can reconstruct PIH $\sqrt{*(\vartheta_1)\text{wes-}}$ ‘to respect’, from which an adjective $*(\vartheta_1)\text{wesu-}$ ‘good’³⁷ was derived already at the Proto-Indo-Hittite stage. The secondary meaning ‘to be favoured’ was originally characteristic of the medio-passive voice of this verb in Anatolian, and was supported by the synonymous Hitt. *ass(ia)-*. I believe that this suggestion is superior to the etymologies of Puhvel 1980 and Weitenberg, *U-Stämme* who derive HLuw. *wasu-* from $\sqrt{*(A)\text{wes-}}$ ‘to dawn’ and $\sqrt{*}\text{wes-}$ ‘to graze’³⁸ respectively.

$\sqrt{\text{TARP}}$ ‘TO TREAD, TRAMPLE’

$\sqrt{\text{tarp}}$ (provisionally transliterated as *TARAP*) underwent meticulous study in Morpurgo-Davies 1986, where all its relevant occurrences in HLuw. have been collected and transliterated (ibid.: 136—139). This spares me the necessity to cite them here and, therefore, I shall limit myself to a presentation of the most characteristic passages.

- (33) *pa-ti-pa-wa/i-ta* | *za-a-sa kar-ka-mi-si-za-sa*(URBS) (DEUS)TONITRUS-*sa* || (“*464”) *ha-tà-ma* | (**PES₂.PES**) *tara/i-pi-i-tu* ‘for him may this Karkamišean Tarhunzas **TARPI-** the ruins (ruinously ?)’ (KARKAMIŠ A2 § 11, p. 109).

- (34) *a-wa/i* | “CAELUM”-*sa* CORNU+*RA/I-na* | *ni* LITUUS+*na-ti* TERRA-*pa-wa/i* CORNU+*RA/I-na* | *ní* || (**PES₂.PES**) [*tara/i-pi-ti*] ‘Let him not behold the *abundance* of the sky and let him not [**TARPI-**] the *abundance* of the earth’ (CEKKE § 25—26, p. 146).

that all the other meanings except for ‘Lob, Preis’ are either unfounded or represent metaphoric extensions of the original meaning. Cf. Humbach—Ichaporla 1994, the latest English translation of the Gathas, where ‘glorification’ is consistently used for Gath. *vahma-*.

³⁷ The hypothetical nature of the initial ϑ_1 in this word cannot be over-emphasized. It is based solely on Hom. $\delta\omega\tau\eta\rho\epsilon\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}\omega\nu$ ‘the dispensers of the goods’ that EWA, II: 534 compares with LAv. *dātār- vohunqm*. It is possible, however, that the anlaut of $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}\omega\nu$ was influenced by an etymologically unrelated $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$ ‘good’.

³⁸ More exactly, Weitenberg, *U-Stämme* writes: “Für diese Wurzel kommen die bei Pokorny sub *wes-₂* ‘schmausen, aufgeräumt sein’ erwähnte Wörter wenigstens teilweise in Betracht”. My analysis of the words collected by Pokorny under *wes-₂* suggests that the original meaning of this root belonged to the domain of cattle-breeding, which can be most clearly seen from the Iranian and Anatolian examples adduced in that entry.

- (35) (“PES₂”) *tara/i-pi+ra/i-pa-wa/i* || REL-sà ‘(they bought the land...) (He) who shall TARPI- (this), (one mina of silver and one MANASAHAN (is) the WASHA)’, (TÜNP 1 § 5, p. 155).
- (36) *a-wa/i ta-ni-mi* | SUPER-*ra/i-’* | (“PES₂+PES”) *tara/i-pa-ta₅* ‘(I seated him on high) (and) he **TARPA-ed** over all (while he was a child)’ (KARKAMIŠ A6 § 11, p. 124).
- (37) *hi-ri+i-ka-pa-wa/i-ta*(REGIO) (“PES₂.PES”) *tara/i-[pa]*³⁹-*ha* ‘(I captured the city *Iluwasi*, I ...ed away Mount(?) *Atursaliyanza*) and I TARPA-ed the land *Hirika*’ (MARAŠ 4 § 6, p. 256).
- (38) REL-*i(a)-sa-pa-wa/i i(a)-ma* REL-*(i)a-sa* | CAPUT-*ti-sa a-mi-i(a)* DOMUS-*ni-i(a)* REL+*ra/i-i(a)-pa* | URBS+*MI-ni-i(a)* *tara/i-pa-a-ti* ‘Whatsoever person shall **TARP-**⁴⁰ on my house or city (let the Storm-God be his prosecutor) (KARAHÖYÜK § 22, p 290).

