

ZSOLT SIMON

TOWARDS AN INTERPRETATION OF THE HIEROGLYPHIC
LUWIAN PAIR OF SIGNS *109.*285 AND THE PHONETIC
VALUE OF *448

J. D. Hawkins (2006: 59–61 with refs.) has recently clarified the meaning of the Hieroglyphic Luwian (henceforth HL) pair of signs *109.*285: 1) ‘to hunt’; 2) ‘hunter’; 3) ‘Hunter, as a royal and aulic title’.¹ His paper, however, has not addressed the question of the phonetic interpretation of this word. This paper intends to propose a reading for the meanings 2) and 3).

In order to determine the reading of HL *109.*285 the starting point could be the already established reading of *285 as *zu(wa)* (Hawkins apud Herbordt 2005: 297–298 with refs.). In other words, we look for an aulic or a royal title of the Hittite Kingdom or that of the so-called Late Hittite states containing this string or a similar one. To my best knowledge there is only one similar title in the sources, namely the *s(u)wanis*.

This title (for the identification as an aulic title and for the following see Starke 1995: 120²⁴²), whose literal meaning is ‘dog’, is known from two kinds of sources. On the one hand, from the KARKAMIŠ A4a inscription (§ 10: *sù-wali-ni-i-sa*, on the other hand, from classical authors who constantly misunderstood the royal title Συέννεος of the Cilician dynasts as their name (for the sources see the entry in PWRE s.v.): this is actually a regular adjective from the aforementioned title (<**s(u)wanassis*, lit. ‘of the dog’).

* I am very grateful to Alwin Kloekhorst (Leiden), Gabriella Frantz-Szabó (München) and my anonymous reviewers for their detailed criticism of the earlier versions of this paper. Needless to say, however, I am alone responsible for any errors or mistakes.

¹ Attested in meaning 3) in the following inscriptions: the EMİRGAZİ-fragment of Great King Tudhaliya IV., the YALBURT 16 + 10 blocks (§ 4–5) of Great King Tudhaliya IV., KIZILDAĞ 4 (§3) of Great King Hartapu and the KOCAOĞUZ stele, see Hawkins 2006: 60–61. For an alternative interpretation of KIZILDAĞ 4 (§ 3) see however Yakubovich (2008b).

However, in order to establish a correspondence between this title and the pair of signs *109.*285 the disagreement in their phonetic value has to be explained first. As is well-known, the sign *448 – by which the word *s(u)wanis* has been written – has two different readings in the scholarly literature and no definite decision has been reached; it is either *sù* or *zú* (cf. Hawkins 2000: 35–36, with refs.).²

The sign *448 occurs in three nouns of obvious etymology,³ whose PIE forms show **k̂* instead of the consonant of sign *448. They are:

- (a) PIE **k̂(u)won-* > HL *448-*wali-ni-* ‘dog’;
- (b) PIE **h₁ekwo-* > HL (EQUUS)á- *448-*wali-* ‘horse’;⁴
- (c) PA **k̂rn̄-* > HL (“CORNU”) *448+*rali-ni* ‘horn’.⁵

Since the Luwian reflex of PIE **k̂* is <z> (Melchert 1987: 182–184, 190–204, 1989: 27–31, cf. 1994: 234, 251–252; for a discussion of the problem cf. Tischler 1992; Raulwing – Schmitt 1998: 693–695, with detailed refs.⁶), some scholars read *448 with an initial <z>

² Thus it would be more appropriate to transcribe the title as *s/z(u)wanis*.

³ The other occurrences are hardly helpful (see the list of Hawkins 2000: 35–36):

- a) personal names unknown from other sources (*448-*wali-ri+i-mi-* (MALADA 3); *448-*zi-* (CEKKE §17g));
- b) unidentified toponyms (*448-*ki-tilta-*(URBS) (BOYBEYPINARI 1, § 2, 2; § 5 and MALPINAR § 1; if the comparison with Hitt. *Šug(az)zi(ya)* were right (Hawkins 2000: 36 with refs.), the second sign would be <*ka*>);
- c) words of unknown meaning (*448-*pu-na* (a verb, ŠIRZI § 4, cf. Hawkins 2000: 324); *466(-) *448-*ní-* (a verb, KARKAMIŠ A1a, § 19, § 20); *x¹(-) *448-*na-la* (a verb, KARKAMIŠ A15c § 1); *448+*rali-wali-za* (an adjective, ASSUR-letter *e*, §27); *187(-) *448-*mi-la-* (a noun, ASSUR-letter *a*, § 11, c § 8).

