

MARGINS OF WRITING, ORIGINS OF CULTURES

edited by

SETH L. SANDERS

with contributions by

Seth L. Sanders, John Kelly, Gonzalo Rubio, Jacco Dieleman,
Jerrold S. Cooper, Christopher Woods, Annick Payne,
William M. Schniedewind, Michael Silverstein,
Piotr Michalowski, Paul-Alain Beaulieu,
Theo van den Hout, Paul Zimansky,
Sheldon Pollock, *and*
Peter Machinist

THE ORIENTAL INSTITUTE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
ORIENTAL INSTITUTE SEMINARS • NUMBER 2
CHICAGO • ILLINOIS

Library of Congress Control Number: 2005938897

ISBN-13: 978-1-885923-39-4

ISBN-10: 1-885923-39-2

ISSN: 1559-2944

©2006 by The University of Chicago. All rights reserved.

Published 2006. Printed in the United States of America.

The Oriental Institute, Chicago

Second Printing with Postscripts and Minor Corrections, 2007

Series Editors

Leslie Schramer

and

Thomas G. Urban

with the assistance of

Katie L. Johnson

*The Series Editors acknowledge the assistance of
Thomas James, Oriental Institute Curatorial Assistant.*

Front Cover Illustration

Hieroglyphic Luwian inscription, once part of Neo-Hittite royal monument. Basalt. Amuq Valley,
Tell Tayinat, Amuq O/Iron Age II (Eighth Century B.C.). OIM A27861D–H

Printed by McNaughton & Gunn, Saline, Michigan

The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of American National Standard for Information Services — Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48-1984.

INSTITUTIONS, VERNACULARS, PUBLICS: THE CASE OF SECOND-MILLENNIUM ANATOLIA

THEO VAN DEN HOUT, UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

INTRODUCTION¹

The society of the Hittite kingdom and subsequent empire between 1650 and 1180 B.C. was one of two scripts and — at least — two languages: Hittite written in cuneiform and Luwian in a “hieroglyphic” writing system. Initially, that is, in the earlier second millennium, it was the Hittites, the rulers of the Hittite empire, who prevailed and imposed their language and script as the means of official communication, but by the end of the second millennium the roles were reversed: Hittite and its cuneiform script disappeared while Luwian and its hieroglyphic script survived.

Hittites and Luwians were not simply two groups defined by two closely related but clearly different languages² and each language being used by its own group. Second-millennium Hieroglyphic Luwian has come down to us almost exclusively through the ruling elite of the empire that increasingly used it from the fourteenth century onwards for specific purposes next to the Hittite records in cuneiform. But when shortly after 1200 B.C. the empire collapsed, the Hittite language and its cuneiform script vanished while Luwian and the hieroglyphic script survived as the major (monumental and perhaps also domestic) means of written communication in southeast Anatolia and northern Syria, an area that, so to speak, claimed itself to be the successor to the Hittite empire. The questions I would like to concern myself with here are the following: What was the nature of the coexistence of the two languages, scripts, and population groups in the second millennium and why did Luwian with its hieroglyphic script live on and Hittite with its cuneiform script become extinct? Rephrased in terms of institutions, vernaculars, and publics, the Hittite ruling class was the institution, almost completely dominating our present picture, but to what extent was Hittite the vernacular? And who was the public of the large royal inscriptions in Hieroglyphic Luwian?

¹ I am very grateful to Trevor Bryce, Petra Goedegebuure, Eric Hamp, Seth Sanders, Ilya Yakubovich, and the staff of the Chicago Hittite Dictionary for reading earlier drafts of this paper and for their valuable suggestions and insights. Needless to say, I alone am responsible for the views expressed here.

² For the problem of distinguishing between languages and dialects, see Haugen 1966. Following Haugen’s socio-linguistic approach Hittite would be more of a language and Luwian a dialect. But from the viewpoint of mutual intelligibility (cf. Dixon 1997: 7f.), however difficult to assess for dead languages, the two might be considered languages.

An impression of the lexical discrepancies between Hittite and Luwian may be gleaned from the two tables in Ivanov 2001: 153–62. But as Eric Hamp reminds me, grammatical and syntactic differences might be even more revealing: think of such basic differences as sentence initial *nu-* (Hittite) vs. *a-* (Luwian), the different sentence particles or the plural common gender noun endings in Hittite and (cuneiform and hieroglyphic) Luwian. Quite intuitively, I refer to Luwian and Hittite as languages instead of dialects, reserving the latter term for the distinction between Hieroglyphic Luwian and Cuneiform Luwian.

THE INSTITUTION

HITTITE AND LUWIAN IDENTITIES

The Hittite texts that have come down to us are the exclusive expression of a ruling elite and their immediate dependents that chose the Hittite language as their internal means of communication. “Hittite,” it seems, can only be defined in political, not in linguistic or even cultural terms.³ Looking at names in Hittite texts from the earliest period of attestation onward, various linguistic strands can be recognized: Indo-European, that is, both Hittite and Luwian, and Hattian, the non-Indo-European language of the substrate population. This mix is how we usually define “Hittite” and over the course of history Hurrian influence from the east considerably added to that picture. Culturally, too, Hittite is this very mixture of cultural-linguistic elements as kings in the course of imperial expansion actively sought to incorporate formerly foreign elements, at least into their written documents. The Hittites called themselves geographically “the people of Ḫatti-Land,” using the local Hattian name of the area. But to what extent inhabitants or subjects of the Hittite empire called themselves by that name we simply do not know. The ruling class certainly imposed the concept of Hittite on the territory they controlled. Hittite kings speak of making other territories “Hittite” when incorporating them into their empire. There was a clear sense of “the other” already starting with the Hittite King Anitta around 1750 B.C. when he avenged the carrying off of “Our God” by the king of Zalpuwa and when he spoke of the city god of Ḫattuš as “their god.”⁴ A certain sense of community might be seen in the fact that citizens from all over the empire could appeal as far up as the Great King in Ḫattuša himself if they felt they were treated unjustly.⁵ Although this path is not likely to have been open to all inhabitants in equal measure, it does show that even on the fringes of the Hittite empire there was a vision of belonging to a state headed by a ruler in a far away capital.⁶

Luwian and other attested language groups, on the other hand, in second-millennium Anatolia go hidden almost completely behind the facade of Hittite power, attested as they are exclusively through sources from the Hittite official archives. Although there was a distinct Luwian pantheon and although there are artworks from Luwian territories that make it likely there existed a Luwian identity independent from the Hittite state, they stem from the period of the Hittite empire only and it is very difficult to prove their independence.⁷

³ For a very useful and recent discussion of Hittite ethnicity and the term Hittite itself, see Bryce (1998: 14–19).

⁴ Singer 1995; on the general notions of foreigners and outsiders, see Klingner 1992.

⁵ Compare the case of the priest Zuba'al in Emar on the far southeastern fringe of the empire (cf. Singer 1999).

⁶ On the basis of these general traits the Hittite state can be shown to have shared some characteristics with more modern nations, at least from the elite's perspective. Anderson (1983: 6f.) defines the concept of nation as “an imagined political community — and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign.” Modern nations are described as involving a “horizontal comradeship” between citizens, established through written communication in a common vernacular. As explained by him, the commu-

nity is *imagined* because without knowing personally all of their fellow citizens, all inhabitants recognize each other as sharing the same “nationality.” It is *limited* because it simply encompasses only part of the world, it is sovereign because it is completely free and independent, and it is a *community* because despite inequalities the nation is thought of as a comradeship: there is a clear sense of “us” and “the others.” Although devised to describe phenomena of nationalism in the modern world, this definition may help us — despite differences in time — to portray the Hittite empire as an institution.

⁷ These problems are apparent and clearly outlined in the treatments on Luwian religion and Luwian art by Hutter 2003 (especially pp. 215–18) and Aro 2003 (especially pp. 281–88) respectively.

THE CHARACTER OF THE HITTITE LANGUAGE CORPUS

The Hittite corpus is massive and shares an overwhelmingly unified character. Over 30,000 tablets and fragments of tablets from the Hittite capital Ḫattuša, its provincial centers Maṣat Höyük/Tapikka(?), and Kuşaklı/Šarešša, and the more incidental finds of documents from elsewhere can almost entirely be characterized as administrative.⁸ And, with just two clear exceptions, we can state that they pertain to the administration of the Hittite kingdom and empire: they are either produced by the chanceries of the empire itself or were addressed by foreign administrations to the Hittite chanceries. The exceptions mentioned consist of two texts, the so-called Arzawa tablets that were part of a correspondence between the independent kingdom of Arzawa in the west around 1400 B.C. and the Egyptian court of the Amarna pharaohs.⁹

The archives of the Hittite capital are among the very few in the ancient Near East where we can analyze and follow an administration over several centuries.¹⁰ These archives distinguished between records that had a long term interest and those of only temporary relevance.¹¹ Records of the first group were regularly copied according to need and sometimes kept for several centuries. Records from the second group, on the other hand, were not considered important enough to be copied and were kept for relatively brief periods only before being discarded, that is, either recycled or destroyed. The speed at which this happened was dictated by a sliding scale of relevance: economic administration may have had a turnaround of no longer than a fiscal period whereas correspondence or oracle reports may have been kept as long as persons involved lived or certain affairs mattered to the current administration. The following table gives an overview of the genres present in the Hittite archives divided according to these principles:

A. TEXTS IN MULTIPLE COPIES

Historical prose, treaties, edicts
(CTH 1–147, 211–16)
Instructions (CTH 251–75)
Laws (CTH 291–92)
Celestial omina (CTH 531–35)
Hymns and prayers (CTH 371–89)
Festival scenarios (CTH 591–721)
Rituals (CTH 390–500)
Mythology, Anatolian (CTH 321–38) and
non-Anatolian (CTH 341–69)
Hattian, Palaic, Luwian, Hurrian texts
(CTH 725–91)
Hippological texts (CTH 284–87)
Lexical lists (CTH 299–309)
Sumerian and Akkadian compositions
(CTH 310–16, 792–819) and the
Hurrian-Hittite bilingual

B. TEXTS IN SINGLE COPIES

Correspondence (CTH 151–210)
Land deeds (CTH 221–25)
Lists and rosters (CTH 231–39)
Economic administration (CTH 240–50)
Court depositions (CTH 293–97)
Cult inventories (CTH 501–30)
Non-celestial omina (CTH 536–60)
Oracle reports (CTH 561–82)
Vows (CTH 583–90)
Tablet collection shelf lists (CTH 276–82)
Tablet collection labels (CTH 283)

⁸ See van den Hout 2002. The texts from Ortaköy remain largely unpublished but are likely to reflect the same character.

⁹ EA 31 and 32, see Moran 1992: 101–03. Although diplomatic correspondence was usually in Akkadian and the Egyptian-Hittite correspondence was indeed conducted in that language, the Arzawans in the far west probably were too far removed from Mesopotamia and cut off by the Hittite empire from that world to be able to conduct Akkadian language correspondence. Significant in this respect

is their explicit request to the Egyptians to write in Hittite. Probably, this was the nearest international language they had access to.

¹⁰ For the latest assessment of the building history of Ḫattuša, see Seeher 2005. According to this view the most important places of tablet storage (the storerooms surrounding Temple 1, the so-called *Haus am Hang*, both in the Lower City, and Building A on the acropolis Büyükkale) may be considerably older than hitherto assumed.

¹¹ For this see van den Hout 2005 and forthcoming.

The only compositions that do not seem to fit the overall archival character¹² are the non-Anatolian myths, the lexical lists, the Sumerian and Akkadian compositions, as well as the Hurrian-Hittite bilingual. They may have been part of a so-called archive-library that kept compositions that were not the product of administration per se but did have an as yet to be defined relevance for the administration. Another possibility would be to think of some of them as library material that was specifically collected for “academic” and/or even entertainment or literary purposes. There can be no doubt, however, that all these records, documents, and compositions were the product of the ruling class of the Hittite state. The language of this class was Hittite but their status as an international power and their religious ideology of incorporating deities and cults of annexed territories and populations living within their borders made them collect and maintain other language compositions in their archives and (archive) libraries.

CUNEIFORM AND HIEROGLYPHIC LUWIAN

As was already briefly stated, there exists a clear one-to-one relation between the Hittite language and the cuneiform script.¹³ For Luwian, Hittite’s close relative, the situation is more complex. Usually we keep Luwian written in cuneiform and Luwian in hieroglyphs strictly apart as two very closely related but nevertheless different varieties of the Luwian language. For the Hieroglyphic Luwian corpus see more in detail below. The Cuneiform Luwian corpus consists of two subcorpora: (1) rituals or ritual passages inserted into Hittite rituals as well as two fragments of letters, and (2) Luwian words in Hittite compositions (among them the so-called *Glossenkeilwörter*).¹⁴ The differences between the two varieties of Luwian are slight. Cuneiform Luwian, for instance, no longer has a separate genitive case but uses an adjectival suffix instead that can be added to every noun and agrees in gender, case, and number with the noun it modifies. Although Hieroglyphic Luwian has the same genitival adjective, it still has a genitive case ending. Another difference concerns the common gender plural of the noun inflection.¹⁵ Compare the following table:

		Cuneiform Luwian	Hieroglyphic Luwian
Plural	Nominative	-nzi	-nzi
	Accusative	-nza	-nzi
	Dative	-nza	-nza

The relation of Cuneiform Luwian vis-à-vis Hieroglyphic Luwian is difficult to assess; according to Frank Starke they would have been mere sociolects,¹⁶ and Craig Melchert suggests that Cuneiform Luwian might have been an archaic dialect from Kizzuwatna.¹⁷

THE CHARACTER OF THE HIEROGLYPHIC LUWIAN LANGUAGE CORPUS

The hieroglyphic-written documents can be divided into three groups: inscriptions, graffiti, and seals, the latter mostly preserved in the form of seal impressions. For the period of the Hit-

¹² For a discussion, see van den Hout 2002.

¹³ But not vice versa: Hittite appears written only in cuneiform, but cuneiform could be used also for a number of other languages in the Hittite scribal centers: Palaic, Luwian, Hattian, Sumerian, Akkadian, and Hurrian. The situation for the hieroglyphic writing system is the other way around: in the Hittite empire it was used for Luwian

exclusively while (at least a very closely related form of) Luwian could also be written in cuneiform.

¹⁴ For the Cuneiform Luwian corpus, see Starke 1985 and CLL.

¹⁵ For more details, see Melchert 2003: 170–210.

¹⁶ Starke 1997: 457f.

¹⁷ Melchert 2003: 174.

tite empire we know about eighty inscriptions on stone.¹⁸ They are either building inscriptions, mostly dedicatory in nature, or short epigraphs in the form of captions accompanying iconic representations of deities and royalty. The self-representations of royalty — both Hittite Great Kings and Queens and local vassal kings — found spread all over Anatolia are sometimes believed to have served as boundary markers. Many of these inscriptions have been inscribed on rock surfaces, some taking the form of stelae, others taking the form of reliefs, often as part of an architectural structure. All stem from the thirteenth century, with each king from Muwatalli II up to the last known King Šuppiluliyama (II) represented thus far except for Urḫiteššub/Muršili III and Arnuwanda III.¹⁹ In the context of this paper it is important to note that as opposed to the cuneiform Hittite documents, the hieroglyphic monuments that contain more than just names and titles are the most straightforwardly propagandistic texts that have come down to us. Hittite annalistic prose in which kings tell of their *res gestae* certainly depict the king's wisdom and military skills but hardly his prowess in battle.²⁰ It would have been true propaganda if these compositions had been disseminated in any way by, for instance, public readings but the real *Sitz im Leben* of these texts is a much-debated problem.²¹ It is interesting to see that some of the few cuneiform instances that do sound unabashedly propagandistic contain hints at public display and can be seen as either copies or drafts of inscriptions.²²

Geographically, the inscriptions range from the far west on the Anatolian coast of the Aegean (KARABEL, SIPYLOS) through central Anatolia (BOĞAZKÖY) to the south (KARADAĞ, KIZILDAĞ) and southeast (ALEPPO). North of the area of Boğazköy they have not been found so far.²³

Graffiti or inscriptions on objects like cups (cf., for instance, the Stag “rhyton” of the Schimmel collection²⁴ or the Boston Fist²⁵), bowls,²⁶ and weapons²⁷ are far fewer in number and often difficult to date. If correctly dated, one of the oldest inscriptions of this type on a silver bowl would go back to Tudḫaliya I of the late fifteenth century B.C.²⁸ Unfortunately, the provenance or exact archaeological context of these objects is rarely known.