It is clear from the examples above that we are dealing with two different stems, TARPA- and TARPI-, although the same determinative PES₂.PES indicates that these stems are co-radical. The stem-formation of TARPI- is uncontroversial: the lenited ending of 3 sg. impv. (“PES₂.PES”) *tara/i-pi-ru-u-’* (KAYSERİ § 5) shows that the *-i-* suffix represents the PIH. *-*eye-* of iterative/causative semantics. The stem-formation of TARPA- is more problematic, but CLuw. verbal stem *tarpā-* of unclear meaning, if it is related here, tips stakes in favour of the reconstruction of a secondary denominative stem in *-ā-* (~ Hitt. *-ā(e)-*) formed from a thematic deverbative noun **TARPA-*.⁴¹

CHLI is silent about the meaning of these two verbs. I believe that this position is over-cautious, at least with regard to TARPI-. The determinative PES₂.PES (“GO”+ “COME”) implies that we are dealing with a non-directed motion verb. The meaning ‘to trample (on), tread’, which was tentatively adopted by Laroche, HH: 59, discussed in Meriggi, Glossar: 123 and lately endorsed by Melchert, CLL: 214, would perfectly suit all the textual occurrences of this stem. Trampling on wrongdoers themselves or their houses, as in (33) and parallel contexts, is an expected behaviour of Tarhunt (Tarhunzas), normally associated with a bull in Luwian iconography. “Let him not tread the abundance of the earth” is a perfect match to “let him not behold the abundance of the sky” in (34). Example (35), in all probability, represents a Neo-Hittite equivalent of a NO LOITERING signboard.

³⁹ CHLI, p. 257: “Restoration [pa] is more likely than [pi] on grounds of spacing”.

⁴⁰ I have corrected TARP- of CHLI to TARPA- by analogy with (35). In my opinion, the existence of the third stem (PES₂.PES)TARP-, in addition to (PES₂.PES)TARPA- and (PES₂.PES)TARPI- is implausible.

⁴¹ This analysis is implied in Melchert’s treatment of *tarpā-* in Melchert, CLL. The secondary thematisation of a verbal stem **tarp-* is unlikely, since such forms normally do not appear with a *plene* suffix and a lenited ending, as CLuw. 3 sg. med. *tarpātar* (2×).

The verb TARPI-, defined this way, is not isolated in Indo-Hittite. Gk. *τραπέω* ‘to tread grapes’, Lith. *trepėnti*, *trepšėnti* ‘to stamp (one’s feet)’, ORuss. *тропа* ‘path’ and MHG. *draven* ‘to trot’ vindicate the existence of IE $\sqrt{*trep-}$ ‘to tread’ (Pok.: 1094; Rix, LIV: 590—591). The parallel between HLuw. TARPI- and Gk. *τραπέω* is especially striking since these two forms may represent direct reflexes of the IH zero grade iterative $*t\ddot{r}p\text{-}eye\text{-}$. If this is the case, then HLuw. TARPI- can be safely transcribed as *tarpī-*.

It is more difficult to capture the exact meaning of TARPA-, in particular due to the scarce attestation of this stem.⁴² In (37) TARPA- is used with a direct object, so one can suggest a semantic development ‘to trample (on) > crush’. The possible translation in (38) is ‘to march on, attack’. Example (36) is taken from the description of the investiture of Kamani and here ‘trampling over all’ apparently serves as a metaphor for exercising power (cf. German *nach unten treten*). These suggestions are obviously conjectural, but the determinative PES₂.PES and the common root with *tarpī-* guarantee that TARPA- denotes some metaphoric extensions of the notion of ‘trampling’.

