CHAPTER 19

Luvian

H. CRAIG MELCHERT

1. HISTORICAL AND CULTURAL CONTEXTS

Luvian (or Luwian) was arguably the most widely spoken member of the Anatolian subgroup of Indo-European. Evidence for the language is twofold. First, the cuneiform archives of the Hittite capital Hattuša in central Anatolia contain a number of texts with passages in a language designated *luwili*; that is, of the land *Luwiya*, which the Old Hittite Laws list as one of three major divisions of the Hittite state.

Starke (1985) has shown in his excellent edition of the Cuneiform Luvian (CLuvian) corpus that the apparently extensive texts actually represent variations on scarcely a dozen distinct compositions (aside from a few fragments). With one or two exceptions, the texts are rituals, some of a private, therapeutic nature, others belonging to the state cult. The CLuvian manuscripts, like the Hittite, date from the sixteenth to thirteenth centuries BC, including a few from the Old Hittite period (see Ch. 18, §1). Beyond this highly restricted material, there are also many isolated Luvianisms scattered throughout the Hittite texts, both as foreign words and as genuine loanwords adapted to Hittite inflection. Starke (1990 and elsewhere) has demonstrated that Luvian influence on Hittite was both earlier (including prehistoric) and more extensive than previously acknowledged. However, the fact that the two languages are very closely related makes it difficult to distinguish with certainty Luvian loanwords into Hittite from native Hittite cognates of Luvian lexemes, and not all of Starke's claims are equally persuasive (see Melchert 1992).

The second source for Luvian consists of texts written in a system of Anatolian hieroglyphs. Aside from a few letters and economic documents on soft lead strips, the vast majority are monumental inscriptions on stone, both natural rock-faces and man-made structures. A few date from the fourteenth and thirteenth centuries BC, the later period of the Hittite Empire, and most of these are attributable to known Hittite kings. Most Hieroglyphic Luvian (HLuvian) texts, however, date from the tenth to seventh centuries, after the fall of the Hittite Empire itself, and describe the activities of local rulers and their subordinates in the various newly independent small states of southern Anatolia and northern Syria. These inscriptions on stone are generally dedicatory in content, but often contain lengthy historical sections.

Both references in the Hittite texts and the geographical distribution of the extant HLuvian inscriptions suggest that the Luvian "heartland" lay in southern and southwestern Anatolia, penetrating into what is now northern Syria. However, inscriptions have also been found in western and central Anatolia (including at Hattuša itself). The status of Luvian as a spoken language in the latter areas is quite unclear. The influence of Luvian on Hittite, particularly in the Late Empire period, has led to suggestions that by this time Luvian was the spoken

language in Hattuša, with Hittite preserved only as a written "chancellery" language. This possibility must be taken seriously, but it should be regarded as merely one of several hypotheses.

Also problematic is the precise relationship between CLuvian and HLuvian. There is nothing to recommend the view that CLuvian is in any sense the "Hattuša dialect" of Luvian. The highly restricted nature of the CLuvian evidence and limited understanding of the contemporary HLuvian inscriptions of the second millennium preclude any definitive statements at present. The prudent current consensus is to treat the two as closely related but independent coequal dialects of a single language with no further presumptions. A last complication to be mentioned is the chance that one set of CLuvian texts, the so-called "Istanuvian songs," represents a dialect distinct from the rest of CLuvian (and HLuvian). The evidence is suggestive (see the references in Melchert 1994a:11), but the Istanuvian texts are too poorly understood to assert anything with confidence. Radical revision of the readings of many basic HLuvian signs by Hawkins, Morpurgo Davies, and Neumann (1974) has shown that differences between CLuvian and HLuvian are minimal. The single description which follows is meant to apply to both unless stated otherwise.