To this corpus of inscriptions and graffiti some 5,000 published seals and seal impressions can be added.²⁹ The overwhelming majority of seals and impressions comes from Boğazköy; about 700 come from elsewhere or are of unknown provenance. Among the findspots of those not found in Boğazköy, all Hittite centers are attested: Alaca Höyük, Maşat Höyük, Kuşaklı, Emar, Karkamiš, and Ugarit.³⁰ But seals and seal impressions have been found also as far west as

¹⁸ For a listing, see Marazzi 1986: 89–120; for the Boğazköy texts, see Hawkins 1995: 121; for editions of most, see Meriggi 1975: 259–331 and Hawkins 1995.

¹⁹ Compare in chronological order the inscriptions from ALEPPO I and SİRKELİ (Muwatalli II), FRAKTIN (Ḫattušili III and Puduḫepa), BOĞAZKÖY, EMIRGAZI I (A–D)–V, KARAKUYU, YALBURT, YAZILIKAYA (Tudḫaliya IV), NIŞANTAŞ, and the Südburg (Šuppiluliyama II).

²⁰ For this, see especially the work of Cancik 1976 and Hoffner 1980.

²¹ Compare the studies of Roszkowka-Mutschler 2002 and Gilan forthcoming. At the conference Sheldon Pollock pointed out that such public readings to the population took place in ancient India with Sanskrit inscriptions. For reading texts out loud in Hittite society, see van den Hout 2002: 866f.

²² See the Anitta Text obverse 33–35 (ed. Neu 1974: 12f., Carruba 2003: 30f.), KBo 12.38 (ed. Güterbock 1967); for the latter text see further below. Bolatti Guzzo and Marazzi 2004 see a development from the less propagandistic cuneiform annalistic tradition to a more visual and public Hieroglyphic Luwian one.

²³ For a map, see Hawkins 2003: 142f.

²⁴ Muscarella 1974: no. 123.

²⁵ Güterbock and Kendall 1995.

²⁶ Emre and Cınaroğlu 1993 and Hawkins 1997.

²⁷ Dinçol 1989.

²⁸ So Hawkins 1997.

²⁹ For a full bibliographic overview of seals and seal impressions up to 1995, see Souček and Siegelová 1996: 316–38.

³⁰ Seals are also reported to have been found at Ortaköy.

Troy,³¹ in Tarsus on the southern coast, and as far east as Korucutepe in the northern Euphrates area. Seals were a legal instrument functioning in a self-contained system without the need for accompanying written documents and attesting to the correctness or validity of objects sealed. Such objects could be written documents where the seal owner vouched for the correctness of the contents of the document, they could be goods or objects the quality, quantity, or integrity of which was guaranteed by the seal owner. It should be kept in mind that, although these seals display the Hieroglyphic Luwian script, nothing can be said of the language. The names on the seals appear uninflected while the titles are almost all logographic. The only important question here is the motivation for the choice of the hieroglyphic script instead of the cuneiform. That cuneiform seals are perfectly possible needs no elucidation: Hittite kings themselves used cuneiform next to hieroglyphic signs but the interesting thing is that they were the only ones to do so, making the use of cuneiform for these purposes practically a royal prerogative (see also below). A chronological development can be observed if we look at the so-called *tabarna*-seals of the *Landschenkungs-urkunden* of the Older Hittite period. Here the names of the kings and the curse formula are written in cuneiform. In the center of the seals we find at best some of the early symbols like VITA and BONUS. Only the BONUS sign would be part of the later Hieroglyphic Luwian script. It is with the seal of Šatanduḫeba of the early fourteenth century that hieroglyphs can be observed as a full-fledged syllabic writing system for the first time.

The Hieroglyphic Luwian corpus is largely linked to the ruling class of the Hittite state. Many inscriptions, graffiti, and seals explicitly refer to individuals belonging to that group (a king, a prince, an official known from the cuneiform texts). In general, style and “wording” are fairly uniform throughout Anatolia. Although the origins of this style may have lain outside the Hittite state, by the time the hieroglyphic writing system is firmly attested, this style was adopted and perhaps even dictated by that state. To what extent inscriptions and seal legends belong to individuals that were not part of the Hittite empire is difficult to determine.

THE VERNACULAR: THE POSITION OF LUWIAN VIS-À-VIS HITTITE STATUS QUAESTIONIS

The fact that the genres (building inscriptions, captions for iconic representations, boundary markers?) for which the hieroglyphic script was used show no real overlap with the genres in cuneiform speaks for a deliberate choice on the part of the ruling class. What motivated this choice? We are either dealing with a bilingual society where the choice of the Hieroglyphic Luwian language and script was geared toward the intended audience of the monuments and seals, or a largely monolingual Hittite-speaking society in which the hieroglyphic script was chosen for aesthetic and decorative or prestigious reasons. The Luwian language that came with the script may in some way have been traditional with only a very small group within that same ruling class who could actually understand it. In the latter case, Luwian would probably go back to some old and venerated tradition and may have been the elevated or high (H) language variety as opposed to the low (L) variety of Hittite.³²

The status of Luwian as the main language in large parts of west, south-central, and southeast Anatolia is not in dispute,³³ but the question discussed here is to what extent the Luwian language was present in the fourteenth and thirteenth century in the core Hittite area within the Halys ba-

³¹ Hawkins and Easton 1996.

³³ Melchert 2003: 11.

³² For high (H) and low (L) language and dialect varieties, see Ferguson 1959.

sin where most of the second-millennium Hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions have actually been found. This question is closely related to the status of Hittite: a substantial Luwian presence in the Hittite heartland is mostly seen as lowering the status of Hittite to that of a mere chancery language. A certain Luwian presence there is evident in Luwian language elements in the Hittite records of the capital and its nearby provincial centers. Those language elements are of two kinds: phenomena in Hittite grammar that find their best explanation as coming from Luwian and more directly, Luwian speech forms, mostly nouns and verbs inserted in genuine Luwian or Hittitized form in Hittite context. The first category may be the result of language convergence of two ethnic groups living or having lived in direct proximity over an extended period of time, although that period may have ended some time ago. The second category may show a more direct contact at the time of composition of the record the Luwian form is attested in. The latter forms are the most tangible form of Luwian interference and it is the only kind of evidence that is in any way measurable. These words fall into two categories: Luwian words in Hittite texts marked by one or two preceding oblique wedges (ᵛ, ᵝ), the so-called *Glossenkeile*,³⁴ and unmarked Luwian forms in Hittite texts.

It was on the basis of such words that the theory of Hittite as a *Hof- und Amtssprache* was first put forward by Bernhard Rosenkranz in 1938. His most important observations concerned the wide variety of genres such words are attested in, not limited to a specific group of texts, and that they often denote objects or emotions from daily life. This led him to conclude that Luwian was the scribes' vernacular³⁵ whereas Hittite was probably only used at the court and in the chanceries, that is, spoken as well as written.³⁶ Several years later (1954) he retracted this claim and suggested that the Luwian influence might be better ascribed to the close and intensive contacts between the Hittite ruling class and Luwians in the years that the capital had been moved to Tarḫuntašša in southern Anatolia during the reign of Muršili II's successor, Muwatalli II (ca. 1295–1274 B.C.).³⁷

In 1956 Hans Güterbock re-examined the question of the *Glossenkeilwörter* (henceforth ᵛ-marked words). In opposition to Rosenkranz, he considered their number "rather limited"³⁸ and observing that "a considerable number" of the compositions they appeared in were related to Kizzuwatna,³⁹ he tried to explain this interference as coming from Kizzuwatna, the Hittite province in southeast Anatolia, the area known in classical times as Cilicia Campestris.⁴⁰ Kizzuwatna was a mixed Luwian-Hurrian region from which a number of ritual compositions was incorporated into the tablet collections of the capital Ḫattuša. It is also thought to have been responsible for the wave of Hurrian culture and texts that invaded those same tablet collections in the reigns of King Tudḫaliya I and his immediate successors at the end of the fifteenth and early fourteenth century. Ḫattušili III's marriage to the Kizzuwatna priestess Puduḫepa in the late 1270s B.C. may have

³⁴ See Rüster and Neu 1989: 217 (no. 248).

³⁵ Rosenkranz 1938: 280.

³⁶ Rosenkranz 1938: 282. To attribute to him the view that Hittite was used for writing purposes only, as is sometimes done, is not correct as follows from his own term *Umgangssprache*: "Das Hethitische selbst war die Sprache einer Oberschicht und diente wohl nur als Hof- und Amtssprache (und deshalb auch als Literatur-sprache). Inwieweit es noch für weitere Kreise als *Umgangssprache* diente, läßt sich einstweilen nicht feststellen" (italics mine). Only later did Rosenkranz (1954: 309) refer to Hittite explicitly as "Schriftsprache." That Rosenkranz did

think that Hittite as a real mother tongue for people was dead at the time of the ᵛ-marked words, however, follows from his remark (1938: 282) that "[d]ie alte Grundlage der hethitischen Schriftsprache war zur Zeit der Schreiber wohl schon tot." With "Hof- und Amtssprache" he may have intended a form of diglossia with Hittite comparable to the status of Latin at the Vatican or that of modern standard Arabic.

³⁷ Rosenkranz 1954: 309 with n. 9.

³⁸ Güterbock 1956: 137.

³⁹ Güterbock 1956: 138.

⁴⁰ In this he was followed by others, compare, for example, Kammenhuber 1959: 9f.

caused a second Hurrian wave in Ḫattuša. According to Güterbock, scribes from Kizzuwatna learned Hittite in the capital,⁴¹ but they could not help reverting now and then to their own tongue resulting in a kind of *Mischsprache* where Luwian words were inserted in Hittite.⁴² On the other hand, the fact that these words not only figure in local Kizzuwatnean texts but also spread to historical narrative, diplomatic documents, and works of foreign literature shows the importance of these scribes in Ḫattuša according to Güterbock.

At a conference in 1963 Jaan Puhvel judiciously referred to Rosenkranz's 1938 hypothesis as suggesting that Hittite "may have been on the road to becoming a scribal petrifact, and that Luwian was spreading as a vernacular of the empire."⁴³ He mentioned how it had been widely rejected but conceded that it "may contain some grain of truth." In 1965 Ruggero Stefanini also repeated the original claim of Rosenkranz.⁴⁴ In the conclusion to his edition of the New Hittite text KBo 4.14 which was then still regarded as one of the last Hittite texts, dated to the reign of the last known king, Šuppiluliyama II, he saw the option of Hittite as a language restricted to writing and liturgy as the only possible one to explain the high number of ʾ-marked words in that text. He accepted Güterbock's immigration of Kizzuwatnean scribes only for the initial phase but supposed that by the end of the thirteenth century the situation had turned around: a scribe's first language was Luwian now with Hittite only for the "literary" tradition and liturgical use. The ʾ-marked words were no longer used, not because a scribe could not think of the proper Hittite term but because everybody used them. In a more recent attempt at a "diachronic reconstruction of the linguistic map of ancient Anatolia" Stefanini is more cautious, holding on to the notion of Hittite as a written language but not denying "its own changes ... up until the end" and its continuation as a spoken language in certain parts of society.⁴⁵

In a recent volume on Luwians, their language, history, and culture, Craig Melchert rejected as "simplistic" and "artificial" the hypothesis that Luwian was the spoken language throughout Anatolia with Hittite a mere administrative or chancellery language used only in writing.⁴⁶ The morpho-phonological and syntactic changes we observe throughout the history of the Hittite language during its almost 500 years of attestation seem incompatible with such a notion while he considers the presence of Hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions in the capital as "irrelevant for the

⁴¹ Güterbock (1956: 138) suggested that this "is more easily understood if it [i.e., Hittite] was still spoken in the center than if it had already become a dead language."

⁴² At this point Güterbock (1956: 138) gives the beautiful example from German immigrants into the United States: "Hast du die onions schon geweedet?" where "'onions' corresponds to a Luwian plural and 'geweedet' to a Hittitized hybrid." The example is somewhat misleading, however. The base language here is German with some Americanisms inserted. In their daily language the Kizzuwatnean immigrants no doubt did the same: a native Luwian sentence with Hittite words strewn in but in the Hittite texts we only meet them in their capacity as scribes and officials using the state idiom. If they were the ones composing texts like the Annals of Muṣili II or the Apology of Ḫattušili III, their command of that language was near perfect. If they were just copying them why would they insert Luwian words? If a native speaker of Luwian who had not quite mastered Hittite as a foreign language were to compose a Hittite text one might expect a text like KUB 24.12+ (CTH 448 – NS, ed. Taracha 2000: 86–95), where the plural dative-locative of nouns is consistently

represented by the plural accusative (cf. *kēdāš tarpalliūš* ii 29, iii 4/11, UGU-ziūš DINGIR.MEŠ ii 33, iii 8/15, 10/17; see also KUB 55.66 iv 9, 11; the emendation to a singular dative-locative *tarpalli<u>š* by Starke apud Hawkins (Hawkins and Starke 1980: 146) is unlikely in view of the consistency and the preceding *kēdāš*). As noted by Yoshida (1991: 54f.), this finds a good explanation through Cuneiform Luwian where the plural accusative and the plural dative-locative were written identically (-*nza*). The text contains many other deviations from Hittite grammar (cf. Rieken 1994: 51 n. 37). If it is true that the text is a New Hittite composition or edition as claimed by Taracha (2000: 150) and the explanation of Cuneiform Luwian influence is valid, this is important for the understanding of the status of Cuneiform Luwian in the thirteenth century B.C.

⁴³ Published as Puhvel 1966: 239.

⁴⁴ Stefanini 1965: 78f.

⁴⁵ Stefanini 2002: 784 with n. 2.

⁴⁶ Melchert 2003: 12f.; compare also, for instance, Melchert 1994: 8 (with lit.) and Oettinger 1979: 387.

question of Luwian as a spoken language in Hattusa.” More relevant according to Melchert for the socio-linguistic relation between Luwian and Hittite is the influence of the Luwian language on Hittite that becomes especially notable from the end of the fourteenth century onward. The oldest borrowings suggest close cultural contact while for the later period Melchert concedes “a gradually increasing Luwian presence in Hattusa and in central Anatolia.”⁴⁷ The Luwian influence referred to is the Luwian *i*-mutation (see below) that led to a confusion of Hittite *a*- and *i*-stem nouns and that of Luwian nominal and verbal forms in Hittite contexts.

Most recently and in more detail, Melchert has returned to the question of the ʾ-marked words and non-marked Luwian words in the wider context of Luwian influence on Hittite.⁴⁸ In a survey of Luwian and other foreign words he concludes that Luwian influence is already in evidence for the Old Hittite period although no unambiguous Luwian inflected forms occur in Old Hittite manuscripts.⁴⁹ Even for Middle Hittite manuscripts he quotes only three such forms.⁵⁰ His survey confirms the observation already made by Rosenkranz in 1938 that the distribution of Luwian words and forms is wide and includes practically all genres. He does, moreover, observe some interesting discrepancies within certain genres. Grouping the material into semantic fields (food, utensils, clothing; hunting and herding; military; religion and cult; social order), he concedes that the first three categories could be seen as colloquialisms. However, strongly opposing the view that Luwian would have been the vernacular and Hittite an administrative or chancellery language, he characterizes a colloquial explanation for the latter two as highly implausible. As an alternative he offers the possibility that foreign words added “to the high tone of a consciously literary composition (cf. the use of French words in English).” On the whole Melchert is reluctant to draw any conclusions other than that New Hittite has a “liberal sprinkling” of Luwian loan-words.

Besides the use of Luwian words and inflected forms in Hittite contexts there is also the more general influence on Hittite grammar which forms the second part of his paper.⁵¹ In most cases an original Luwian grammatical feature was remodeled in Hittite by adding, for instance, a Hittite ending to a borrowed Luwian stem or suffix, often already attested in the Old Hittite period. Examples of these are Luwian nominal suffixes *-alla/i-*, nomina agentis in *-(a)t(t)alla-* as well as verbal forms in *-(i)yai-*. Of somewhat later date is the more general uncertainty in nominal *a*- and *i*-stems in Hittite caused by the Luwian phenomenon known as *i*-mutation. In this system Luwian common gender nouns and adjectives of several stem classes are marked by an *-i-* in between the stem and ending of the singular and plural nominative and accusative common gender, while the oblique cases have *-a-*. As shown by Elisabeth Rieken⁵² the resulting vacillation in Hittite stems is not limited to specific genres or to texts from a certain region: such forms occur indiscriminately in texts from a Hittian or Kizzuwatnean background and in rituals, oracles, lexical lists, and historical prose alike. In this context we may recall that Norbert Oettinger already explained the productivity of the semi-consonantal *hi*-class (of the type third-person singular *šuhhai*: third-per-

⁴⁷ Melchert 2003: 13; for Hittites and Luwians having lived in each other’s immediate proximity in prehistoric and early historic times, see Yakubovich (forthcoming).