Crucial data for establishing the sound form of Luwian TARPA- come from cuneiform texts. CLuw. *tarpā-* and *tarpī-* (v.) are, unfortunately, not very probative since their meaning remains a matter of speculation.⁴³ There are, however, Luwoid forms, (≈)*tarpalli-* ‘substitute’, (≈)*tarpanalli-* ‘substitute; rival’ (≈)*tarpāssa-* ‘substitute’ and ≈*tarpat-* ‘substitution’, attested in Hittite texts. Tischler, HEG, T: 205—206 groups these form together under the lemma *tarpai-* (= *tarpā-* apud Melchert) ‘*vertreten*, *erzetzen*; *zertreten*’ i.e. ‘to substitute; to trample, crush’. In my opinion, it is better to start the analysis with a thematic noun $*tarpa-$ ‘substitution, (Stell)*vertretung*’, of which *tarpā-* (v.) and the above nominal formations could be easily derived, but this does not change the semantic analysis. Luw. \sqrt{tarp} ‘tread, *treten*’ apparently had yet another metaphoric meaning ‘substitute, *ver-treten*’ and its nominal derivative $*tarpa-$ took over the latter meaning in Cuneiform Luwian. CLuw. data give us no reason to think that IH $\sqrt{*trep-}$ ‘to tread’ left any full grade derivatives in Anatolian, and, therefore, we can transcribe the second HLuw. stem as *tarpā-*.

So much for what I regard as the correct interpretation. Now, the possibility of deriving HLuw. TARAPA-/TARAPI- from \sqrt{tarp} ‘to tread, trample’ was considered in Morpurgo-Davies 1986 on page 139, only to be rejected on the following page. Prof. Morpurgo-Davies opted instead for HLuw. TARAP ‘plough’, cognate with Hitt. *terip(p)-* ‘id.’⁴⁴ This suggestion was supported, at least in part, by Starke, StBoT 31: 234 (fn. 796), Tischler, HEG, T: 203 and

⁴² The three examples cited above are the only instances of finite forms of TARPA-. CHLI: 126 cites also PES₂.PES-*pa-i-tu-u* (KARKAMIŠ A16a, §7), but this is clearly 3 pl. imp. of TARPI-.

⁴³ Melchert, CLL: 214, 217. Cf. a more confident analysis of Starke, StBoT 31: 234.

⁴⁴ For the etymology of this word, and, in particular, against its identification with Gk. *τρέπω* < *trek^{wō}* ‘to turn’ see Kassian—Yakubovich above, p. 13—14.

lately by Hajnal 2000: 176, but rejected by Melchert, AHP: 84. CHLI takes a cautious position, abstaining from implementing either the suggestions of Morpurgo-Davies 1986, or those of Laroche, HH and other earlier scholars in his translation.

The disadvantages of looking for TARAP ‘to plough’ in examples (33—38) are obvious. First, one does not expect such a verb to be determined by PES₂.PES. Second, TARAP ‘to plough’ does not suit the contexts of these examples so well as $\sqrt{\text{tarp}}$ ‘to tread, trample’ except probably (35) and possibly (34) and (36). Third, the comparison with Hitt. *terip(p)*- is possible on the root level only, whereas the comparison between HLuw. *tarḫi*- and Gk. *τραπέω* is lexical. One needs very strong reasons to maintain an etymology against these odds. Below I shall try to scrutinize the arguments that were or can be advanced in support of TARAP ‘plough’ in Luwian.

Morpurgo-Davies 1986 starts with the discussion of a passage (39) from the KARKAMIŠ inscription A6 (§ 13—17, CHLI: 124—125) where the tyrant Yari-ri describes the gifts that he has bestowed upon the brothers of the young prince Kamani. The text runs as follows:

§ 13	CUM- <i>ni-pa-wa/i-tú-ta-’</i> <i>á-pa-sá</i> FRATER- <i>la-zi-i</i> <i>i-zi-i-ha</i>	And with him I made his brothers.
§ 14	<i>a-wa/i</i> REL <i>-i-zi</i> (“*314”) <i>ka-tú-na-sa</i>	(For them) who (are) of KATUNI-,
§ 15	<i>i-zi-i-sa-ta+ra/i-wa-ma-za</i> <i>zi-la</i> (“*314”) <i>ka-tú- ni-zi</i> (MANUS) <i>i-sà-tara/i-i</i> (“PONERE”) <i>tú- wa/i-há</i>	With honour to them thereupon I put KA- TUNI’s in (their) hand(s).
§ 16	REL- <i>zi-pa-wa/i-ma-za-’</i> (“LIGNUM”) <i>tara/i-pu- na-sá</i>	And for them who (are) of TARPUNA-,
§ 17	<i>i-zi-i-sa-ta+ra/i-wa/i-ma-za</i> <i>zi-la</i> (“LIGNUM”) <i>tara/i-pu- na-zi-i</i> (MANUS) <i>i-sà-tara/i-i</i> (“PONERE”) <i>-wa/i-ha-’</i>	With honour to them thereupon I put TAR- PUNA’s in (their) hand(s).

The hypothesis of Morpurgo-Davies 1986 is a simple one: Yariri appoints the brothers of Kamani either to the military or to the civil service and thus KATUNI and TARAPUNA (=TARPUNA in CHLI) are words for ‘fighting’ and ‘ploughing’. This hypothesis is supported by the meaning of respective logograms: *314 accompanies nouns of violent semantics, such as ‘enemy’ and ‘violence’, while LIGNUM (WOOD) could denote a wooden plough.⁴⁵ One wonders what motivates the morphological difference between KATUNI- and TARPUNA- if both are substantivized infinitives, but, on the whole, this hypothesis is not unlikely, especially in view of Hitt. *terip(p)*- ‘to plough’.

⁴⁵ Cf. Sum. *GIŠ*APIN ‘plough’.

It would be, however, a false assumption to think that only one root TARP could exist in Luwian. The only way to prove that the verbs in (33)—(38) are co-radical with TARPUNA would be to find the parallel passages where the stems *tarpī-* or *tarpā-* are accompanied by the ideogram LIGNUM. This is not the case, while (36), taken from the same text as (39), provides us with the evidence that the scribe perceived *tarpā-* and TARPUNA- as two unrelated words that ought to be preceded by different determinatives. So far as I can see from the data available, TARPUNA- is useless for the analysis of our root.

The following argument against $\sqrt{\text{tarp}}$ ‘to tread, trample’ does not appear in Morpurgo-Davies 1986, but can be inferred from the CHLI treatment of a group of examples with the word KIPUTA-:

- (40) *wa/i-ta-’ pa-sa-’ | tá-ti-ia-za | DOMUS-ni-za | kar-ka-mi-si-za-sa(URBS) | (DEUS) TONITRUS-sa | (CORNU)ki-pu-tà-ti-i a-tá | (PES₂.PES) tara/i-pi-tu-u* ‘may Karkamišean Tarhunzas ANDA **TARPI-** against his paternal house(s) with (his) KIPUTA!’ (KARKAMIŠ A2 § 15, p. 109).
- (41) | “LUNA”-*ma-sá-pa-wa/i-na | ha+ra/i-na-wa/i-ni-sá || | á-pa-sá | (“CORNU”)ki-pu-tà-’ | a-ta | tu-wa/i-i-’* ‘and the Moon God of Harran shall put him on his horn’ (SULTANHAN § 31, p. 466).
- (42) | [*ha*]*ra/i-[na-w]á/i-ni-sa-pa-wa/i-tu-u-ta | LUNA+MI-ma-sa | á-pa-sa (C) | (“CORNU”)k[i-p]u+ra/i | a-ta | (“PES₂.PES”)tara/i-pi-ru-u-’* ‘and on him may the Haranean Moon-God **TARPI-** (with(?)) his KIPURA-’ (KAYSERİ § 16, p. 473).