For the refutation of Melchert’s argument (1988: 236–240) regarding KÖRKÜN § 3 (1988: 236–240) see Hawkins 2000: 35 and 173. Add to this list: á-*na+rali-sù-ha-* ‘?’ (noun/adj., EMİRGAZI § 37). For the remaining cases see the main text.

⁴ For the evidence for **h₁*, see Kloekhorst 2004. For the exact form of the word for ‘horse’, see, however, below.

⁵ It is a hapax: ASSUR-letter *g* “3”, § 36, nom.-acc. pl. n. (for its shape and etymology see Hawkins 2000: 552, refuting the interpretation of Starke 1990: 406–408). Due to the semantic remoteness I am not convinced that (“CORNU+RA/I”) *su+rali-* = Phoen. *šb* ‘prosperity’ (KARATEPE A1 35, 191 [only Hu.] / 1 § 6 and 36) has anything to do with (“CORNU”) *448+*rali-ni* (contra Hawkins 2000: 36 and Kloekhorst 2008: 447). See rather below Melchert’s remarks.

⁶ Starke 1995: 118²³⁷ argues against this sound law, however, with too vague and therefore not convincing objections (the etymologies would have been proposed “ohne Rücksicht auf abweichende Semantik, Wortbildung und Flexion”) deducing <z> from PIE **g* which is untenable, see e.g. PA **k̂o-/k̂i-* ‘this’ > CL HL *za-/zi-*; PIE **k̂ey-o-* ‘lies’ > CL *ziya-*; PA **k̂yd-* ‘heart’ > CL HL *zart-*; PA **wek̂-yelo-* ‘ask for’ > HL *wazi(ya)-*; PA **-sk̂elo-* ‘iterative suffix’ > CL HL *-z(z)a-*; PA **-i(s)k̂o-* ‘ethnic suffix’ > CL HL *-iz(z)a-*.

(Melchert 1987: 201–202).⁷ The vocalism of the sign was due to the following sign being *wali* in examples (a) and (b).⁸

However, two serious counterarguments have been adduced against this view:

1) The assured reading of sign *108 CORNU as *sú* (cf. *a-sú+rali* (REGIO)-*ya*- ‘Assyria’, *a-sú+rali*(REGIO)-*wali-ni*- ‘Assyrian’; *wali-sú* ‘well’ (ÇALAPVERDİ 1 § 4, although otherwise *wali-su*). If this sign has been constructed as an acrophonic sign, then the word meaning ‘horn’ begins with *su*^o which clearly contradicts the reading suggested above (Hawkins 2000: 36, cf. Oshiro 1989).

2) If the expression *448+*rali-wali-ni-ti*(URBS) ‘(in the writing of) X (people) (abl.-instr.)’ on the inscription KARKAMIŠ A15b (§ 19) and *su-rali-za*(URBS) ‘at X (people) (dat.-loc. pl.)’ (KARKAMIŠ A6 § 6) refer to the same place (which may be identical with Urartean ^{KUR}*šura**we*, ^{KUR}*šure**le* ‘<an ethnical designation (abs. pl.)>’ [Hawkins 2000: 126, Rollinger 2006; cf. most recently Buhály 2006: 28–30]), then it is a new piece of evidence against the reading *zú*.