⁴⁸ Melchert forthcoming. I am most grateful to Craig Melchert for allowing me to use his manuscript and to include his findings here in my investigation. Pending the publication of that paper I refer to paragraph numbers.

⁴⁹ In Old Hittite “the loanwords ... are fully adapted to Hittite patterns”: thus already Melchert (2003: 13). In dating Hittite compositions and tablets I follow the system of

the Chicago Hittite Dictionary: left of the slash the period in which a text was composed is given (Old, Middle, or New Hittite: OH, MH, NH), right of the slash the period in which the tablet was written (Old, Middle or New Script: OS, MS, NS).

⁵⁰ For the latter observation, see already Rieken 1994: 48 n. 25.

⁵¹ See Melchert forthcoming §§3.1–3 building on earlier work by Starke and Oettinger.

⁵² Rieken 1994: 48.

son plural *šuhhanzi*) and the *mi*-class of verbs in *-iya-* through Luwian influence. In both cases he sees the reign of Muršili II as the point from which such changes become visible. Again, Melchert does observe a dramatic increase for some of these changes in the New Hittite period but steers clear of “any attempt at characterizing this influence more precisely in terms of language-contact typologies.”

In the following I discuss both the $\hat{\lambda}$ -marked words and those that are unmarked. The former group is the easier one since they are instantly recognizable. Only rarely were non-Luwian words marked by the wedges; there are a few examples of Hurrian or West Semitic words with the markers without any trace of Luwianization and they have not been included here.⁵³ Since I am interested in the socio-linguistic situation in the thirteenth century B.C. and “real,” that is, unequivocal Luwian forms seem the best indicators of “live” Luwian language use in Hittite surroundings, I have for the non-marked forms — unlike Melchert — restricted this investigation to only such exclusively Luwian forms. As he has convincingly demonstrated, Luwian has exerted influence on the Hittite language in the form of lexical roots and stems, certain suffixes and derivations already early on as is evidenced in Hittite texts from the Old Hittite period. But such older borrowings may not tell that much about the linguistic realities of the thirteenth century.⁵⁴ The non-marked Luwian words used here were selected therefore because they show exclusively Luwian endings; for the noun and adjective these are the neuter singular nominative-accusative *-ša/-za*, ablative *-ati*, common plural nominative *-nzi*, common accusative *-nza*, dative *-nza*, for the verb the first-person singular active present *-wi*, second-person singular *-ti*, third-person singular *-ti*, *-iyai*, first-person plural *-uni*, third-person plural *-nti*, first-person singular preterite *-ha*, third-person singular *-Vtta*, third-person plural *-nta*, second-person plural medio-passive *-tuwar(i)*. In general, Luwian names (for gods, birds, breads, etc.) and epithets have not been included since they could easily be used without their being evidence of influence on the Hittite language.

THE $\hat{\lambda}$ -MARKED WORDS

The corpus of $\hat{\lambda}$ -marked words gathered here comprises 337 different words,⁵⁵ often attested in several inflected forms and found in 130 compositions distributed over practically all genres of documents.⁵⁶ In most cases both the stem and the ending are Luwian, occasionally the ending is Hittite. Sometimes it is difficult to determine whether a specific form is either Luwian or Hittite but the Luwian character of the overwhelming majority of words marked with gloss wedges suggests that the form in question or at least part of it was felt as Luwian by the scribe.⁵⁷ These wedges to mark Luwian words start appearing in texts from the reign of Muršili II (ca. 1318–1295 B.C.) onward with only a single uncertain older example dating to the earlier fourteenth century.⁵⁸ A few other examples occur in later copies of Middle Hittite compositions where the possibility

⁵³ For example, $\hat{\lambda}g/kupa\hat{\lambda}i$ - “tiara, crown” (cf. Laroche 1976–1977 s.v. *kuwaḫi* and Catsanicos 1994: 318); $\hat{\lambda}na\hat{\lambda}arta$ - “?” (cf. Laroche 1976–1977 s.v. *naḫarti*, 179, CHD L–N s.v. (:) *naḫarta*-); $\hat{\lambda}kubate\hat{\lambda}$ Msk 75.57+98:9 (cf. Salvini and Trémouille 2003: 233, 237, and 239).

⁵⁴ Thus also Melchert forthcoming §2.6.

⁵⁵ Words are defined here as separate entries in a dictionary. This means that derivatives of a lexeme — except for the genitival adjective — are counted separately but inflected forms of a single derived stem are not.

⁵⁶ Compositions are defined as entries in E. Laroche, *Catalogue des textes hittites* (Paris 1971 = CTH) now in en-

larged and updated form accessible through S. Košak, *Konkordanz der hethitischen Keilschrifttafeln* (I–LX) at <http://www.orient.uni-wuerzburg.de/hetkonk/>, version 1.

⁵⁷ Melchert 1994: 35 correctly warns against taking all occurrences of the gloss wedges as indicating Luwian origin of some kind although the position of Oettinger 1986: 51 is more nuanced than Melchert makes it seem. For the different uses of such wedges, see Souček 1957–1971.

⁵⁸ This is HKM 88:12 ($\hat{\lambda}annarā$) from the small Middle Hittite corpus from Maşat Höyük, but the fragmentary context makes it not quite certain.

of a later modernization cannot be ruled out.⁵⁹ From Muṣili II to the end of the empire, compositions from the reigns of all kings are attested except for the two very briefly reigning and in documents scarcely attested kings Urḫiteššub (ca. 1274–1267 B.C.) and Arnuwanda III (late thirteenth century).⁶⁰ The distribution of 𐎶-marked words over genres can be seen in the following table:

GENRE	NUMBER OF WORDS	% OF TOTAL
Historical prose, treaties, edicts	79	20.4%
Correspondence	27	7.0
Administration	15	3.9
Instructions	13	3.4
Depositions	21	5.4
Translated literature	1	0.2
Mythology (foreign)	30	7.7
Hymns	10	2.6
Rituals	29	7.5
Cult inventories	24	6.2
Oracle reports	65	16.8
Vows	18	4.6
Festival scenarios	29	7.5
Texts from Luwian milieu	18	4.6
Texts from Hurrian milieu	2	0.5
Medical text (CTH 808)	1	0.2
CTH 832 (unclassified fragments)	6	1.5
<i>Total</i>	388	

As observed by Rosenkranz (and again by Melchert) the distribution is wide and practically all genres are represented. This spread is all the more wide when one takes in consideration the date and language of a composition. Almost all gaps in terms of CTH numbers are either Old or Middle Hittite compositions or foreign, most notably those in Akkadian or Hurrian. Examples for the first group include the laws, Old and Middle Hittite historical prose and diplomatic documents, the hippological treatises, and indigenous Anatolian myths. The number of 𐎶-marked words in

⁵⁹ Compare the examples of 𐎶*hanḫaniya*- “to be malicious,” 𐎶*dūr* “urine,” and 𐎶*zūwa*- “bread” in the Instructions for Temple Personnel (CTH 264), but the exact date of this composition remains uncertain. All manuscripts are New Script, but a composition date around 1400 B.C. seems likely; the Chicago Hittite Dictionary usually characterizes the text as “pre-New Hittite/New Script.” The fact that the first and third words are attested in two and three manuscripts respectively (the second one, 𐎶*dūr* may be preserved in KUB 13.6 iii 18 ([...-]*ūr*) which would make it attested in two manuscripts as well) makes it less likely they are later modernizations. It is conceivable, however, that only the wedges are the modernization while the Luwian words were already in the (older) original. The certainly Middle Hittite/New Script instruction KUB 31.84 has the hapax 𐎶*katapenniš* (cf. CLL 103, Pecchioli Daddi 2003: 110f. with n. 287), but as a hapax it cannot yet be linked to anything known in the Luwian lexicon. The Middle Script 𐎶*sakuwa* “eyes” in the Šunaššura treaty is purely Hittite (the Luwian word for “eyes” being *tāwal*

i-; cf. CLL 224); see already Güterbock 1956: 133, 135f. The (Old Hittite/Middle Script) attestation of 𐎶*warkuššan* (= *warkun* *z* *šan* “his anger” or similar) in KUB 17.10 iii 12 is puzzling: it would be the oldest instance of the gloss wedges to indicate Luwian. The parallel *warkuiššan* (= *warkuin* *z* *šan*) does not have the wedges and differs in spelling. Is *wa-ar-ku-uš*- a mistake for *wa-ar-ku-iš*- and did the scribe want to draw attention to the deviating form (thus tentatively Houwink ten Cate 1970: 55; cf. also Weitenberg 1984: 271; and Kellerman 1986: 117)? If so, or if the wedges are there for any other reason than marking the word as Luwian, there is no independent evidence for a stem *warku*- in Luwian and it should be deleted from CLL 259.

⁶⁰ This is the same situation as we faced in the case of Hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions (see above): Arnuwanda probably reigned very briefly and there are no texts that can be assigned to him with any certainty. Urḫiteššub may have ruled for seven years but very few texts can be ascribed to him.

compositions of clear Kizzuwatnean origin is quite low. Among the twenty-nine ritual compositions that have one or more Luwian words with wedges in them, only CTH 485 (ritual of drawing paths), 492 (ritual for the primeval gods/gods of the Netherworld), 495 (rituals of counter magic), and 500 (fragments of Kizzuwatnean rituals) originated from there.⁶¹ They are good for only six of the 337 𐎶-marked words.

The 𐎶-marked words are especially frequent in ephemeral records from Group B (see above). If we group them accordingly we get the following numbers:

<i>GROUP A</i> (longer-term documents, multiple copies)		
Historical texts	79	
Instructions	13	
Translated literature	1	
Mythology	30	
Hymns	10	
Rituals	29	
Festival scenarios (including Luwian, etc.)	49	
Medical text	1	
<i>Total</i>	212	55.5% ⁶²
 <i>GROUP B</i> (short-term documents, single copies only)		
Correspondence	27	
Administration	15	
Depositions	21	
Cult inventories	24	
Oracle reports	65	
Vows	18	
<i>Total</i>	170	44.5% ⁶³

Although the total for Group A is still higher than in Group B, we have to keep in mind that the 212 of Group A is an accumulation of over about a century (from Muršili II around 1300 B.C. until shortly after 1200 B.C.). The records of Group B, however, date to the last decade(s) of the administration. This means that either the tendency to use such words became ever more widespread toward the end of the empire or, since in general we do not have texts of Group B dating before 1240/1230 B.C., that such words were used especially frequently in the most ephemeral texts where there was little or no influence of tradition and where elevated language was the least present. Had we had earlier Group B records their total could well have been much higher.

THE UNMARKED LUWIAN WORDS AND FORMS

The picture for the unmarked Luwian words as selected according to the above criteria is quite different. I have counted 131 words distributed over ninety-nine compositions.⁶⁴ The difference concerns not so much the total number of words or compositions as their spread over genres and their dating:

⁶¹ Following Miller 2004: 447–52, I do not include here rituals like that of 𐎶antitaššu (CTH 395) or Tunnawi (CTH 409).
⁶² On a total of 382 occurrences = 388 - 6 of CTH 832 (unclassified compositions).

⁶³ See preceding footnote.
⁶⁴ For the definition of “word” and “composition” see above notes 54 and 55.

GENRE	NUMBER OF WORDS	% OF TOTAL
Historical prose, treaties, edicts	7	4.6%
Correspondence	5	3.3
Administration	10	6.6
Instructions	3	2.0
Hippological	2	1.4
Laws	1	0.6
Depositions	2	1.4
Mythology (foreign)	3	2.0
Hymns	5	3.3
Rituals	38	25.4
Cult inventories	14	9.3
Omina	2	1.4
Oracle reports	13	8.6
Vows	5	3.3
Festival scenarios	15	10.0
Texts from Luwian milieu	23	15.4
Medical texts	2	1.4
<i>Total</i>	150	

The distribution leans heavily toward rituals, festivals, and texts with Luwian content that make up over 50% of the occurrences. The difference for each of these three groups in comparison with the 𐎶-marked words is very significant:

	𐎶-MARKED WORDS	UNMARKED
Rituals	7.5%	25.4%
Festival scenarios	7.5	10.0
Texts from Luwian milieu	4.6	15.4

On the other hand, there is an inverse relation in the following genres:

	𐎶-MARKED WORDS	UNMARKED
Historical prose, treaties, edicts	20.4%	4.6%
Correspondence	7.0	3.3
Depositions	5.4	1.4
Mythology (foreign)	7.7	2.0
Oracle reports	16.8	8.6
Vows	4.6	3.3

These shifts are reflected in the great majority of occurrences in texts from Group A (longer-term documents, multiple copies) as opposed to Group B (short-term documents, single copies only) among the unmarked Luwian words and forms:

A	101	67.3%
B	49	32.7

In dating this group also differs fundamentally. Whereas among the 𐎶-marked words we could identify only a single possible instance in a (late) Middle Script text (HKM 88:12 𐎶*annarā*),

there are contrary to the claims of Rieken and Melchert at least⁶⁵ eight, possibly nine,⁶⁶ different Middle Script manuscripts with unmarked unambiguous Luwian forms:

<i>akkurriyai</i>	third-person singular active present indicative	IBoT 1.36 iii 59	CTH ⁶⁷ 262
<i>zapzagaššanza</i>	plural dative-locative ⁶⁸	KBo 17.93:18	470
<i>zurkiyanza</i>	neuter singular nominative-accusative	KBo 21.41 reverse 22	480
<i>arnamitti</i>	third-person singular active present indicative	KUB 29.7 reverse 63 ⁶⁹	480
<i>kunzigannaḥiša</i>	neuter singular nominative-accusative	KBo 17.65 reverse 42	489
<i>šaḫhanza</i>	neuter singular nominative-accusative	KBo 29.92 reverse 5 ⁷⁰	693
<i>alaššiyanza</i>	neuter singular nominative-accusative	KUB 11.31 vi 5	700
<i>šarraššiyanza</i>	neuter singular nominative-accusative	KUB 11.31 vi 3	700
<i>murtanza</i>	neuter singular nominative-accusative	HKM 72:35	190
<i>arunainta</i>	third-person plural active preterite indicative	HKM 109:1	239
<i>mannāimminzi</i>	common plural nominative	KBo 23.50+ ii 23	433
<i>mannāimminza</i>	common plural accusative	KBo 23.51+ i 18, KBo 23.50+ iii 32 ⁷¹	433

Of these texts the CTH nos. 285, 480, 489, 693, and 700 originated in Kizzuwatna or came to Ḫattuša through southeast Anatolia in general. If we look for later copies of originally Middle Hittite compositions we count about thirty of those. On the other hand, the genres where we just observed a significantly lower number of Luwianisms in the unmarked group (historical prose/diplomatic records, administration, correspondence, cult inventories, oracle investigations, vows) all date to the thirteenth century (Muršili II and later). This means that we have a kind of complementary distribution: in the religious texts there was a higher tolerance for unmarked Luwian forms as opposed to the more secular genres of historical prose, diplomatic documents, and Group B texts where most Luwian forms were marked. In general, one can say that the numbers and percentages become even more pronounced when extending the material along the lines followed by Melchert.

⁶⁵ One might add to the following list of exclusively Luwian forms as well some present plural 1 verb forms ending in *-uni*: *tiyauni* ... SIG₅-*aḫhuni* (both 1691/u ii 18, CTH 375 - MH/MS), *ḫatrāuni* (KUB 14.1+ reverse 36, CTH 147 - MH/MS), mentioned by Hoffner 1997: 15. As remarked by Hoffner, a scribal error for the first two is unlikely. The interpretation of *šekkuni* in HKM 48: 24 (MH/MS) remains uncertain. Other possible Middle Script Luwian forms are neuter singular nominative-accusatives in *-ša*: *ḫanzarwiša* Bo 90/758: 3 in a land deed of Ḫantili II as edited by Rüster 1993: 64f. with commentary 68, ^{TV}*nirikkiš[a]* KBo 10.52:6 + KBo 15.16 ii 17, edited by Taracha 2000: 42 with commentary on p. 110, and the plant names *ankišša* and *gakkūšša* in the lexical list from Ortaköy (Ortaköy 95/3 ii 12, 13, 23) as edited by Süel and Soysal 2003: 349–65. Rieken (1997: 173 n. 35) also draws attention to the possible Luwian infinitive *āršūna* KBo 32.47a iii 8 (MH/MS).