The HLuw. *kiput(i)-* is usually considered cognate with a Luwoid hapax ^{SI}*kiputi-* (c.) attested in a broken context in KUB 36.77, 3 (Puhvel, HED, K: 188). The hesitant decision of Hawkins to translate it as ‘horn’ in (41) was apparently influenced by the fact that the horned crown is the standard attribute of any god in Hittite iconography and of the Haranean Moon God in Neo-Assyrian iconography. If this decision is correct, then it becomes difficult to translate *tarpī-* as ‘trample’ in (40) and (42), while the metaphor ‘let X plough him with his horn’ would not defy common sense.

Fortunately for my argument, CHLI’s translation of (41) is problematic for three separate reasons. First, **kiputa* is not a normal dative-locative, while *-tā*, unlike *ta₄/ta₅* is not suspected of having a possible reading /Ti/. It is equally difficult to interpret **kiputa* as an allative since an Anatolian noun in the allative is unlikely to be governed by the verb ‘to put’, at least judging by Hittite⁴⁶. Second, the “prototypical” Luwian word for ‘horn’ is reflected in HLuw. (“CORNU”) *sù+ra/i-ni* (ASSUR *f+g* § 36), a word from which the phonetic value *sú* for the ideogram CORNU is derived (CHLI: 36). Most

⁴⁶ See StBoT 32: 201—202 for the list of Hittite predicates admitting arguments in the allative.

importantly, “CORNU” in (41) does not look at all like a horn, but rather resembles an offprint of the front part of a hoof!

These considerations prompt me to prefer a different translation for (41), namely ‘and the Moon God of Harran shall put on him his hoofs’. Instead of emending *kiputa* to **kiputi*, I assume that the scribe has written “LUNA”-*ma-sá-pa-wa/i-na* instead of **“LUNA”-ma-sá-pa-wa/i-tu*, possibly anticipating the following two sentences (§ 32,33) where the direct object enclitic pronoun /-an/ is used in similar curses. (“CORNU₂”) *ki-pu-tà-’*, or rather (“UNGULA”) *ki-pu-tà-’*, would be an accusative collective plural of *kiputi*- ‘hoof’. The connection between Luw. *kiputi*- and Slav. **kopyto* ‘hoof’, suggested already in Meriggi, Glossar, now gets a new confirmation.⁴⁷ Sentences (40) and (42) reveal a formula ‘let X trample Y with his hoofs’, although in these cases *kiputi*- is accompanied by the standard determinative CORNU, for which one can compare e.g. Akk. ^{SI}*šupru*- ‘nail, hoof’.

My interpretation of (41) and (42) admittedly creates problems for a historian of religion because, judging by iconographic data, the Moon God of Harran was normally perceived by Anatolians as an anthropomorphic creature, and not as a hoofed animal. One can take a closer look at its Mesopotamian counterpart Sin (Suen) for a possible solution. Here too, we see Sin portrayed as an anthropomorphic figure, but literary monuments reveal his bovine associations. The Old Babylonian hymn to Sin in Sumerian where he is called “a bull travelling alone” is too distant in time from our period, but one can compare the myth of Sin impregnating a cow, which was embedded in a birth incantation. In this Akkadian text, which is known from Boğazköy and Nineveh, among other places, Sin was explicitly called “a wild bull”.⁴⁸ The Assyrian cultural influence on Neo-Hittite states is well known, and possibly it was also responsible for providing the Moon God of Harran with hoofs. This question, of course, requires further study, but an aprioristic claim that the Moon God of Harran may not have hoofs can now be dismissed.

One more argument for the re-interpretation of ‘trampling’ was advanced in Morpurgo-Davies 1986: 140. It is based on a group of examples containing the adverb TARPI/TARPA/TARPIWA, always in collocation with (CRUS) *ta-* ‘to (come to) stand’. For a complete list of examples see CHLI: 487, but one instance for each variant will suffice here.

⁴⁷ An obvious phonological problem of this comparison is the irregular correspondence of first syllable vowels in Luwian and Slavic. It is possible that Slavic *-o-* owes its existence to the folk etymology deriving **kopyto* of Slav. **kopati* ‘to dig’. In spite of the non-productivity of the *-yt-* suffix in Slavic, this folk etymology was also favoured by many Slavists in the past (cf. Фасмер, II: 320).