The two counterarguments are, however, not impeccable:

1) The first counterargument is based on the assumption that the sign CORNU has been constructed in an acrophonic way, which is of course possible, but a) it is not provable, b) it is not necessary. Moreover, actually only a part of the HL signs are acrophonic, in other words, it causes no problem that the phonetic value of the sign CORNU is *sú* (see Melchert apud Raulwing–Schmitt 1998: 694¹⁴⁶). On the other hand, Melchert himself suggested (apud Yakubovich 2008: 81⁵⁸) a very plausible alternative scenario for the formation of the phonetic value of CORNU, namely that it could have been extracted from *suwa*- ‘to fill in’ through the concept of a cornucopia (cf. KARATEPE 1 § 6 and 36 (only Hu.) (‘^(c)CORNU+RA/I(‘ⁿ’)*su+rali*= Phoen. *šb* ‘abundance’).

2) We cannot be certain that the two places are the same (cf. the discussion in Melchert 1987: 202 and Starke 1995: 118²³⁷) and we cannot be certain that both of them or one of them matches the Urartean place (Wilhelm 1993 pointed out that the identification with the Urartean toponym is theoretically possible but is not provable). Moreover, Starke (1997: 382, 385, 389, for forerunners see Greenfield 1991: 179–180 and Starke 1990: 231⁷⁸⁰, 1995: 118²³⁷)

⁷ Therefore Starke’s assumption (1995: 118²³⁷) that Melchert established the phonetic value as *zú* only “zwecks Stützung des von ihm postulierten Lautwandels” is clearly false.

⁸ In theory, *448-*wali-ni*- could reflect the Lindeman-variant **kuvon*- too and thus could provide an additional piece of evidence in favour of the *u*-vocalism.

has elaborated an alternative identification, namely with the Phoenician city of Tyre as *pars pro toto* (cf. the Phoenician name of the city: *Šr*).

The arguments for *zú* have been shortly described above with one exception treated as the decisive argument for this reading by its followers (Melchert 1987: 201–202): the HL form of the goddess known in cuneiform script as ^D*Allanzu*: (DEUS)*á-la-**448-*wali-sa* (nom., KULULU 5, §1, ÇİFTLİK § 10, and YAZILIKAYA 45: *ta₅-zu(wa)*), for the reading of the latter see Hawkins apud Herbordt 2005: 289; cf. already Laroche 1969: 86–89).

This argument, however, is not necessarily decisive, because both in Hittite and in Luwian /s/ appears as <z> (i.e. [z] or [tʰ]) next to a nasal, therefore an “etymological” writing with <s> cannot be excluded, as such a process is known from a couple of examples (see Melchert 1994: 121, 172, 233–234; Kimball 1999: 452, 454).⁹

Starke 1990: 408¹⁴⁶⁸ opened up another possibility which was followed by Hawkins 2000: 36 and then by Plöchl 2003: 22: the palatal velar **k̥* may have become /s/ before /u/ and /w/ even if elsewhere is appeared as <z>.¹⁰ This suggestion would solve almost all problems except for those posed by the word for ‘horn’, *448+*ra/i-ni*. The root etymology of this word is beyond doubt (PIE and PA

⁹ Many of these examples are debated and there are alternative explanations too (see the refs. in the cited works). I would stress that such synchronic alternations as Hittite *šepa-/zipa-* (*Kamrušepa/Daganzipa*) and Luwian sg. nom.-acc. neuter particle *-za* (after *n* and *l*) *-sa* (elsewhere, Melchert 2003: 186–87) clearly show that <š> appeared synchronically as <z> (at least) after an /n/ in both languages and therefore an “etymological” writing cannot be a priori excluded.

¹⁰ Plöchl 2003: 22 cites as an additional piece of evidence the HL word *a-su-* ‘stone(monument) or similar’ (recte: *á-su-*, cf. TÜNP 1, § 2 (“SCALPRUM”) *á-su-*, Hawkins 2000: 155–156 with commentary) comparing it with Hitt. ^{NA4}*aku-* ‘stone’ (first suggested by Hawkins 2000: 127, however, with suitable hesitation). However, this suggestion encounters many problems:

1) Hoffner 1978: 245 convincingly argued in favour of a translation of Hittite ^{NA4}*aku-* as ‘sea-shell’ (I owe this reference to Alwin Kloekhorst). If this turns out to be correct, any connection with the Luwian words would be implausible.