⁶⁶ The tablet KBo 23.50+51++ containing the two forms at the end of the list (*mannāimminzi/a*) is given as “mh?”

in Košak's *Konkordanz*, which is the equivalent to Middle Script in the Chicago Hittite Dictionary system (see above n. 50).

⁶⁷ For CTH-numbers as a classification of genres, see above n. 57.

⁶⁸ Thus with Neu 1995: 399, although his analysis remains unclear and he does not comment on the apparently Luwian character of the form; Rieken (1997: 173 n. 35) rightly recognizes it as Luwian but prefers to take it as a neuter singular nominative-accusative.

⁶⁹ The fragment KUB 29.7 is part of the same tablet as the preceding entry KBo 21.41.

⁷⁰ Compare also *ibid.* iii 8, and perhaps obverse 11 as well as KBo 24.37 i 17. For a discussion, see Starke 1990: 228f.; CHD Š lists this and other attestations as ablative but where context is preserved an interpretation as accusative seems compelling to me.

⁷¹ The fragments KBo 23.51+KBo 20.107 are part of the same tablet as the preceding entry KBo 23.50.

The share of compositions from Kizzuwatna and (south)east Anatolia is considerable in the unmarked group, but not in that of the 𐎶-marked words as was already noted above. However, in the unmarked group we also find Luwian words in compositions that arose in the core area of the Hittite empire (e.g., the Deeds of Šuppiluliuma, the Annals of Muṣili, all the oracles, administrative texts, and cult inventories).

THE 𐎶-MARKED AND UNMARKED WORDS AND THE REST OF THE HITTITE LEXICON

Finally, we have to put the above numbers of Luwian words and forms into the wider perspective of the Hittite lexicon at large. “Hittite” here means all words used in Hittite context which includes Luwian, Hurrian, Hattian, and Semitic elements. The total number of different Luwian words from both groups comes to about 480. With an estimated 4,000 words in the known Hittite lexicon this brings the Luwian share of that lexicon to 12%. If we count all different words in Melchert’s list this number climbs to almost 600, equaling 15%.

THE PUBLIC

SOME PRELIMINARY CONCLUSIONS AND THE EARLIER VIEWS

The combined evidence of the 𐎶-marked words and the unmarked Luwian words suggests that Luwian interference in the form of words and inflected forms became prominent in the written record from the late fifteenth century onward.⁷² Unmarked words and forms seem well established in the fourteenth century if we look at the Middle Script manuscripts and the number of older compositions in that group in general. To what extent we may posit an increase for the thirteenth century is a difficult question. In absolute terms the numbers certainly go up and taking into account the chronological limitations of Group B texts, our numbers almost certainly are on the low side. Our sources, however, flow more generously over time and the overwhelming majority of the records dates to the thirteenth century. What the present evidence does unambiguously show is that *Glossenkeile* preceding Luwian words and forms were a relatively recent and “sudden” phenomenon that must have been introduced during the reign of Muṣili II (ca. 1318–1295 B.C.).⁷³ Looking at their distribution Luwianisms of both kinds were an accepted feature of religious texts, but they increasingly appear in secular genres from Muṣili onward, this time, however, accompanied by the wedges.

The presence of these Luwianisms in Hittite texts found and mostly written in the capital during roughly the last two centuries of the Hittite empire (ca. 1400–1200 B.C.) presupposes either intensive contact with Luwian speakers or the presence of many Luwians among the scribes in Ḫattuša. The wide range of forms and the heavy presence in the most ephemeral records with no literary or traditional character plead strongly against an explanation as frozen forms and phrases to heighten the literary tone of a composition or to showcase the erudition of a scribe or author. Both intensive contact with or the presence of many Luwian speakers amount to the same conclusion: the population of the Hittite heartland is likely to have consisted of many Luwian speakers.

⁷² Note also for this earlier period — as pointed out by Watkins (2004: 574) — the passage in the Instruction for the Royal Bodyguard IBoT 1.36 iv 45–46 (MS, ed. Güterbock and van den Hout 1991: 38f.) referring to orders given to some guardsmen in Luwian.

⁷³ Thus already Kammenhuber 1969: 262. Besides the one not quite certain instance already referred to (see n. 59) these wedges may have been used for other purposes already earlier, but the institutionalized use to highlight Luwian words dates to the reign of Muṣili II.

If indeed many scribes spoke Luwian as their first language, they must have been employed in all offices given the wide distribution over genres; as a consequence, they were not a special task force hired to write and copy Luwian compositions only, just as we know there were specialists for Akkadian language texts and probably also for Hurrian texts.⁷⁴ It is reasonable to assume they were probably recruited locally, which would again speak for many Luwian speakers in the local population. In turn, this would probably mean that they had not enough genuine Hittite speakers to fill those positions. This might *a fortiori* be true for non-scribal positions.⁷⁵ The inevitable conclusion of all this would have to be that Luwians formed the clear majority of the population in and around the capital.

If with Güterbock one were to assume that at sometime in the fifteenth century a contingent of Kizzuwatnean scribes immigrated into the capital that was otherwise Hittite speaking, the continued Luwian interference until the end of the Hittite empire would be difficult to explain.⁷⁶ Usually, immigrants living and working within a society speaking another language lose their language within three generations and often sooner.⁷⁷ By this measure, a generation of scribes that came in around 1425 B.C. would have completely assimilated linguistically by the middle of the fourteenth century. The first generation of immigrating scribes, moreover, may be expected to have written texts with mistakes influenced by their native Luwian, something which has thus far never been claimed.⁷⁸ Also, if this phenomenon was indeed due to the Kizzuwatnean cultural wave that seems to have been brought in with the coming of Tudḫaliya I toward the end of the fifteenth century, one wonders why there are so few Hurrian words with wedge markers.⁷⁹ It is more than likely there were Hurrian scribes in Ḫattuša whose task it was to write and copy Hurrian language texts whose number by far exceeds the Luwian corpus. If they had been asked to write Hittite texts as well one would expect many more of those. To be sure, especially in ritual texts and oracle reports there are very many Hurrian terms, but they are never marked and clearly belong to a very limited technical repertoire. What is more, in the corpus of ʾ-marked words and non-Hittite words that are unmarked, there are several hybrid forms that have a Hurrian stem and a Luwian ending.⁸⁰ All this brings back to mind Rosenkranz' initial observation that many ʾ-marked words belong to the sphere of daily life.⁸¹ The corpus of Luwian words in Hittite texts is indeed different in this respect from Hurrian as well as Hattian words that generally belong to specialized vocabulary.⁸²

Rosenkranz's later idea (1954, see above) that the temporary move to Tarḫuntašša under Muwatalli II in the first quarter of the thirteenth century was responsible for the rise of Luwians to Hittite court circles and that this would more easily explain the Luwian interference in the Hittite language is in my opinion not very likely either. The move proved short-lived when his succes-

⁷⁴ For Akkadian scribes at Ḫattuša, see Beckman 1983 and Klinger 1998. For Hurrian scribes, see Mascheroni 1984.

⁷⁵ Melchert forthcoming §4 reminds modern readers that our observations can only concern "a very small number of people," that is, the scribes, and that "we may assume that the overwhelming majority of the population was illiterate." In my opinion this only reinforces our conclusion that Luwian was widespread; if even the "learned" scribes mixed their Hittite with Luwian, how much more could we expect the common man to do so?

⁷⁶ Note, however, that according to Miller 2004 the Kizzuwatnean influence has been overestimated.

⁷⁷ See, for instance, Hamers and Blanc 2000: 296–98; see also the contribution to this volume by Christopher Woods.

⁷⁸ For the kind of mistakes one might expect, see above n. 42.

⁷⁹ See above n. 53.

⁸⁰ See, for example, CLL s.vv. *āḫrušḫit-*, *irimpit-*, *nišḫi-*, *šuntinna-*, *zuzḫit-*; for *allaššiya-*, *šarraššiya-*, see Haas and Wilhelm 1974: 125; for *zurki-*, see van den Hout 1984: 72.

⁸¹ Rosenkranz 1938: 278f.

⁸² For the latter, see the negative assessment of Melchert 2003: 15–22.

sor Urhiteššub moved the capital back and by the 1260s Ḫattušili III had reinstated the Ḫattuša scribal “dynasty” of Mittannamuwa.

As we saw earlier, Melchert suggests that Luwian words and forms might have been used to lend a composition a certain literary character.⁸³ He follows a similar line of thought when he calls the fact that thirteenth-century Hittite kings used Luwian and the hieroglyphic script in their monumental inscriptions “irrelevant for the question of Luwian as a spoken language in Hattusa.”⁸⁴ It is true that from inscriptions in, for instance, Latin on modern buildings and monuments we should not infer that Latin is in any way a spoken language in any of those societies. But the status of Latin as the language of learning and high culture *par excellence* and especially the widespread associations (without any necessary knowledge of Latin) of power and dominance harking back to the days of the Imperium Romanum cannot be compared to that of Luwian in second-millennium Anatolia.

If Luwian had been a kind of high (H) language variety one would have expected many compositions to have been written in Luwian, especially those that were to be solemnly deposited in a temple, often in the form of metal tablets. Of course one could argue that the clay copies that we have were all just drafts to be translated into Luwian for the official or engrossed version. This, however, seems quite inefficient and we should have found at least some drafts in Luwian as well. Moreover, one such engrossed copy in bronze does exist: the text of the treaty with Kuruntiya, vassal king of Tarḫuntašša, which once was deposited in several copies in several temples.⁸⁵ Although this treaty is even concluded with the king of a Luwian-speaking region, the entire text is in Hittite. Also, all historical narratives like the Annals of Muršili II or his biography of Šuppiliuma I that was to be transferred to a bronze tablet are known in Hittite only. Finally, if Luwian was added to texts to enhance their literary character, why do we find it so frequently in the most ephemeral texts like economic administration, oracles, and cult inventories?⁸⁶

The assumption that Hieroglyphic Luwian was the language and script of an old tradition or was chosen for reasons of prestige thus lacks in my opinion any basis. For all we know, Hittite should have been that language and yet Hittite kings chose Hieroglyphic Luwian for their large, publicly displayed inscriptions. Putting up such inscriptions for visitors from the Luwian-speaking areas outside the Halys basin without having a parallel version in some other medium (i.e., Hittite in cuneiform) for the supposedly local Hittite-speaking core population would seem strange and unwise from a propagandistic point of view.⁸⁷ A bilingual option, that is, the assumption of a society in central Anatolia containing a large Luwian-speaking component, seems the only realistic one. Without going into a discussion of literacy, the minimal sense these monuments have to make is that they must have been recognizable to Luwians as Luwian. And then still the question remains: Why only Luwian and not also Hittite?

⁸³ Melchert forthcoming §2.6. His observation that the terms *nū-* and *tummantiya-* as “ideal elements of a peaceful and ordered society” in the Old Hittite/Middle Script Myth of Telipinu (KUB 17.10) are far from colloquial is certainly true but only in a hypothesis that sees the relation between Hittite and Luwian as one of low (L) versus high (H) language. Note, however, that the presence of the goddess Kamrušepa in the same text could point at Luwian influence; compare Haas 1994: 439–41 and Hutter 2003: 230f.

⁸⁴ Melchert 2003: 13.

⁸⁵ This is Bo 86/299 edited by Otten 1988; for the list of places where the copies had been deposited, see the same text column iv 44–51 (edited by Otten 1988: 28f.).

⁸⁶ Neither is there any serious evidence for a Luwian kingdom or empire in the past that might have lived on in legends and that might have been a source for Luwian as a language of tradition. From the earliest beginnings of Hittite history it was the Hittites who dominated, starting with Anitta around 1750 B.C. and evident as well through the mention several times of the country Luwiya in the Old Hittite Laws where Luwiya appears as a closely related territory where Hittite Laws seem to have been in effect; on the earliest Luwian history, see Bryce 2003: 27–31.

⁸⁷ Compare the remarks by Versteegh 2002: 56, on the use of Sanskrit in political inscriptions outside India.

A DIFFERENT PICTURE: LUWIAN AS THE MAIN LANGUAGE IN THIRTEENTH-CENTURY ḪATTUŠA

Overseeing the evidence of ʾ-marked words, unmarked Luwian words and forms, the wider grammatical influence of Luwian on the Hittite language, the presence of the Hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions and seals, and adding the implied realities as just sketched, I would advocate a largely bilingual Hittite-Luwian society for the thirteenth century B.C. where the Hittites politically and militarily dominated an increasing Luwian-speaking or increasingly Luwian-speaking population.⁸⁸ The presence of the Luwian language as noted above betrays a substantial Luwian undercurrent in what we usually perceive as “Hittite” society in the core area of the empire. Despite this large presence it was the language of the Hittite ruling class that was the official language of the empire imposed on all its “employees.” As Trevor Bryce puts it: “the retention of this language would have helped reinforce the sense of dynasty, of unbroken family continuity through a succession of generations. [Hittite] was to remain the language of royalty throughout the period of the Hittite kingdom. This need not indicate continuing political supremacy by a particular group. Rather it reflects the retention of an important dynastic tradition.”⁸⁹

But the same employees were able to switch languages when needed. A rare example of code switching may be hidden in the alloglottography in the cuneiform Hittite text KBo 12.38. Alloglottography is defined as “the use of one language (L1) to represent an utterance in another language (L2) ... in such a way that the original utterance in L2 can be accurately and unambiguously recovered from the document in L1.”⁹⁰ As shown by Güterbock, Laroche, and Hawkins⁹¹ KBo 12.38 contains the text of two inscriptions that must have been executed in Hieroglyphic Luwian in the capital. One of the two texts can even be identified with the Hieroglyphic Luwian NIŞANTAŞ inscription in the Upper City of Ḫattuša. Hawkins explicitly calls it a draft for this Hieroglyphic Luwian inscription. Güterbock recognized how the beginning of the second text (ii 22–23: *ūk=za* ^dUTU-ŠI *tabarnaš* ^mKÜ.GA.[P]Ú-*aš* LUGAL.GAL LUGAL KUR ^{UR}[^UḪa]tti etc. “I am His Majesty, *tabarna*, Šuppiluliyama, Great King, King of Ḫatti” etc.) exactly follows the model of Hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions and not that of the usual cuneiform royal edicts and similar records (*kiššan/UMMA* NN: “Thus speaks NN”). So this is not an example of a bad translation but a deliberate phrasing of the text according to typical Hieroglyphic Luwian stylistic patterns by a court scribe intimately familiar with Luwian and able to switch from one to the other.⁹²

The choice of Luwian and the hieroglyphic script for public inscriptions from about 1300 B.C. onward can only be understood in this light. These monuments mainly addressed the majority of Luwian speakers in the Hittite heartland. The fact that no cuneiform Hittite versions were put up suggests that there may not have been a significant, larger Hittite-speaking population besides that of the ruling elite; they were making the propaganda but did not need persuading themselves. It does not have to mean (and most likely does not) that the population at large could read them,⁹³

⁸⁸ The latter implies a subtle but important shift from a society where Luwian and Hittite language speakers kept largely to themselves to one where through, for instance, intermarriage such divisions became less prominent and Luwian became more and more the language of daily life.

⁸⁹ Bryce 1998: 17f.

⁹⁰ Langslow 2002: 44f.

⁹¹ Güterbock 1967; Laroche 1969–1970; and Hawkins 1995: 58f.

⁹² Compare similarly Bolatti Guzzo and Marazzi 2004: 171, although in contrast to Hawkins they see Luwian as the source language in this case and Hittite as the target language.

⁹³ One should be careful with such claims, however. First of all, we should, of course, distinguish between active and passive literacy. Secondly, the hieroglyphic script was and is much simpler to learn and to memorize than the highly abstract cuneiform script. The iconographic inventory of signs, moreover, must have been much more recognizable to them than to us.

but Luwians would have recognized the medium and as a consequence (or at least the ruling class hoped so) their rulers as theirs.⁹⁴ The message of a public inscription is often not so much its contents but simply its being public in a specific form; the form itself is an important part of the message.⁹⁵ The choice, then, for this medium by the ruling elite was not inspired by “solidarity with the masses,” a notion rightly rejected by Melchert,⁹⁶ if understood as an expression of compassion. Rather, it was to send the message of alleged solidarity, a strategy to survive. On the one hand the ruling class considered it important to maintain the status of Hittite as the traditional and official language of power, on the other hand Luwian imagery in script and word was the perfect means not to alienate the majority of the population and to make state propaganda effective. Hittite as the official language of the state also makes it understandable why within the Hittite empire only Hittite Great Kings used cuneiform on their stamp seals. Given the fact that seals of officials give their name in hieroglyphic script only, the use of cuneiform seems to have been a royal prerogative. One could say the same of the Hittite text corpus in as far as all texts come from the royal archives and may be said to have been ultimately issued by the king.