⁴⁸ Röllig 1985, see pp. 268—269 for the translation. I am grateful to Prof. W. Farber for this reference. A similar myth was recorded in Hittite (CTH § 363), although here it is the Son God, and not the Moon God, who impregnates a cow.

- (43) *ní-pa-wa/i-sa za-ti STELE-ri+i (SCALPRUM)tara/i-pi || CRUS-ia* ‘(He (who) approaches this city with malice...) or shall stand for TARPI- against this stele’ (CEKKE § 22, p. 146).
- (44) *NEG₂-pa-wa/i ¹ara/i-pa-ia | REL-sa | (“CORNU”)tara/i-pa | CRUS-i* ‘(Who(ever) approaches this god with malice) or who(ever) stands for TARPI- against Arpas’ (ALEPPO 2 § 25, p. 237).
- (45) *wa/i-tu-u | DEUS-ni-i-zi | MALUS-tà-ti-i | tara/i-pi-wa/i | CRUS-i-* ‘the gods shall stand TARPIWA⁴⁹ against him with evil’ (SULTANHAN § 21, p. 466).

It is clear that we are dealing with historical case forms of a noun, which can be now identified with Luw. **tarpa-* ‘Tritt, Vertretung’ posited in Melchert, CLL: 215. Examples (43) and (44) contain the old dative-locative and allative forms of this noun. In (45) we are probably dealing with an agglutination of the new allative *-wa* suffix that was extracted from *u*-stem allatives, but here new data may force us to change interpretation. There is no Luwian equivalent for CHLI’s ‘against’ in (43–45), although this preposition is clearly borne out by the contexts. The most natural solution is to accept that this preposition simply translates HLuw. TARPA/TARPI/TARPIWA.

Since adverbial TARPA occurs once in a broken context with a determinative PES₂.PES (BOROWSKI I § 1), it is likely that its connection with HLuw. *tarpi-/tarpā-* (v) was still perceived by native speakers. But what to do with its other determinatives, CORNU and SCALPRUM? For Morpurgo-Davies 1986, they represent one of the main arguments against the interpreting *√tarp* as ‘to tread, trample’. I do not think that this argument is cogent. As we have already seen above, CORNU can determine not only horns, but also hoofs and, therefore, (“CORNU”)tara/i-pa CRUS-i, as well as (PES₂.PES)tara/i-pa (CRUS)ta-i could originally mean something like **(he) will stand up for trampling X down* > *‘(he) will stand up against X’*. The determinative SCALPRUM (STONE) would require a more general meaning **(he) will stand up for crushing X*’, but the semantic development ‘to trample’ > ‘to crush’ appears to be independently attested in (37). It would hardly be easier to explain this set of determinatives if we start with the meaning ‘to plough’, and not ‘to tread, trample’, so the old interpretation of *√tarp* remains valid. And hence the title of this section.

MINOR POINTS

p. 109: KARKAMIŠ A 11c § 21 can be translated ‘or if they shall pass down to someone’. For a parallel usage of an indefinite pronoun see e.g. KARKAMIŠ

⁴⁹ CHLI has TARPI.

A 6 § 25, p. 125. A single *kuis* could function as indefinite pronoun in a conditional clause in Hittite (HEb², I § 253b), and there is no reason to think that the situation in Luwian was any different.

p. 125: KARKAMIŠ A 6 § 20 is to be translated ‘I shall raise him (Kamani) up in front of Tarhunt, the Sun, Kubaba and every god’. The initial particle chain *wa/i-ta* is to be interpreted as /wa+an+ta/, /ta/ being a sentential particle.

p. 413: § 4 of the near-duplicate inscriptions HAMA 1, HAMA 2 and HAMA 7 contain an introductory *anda* ‘also, in addition’, as per Meriggi, *Manuale*: 18. The same introductory adverb also occurs in Hittite, mostly in combinations *anda-ma* and *anda-ia*, but cf. KBo 6.2 iii 57 *anda-sse 2-ki pāi* (OH/OS) ‘in addition he gives him twofold’. Within Hieroglyphic Luwian, one can compare ASSUR *e* § 25, where, pace CHLI: 536, the introductory *anda* also means ‘in addition’.