2. WRITING SYSTEMS

2.1 Cuneiform Luvian

CLuvian was written by Hittite scribes, using the same version of the Old Babylonian syllabary that they used to write Hittite, and the writing conventions are mostly the same (see Ch. 18, §2). Word spacing and paragraph dividers are used consistently. Logograms are less frequent than in Hittite, but more common than in Palaic. One should certainly regard *scriptio plena* (repeating the V of a VC or CV sign with the matching V sign) as a marker of vowel length (Melchert 1994a:27, extending the claims of Kimball and Eichner for Hittite). The contrast of intervocalic single and geminate consonants is significant as in Hittite, however one interprets this in phonetic terms (see the lengthy discussion with references in Melchert 1994a:13ff.). The most striking spelling habit is the free use of word-initial *scriptio plena*, almost nonexistent in Hittite: CLuvian *i-i-ti* for /īdi/ "goes," *a-an-ta* for /ānda/ "in(to)." Since it is virtually certain that Luvian does not distinguish /i/ and /e/, the sporadic use of cuneiform signs with *e*-vocalism for /i/ is surely insignificant.

Emil Forrer in 1919 already established CLuvian as a distinct language with close affinities to Hittite. Further significant progress came following World War II with the publication of a large number of texts and analyses by Bernhard Rosenkranz, Heinrich Otten, and Emmanuel Laroche. A new era in CLuvian studies began with the publication of the radically reorganized corpus by Starke (1985).

2.2 Hieroglyphic Luvian

The Anatolian hieroglyphs are first attested on Hittite personal seals dating from the fifteenth and fourteenth centuries. These inscriptions, consisting of names, titles, and good luck signs, can hardly be said to represent texts in a given language. Except for a few isolated cases (Urartean glosses on pithoi, Hurrian divine names in the pantheon at Yazilikaya), all genuine texts in the hieroglyphs discovered thus far are in Luvian. That the system was invented for writing Luvian is supported by evidence from acrophony (secondary use of a logogram as a phonetic sign based on the initial sequence of the word represented): e.g., the

Table 19.1 Examples of Hieroglyphic Luvian logograms

Character	Value	Character	Value	Character	Value
	"head"		"god"		"offer"
	"I"		"moon"		"put"
	"speak"		"sun"		"below"
	"anger"		"boundary"		"above"
	"king"		"scribe"		"after"
	"kingdom"		"Aleppo"		"before"
	"camp"		"give"		

sign *tara/i-* clearly is based on Luvian /tarri-/ "three" (vs. Hittite *tēri-*). The precise time and place of development of the hieroglyphs and the relationship of their use on seals to that for writing texts remain to be elucidated: see Hawkins 1986 for further discussion.

The HLuvian system is mixed logographic-syllabic. A word may be written as a logogram (particularly common in the second-millennium texts), entirely phonetically, or as a logogram with phonetic complements. The logogram may also stand before the complete phonetic word as a determinative (semantic marker). The nominative singular of "cow" may thus be written in four ways: (i) BOS (by a now widely accepted convention, logograms are with a few exceptions represented by capitalized Latin equivalents); (ii) *wa/i-wa/i-sa*; (iii) BOS-*wa/i-sa*; or (iv) (BOS)*wa/i-wa/i-sa* (where BOS is used as a determinative). The phonetic portion of the system includes only signs for V and CV sequences (and rarely CVCV). This fact means that neither word-final consonants nor any consonant clusters may be directly represented: see *wa/i-wa/i-sa* for /wawīs/ above. One should note in particular the failure to indicate preconsonantal nasals: the animate nominative plural ending /-intsi/ is spelled *-Ci-zi*. For a provisional list of logograms and phonetic signs see Hawkins 1975:153ff.

The system does not distinguish simple from geminate consonants nor a possible voicing contrast in stops. Repetition of the vowel of a CV sign by a V sign does **not** indicate vowel length, but is regulated by aesthetic principles (there is a strong tendency to fill available space evenly). The syllabary only gradually and imperfectly developed separate CV signs for /a/ and /i/ vocalism, hence the rather awkward use of spellings like *wa/i-wa/i-sa*. For more on the system see Melchert 1996.