How far the imposition of Hittite as the language of power could go can be seen in the fact that scribes in their appended private notes to official letters used Hittite.⁹⁷ The use of wedge markers can sometimes be understood along the same lines. The term *Glossenkeile* or gloss wedges is due to their use elsewhere in the ancient Near East as elucidations of words or phrases in a text.⁹⁸ They were inserted in the text following or near a term that needed explanation. Relatively rare is their use simply to signal words from a language other than that of the rest of the document, for instance, Hurrian words in otherwise Akkadian texts of the earlier or mid-fourteenth century in Syrian Qatna.⁹⁹ In these cases it has been assumed that Hurrian was the language of the local population with Akkadian as the administrative medium.¹⁰⁰ For the Hittite situation scholars have also taken them, albeit mostly implicitly, as calling attention to unusual, often non-Hittite elements in a text.¹⁰¹ Melchert compares the modern “sic,” which is commonly defined as an “editorial interpolation.”¹⁰² If we are right in assuming that the wedges were used for calling attention, that is, to warn readers that the following word was not Hittite, it seems simplest to assume a situation analogous to the one supposed for Qatna, where the scribes’ first language was Luwian and, to speak with Güterbock, at times they “were not able to rid themselves from their own Luwian idiom.”¹⁰³ Given the breadth of attestation and lexicon this implies a large Luwian-speaking contingent living right in the center and occupying many of the scribal positions.

Another consequence of the above regards the linguistic status of the Luwian words in Hittite context. Since the Hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions would address the same group of the population to which the scribes belonged that used the Luwian words in their texts, the 𐎶-marked and unmarked words would more likely be Hieroglyphic Luwian than Cuneiform Luwian regard-

⁹⁴ See Bolatti Guzzo and Marazzi 2004: 158. For the same phenomenon in rituals where a ruling elite uses local popular ritual elements in creating state rituals, see Gilan 2004.

⁹⁵ An interesting case of playing with this notion can be seen in downtown Amsterdam where a modern structure in postmodern style carries the “Latin” inscription *HOMO SAPIENS NON URINAT IN VENTUM*.

⁹⁶ See Melchert forthcoming §2.6.

⁹⁷ According to Melchert forthcoming §3.2 this would be an argument in favor of Hittite as a spoken language. This may certainly be true, but it could have been the preferred office language. It is interesting to note that Ferguson

(1959: 329), in his famous article on diglossia, gives “personal letters” as a typical H category.

⁹⁸ See Krecher 1957–1971.

⁹⁹ See Richter 2003: 171–76.

¹⁰⁰ See already Krecher 1957–1971: 438 and Richter 2003: 172.

¹⁰¹ See Rosenkranz 1938: 283f.; compare also Güterbock 1956: 119; for other uses of the wedges, see Souček 1957–1971: 440.

¹⁰² Thus Gibaldi 2003: 271; similarly *The Chicago Manual of Style* [Chicago, 2003] 464 [§11.69].

¹⁰³ Güterbock 1956: 138.

less whether one thinks of Cuneiform Luwian as an archaic dialect with Melchert or a sociolect with Starke.¹⁰⁴ The only morphological feature that separates Hieroglyphic Luwian from both Cuneiform Luwian and Hittite (see above) is the common plural accusative in *-nzi* as opposed to Cuneiform Luwian *-nza* and Hittite *-uš*. Looking at all the $\hat{\text{z}}$ -marked words there is only a single specifically Cuneiform Luwian common plural accusative $\hat{\text{z}}$ *tarpanallinza* “substitutes (in a substitute or scapegoat ritual)” KUB 24.5 reverse 16 (CTH 419).¹⁰⁵ Substitute rituals originated in southern Anatolia ranging from the west to Kizzuwatna in the east¹⁰⁶ so that this specific ritual could well be a genuine Cuneiform Luwian composition. This form, moreover, can be contrasted with one common plural accusative in *-nzi*: $\hat{\text{z}}$ *hutanuenzi* “?” KUB 8.63 iv 13 (CTH 347) which as a Cuneiform Luwian form would have been incorrectly used but would be correct according to Hieroglyphic Luwian grammar. In the corpus of unmarked Luwian words there are some more examples of such “incorrect” forms in *-nzi* in object function: *halalenzī* “clean, pure” KBo 11.2 i 10 (CTH 703), *marwāinzi* “dark” KUB 54.65 ii 11 (CTH 425), and *šehellinzi* “pure” IBoT 2.129 obverse 23 (CTH 574). Scribes make all kinds of mistakes, but using a wrong case form is rare. I am not saying that the $\hat{\text{z}}$ -marked and unmarked Luwian words and forms are all Hieroglyphic Luwian rather than Cuneiform Luwian but that our separation by script risks being artificial and that the possibility of Hieroglyphic Luwian material among the Cuneiform Luwian words should be seriously considered as was already cautiously suggested by Melchert.¹⁰⁷

The scenario sketched here for the socio-linguistic situation in the heartland of second-millennium Anatolia also fits the fact that with the abandonment of the capital by the ruling class shortly after 1200 B.C. the Hittite language and the cuneiform script disappeared forever from Anatolia. On the basis of the three Hittite-style Great kingships that emerged in the Karadağ-Kızıldağ area, in Elbistan-Karahöyük and Malatya/Karkamiš in the twelfth century B.C. it is assumed that the last Hittite ruler and his retinue moved in a southeast direction.¹⁰⁸ This is the same region where Luwian survived and where we see an almost explosive increase of Hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions in the early Iron Age.¹⁰⁹ Although they would have moved into an area formerly part of the Hittite empire, the Hittites apparently no longer had either the political or numerical weight to assert themselves as they had for the past 500 years. The former empire completely broke up and the language and its cuneiform script disappeared.

In a final speculation I may perhaps offer a possible scenario where “it went wrong”: what was the “tipping” point that may have given the Luwians the majority in the center of the empire making the eventual demise of the Hittite language only a matter of time? If we consider the rise and fall of languages along the lines of the punctuated equilibrium as proposed by Dixon,¹¹⁰ we

¹⁰⁴ That is, if he means by this a variety used for cult purposes especially.

¹⁰⁵ The duplicate KUB 36.94 reverse 12 has the singular $\hat{\text{z}}$ *tarpallin*, but the anaphoric demonstrative *apūš* in KUB 24.5 reverse 16 confirms the correctness of the Luwian plural there; see also Soysal 2004: 104 n. 12.

¹⁰⁶ See Janowski and Wilhelm 1993: 134–39.

¹⁰⁷ Melchert 2003: 173. A morphological feature shared by Hieroglyphic Luwian and Hittite but not by Cuneiform Luwian is the singular genitive in *-(a)š*. As is well known the Luwic languages together innovated in creating an adjectival genitive in *-assa/i-*. Whereas Hieroglyphic Luwian and Lycian retained the old Indo-European ending **-os* alongside the new formation, Cuneiform Luwian seems to have done away with *-aš* (< **-os*) completely

(cf. Hajnal 2000 and Melchert 2003: 186–88). Several of the $\hat{\text{z}}$ -marked words have genitives in *-aš*. Because of hybrid forms among both the $\hat{\text{z}}$ -marked and unmarked words where a Luwian stem is provided with a Hittite ending like, for example, an ablative in *-az* as opposed to a Luwian ablative *-ati*, or an plural accusative in *-uš* as opposed to a Luwian one in *-nza*, such genitives are usually labeled as “Hittite.” They are attested about as often hybrid ablatives: I know of eight ablatives in *-az* versus nine genitives in *-aš*. In fact, it would be better to leave that decision open since we could be dealing with genuine Hieroglyphic Luwian forms.

¹⁰⁸ For the inscriptions, see Hawkins 1988.

¹⁰⁹ See the map in Hawkins 2003: 142.

¹¹⁰ Dixon 1997.

should be looking for such a punctuation in the course of Hittite history. The more than twenty-year long epidemic during the last quarter of the fourteenth century may be a good candidate. According to Hittite sources the widow of one of the last Amarna pharaohs, possibly Tutankhamun, asked the Hittite King Šuppiluliuma I around 1325 B.C. for one of his sons to become her new husband and king in Egypt.¹¹¹ After having waited too long, Šuppiluliuma complied but the son was killed; the widow had to marry an Egyptian and the Amarna dynasty came to an end. Enraged, the Hittite Great King sent another son out on a punitive raid into Egyptian controlled territory in Syria and he returned to Ḫatti with prisoners of war. Among these prisoners an epidemic developed that spread and raged through Hittite territory for over twenty years according to Šuppiluliuma's second successor Muṣṣili II. Both Šuppiluliuma and his first successor Arnuwanda II fell victim to the illness which suggests that it went around in the capital itself. This is also the impression one gets from the so-called Plague Prayers of Muṣṣili where he threatens the gods that nobody would be left to bring them their offerings. The picture he paints is that of devastation and decimation of the population.¹¹² If we date the outbreak of the epidemic to 1323 B.C., it lasted into Muṣṣili's nineteenth regnal year or 1300/1299 B.C. If we suppose that the epidemic was confined to or had its greatest effect on the core part of the empire, the consequences for the population here may have been very serious. It may well be that as a result the Hittite administration was increasingly dependent on more peripheral areas for its labor force thereby setting in motion a reversal of the ethno-linguistic composition of that core area. This need may be reflected in the very large numbers of deportees from Luwian Arzawa in the west, Karkamiš in the southeast, and Azzi-Ḫayaša in the northeast, that Muṣṣili brought to the capital early in his reign. Especially the high number of inhabitants from Arzawa, where a form of Luwian (Muṣṣili mentions 66,000 + 15,000 + 4,000 = 85,000 deportees from there¹¹³) was spoken, must have significantly changed the demographic makeup of the core area and may in the end have proved fatal for Hittite as a language.¹¹⁴

FINAL THOUGHTS

Was Hittite society in the capital bilingual with the minority imposing its language as the official one where most Luwians spoke Hittite but not all Hittites knew Luwian?¹¹⁵ Or was there a situation of diglossia in which Hittite was the high (H) language variety and Luwian a low (L) language variety?¹¹⁶ A minority determining a nation's official language is nothing unusual, "so long as it is a minority of sufficient political weight."¹¹⁷ According to Hobsbawm half of the population of France did not speak French in 1789 and in Italy "only 2½% of the population used [Italian] for everyday purposes" around 1860.¹¹⁸ However, these were nations *in statu nascendi* where the ruling minority was to impose its language successfully to the detriment of regional

¹¹¹ For a full account of this affair and its aftermath, see Bryce 1998: 193–99, 223–25.

¹¹² Trevor Bryce (pers. comm. April 7, 2005) rightly warns me that "The Plague Prayers are highly emotional pleas which seek to present the plague in the most catastrophic light possible. They are not dispassionate historical sources of information."

¹¹³ See the listing in Hoffner (2002: 61) and also Bryce (2003: 61f.).

¹¹⁴ For such demographic changes as determining factors in language death, see also the contributions by William

Schniedewind and Paul Zimansky to this volume. An interesting consequence of this would be that if I am right in seeing Hieroglyphic Luwian as the form of Luwian spoken in the center rather than Cuneiform Luwian, the former would have been in all likelihood the Arzawan variant or one heavily influenced by it.

¹¹⁵ Compare Dixon 1997: 22f.

¹¹⁶ For diglossia in ancient language corpora, see Langslow (2002: 26–28) and Versteegh (2002: 54f., 66–70).

¹¹⁷ Hobsbawm 1990: 60.

¹¹⁸ Hobsbawm 1990: 60f.

vernaculars in centuries to come. The Hittite state, on the other hand, was already some 400 years old and had around 1300 B.C. during the reign of Muṣili just entered its last century; in hindsight it was a nation in decline. If there had been a time when Hittite was in full bloom at least in the Anatolian heartland, there may have been a shift at some point where Hittite had to cede its majority status to Luwian. The situation originally envisaged by Rosenkranz of Hittite as the standard language for more official and literary purposes but nobody's first language while Luwian was the real vernacular may be one step further in the possible decline of Hittite.

There may be no need, however, for an either/or opposition as convincingly argued by Kees Versteegh; vernacular and standard language can also be seen as two extremes in a linguistic continuum.¹¹⁹ The written record, especially if it is the "official" record, is notoriously unreliable. Our view of Hittite is almost certainly skewed by the one-sidedness of our evidence. To say that Luwian was the vernacular does not deny that Luwian linguistic expression had or may have had its own sophistication, but we hardly have an independent textual transmission to support it: practically all sources for both languages are documents issued by the Hittite state. We have only one extreme of the continuum.¹²⁰ Neither are there independent Luwian texts that might show its use as a widespread means of regular daily communication. Unmarked Luwian forms, whether genuinely Luwian or in a Hittite guise, may have been in the language for a long time before they reached a point of written acceptance where they may no longer have been felt as foreign. This is where the *Glossenkeilwörter* are so important; they show the contemporary awareness of Luwian interference and force us to consider the realities behind their use.¹²¹

NOTE TO APPENDICES A AND B

The *Appendices A* and *B* contain the Luwian material used in this study. *Appendix A* lists all words known to me preceded by one or two *Glossenkeile* (✓/∧) that can be considered Luwian, *Appendix B* all Luwian forms as given earlier that are not marked by *Glossenkeile*. All entries in both lists are ordered by CTH numbers. For the sake of brevity, words that are listed in Melchert's *Cuneiform Luvian Lexicon* are only referenced by volume and text number of the cuneiform edition (e.g., KBo 4.14, KUB 23.1, or ABoT 65). Attestations that are not in CLL get additional column and/or line numbers (e.g., KBo 5.4 reverse 29, KUB 26.32 i 12, or HKM 88:12). "Hattuṣili Apology" refers to the edition of this text in Otten 1981, and "Bronze Tablet" refers to the edition of this text in Otten 1988. If a reference in CLL is to the excavation number only (e.g., Bo 6447 or 1762/c) and the fragment has been published meanwhile, the excavation number is given in parentheses (KUB 48.80 (= Bo 6447) or KBo 41.200 reverse 14 (= 1762/c)).

The following list gives the groups of CTH numbers and the genres they correspond to as they are listed in the text:

¹¹⁹ See Versteegh 2002 on the relation of standard languages vis-à-vis vernaculars.

¹²⁰ Compare also the remarks of Watkins (2004: 552) on the virtually complete lack of dialectal variation consistent with the status of Hittite as a "literary language." Nevertheless, as Watkins rightly observes, the changes in Hittite over the course of its attestation are also consistent "with

the development of a spoken language. At the same time, the extensive Luvian elements ... would point to widespread use of Luwian and bilingualism."

¹²¹ Note also the hieroglyphic graffiti of at least ten scribes in several public places in Hattuša interpreted as advertisements by Dinçol and Dinçol 2002.