2) Even if the problem(s) in 1) were solved, which I do not believe, other difficulties arise, if we accept Kloekhorst’s (2004) demonstration that HL <á> denotes [ʔa] or [ʔ] (for an alternative explanation of <á> see however Melchert forthcoming). This and the CL form of *á-su-* (^{NA4}*āššu-* ‘pillar, column or sim.’, Melchert 1993: 38) point to a phonetic shape [ʔassu-] (for the evidence that CL initial *plene* writing denotes glottal stop when its HL counterpart shows <á> see Simon forthcoming). However, as Kloekhorst (2006: 78–81) suggested, Hittite preserves an initial glottal stop in prevocalic position and denotes it with scriptio plena, but, as we have seen, there is no trace of scriptio plena in the spelling of ^{NA4}*aku-*.

In conclusion, it seems impossible to link the Hittite and the Luwian words.

**k̑rn*^o- ‘horn’), but Luwian /u/ goes back only to PA /u/ (Melchert 1994: 241) and there is no morphological way to derive **kurn*^o from **k̑rn*^o. An alternative possibility is that Luwian *ur* is the reflex of PA **r*. However, the Luwian reflex of **r* is *ar*, demonstrated e.g. by the CL *zarwani(ya)*- ‘of a horn’ formed from the same stem (see already Melchert’s (1987: 183²) and Starke’s (1990: 408¹⁴⁶⁸) critical remarks, for a discussion of the problem see Melchert 1994: 260–261).¹¹ From this follows that none of the compromise proposals can explain this word, because the conditioning factor, i.e. the presence of /u/, is impossible.¹²

We have shown that the reading *zú* leads to undesired self-contradictions. In my view, in order to solve these problems, one has to go back to the basic question; more precisely to a simplification of earlier research. In fact, the sequence *zw* deduced from the etymological correlations and the structure of the script could be written in HL script not only with <zu-wa> which has been taken to be the only possible spelling, but in theory also with the sequence <za-wa> with a so-called empty vowel; since all HL signs of <Ca> structure may be read both as [C] and [Ca]. Although [Cw] clusters are normally written as <Cu-w^o>, on the one hand note that when [C] is [r] the <ra/i> spelling is regularly used for a mere consonant, and on the other hand, the origin of (“CORNU”) *448+*rali-ni* compels us to assume the value *z(a)* for the sign *448: for whichever ablaut grade lies at its origin, the result is necessarily *zarn*^o (lengthened *e*-grade and perhaps a pretonic *e*-grade form an exception, but the reflex in these cases would have been †*zīrn*] and †*zirn*), for the sound laws see Melchert 1994: 261–265. The introduction of the *za_x* reading, extrapolated from these data, into the words discussed above leads to impressive solutions:

- a) PIE **k̑(u)won-* > *za_x-wali-ni-* [z/t^hwani-] ‘dog’;
- b) PIE **h₁ekwo-* > (EQUUS)á-*za_x-wali-* [ʔaz/t^hwa-] ‘horse’;
- c) PA **k̑rn*^o > *za_x+rali-ni* [z/t^harni] ‘horn’.

The first and the third case are unproblematic from the phonological and etymological point of view. The case of ‘horse’, however, is more complicated. Kloekhorst (2008: 237–239) has clearly demonstrated that here we deal with a *u*-stem (cf. esp. acc. sg. EQUUS.ANIMAL- *448=*ha=wali=ta*, KARATEPE 1 § 8 (Hu.); nom. sg. ANŠE.KUR.

¹¹ I cannot follow Kloekhorst, who cautiously suggested (2008: 447) a metathesis in **k̑wan-* (> *zarwan-(i)ya-*), since it is unparalleled.

¹² Incidentally, this refutes Kloekhorst’s view (2008: 238) that “this sign [i.e. *448] is the regular outcome of PIE **kū-*”.