<i>Genre</i>	<i>CTH</i>
Historical prose, treaties, edicts	1–147, 211–216
Correspondence	151–210
Administration	221–250, 276–283
Instructions	251–275
Hippological	284–287
Laws	291–292
Depositions	293–297
Lexical lists	299–309
Translated literature	310–316
Mythology (Anatolian)	321–338
Mythology (foreign)	341–370
Hymns	371–389
Rituals	390–500
Cult inventories	501–530
Omina	531–560
Oracle reports	561–582
Vows	584–590
Festival scenarios	591–722
Texts from Hattian milieu	725–745
Texts from Palaic milieu	750–754
Texts from Luwian milieu	757–773
Texts from Hurrian milieu	774–791
Medical texts (CTH 808)	808
Unclassified fragments	832

APPENDIX A: ʾ/ʿ-MARKED LUWIAN WORDS

<i>CTH</i>	<i>GLOSS</i>	<i>ATTESTATION</i>
61	guršawar	KBo 3.4
61	šamlayaya-	KUB 14.24
61	ḫui(ya)-	KBo 3.4
61	tapar-	KBo 3.4
62	ḫuiduwaluwar	KBo 5.9
67	wiwida(i)-	KBo 5.4 reverse 29, 36
68	iyant-	KUB 6.41
68	tarpanalašša-	KBo 4.7
71	waššura(ya)-	KBo 4.8
81	arpa-	Hattušili Apology
81	ḫui(ya)-	Hattušili Apology
81	ḫumma-	Hattušili Apology
81	irmala-	Hattušili Apology
81	lulut-	Hattušili Apology
81	marḫ-	Hattušili Apology
81	marna-	Hattušili Apology
81	palahša-	Hattušili Apology
81	tapar-	Hattušili Apology
81	taḫušiya-	Hattušili Apology
81	dannatta/i-	Hattušili Apology

APPENDIX A: ʾ/ʿ-Marked Luwian Words (*cont.*)

CTH	GLOSS	ATTESTATION
81	karna-	Hattušili Apology
81	aršaniya-	Hattušili Apology i 32
81	ḫuwappa-	Hattušili Apology
81	arpaša-	Hattušili Apology
81	kuwaya-	Hattušili Apology
85	ḫupal-	KBo 6.29
85	maruwae-	KBo 6.29
85	arkammanalla-	KUB 23.127
85	warwalan-	KUB 21.37
86	šarl[a-	KUB 31.26:5
87	arannu-	KBo 4.12
89	kupiyat(i)-	KUB 21.29, KUB 23.123
90	ḫuwantala-	KUB 21.8
105	ḫuta-	KUB 23.1
105	upaḫili-	KUB 23.1
105	kugurniyaman-	KUB 23.1
105	kupiyat(i)-	KUB 23.1
105	tišša(i)-	KUB 23.1
106	ḫallapuwant-	KBo 4.10
106	ḫarmima-	KBo 4.10
106	ḫinnaru(wa)-	KBo 4.10
106	kantanna	KBo 4.10
106	kuwappal-	KBo 4.10
106	lapan(a)-	KBo 4.10
106	upatit-	KBo 4.10
106	warwalan-	KBo 4.10
106	nawila-	Bronze Tablet
106	wani(ya)-	KBo 4.10
106	zantalānu(wa)-	Bronze Tablet (= Bo 86/299)
106	lapanalli(ya)-	KBo 4.10, Brt.
106	lapan(a)-	Bronze Tablet
123	allalla-	KBo 4.14
123	aplušan	KBo 4.14
123	ḫalwatiya-	KBo 4.14
123	ḫiššalla-	KBo 4.14
123	kuwaya-	KBo 4.14
123	marša-	KBo 4.14
123	naḫḫuwa-	KBo 4.14
123	pappaša-	KBo 4.14
123	limma(n)-	KBo 4.14
123	pašattarma-	KBo 4.14
123	kuw(ay)ata-	KBo 4.14
123	mal(a)i-	KBo 4.14
123	kuw(ay)ta-	KBo 4.14
124	ḫurtiyant-	KUB 26.32 i 12
124	ḫarpanuwant-	KUB 26.32
124	iyant-	KUB 26.32
124	kuwayata-	KUB 26.32

APPENDIX A: ʌ/ʌ-Marked Luwian Words (cont.)

CTH	GLOSS	ATTESTATION
125	kuwayata-	KUB 26.33
126	ḫattalla/i-	KUB 26.25
126	kupiyat(i)-	KBo 12.30
126	mali-	KBo 12.30
126	zammuratt(i)-	KBo 12.30
176	annan	KUB 21.38
176	luppašti-	KUB 21.38
177	puškantatar	KUB 23.101
180	purpuriyaman-	KUB 23.85
181	kargaranti	KUB 14.3
181	pašiḫa(i)-	KUB 14.3
181	zaršiya-	KUB 14.3
181	uša(i)-	KUB 14.3
181	ḫašpa-	KUB 14.3
183	gursawar	KUB 26.91
186	anzanu-	KBo 18.48
186	annari-	KBo 18.48
187	upaššalla	KBo 18.24 i 11
190	annara?	HKM 88:12
192	iyašḫant-	KUB 19.23
192	karšantalla/i-	KUB 19.23
192	iyašḫanduwant-	KUB 19.23
203	parzašša/i-	KUB 40.1 reverse! 15
203	šiwari(ya)-	KUB 40.1
203	dayalla	KUB 40.1 reverse! 16
203	uwalla	KUB 40.1 reverse! 7
209	antari-	KBo 2.11
209	arkamman-	KUB 26.92
209	gaši-	KBo 2.11
209	puḫaršan[(-)]	KBo 18.23 obverse 11
210	tatta-x[KUB 60.65 reverse 2
210	tata-x?-yama	KUB 60.65 reverse 4
211	wašda-	KUB 23.13
212	zamurai-	KUB 40.33
212	arza-	KUB 40.49
214	ḫašpa-	KBo 16.22
214	kulani(ya)-	KUB 21.20
214	wanna[(-)]	KUB 48.80 (= Bo 6447)
215	palḫa-	KUB 60.81:4
239	arramma/i-	KUB 8.75
239	ašḫaimmattanašša/i-	KUB 8.75
239	ḫuiellari-	KUB 8.75
239	lalatašša/i-	KUB 8.75
239	muttanawann(i)-	KUB 8.78
239	paratašša/i-	KUB 8.75
239	tarpanutiya-	KUB 8.78, KBo 19.19, KBo 19.25
239	tapašuwant(i)-	KUB 8.75

APPENDIX A: ʿ/ʿ-*Marked Luwian Words (cont.)*

CTH	GLOSS	ATTESTATION
239	ašan(ašša/i)-	KUB 8.75
239	zaršiya-	KUB 8.79
241	parzaki-	KUB 42.22 r.c. 13
242	pišate-?	KUB 60.1:8
242	puriyalla/i-	KBo 18.153
244	pariyaššaima/i-	KUB 42.29
247	lalinaima/i	KUB 42.84
255	ḫalliya-	KUB 26.1
255	ḫuḫupa-	KUB 26.13
255	kukupalatar	KUB 26.1
255	kugurniyaman-	KUB 21.42
255	kuništayalla/i-	KUB 26.1, KUB 31.97
255	mazalla-	KUB 21.42
256	gallar	ABoT 56 iii 13
256	taparamaḫit-	ABoT 56
256	waškuit-	ABoT 56
261	katapenna-	KUB 31.84
264	ḫanḫaniya-	KUB 13.4, KUB 13.5
264	dur	KUB 13.4
264	zuwa-	KUB 13.4
293	ḫarpanalla/i-	KUB 13.35
293	lalama/i-	KUB 13.35
293	lawarr(iya)-	KUB 13.35
293	šallakartatar	KUB 13.35 i 25, iv 43
293	dušduma/i-	KUB 13.35
293	walwayalla/i-	KUB 13.35
294	mana-	KUB 31.76
295	tarpaša-	KUB 13.33
295	mientiš(n)-	KBo 3.15
295	mišti-	KUB 13.35
295	parzašša/i-	KUB 13.35
297	tarši(ya)-	KUB 31.71
297	ziyadu-	KUB 26.49
297	daddawant-	KUB 54.1 i 11
297	ul[i]?	KUB 52.93 obverse 2
297	zammurinu-	KUB 54.1 ii 20
297	zarta(-)enni-	KUB 60.98 reverse 12?
297	zela-	KUB 54.1 i 35
297	kunduriya(i)-	KUB 60.97 obverse 13
297	ḫaḫreške-	KUB 31.71+ ii 6
297	mal(a)i-	KUB 40.80
316	tarpi-	KBo 12.70
341	aggat(i)-	KUB 8.56
341	akkušša-	KUB 8.56, KBo 10.47
341	galpariwala-	KUB 8.51, KBo 10.47
341	niwalla/i-	KUB 8.48
341	pinta-	KUB 8.50
341	pittanummi-	KUB 8.50

APPENDIX A: ʌ/ʌ-Marked Luwian Words (*cont.*)

CTH	GLOSS	ATTESTATION
341	pulpuli-	KUB 8.53
341	šapp(a)-	KUB 8.50
341	winal	KUB 8.50
342	šaššumai	KUB 36.35
342	mišti-	KUB 36.35
343	niwaralla-	KUB 33.111, KUB 36.2
343	šuwaru-	KUB 36.2 ii 22
343	niwaralla-	KUB 33.111, KUB 33.112, KUB 36.2
343	zuwa-	KUB 36.5
345	ikunta	KUB 33.96, KUB 33.98
345	maltani-	KUB 33.106
345	šapidduwa-	KUB 33.113
345	tarpanalla/i-	KUB 33.96
345	gulluši(ya)-	KUB 33.106
345	tišša(i)-	KUB 36.12
346	ḫuwaḫuwanala-	KUB 36.25
346	laḫpa-	KUB 36.25 i 4
346	malušteya-	KUB 36.25
347	ḫaršanta(n)-	KUB 8.63
347	ḫutanu(i)-	KUB 8.63
348	puri-	KBo 26.82 obverse 8
349	tatta-	KUB 23.97
350	ḫanḫama(n)-	KUB 33.89
363	ḫapa(n)zuwalatar	KUB 24.7
378	kappilazza-	KUB 14.8
381	ḫuwayalla/i-	KUB 6.46
381	ziladuwa	KUB 6.46
381	kulani(ya)-	KUB 6.46
382	gulzattar	KBo 11.1
382	tarawi(ya)-	KBo 11.1 obverse 15
383	iyašḫanduwant-	KUB 14.7
389	auwalla-	KUB 36.96
389	awiyahḫa	KUB 36.96:12
389	mumuwa-	KUB 36.96
390	ḫurdant-	VS 100:2, 9(?)
391	mulatar	KBo 13.109, KUB 57.122 (= Bo 898)
395	nut-	KBo 11.14
401	iyawa(n)-	KUB 30.33
402	padumazzi(ya)	KUB 24.11
409	alli-	KUB 12.58
419	tarpalla/i-	KUB 36.94
419	tarpanalla/i-	KUB 24.5
431	wašša-	KUB 17.12
433	ḫaršanta(n)-	KUB 36.83
434	šamma/i-	KBo 20.82 ii 30, 35, 37
434	ušantari(ya)-	KUB 58.108
441	ammašša-	KUB 12.26
441	wašan	KUB 12.26 ii 26

APPENDIX A: ʌ/ʌ̃-Marked Luwian Words (cont.)

CTH	GLOSS	ATTESTATION
448	ḫalḫalzana/i-	KUB 24.12
448	mammanna-	KUB 24.12
450	uruhḫi-	KUB 39.41 i 10
451	lila(i)-	KUB 30.27
470	aranati(ya)-	KBo 13.200
470	luppašduwala/i-	KUB 60.137
470	šalupz[a(-)]	KBo 7.56
470	ušantarahit-	KBo 13.104
485	kattawatnalla/i-	KUB 58.73
492	luḫa-	KUB 17.20, 1516/u
492	dummanteya-	KUB 17.20
492	ušašša/i-	KUB 17.20
495	zazkitalla/i-	KUB 46.42
500	artalliyama/i-	KUB 44.50
500	šuwaru-	KUB 44.50 i? 10
501	ḫupitawant-	KUB 38.1
501	lupanauwant-	KUB 38.1
502	ḫupitawant-	KUB 38.3
504	kinzalpa-	KUB 12.1
505	ḫašḫannari-	KBo 2.7
505	kummayanna/i-	KBo 2.13
505	dupša-	KBo 2.7, KBo 2.13
505	kulani(ya)-	KBo 2.7
509	titaimma/i-	KBo 2.1
509	walipattašša/i-	KUB 2.1
514	duppaun[-]	KUB 38.4
518	larella	IBoT 2.131
518	lapanalla/i-	IBoT 2.131
518	lapan(a)-	IBoT 2.131
519	zuzunimma/i-	KBo 2.8
519	ḫupitawant-	KBo 2.8
524	tarmattar	KUB 38.25
525	ḫurpušta-	KUB 17.35
530	alattar	KUB 42.91
530	ariaz[i(-)] ?	KuSa 6 reverse 8
530	mallitiwalla/i-	KUB 42.91
530	parašamešmašša/i-	KuSa 6 reverse 10
530	taḫarimaima/i-	KuSa 6 reverse 11, KuSa 7:1?
530	ušantara(ya)-	1167/z
557	šaruš-	KUB 18.1
561	arpa-	KUB 5.1
562	putalli(ya)-	KUB 40.106 (= Bo 5607)
566	atupalašša/i-	KUB 22.70
566	pinkit-	KUB 22.70
566	walantalamma/i-	KUB 22.70
566	takkišra/i-	KUB 22.70
566	marušama/i-	KUB 22.70
566	wašda-	KUB 22.70

APPENDIX A: ʌ/ʌ-Marked Luwian Words (*cont.*)

CTH	GLOSS	ATTESTATION
569	arandaz	KUB 16.77
569	aršula(i)-	KUB 16.32
569	ḫazziwit-	KUB 16.77
569	zappantalla(i)-	KUB 16.77, KUB 49.93:3
569	šakkuriya-	KBo 9.151:2, KUB 50.6 ii 52
570	šaḫuidara-	KUB 6.2
570	šarqaza	KUB 52.34 obverse 5
570	malḫaššallahit-	KUB 5.6
570	iyant-	KUB 22.31
570	kuwayata-	KUB 22.52
572	šalta-x-li-	KUB 18.58
572	kulan-	KBo 13.76
572	iyant-	KUB 6.5, KUB 22.42
573	pallašarinu(wa)-	KUB 6.12
573	tita/i-	KUB 49.19 iii 27?
574	kiša(i)-	KUB 18.24
575	arpa-	KBo 23.117
575	lulut-	IBoT 1.33
577	ḫapuš-	KUB 16.66:6, 7
577	mantalla/i-	KUB 16.17
577	mataššu	KBo 2.2
577	parataššata-	KBo 24.126 obverse 29
577	paštari(ya)-	KUB 18.57
577	šargašamma/i-	KUB 5.24
577	tapašša-	KBo 2.2
577	urana(i)-	KBo 23.112:3, 4
577	paštarnuwa-	KUB 5.24
577	arpa-	KUB 52.49 ii 2
577	šargašamma/i-	KUB 16.31
577	wiḫu-x[KBo 41.200 reverse 14 (= 1762/c)
578	ašanay(a)-	KUB 5.5
578	parri(ya)-	KUB 22.61
578	maliyašḫa-	KUB 49.92 iv 4
578	gallaratar	KUB 5.5 ii 28
579	ḫuwalli-	KUB 22.40 iii 17
579	nan(a)i-	KUB 22.40
579	tišša(i)-	KUB 5.9
579	tiššalli-	KUB 5.9
580	šurašura-	KUB 18.9 ii 8
582	ḫaḫḫaluwant(i)-	KUB 6.15
582	ḫallapa-	KUB 16.2
582	ipatarma-	KUB 16.57
582	naduwan(t)-	KUB 52.91 iii 3
582	tarrawi(ya)-	KUB 6.15
582	ipru-xxx	KBo 44.210 reverse 17
582	maliya-	KUB 18.46
582	marušama/i-	Msk. 74.57:30
582	tiwatani(ya)-	KUB 18.3

APPENDIX A: ʌ/ʌ̄-Marked Luwian Words (cont.)

CTH	GLOSS	ATTESTATION
582	walwaḫišsar	KBo 31.32:5
582	duwi(?)pa	KuSa 14 reverse 1
582	ziddari-	Msk. 74.57+98:53?
582	arpa-	KBo 22.260
582	ipatarma-	KUB 22.17
582	lawarr(ia)-	KBo 44.210
582	šargašamma/i-	KUB 6.6
582	šardi-	KUB 52.91 ii 5
584	ḫuwahḫuwartalla-	KUB 15.23
584	purani	391/w iii 7, 9, 15
584	šanduri-	KUB 31.77 i 20, 25
584	talla-	KUB 15.3 i 20?
584	ušan-x[KUB 31.77 iii 14
584	mataššu-	KUB 15.3
590	arraḫḫani(ya)-	KUB 15.12
590	ḫul[a-	KUB 60.60 r.c. 11
590	iparwašḫa-	KUB 15.26
590	gaštarḫaiya-	KBo 9.96
590	kuwarayalla/i-	KUB 15.12
590	piḫatt-	KUB 56.28 reverse 26
590	titita/i-	KUB 56.28 obverse 8
590	tuwant-	KUB 56.28 reverse 10, 11
590	warpa/i-	KBo 9.96
590	palayanalliya(n)-	KUB 48.126 i 11
590	tapar-	KBo 8.63 i 10
590	ḫelwati-	KUB 56.28 reverse 12
600	luppašti-	KUB 36.97
617	annari-	KUB 10.81
628	marani	KUB 59.60 iii 4, 5
628	ḫauni	KUB 59.60 iii 4, 5
628	kur(a)i-	KUB 51.27
638	uraliya-	KBo 13.256 (= 2184/g)
641	tuwaš-	KBo 29.213
655	luḫa-	KBo 3.65
669	nikrani-	KUB 10.91
671	marwatar	KUB 36.89
671	ipatarmay(a)-	KUB 36.89
671	lalama/i-	KUB 36.89
672	alpašša/i-	KBo 2.4
672	gaḫari-	KBo 2.4
672	tarwa(na)šša/i-	KBo 2.4
678	alalanima/i-	KUB 57.112 reverse 4
682	ḫaladdašša/i-	KUB 2.1
682	tarpatta-	KBo 2.38
682	ḫandattašša/i-	KBo 2.38
682	ḫišda	KBo 12.59
682	paraštarrašša/i-	KUB 2.1
682	lapan(a)-	KUB 2.1

APPENDIX A: ʌ/ʌ-Marked Luwian Words (*cont.*)

CTH	GLOSS	ATTESTATION
682	lapan(a)-	KUB 44.16
691	ḥappinant-	KUB 17.24
692	man-na-	KUB 27.52
701	unatiwala/i-	KBo 23.42
712	ḥuwart(i)-	KUB 37.1
716	dummanteya-	KBo 2.9
717	iši-	KUB 24.7
765	ḥuwanda-	KUB 44.4
765	zallawar	KUB 44.4
765	ḥaršani-	KUB 44.4
765	kuwar(i)	KUB 44.4
765	mannaima/i-	KUB 44.4
765	mutti(ya)-	KUB 44.4
765	palpadama/i-	KUB 44.4
765	papartaman-	KUB 44.4
765	patalḥa(i)-	KUB 44.4
765	dannamma/i-	KUB 44.4
765	dawalli(ya)-	KUB 44.4
765	dummantiyal	KUB 44.4
765	zalli(ya)-	KUB 44.4
765	zam(n)ant(i)-	KUB 44.4, KBo 13.241
765	zunni(ya)-	KUB 44.4
765	duwa/i-	KUB 44.4
765	palḥa-	KUB 44.4
770	apparant(i)-	KUB 35.130
781	mišti-	KUB 36.36
790	puri-	KUB 45.26 ii 7
808	mamanaš(a)-	KUB 37.1
832	kuwalumuš	KUB 58.89 obverse 5
832	dumman(t)-	KUB 58.89 obverse 4
832	duwadu-	2025/g
832	wira-	IBoT 3.7
832	malwana(nt)-	KBo 40.223:4, 6
832	arraḥḥani(ya)-	KBo 13.50

APPENDIX B: UNMARKED LUWIAN WORDS

<i>CTH</i>	<i>LUWIAN</i>	<i>ATTESTATION</i>
40	iyas̥ha-	KBo 5.6
61	pawari(ya)-	KUB 14.20
61	tapar-	KUB 19.29
62	damaš-	KBo 5.9
81	taḥušiya-	Hatt.
89	mazzallaša-	KUB 21.29
106	nuratašša/i-	Br. 106
181	pašiḥa(i)-	KUB 14.3
182	šiwari(ya)-	KUB 19.55
190	murta-	HKM 72 reverse 35
203	pašiḥa(i)-	KUB 40.1 obverse 9
209	alalu-	KUB 21.40
224	aš-	KUB 26.58
225	ḥuramman-	KUB 26.43
239	aruna(i)-	HKM 109 obverse 15
241	lakkuššanzani-	KBo 18.175
241	aḥḥuwatar	KUB 42.19
245	kulaima/i-	KUB 42.69
245	lalinaima/i-	KUB 42.69
245	lammamma/i-	KUB 42.69
250	palšuwān-	KUB 42.75
257	ḥapalli(ya)-	KUB 31.100
259	ziyadu-	KUB 13.20
262	akurriya(i)-	IBoT 1.36 iii 59
279	nuḥḥari(ya)-	KUB 8.36
284	zalla-	KBo 3.5
285	taštari(ya)-	KUB 29.44
291	karmalašša-	KUB 6.4
294	mana-	KUB 31.76
297	zuzunni(ya)-	KUB 43.76
342	ḥalanza-	KUB 36.35
363	pašš-	KUB 24.7
370	ḥappinatta-	KUB 36.49
372	wenal	KUB 31.127
376	lauwar-	KUB 24.3
378	kappilazza-	KUB 14.10/11
380	ammašša-	KBo 4.6
386	ḥalwatnazza-	KUB 36.88
390	parti(ya)-	KBo 3.8
391	ḥurtalla/i-	KUB 27.67
395	lilipa-	KBo 11.14
398	puwa(i)-	KBo 4.2
409	tiyanešš-	KUB 7.53
409	ḥartuwahartu-	KUB 12.58 (= Tunn.)
412	ḥurkilašša/i-	KUB 35.148
412	zida/i-	KUB 35.148
412	tiwatani-	VBoT 111

APPENDIX B: Unmarked Luwian Words (cont.)

CTH	Luwian	Attestation
425	mura/i-	KUB 7.54
425	marway(a)-	KUB 54.65
431	kuwal(a)i-	KUB 17.12
431	partanna/i-	KUB 17.12
431	warmanna/i-	KUB 17.12
433	mannaima/i-	KBo 23.50/51
448	ḫaššuwašša/i-	KUB 12.16 i 10
450	šamamma(n)-	KUB 39.7 ii 17
457	ušantaray(a)-	KUB 35.84
461	tišnit-	KUB 44.64
470	šitarni(ya)-	KBo 38.209 (= 1153/c)
470	zapzagašša/i-	KBo 17.93:18
470	paḫḫit-	KBo 38.209:2 (= 1153/c)
470	zurki(ya)-	KUB 58.57 i? 11, 14
471	nišḫi- (hurr.)	KBo 5.2
471	šuntinna- (hurr.)	KBo 5.2
475	nathit-	KBo 31.110 right column 7
476	paḫḫit-	KBo 5.1
477	paḫḫit-	Bo 4951
477	kunzigannaḫit-	Bo 4951
479	katmarši-	KUB 30.31
480	zurki(ya)-	KBo 21.41+ reverse 22
480	arnami(ya)-	KUB 29.7
481	arnami(ya)-	KUB 29.4, KBo 8.90
481	šarlatta-	KUB 29.4
489	kunzigannaḫit-	KBo 17.65
495	lila(i)-	KUB 17.32, KUB 46.38
500	painit-	KBo 31.149 (= 258/d)
500	paḫḫit-	KBo 22.135
504	kiklibaima/i-	KUB 12.1
504	mallitalla/i-	KUB 12.1
504	šakantama/i-	KUB 12.1
504	tittalitaimma/i-	KUB 12.1
504	aḫḫuwatar	KUB 12.1
504	baštaima/i-	KUB 12.1
504	lalinaima/i-	KUB 12.1
507	ḫupita(wa)nt-	KUB 38.26
508	wattattar	KUB 38.32
509	anna/i-	KBo 2.1
510	tarmaima/i-	KUB 38.6
519	zuzunni(ya)-	KBo 2.8
522	kurutauwant-	KBo 26.147:8
522	ḫupita(wa)nt-	KBo 26.147:2
552	ḫappi(ya)-	KUB 4.1
552	muwizza-	KUB 4.1
564	zaḫarliti-	KUB 18.12
569	gulzattar	KUB 50.6

APPENDIX B: Unmarked Luwian Words (*cont.*)

CTH	LUWIAN	ATTESTATION
569	mantalli(ya)-	KBo 2.6
570	dammara-	KUB 5.6
570	lalatta-	KUB 22.67
572	ḫatarni(ya)-	KUB 22.37
574	šeḫelli(ya)-	IBoT 2.129
574	purulliyašša/i-	KUB 16.35, IBoT 2.129
577	aštaniya-	KBo 24.126
579	kangat(a)i-	KUB 22.40
579	duddu(wa)-	KUB 22.40
582	mantalli(ya)-	KUB 22.35
582	tamma/i-	VBoT 25
584	targašnalli(ya)-	KUB 31.71
590	papartama/i-	KBo 44.226 obverse 14
590	-ḫju?wanaššari	KUB 31.67
590	ḫapuš-	KBo 31.169 (= 342/f)
590	kunzigannaḫit-	KUB 56.30 reverse 3
616	kaluti(ya)-	KUB 20.59
628	irḫatta-	KUB 20.74
641	nathit-	KUB 40.2
670	zuzḫitašša/i- (hurr.)	643/z
671	ḫalwatnazza-	KUB 36.89
691	šuwatar	KUB 27.59
693	šaḫḫan	KBo 29.92 (= 509/d+)
694	šuwatar	KUB 46.51, KBo 29.65
700	alaššiya-	KUB 11.31 vi 5
700	šarrašša/i- (hurr.)	KUB 11.31 vi 3
700	kullit-	KBo 10.34
702	gulza(i)-	KUB 9.2
703	ḫalal(i)-	KBo 11.2
706	irimpit- (hurr.)	KUB 10.92
707	alalu-	KBo 17.103
757	tata/i-	KUB 9.31
761	ḫaliyatta-	KUB 35.33
764	arraḫḫani(ya)-	KBo 12.89
764	tapašallat(i)-	KBo 12.100
764	wašummaniyauil(i)-	KBo 12.100
765	putalli(ya)-	KUB 44.4
767	ḫalta-	KUB 35.145
767	malwara-	KUB 35.145
767	palḫama/i-	KUB 35.145
767	šapartara-	KUB 35.143, KUB 35.145
767	taḫḫara	KUB 35.145, KUB 35.144, KUB 17.15
767	dunduma/i-	KUB 35.145
768	alašša/i-	KUB 60.59 (= Bo 1391)
770	alašša/i-	VBoT 60
770	annarumm(i)-	VBoT 60
770	anni-	HT 82
770	karš-	VBoT 60

APPENDIX B: Unmarked Luwian Words (cont.)

CTH	LUWIAN	ATTESTATION
770	la-	VBoT 60
770	lala-	VBoT 60
771	šawatar	KUB 25.37
772	awi-	KUB 55.38
772	immara/i-	KBo 44.200 i? 8
772	nirikkit-	KBo 14.121
808	pattur/n-	KUB 37.1
808	puwa(i)-	KUB 37.1
831	šunnuwanti-	KBo 19.155

ABBREVIATIONS

Bo	Inventory number of Boğazköy tablets excavated 1906–1912.
CHD	The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, edited by H. G. Güterbock, H. A. Hoffner, and Th. P. J. van den Hout. Chicago: The Oriental Institute, 1989–.
CLL	Cuneiform Luvian Lexicon, by H. C. Melchert. Lexica Anatolica 2. Chapel Hill, 1993.
CTH	Catalogue des textes hittites, by E. Laroche. Paris: Klincksieck, 1971.
EA	Die El-Amarna-Tafeln, by J. A. Knudtzon. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1915.
HKM	S. Alp. Hethitische Keilschrifttafeln aus Maşat-Höyük (Atatürk Kültür, Dil ve Tarih Yüksek Kurumu, TTKYayın VI/34) — Ankara 1991.
IBoT	İstanbul Arkeoloji Müzelerinde Bulunan Boğazköy Tabletleri(nden Seçme Metinler) — İstanbul 1944, 1947, 1954, Ankara 1988.
KBo	Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi (vols. 1–22 are a subseries of WVDOG) — Leipzig, Berlin.
KUB	Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi — Berlin.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, B.
1983 *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Aro, S.
2003 “Art and Architecture.” In *The Luwians*, edited by H. C. Melchert, pp. 281–337. *Handbuch der Orientalistik* 68. Leiden: Brill.
- Beckman, G.
1983 “Mesopotamians and Mesopotamian Learning at Ḫattuša.” *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 35: 97–114.
- Bolatti Guzzo, N., and M. Marazzi
2004 “Storiografia hittita e geroglifico anatolico: Per una revisione di KBo 12.38.” In *Šarnikzel: Hethitologische Studien Zum Gedenken an Emil Orgetorix Forrer*, edited by D. Groddek and S. Röble, pp. 155–85. Dresden: Technische Universität.
- Bryce, T. R.
1998 *The Kingdom of the Hittites*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
2003 “History.” In *The Luwians*, edited by H. C. Melchert, pp. 27–127. *Handbuch der Orientalistik* 68. Leiden: Brill.

- Cancik, H.
1976 *Grundzüge der hethitischen und alttestamentlichen Geschichtsschreibung*. Abhandlungen des Deutschen Palästinavereins. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Carruba, O.
2003 *Anittae Res Gestae*. Studia Mediterranea 13. Pavia: Italian University Press.
- Catsanicos, J.
1994 Review of *Hethitisches Zeichenlexikon: Inventar und Interpretation der Keilschriftzeichen aus den Boğazköy-Texten*, by Chr. Rüster and E. Neu 1989. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 99: 301–35.
- Diñçol, A.
1989 “Mizrakucu Üzerindeki Hiyeroglif Yazıt/The Hieroglyphic Signs on the Spearhead.” In *Protohistorik Çağ Silahlari*, edited by Ç. Anlağan and B. Önder, pp. 103–04. Istanbul: Vehbi Koç Vakfı.
- Diñçol, A., and B. Diñçol
2002 “Die ‘Anzeigen’ der öffentlichen Schreiber in Hattuscha.” In *Anatolia Antica: Studi in memoria di Fiorella Imparati*, edited by St. de Martino and F. Pecchioli Daddi, pp. 207–15. Eothen 11. Florence: LoGisma Editore.
- Dixon, R. M. W.
1997 *The Rise and Fall of Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Emre, K., and A. Çınaroğlu
1993 “A Group of Metal Hittite Vessels from Kınık/Kastamonu.” In *Aspects of Art and Iconography: Anatolia and Its Neighbors: Studies in Honor of Nimet Özgüç*, edited by M. Mellink, E. Porada, and T. Özgüç, pp. 684–703. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Ferguson, C. A.
1959 “Diglossia.” *Word* 15: 325–40.
- Gibaldi, J.
2003 *MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers*. New York: Modern Language Association of America.
- Gilan, A.
2004 “Sakrale Ordnung und politische Herrschaft im hethitischen Anatolien.” In *Offizielle Religion, lokale Kulte und individuelle Religiosität* (Akten des religionsgeschichtlichen Symposiums “Kleinasien und angrenzende Gebiete vom Beginn des 2. bis zur Mitte des 1. Jahrtausends v. Chr.,” Bonn, 20.–22. Februar 2003), edited by M. Hutter and S. Hutter-Braunsar, pp. 189–205. *Alter Orient und Altes Testament* 318. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- Forthcoming “Die hethitischen ‘Mannestaten’ und ihre Adressaten” In *Acts of the 5th International Congress of Hittitology, Çorum, 2–6 September 2002*.
- Güterbock, H. G.
1956 “Notes on Luwian Studies. (À propos B. Rosenkranz’ Book *Beiträge zur Erforschung des Luvischen*).” *Orientalia* 25: 113–40.
- 1967 “The Hittite Conquest of Cyprus Reconsidered.” *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 26: 73–81.
- Güterbock, H. G., and T. Kendall
1995 “A Hittite Silver Vessel in the Form of a Fist.” In *The Ages of Homer: A Tribute to Emily Townsend Vermeule*, edited by J. B. Carter and S. P. Morris, pp. 45–60. Austin: University of Texas.
- Güterbock, H. G., and Th. van den Hout
1991 *The Hittite Instruction for the Royal Bodyguard*. Assyriological Studies 24. Chicago: The Oriental Institute.
- Haas, V.
1994 *Geschichte der hethitischen Religion*. Handbuch der Orientalistik 15. Leiden: Brill.
- Haas, V., and G. Wilhelm
1974 *Hurritische und luwische Riten aus Kizzuwatna*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.