RA-uš (KUB 35.107+108 iv 7)¹³, i. e. PIE **h₁ek_u-* > **ázu-*. It means that although other attestations are ambiguous,¹⁴ *448 must be read as *zú* at least in case of KARATEPE 1 § 8 (Hu.).¹⁵ Since, however, the necessity of a reading *za_x* has already been demonstrated above, we are forced to assume a double phonetic value of *448: *za_x/zú*.¹⁶ Accordingly, the final interpretation of these words is as follows:

- a) PIE **k(u)won-* > *za_x/zú-wali-ni-* [z/t^s(u)wani-] ‘dog’;
- b) PIE **h₁ek_u-* > (EQUUS)á-*za_x/zú* - [ʔaz/t^su-] ‘horse’;
- c) PA **k₁rn^o* > *za_x/zú+rali-ni* [z/t^sarni] ‘horn’;

Below this reading is substituted into both the arguments and counterarguments:

1) *za_x/zú+rali-wali-ni-ti*(URBS) ‘(in the writing) of X (people) (abl.-instr.)’ (KARKAMIŠ A15b § 19). As was pointed out above, this ethnic need not refer to the same place as *su-ra-li-za*(URBS). On the other hand, an identification with Tyre also remains possible as *Zara*: although the vocalism of the Phoenician name of the city is unknown (*Šr*), data from Biblical Hebrew (*Šōr* and *Šôr*, see Brown–Driver–Briggs 1951: 862–863) suggest /ō/, and since Hieroglyphic Luwian possessed only /i/, /u/ and /a/, a replacement by /a/ seems to be logical. Phonetic substitution may also explain the <z> which can be accounted for by the similarity of the HL and the Phoenician sounds (probably both of them were dental or alveolar affricates most probably, for Luwian see above, for Phoenician see Hackett 2004: 369).¹⁷

¹³ And perhaps “ANIMAL.EQUUS” > *448-sà-ta-la-u-na (BOHÇA § 10) with Neumann 2004.

¹⁴ Dat.-loc. sg. EQUUS.ANIMAL á- *448-waliwá/i (KARATEPE 1 § 8 (Hu., Ho. resp.); dat.-loc. pl. EQUUS á- *448-wali-za (ANDAVAL § 4).

¹⁵ Scribal error (e. g. omission of the sign *wali*: *EQUUS- *448- <wá/i>=ha=wá/i=ta) can be excluded, since the parallel text has a scribal error already (EQUUS.ANIMAL á- <*448>=pa=wá/i=ta, KARATEPE 1 § 8 (Ho.)), and a double omission is extremely implausible.

¹⁶ Though this sign-structure has no exact parallels in the HL script, signs with different vocalism (Ca/i) are quite frequent, moreover, the sign *lu* was also used for *la* and *li*, too, in the Iron Age (la/i/u).

¹⁷ Other transcriptions of the name of Tyre (cf. Sader 2002) do not shed more light on the Phoenician form: the vocalism of Ugaritic *Šr* remains unknown; Akkadian *Šurru* can reflect both /o/ and /u/ (for the existence of /o/ in Akkadian see Westenholz 1991); Egyptian did not possess the phoneme /u/ at that time, only /ō/ (cf. Loprieno 1995: 38–39, the Egyptian form is: *Dwrl/Dr*), thus it does not provide any help to clarify this form. Ancient Greek Τύρος may already reflect the change *ō* > *ū* happened later in Phoenician (cf. Hackett 2004: 370–371).

2) (DEUS)*á-la-za_x/zú-wali-sa* fits well into the other forms too.¹⁸

If this proposal is correct, the phonetic difference between the Late Hittite title (now *zwanis*¹⁹) and *109.*285 disappears. *109.*285 is an acrophonic form, (*109)*Zu(wa)* of this title (such as (IUDEX)*La* for *labarna* in the Hittite royal aediculae), at least in the case of the EMIRGAZI-fragment, YALBURT 10 + 16 blocks and KIZILDAĞ 4 (if not with Yakubovich (2008b) for KIZILDAĞ 4; see *infra*).