- Hajnal, I.
2000 "Der adjektivische Genetivausdruck der luwischen Sprachen (im Lichte neuerer Erkenntnis)." In *125 Jahre Indogermanistik Graz: Festband anlässlich des 125-jährigen Bestehens der Forschungsrichtung "Indogermanistik" an der Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz*, edited by M. Ofitsch and Chr. Zinko, pp. 159–84. Arbeiten aus der Abteilung Vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft 15. Graz: Leykam.
- Hamers, J. F., and M. H. A. Blanc
2000 *Bilinguality and Bilingualism*. Second edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Haugen, E.
1966 "Dialect, Language, Nation." *American Anthropologist*, n.s., 68: 922–35.
- Hawkins, J. D.
1988 "Kuzi-Tešub and the 'Great Kings' of Karkamiš." *Anatolian Studies* 38: 99–108.
1995 *The Hieroglyphic Inscription of the Sacred Pool Complex at Hattusa (SÜDBURG)*. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten Beiheft 3. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
1997 "A Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscription on a Silver Bowl in the Museum of Anatolian Civilizations, Ankara." In *Anadolu Medeniyetleri Müzesi (1996 Yılığ)*, pp. 7–24. Ankara: Anadolu Medeniyetleri Müzesi.
2003 "Scripts and Texts." In *The Luwians*, edited by H. C. Melchert, pp. 128–69. Handbuch der Orientalistik 68. Leiden: Brill.
- Hawkins, J. D., and D. F. Easton
1996 "A Hieroglyphic Seal from Troia." *Studia Troica* 6: 111–18.
- Hawkins, J. D., and F. Starke
1980 "The Logogram 'LITUUS' and the Verbs 'to See' in Hieroglyphic Luwian." *Kadmos* 19: 123–48.
- Hobsbawm, E. J.
1990 *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hoffner, H. A.
1980 "Histories and Historians of the Ancient Near East: The Hittites." *Orientalia* 49: 283–332.
1997 "On Safari in Hittite Anatolia: Remarks on a Middle Hittite Letter from Mašat." In *Studies in Honor of Jaan Puhvel 1: Ancient Languages and Philology*, edited by D. Disterheft, Martin Huld, and John Greppin, pp. 5–21. Journal of Indo-European Studies Monograph 20. Washington, D.C.: Institute for the Study of Man.
2002 "The Treatment and Long-Term Use of Persons Captured in Battle According to the Mašat Texts." In *Recent Developments in Hittite Archaeology and History: Papers in Memory of Hans G. Güterbock*, edited by K. A. Yener, H. A. Hoffner, Jr., and Simrit Dhesi, pp. 61–72. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Houwink ten Cate, Ph. H. J.
1970 *The Records of the Early Hittite Empire (c. 1450–1380 B.C.)*. Uitgaven van het Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut te Istanbul 26. Istanbul: Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut in het Nabije Oosten.
- Hutter, M.
2003 "Aspects of Luwian Religion." In *The Luwians*, edited by H. C. Melchert, pp. 211–80. Leiden: Brill.
- Ivanov, V. V.
2001 "Southern Anatolian and Northern Anatolian as Separate Indo-European Dialects and Anatolian as a Late Linguistic Zone." In *Greater Anatolia and the Indo-Hittite Language Family* (Papers presented at a colloquium at the University of Richmond, 18–19 March 2000), edited by R. Drews, pp. 131–83. Journal of Indo-European Studies Monograph Series 38. Washington, D.C.: Journal of Indo-European Studies.
- Janowski, B., and G. Wilhelm
1993 "Der Bock, der die Sünden hinausträgt. Zur Religionsgeschichte des Azazel-Ritus Lev 16,10.21f." In *Religionsgeschichtliche Beziehungen zwischen Kleinasien, Nordsyrien und dem Alten Testament: Internationales Symposium, Hamburg, 17.–22. März, 1990*,

- edited by B. Janowski and Gernot Klaus Koch, pp. 109–69. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Kammenhuber, A.
 1959 “Zur hethitisch-luvischen Sprachgruppe.” *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft* 76: 1–26.
 1969 “Die Sprachstufen des Hethitischen.” *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft* 83: 256–89.
- Kellerman, G.
 1986 “The Telipinu Myth Reconsidered.” In *Kaniššuwat: A Tribute to Hans G. Güterbock on His Seventy-fifth Birthday, May 27, 1983*, edited by H. A. Hoffner, Jr. and G. Beckman, pp. 115–23. Assyriological Studies 23. Chicago: The Oriental Institute.
- Klinger, J.
 1992 “Fremde und Außenseiter in Hatti.” In *Außenseiter und Randgruppen: Beiträge zu einer Sozialgeschichte des Alten Orients*, edited by V. Haas, pp. 187–212. Xenia 32. Konstanz: Universitätsverlag.
 1998 “Wer lehrte die Hethiter das Schreiben? Zur Paläographie früher Texte in akkadischer Sprache aus Boğazköy: Skizze einiger Überlegungen und vorläufiger Ergebnisse.” In *III. Uluslararası Hititoloji Kongresi Bildirileri, Çorum 16–22 Eylül 1996*, edited by S. Alp and A. Süel, pp. 365–75. Ankara: Uyum Ajans.
- Krecher, J.
 1957–1971 “Glossen.” In *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und vorderasiatischen Archäologie*, Band 3, edited by Ernst Weidner and Wolfram von Soden, pp. 431–40. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Langslow, D. R.
 2002 “Approaching Bilingualism in Corpus Languages.” In *Bilingualism in Ancient Society: Language Contact and the Written Text*, edited by J. N. Adams, M. Janse, and S. Swain, pp. 23–51. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Laroche, E.
 1969–1970 “Nišantaş.” *Anatolica* 3: 93–98.
 1976–1977 *Glossaire de la langue hittite et asianique* 34–35. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Marazzi, M.
 1986 *L’Anatolia hittita: Repertori archeologici ed epigrafici*. Rome: La Sapienza.
- Mascheroni, L. M.
 1984 “Scribi hurriti a Boğazköy: Una verifica prosopografica.” *Studi micenei ed egeo-anatolici* 24: 151–73.
- Melchert, H. C.
 1993 *Cuneiform Luvian Lexicon*. Lexica Anatolica 2. Chapel Hill.
 1994 *Anatolian Historical Phonology*. Leiden Studies in Indo-European 3. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
 2003 *The Luwians*. Handbuch der Orientalistik 68. Leiden: Brill.
 Forthcoming “The Problem of Luvian Influence on Hittite.”
- Meriggi, P.
 1975 *Manuale di eteo geroglifico*, Parte 2. Incunabula Graeca 13. Rome: Testi Edizioni dell’Ateneo.
- Moran, W. L.
 1992 *The Amarna Letters*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Muscarella, O. W.
 1974 *Ancient Art: The Norbert Schimmel Collection*. Mainz: P. von Zabern.
- Neu, E.
 1974 *Der Anitta-Text*. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 18. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
 1995 “Hethitisch zapzagi-.” *Ugarit-Forschungen* 27: 395–402.
- Oettinger, N.
 1979 *Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbums*. Erlanger Beiträge zur Sprach- und Kunstwissenschaft 64. Nuremberg: Verlag Hans Carl.
 1986 “Anatolische ‘Kurzgeschichten.’” *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 99: 43–53.

- Otten, H.
1981 *Die Apologie Hattusilis III: Das Bild der Überlieferung*. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 24. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
1988 *Die Bronzetafel aus Boğazköy: Ein Staatsvertrag Tuthalijas IV*. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten Beiheft 1. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Pecchioli Daddi, F.
2003 *Il vincolo per i governatori di provincia*. Studia Mediterranea 14. Pavia: Italian University Press.
- Puhvel, J.
1966 "Dialectal Aspects of the Anatolian Branch of Indo-European." In *Ancient Indo-European Dialects. Proceedings of the Conference on Indo-European Linguistics Held at the University of California, Los Angeles, April 25–27, 1963*, edited by H. Birnbaum and J. Puhvel, pp. 235–47. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Richter, Th.
2003 "Das 'Archiv des Idanda.'" *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft* 135: 167–88.
- Rieken, E.
1994 "Der Wechsel -a-/-i- in der Stammbildung des hethitischen Nomens." *Historische Sprachforschung* 107: 42–53.
1997 "Zu den Reflexen von uridg. *(s)k'el- 'springen, eilen.'" *Historische Sprachforschung* 110: 167–75.
- Rosenkranz, B.
1938 "Die Stellung des Luwischen im Ḫatti-Reiche." *Indogermanische Forschungen* 56: 265–84.
1954 "Luwisch und 'anatolische' Sprachen." *Forschungen und Fortschritte* 28: 308–12.
- Roszkowska-Mutschler, H.
2002 "Zu den Mannestaten der hethitischen Könige und ihrem Sitz im Leben." In *Silva Anatolica: Anatolian Studies Presented to Maciej Popko on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, edited by P. Taracha, pp. 289–300. Warsaw: Agade.
- Rüster, Chr.
1993 "Eine Urkunde Ḫantilis II." *Istanbuler Mitteilungen* 43: 63–70.
- Rüster, Chr., and E. Neu
1989 *Hethitisches Zeichenlexikon: Inventar und Interpretation der Keilschriftzeichen aus den Boğazköy-Texten*. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten Beiheft 2. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Salvini, M., and M.-Cl. Trémouille
2003 "Les textes hittites de Meskéné/Emar." *Studi micenei ed egeo-anatolici* 45: 225–71.
- Seeher, J.
2006 "Ḫattuša-Tuthalija-Stadt? Argumente für eine Revision der Chronologie der hethitischen Hauptstadt." In *The Life and Times of Ḫattušili III and Tuthaliya IV*, edited by Th. van den Hout. Leiden: Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut te Istanbul.
- Singer, I.
1995 "'Our God' and 'Their God' in the Anitta Text." In *Atti del 2 Congresso Internazionale di Hittitologia*, edited by O. Carruba, Mauro Giorgieri, and Clelia Mora, pp. 343–49. Studia Mediterranea 9. Pavia: Iuculano.
1999 "A New Hittite Letter from Emar." In *Landscapes, Territories, Frontiers and Horizons in the Ancient Near East*, edited by L. Milano, pp. 65–72. Padua: Sargon.
- Souček, V.
1957–1971 "Glossen." In *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und vorderasiatischen Archäologie*, Band 3, edited by Ernst Weidner and Wolfram von Soden, p. 440. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Souček, V., and J. Siegelová
1996 *Systematische Bibliographie der Hethitologie 1915–1995*. Leiden: Brill.
- Soysal, O.
2004 "On Hittite (LÚ) ANT- '(The) Equal (One) > Rival' Again." *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions* 4: 99–105.

- Starke, F.
 1985 *Die keilschrift-luwischen Texte in Umschrift*. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 30. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
 1990 *Untersuchung zur Stammbildung des keilschrift-luwischen Nomens*. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 31. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
 1997 "Troia im Kontext des historisch-politischen und sprachlichen Umfeldes Kleinasiens im 2. Jahrtausend." *Studia Troica* 7: 447–87.
- Stefanini, R.
 1965 "KBo IV 14 = VAT 13049." *Atti della accademia nazionale dei lincei* 367 (20): 39–79.
 2002 "Towards a Diachronic Reconstruction of the Linguistic Map of Ancient Anatolia." In *Anatolia Antica: Studi in memoria di Fiorella Imparati*, edited by St. de Marino and F. Pecchioli Daddi, pp. 783–806. Eothen 11. Florence: LoGisma Editore.
- Süel, A., and O. Soysal
 2003 "A Practical Vocabulary from Ortaköy." In *Hittite Studies in Honor of Harry A. Hoffner on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, edited by G. Beckman, R. Beal, and G. McMahon, pp. 349–65. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Taracha, P.
 2000 *Ersetzen und Entsühnen: Das mittelhethitische Ersatzritual für den Großkönig Tuthaliya (CTH *448.4) und verwandte Texte*. Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 5. Leiden: Brill.
- van den Hout, Th.
 1984 "Einige luwische Neutra auf -ša/-za in überwiegend junghethitischen Texten." *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 97: 60–80.
 2002 "Another View of Hittite Literature." In *Anatolia Antica: Studi in memoria di Fiorella Imparati*, edited by St. de Marino and F. Pecchioli Daddi, pp. 857–78. Eothen 11. Florence: LoGisma Editore.
 2006 "Administration in the Reign of Tuthaliya IV and the Later Years of the Hittite Empire." In *The Life and Times of Hattušili III and Tuthaliya IV*, edited by Th. van den Hout. Leiden: Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut te Istanbul.
 Forthcoming "The Nature of the Hittite Tablet Collections." *Studi micenei ed egeo-anatolici*.
- Versteegh, K.
 2002 "Dead or Alive? The Status of the Standard Language." In *Bilingualism in Ancient Society. Language Contact and the Written Text*, edited by J. N. Adams, M. Janse, and S. Swain, pp. 52–74. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Watkins, C.
 2004 "Hittite." In *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the World's Ancient Languages*, edited by R. D. Woodard, pp. 551–75. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Weitenberg, J. J. S.
 1984 *Die hethitischen U-Stämme*. Amsterdamer Publikationen zur Sprache und Literatur 52. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Yakubovich, I.
 Forthcoming "Luwian Migrations in Light of Linguistic Contacts." In *Proceedings of the Conference "Hittites, Greeks, and Their Neighbors in Ancient Anatolia"* (Atlanta, 17–19 September, 2004), edited by M. Bachvarova, B. Collins, and I. Rutherford.
- Yoshida, D.
 1991 "Ein hethitisches Ritual gegen Behexung (KUB XXIV 12) und der Gott Zilipuri/Zalipura." *Bulletin of the Middle Eastern Culture Center in Japan* 4: 45–61.

POSTSCRIPT (NOVEMBER 2007)

Since submitting my manuscript for the above contribution a few articles have appeared that take up the discussion concerning the role of the Luwian language in Hittite society in general and especially that of the thirteenth century B.C. In her article “Zum hethitisch-luwischen Sprachkontakt in historischer Zeit” (*Altorientalische Forschungen* 33 [2006]: 271–85), Elisabeth Rieken lays out in considerable detail how the Hittite language underwent a number of changes that resulted in a morphosyntactic structure that increasingly resembled that of the language we call Hieroglyphic Luwian. She cautiously describes this convergence as the result of “Einfluß des dominanten Hieroglyphen-Luwischen,” most notably since the reign of Muršili II around 1300 B.C.

In a review article of the influential volume *The Luwians*, edited by H. Craig Melchert (2003), Itamar Singer (*Bibliotheca Orientalis* 62 [2005]: 430–51) elaborates on the notion of an ever larger Luwian component in the “sociological profile” of Hittite society. As a “working hypothesis” (cols. 447–51) he suggests that the army may have been an important home to many deportees while at the same time being a potential breeding ground for a powerful revolt “in times of distress and disarray.”

Relevant in this same context is the article “Last Writing: Script Obsolescence in Egypt, Mesopotamia, and Mesoamerica,” by Stephen Houston, John Baines, and Jerrold S. Cooper (*Comparative Studies in Society and History* 45.3 [2003]: 430–79), that — thanks to Melissa Rosenzweig — came to my attention only after the first publication of this book. In the case of second-millennium Anatolia the demise of Hittite went hand in hand with the obsolescence of its cuneiform script and the survival of the hieroglyphic script used for the Luwian language. In their final discussion (pp. 467–71) of the extinction of Egyptian hieroglyphic, Mayan glyphs, and Mesopotamian cuneiform, the authors mention “sociolinguistic, ‘spheres-of-exchange,’ and demographic assaults” (p. 467) as general responsible factors. “All these scripts had as alternatives ‘target’ writing systems, often connected to dominant groups and languages” (ibid.). All this applies to the death of cuneiform in Anatolia as well. On the other hand, as the authors observe (p. 469), script disappearance or replacement is mostly an issue of high culture, all three script systems they study being “deeply embedded in their civilizations.” For the Hittite case this may not be true: the use of cuneiform seems to have been restricted to the administration of the ruling class with no public display function and there is no evidence for the use of cuneiform by other levels of society. Whenever the elite wished to address a wider audience they seem to have used the Luwian language in its own hieroglyphic script. The change in Anatolia therefore looks more political than anything else.

The article by Melchert on “The Problem of Luvian Influence on Hittite” quoted as still forthcoming in my bibliography has meanwhile appeared in *Sprachkontakt und Sprachwandel, Akten der XI. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, 17.–23. September 2000*, edited by G. Meiser and O. Hackstein (Wiesbaden, 2005), pp. 445–60. In the more recent article “Indo-European Verbal Art in Luvian” (in *La langue poétique indo-européenne*, edited by G.-J. Pinault and D. Petit [Leuven-Paris 2006], pp. 291–98), Melchert analyses a number of passages from Hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions of both the second and first millennium B.C. “to demonstrate that the HLuvian dedicatory inscriptions ... emphatically are not unreflecting and spontaneous ‘simple prose’ derived from the pattern of ordinary speech. They are on the contrary the products of a highly developed and in some cases remarkably sophisticated

compositional technique” (p. 295). This is certainly true and in keeping with the remark in my “Final Thoughts” that identifying Luwian as the vernacular in the late Hittite empire does not deny it its own high form of expression and possible literary sophistication. We need to keep in mind, though, that all Hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions of the second millennium that contain more than just names and titles were products of the Hittite ruling class.

For my article “On the Nature of the Hittite Tablet Collection,” quoted as forthcoming, see now *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici* 47 (2005): 277–89.

Finally, to the three instances of Luwian plural accusatives in *-nzi* that are correct according to Hieroglyphic Luwian grammar but not to that of Cuneiform Luwian (see p. 240 in this volume) a fourth one can be added: KUB 24.5 obv. 29 + KUB 9.13:17 has SISKUR [... *-i*]*n-zi* DÜ-*zi* “(the king) performs the ... rituals.”