There remains only one question: what does the first sign cover? First, the inscriptions are to be divided into two groups: already Hawkins 2006: 61 pointed out that we face two signs actually: *109 (depicting the head of a cervid without antlers but with a knob, the pedicel) stands everywhere, except for the KOCAOĞUZ inscription where a variant of *98 CANIS could be observed. Unfortunately, the interpretation of this part of the KOCAOĞUZ inscription (“PES₂. PES *109.*285 REX.FILIUS”) is not unambiguous regarding the boundary between the personal name and the title. Considering the structure of Anatolian onomastics the editors’ interpretation (Şahin–Tekoğlu 2003: 542, followed by Starke *apud* Ehringhaus 2005: 48) seems more plausible to me:²⁰ the discussed signs (recte *98.*285) belong to the name of the prince, i.e. PES₂.PES-(CANIS)*zu(wa)* REX.FILIUS “Prince Tarpazwani”.

Concerning the sign *109 of the other inscriptions, Hawkins’ suggestion (2006: 59) should be mentioned first. According to him this sign probably represents a cervid-head without antlers but with a knob, i.e. the pedicel; thus he treats this sign as the 4th variant of the *102, *103 CERVUS₁₋₃ signs. In my opinion, however, *109

¹⁸ Moreover, if we substitute this suggested new reading into the words of unknown meaning discussed above (n. 3), one of them may become clear: *á-na+rali-sù-ha-‘?’*, a noun or adjective in abl. sg. (EMIRGAZI § 37, cf. Hawkins 2000: 123) becomes *á-na+rali-za_x/zú-ha-* [ʔannarzha-], as a noun from CL *ānnaralī-* ‘forceful, virile’ (Melchert 1993: 14) by the well-known Luwian suffix *-sha-* deriving animate nouns from adjectives (Melchert 2003: 196) with a meaning ‘force, power’. This proposed meaning fits well into the context (see Hawkins 1995: 88–89): “*wali-tu-’* CERVUS₂.DEUS.*463-*ti* (DEUS)MONS.MENSA Á.FEMINA¹.DEUS.*461 *su-na-sa-ti á-na+rali-’448-ha-ti* PRAE *hwila¹-i(a)-tu*”, i. e. “may the god Kurunta, the god of the Table-Mountain (and) god X run before him with fullness (and) power” (for the name of the Stag-God see Hawkins *apud* Herbordt 2005: 290–291, Hawkins 2004, 2006: 51–52). However, this suggestion depends on whether the change /s/ → [z] next to an /r/ is valid or not.

¹⁹ The initial sigma of Στέννεος is the Ancient Greek transcription of the sound [tʰ] / [z] unknown in Ancient Greek which presumably substituted [s] for it.

²⁰ Against the opinion of Hawkins (2006: 59, 61) who translates it as “Prince Tarpa, the Hunter”. However, “Tarpa” occurs only as the first part of compound names (Şahin–Tekoğlu 2003: 542).

cannot be a variant of the CERVUS signs because they look entirely different (a whole deer or just its head but with full-blown antlers or only an antler), but at the same time I agree with Hawkins' reasons for refuting the transcription VITELLUS. Regarding the unsolved problem of the logographic and syllabic value of *109 (the latter is debated, however, there are good arguments for *ma_x*, see recently Şahin–Tekoğlu 2003: 542–543 with refs.), it is hard to define its role in this context. I am unable to solve this question at present, though I am clear that the function of *109 is similar to that of the IUDEX in case of (IUDEX)*La*.

Finally, it is worth adding a brief excursus. There is a still unexplained situation in the narration of the siege of Uršu in Babylonian Akkadian from the time of Hattušili I. (CTH 7, ed. Güterbock 1938: 113–138; Beckman 1995) when the Hittite king says what follows to his officer Šanda:

“When you go [into] battle, exhibit (your) nobles before [you] from afar! (But) a dog (UR.GI₇) will run before <you>. That dog (UR.GI₇) [will ...] – (but) who will see him?”

(KBo 1.11 obv' 7'-9', translation of Beckman 1995: 23, 25, 28)

Two types of interpretations have been proposed until now. Beckman (1995: 31–32) saw in the text a piece of Hittite humour; this is possible of course, but not corroborated by the style of the entire text describing the siege. Haas (2006: 42–43), on the contrary, thinks that either the king is mocking his officer saying he is a dog or (with a question mark) 'dog' refers to a military rank. In my opinion, the investigations above confirm this latter suggestion. If my suggestion turns out to be right, then the history of an Anatolian title becomes detectable from the beginning of the Hittite Kingdom until Classical Antiquity, first as a military rank, then as an aulic title and finally as the title of kings.

References

- Beckman, Gary (1995) The Siege of Uršu Text (CTH 7) and the Old Hittite Historiography. *JCS* 47: 23–34.
 Brown, Francis – Driver, S. R. – Briggs, Charles A. (1951): *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament with an Appendix containing the Biblical Aramaic*. Oxford.
 Buhály Attila (2006): Die Erscheinungsform der Liminalität in der urartäischen Religion. *Acta Antiqua Hung.* 46: 25–32.

- Ehringhaus, Horst (2005): Götter, Herrscher, Inschriften. Die Felsreliefs der hethitischen Großreichszeit in der Türkei. Unter beratender Mitarbeit von Frank Starke. Mainz am Rhein.
- Greenfield, Jonas C. (1991): Of Scribes, Scripts and Languages. In: Claude Baurain – Corinne Bonnet – Véronique Krings (eds.): *Phoinikeia grammata. Lire et écrire en Méditerranée. Actes du Colloque de Liège*, 15–18 novembre 1989. Namur, Société des Études Classiques, 173–185.
- Güterbock, Hans-Gustav (1938): Die historische Tradition und ihre literarische Gestaltung bei Babyloniern und Hethitern bis 1200. Zweiter Teil. Hethiter. ZA 44: 45–149.
- Haas, Volkert (2006): Die hethitische Literatur. Texte, Stilistik, Motive. Berlin – New York.
- Hackett, Jo Ann (2004): Phoenician and Punic. In: Roger D. Woodard (ed.): *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the World's Ancient Languages*. Cambridge, 365–385.
- Hawkins, John David (1995): The Hieroglyphic Inscription of the Sacred Pool Complex at Hattusa (SÜDBURG). With an Archaeological Introduction by Peter Neve. StBoT Beiheft 3. Wiesbaden.
- Hawkins, John David (2000): *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions I. Inscriptions of the Iron Age*. Berlin – New York.
- Hawkins, John David (2004): The Stag-God of the Countryside and Related Problems. In: J. H. W. Penney (ed.): *Indo-European Perspectives. Studies in Honour of Anna Morpurgo Davies*. Oxford, 355–369.
- Hawkins, John David (2006): Tudhaliya the Hunter. In: Theo P. J. van den Hout (ed.): *The Life and Times of Hattušili III and Tuthaliya IV. Proceedings of a Symposium Held in Honour of J. de Roos*, 12–13 December 2003. Publications de l'Institut historique-archéologique néerlandais de Stamboul CIII. Leiden, NINO, 49–76.
- Herbordt, Susanne: (2005): Die Prinzen- und Beamtensiegel der hethitischen Grossreichszeit auf Tonbulln aus dem Nişantepe-Archiv in Hattusa mit Kommentaren zu den Siegelinschriften und Hieroglyphen von J. D. Hawkins. Boğazköy-Hattuša. Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen XIX. Mainz am Rhein.
- Hoffner, Harry A. (1978): [J. Friedrich – A. Kammenhuber: Hethitisches Wörterbuch I/1 (*a-annari*)]. BiOr 35: 242–246.
- Kimball, Sara E. (1999): Hittite Historical Phonology. IBS 95. Innsbruck, Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- Kloekhorst, Alwin (2004): The Preservation of **h₁* in Hieroglyphic Luwian. Two Separate *a*-Signs. HS 117: 26–49.
- Kloekhorst, Alwin (2006): Initial Laryngeals in Anatolian. HS 119: 77–108.
- Kloekhorst, Alwin (2008): *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series 5. Leiden – Boston.

- Laroche, Emmanuel (1969): Les dieux de Yazılıkaya. RHA 27/84–85: 61–109.
- Loprieno, Antonio (1995): Ancient Egyptian. A linguistic introduction. Cambridge.
- Melchert, H. Craig (1987): PIE velars in Luvian. In: Calvert Watkins (ed.): Studies in Memory of Warren Cowgill (1929–1985). Papers from the Fourth East Coast Indo-European Conference, Cornell University, June 6–9, 1985. Berlin – New York, 182–204.
- Melchert, H. Craig (1988): Luvian Lexical Notes. HS 101: 211–243.
- Melchert, H. Craig (1989): New Luvo-Lycian Isoglosses. HS 102: 23–45.
- Melchert, H. Craig (1993): Cuneiform Luvian Lexicon. Chapel Hill, self-edition.
- Melchert, H. Craig (1994): Anatolian Historical Phonology. LSIE 3. Amsterdam – Atlanta.
- Melchert, H. Craig (2003): Language. In: id. (ed.): The Luwians. HdO 68. Leiden – Boston, 170–210.
- Melchert, H. Craig (forthcoming): The spelling of initial /a-/ in Hieroglyphic Luvian. In: Festschrift for N. N.
- Neumann, Günter (2004): Hieroglyphen-Luwisch “reiten”. HS 117: 22–25.
- Oshiro, Terumasa (1989): On Hieroglyphic Luwian Sign *sù* or *zú*. JIES 17: 181.
- Plöchl, Reinhold (2003): Einführung ins Hieroglyphen-Luwische. DBH 8. Dresden, Technische Universität.
- Raulwing, Peter – Schmitt, Rüdiger (1998): Zur etymologischen Beurteilung der Berufsbezeichnung *aššuššanni* des Pferdetrainers Kikkuli von Mittani. In: Peter Anreiter et al. (eds.): Man and the Animal World. Studies in Archaeozoology, Archaeology, Anthropology and Palaeolinguistics in memoriam Sándor Bökönyi. Budapest, Archaeolingua, 675–706.
- Rollinger, Robert (2006): Assyrios, Syrios, Syros und Leukosyros. WO 36: 72–82.
- Sader, Hélène (2002): Tyros. DNP 12/1: col. 951–955.
- Şahin, Seracettin – Tekoğlu, Recai (2003): A Hieroglyphic Stele from Afyon Archaeological Museum. Athenaeum 91: 540–545.
- Simon, Zsolt (forthcoming): Das Problem der phonetischen Interpretation der anlautenden scriptio plena im Keilschriftluwischen. Babel und Bibel 4–5 (2007–2008) (= CRRAI 53).
- Starke, Frank (1990): Untersuchung zur Stammbildung des keilschriftluwischen Nomens. StBoT 31. Wiesbaden.
- Starke, Frank (1995): Ausbildung und Training von Streitwagenpferden. Eine hippologisch orientierte Interpretation des Kikkuli-Textes. StBoT 41. Wiesbaden.
- Starke, Frank (1997): Sprachen und Schriften in Karkamis. In: Beate Pongratz-Leisten – Hartmut Kühne – Paolo Xella (eds.): *Ana šadî Labnāni lū allik*. Beiträge zu altorientalischen und mittelmeerischen Kulturen.

- Festschrift für Wolfgang Röllig. AOAT 247. Kevelaer – Neukirchen-Vluyn, 381–395.
- Tischler, Johann (1992): Zum Kentum-Satem Problem im Anatolischen. In: Onofrio Carruba (ed.): *Per una grammatica ittita. Towards a Hittite Grammar*. *Studia Mediterranea* 7. Pavia, 253–274.
- Westenholz, Aage (1991): The phoneme /o/ in Akkadian. *ZA* 81: 10–19.
- Wilhelm, Gernot (1993): *SURA/I* in Kargamiš und das urartäische Gentiliz *šurele*. *SMEA* 31: 135–141.
- Yakubovich, Ilya (2008): *Sociolinguistics of the Luvian Language*. PhD-dissertation, Chicago.
- Yakubovich, Ilya (2008b): The Luvian Enemy. *Kadmos* (this volume) 1–19.

Abstract

The paper discusses the phonetic value of the Hieroglyphic Luwian sign *448. Based on the new reading, a more precise form of the aulic title *s(u)wanis* can be obtained. It will be argued for that this title is hidden behind the sign sequence *109.285.