It had long been surmised that the monumental inscriptions in Anatolian hieroglyphs were associated with the Hittite Empire, but it was only the discovery of the cuneiform Hittite documents at Hattuša/Boğazköy in the early twentieth century that permitted serious work on deciphering the hieroglyphs. Emil Forrer, Bedřich Hrozný, Piero Meriggi, and Ignace Gelb all made important pioneering contributions, and by 1940 a partial decipherment of the script and basic understanding of many texts had been achieved. It was also clear that "Hieroglyphic Hittite" was closely related to cuneiform Hittite and Luvian, but the precise relationship remained uncertain. The discovery of an extensive Hieroglyphic–Phoenician

bilingual at Karatepe in 1947, published in stages by Helmut Bossert, promised to revolutionize study of the hieroglyphs, but it was not until the mid-seventies that David Hawkins, Anna Morpurgo Davies, and Günter Neumann, building on work of Bossert, could demonstrate that the phonetic readings of a number of basic signs required radical revision. The major reassessment demanded by these changes confirmed the early claim of Meriggi that the language of the hieroglyphs is a form of Luvian, and indeed one very closely related to CLuvian.

The multiple ambiguities of the HLuvian syllabary mean that analysis of Luvian phonology is based primarily on CLuvian data. In compensation, the much more varied content of the HLuvian texts tends to give a broader picture of Luvian morphology.

3. PHONOLOGY

3.1 Consonants

The Luvian phonemic inventory consists of at least the following consonants:

(1) Luwian consonantal phonemes

p	t		k		
b	d		g		
	ts				
	s				ħ
					ʕ
m	n				
	l	r			
w		y			

The absence of positive evidence for a unitary labiovelar /k^{w}/ as in Hittite may be accidental, and words like *ku-i-* "who, which" from *$k^{w}i$- may still contain /k^{w}/. It is certain that there is no corresponding voiced stop, because inherited *g^{w} merges with *w: recall /wawī-/ "cow" from *$g^{w}ow$- above. As already noted, the orthography of stops in CLuvian follows the same principles as in Hittite (intervocalic contrast of simple vs. geminate; see Ch. 18, §3.1), although the specific distribution diverges due to different prehistoric changes. Interpretation of this orthography remains controversial. HLuvian obviously can render no assistance, but the restriction of rhotacism (see below) to the voiced dental stop confirms that some kind of phonemic contrast remained between inherited voiceless and voiced stops, whatever its precise synchronic realization.

The sound conventionally transliterated *z* represents sequences of /t/ + /s/, as well as the result of prehistoric assibilation of *t before *y and Proto-Indo-European palatal *$\hat{k}$ (for the last see Melchert 1987 and 1989). While there is no reason to assume more than one synchronic phoneme, it is quite possible that /ts/ includes a palatal or palatalized allophone. Despite the hesitation of Melchert (1994a:274), there is good reason to suspect that graphic *z* also in some cases represents a voiced dental fricative /z/ (cf. the same possibility for Lycian *z*). The transliteration of the voiceless coronal sibilant as *š* in CLuvian is merely conventional, as in Hittite, and there is no reason to suppose that the sound is anything other than a dental-alveolar /s/. As in the case of Hittite and Palaic, the characterization of the sounds spelled -*ḫḫ*- and -*ḫ*- in CLuvian as pharyngeals is by no means assured, and velar fricatives /x/ and /γ/ are quite viable alternatives.

3.1.1 Diachronic variation

Two diachronic developments affecting Luvian consonants are worthy of mention. The first is *Čop's Law*, by which a prehistoric sequence *$\check{e}.C_1$ becomes Luvian $aC_1.C_1$: for example, *$n\check{e}\,b(^h)es$- > CLuvian *tappaš*- "heaven"; *$m\check{e}lid$- > CLuvian *mallit*- "honey" (see Čop 1970 and Melchert 1994b:305 for further details). The second is *rhotacism*, a sporadic change by which *d*, *l*, and rarely *n* become *r* in HLuvian: for example, HLuvian /īri/ beside /īdi/ "goes," /wara-/ beside /wala-/ "die" (see Morpurgo Davies 1982–1983 for details).

3.2 Vowels

Luvian has only three vowels, /a/, /i/, and /u/, in contrasting short and long varieties. While there are some underlying long vowels, most phonetic length is due to synchronic rules which lengthen underlying short vowels under the accent: contrast sentence-initial conjunction *pā* < /pá/ versus enclitic *-pa* < /-pa/, or adverb *ānnan* "under" < /ánnan/ versus *annān pātanza* "under the feet" < /annán/ with accent shift in a prepositional phrase (see Melchert 1994a:247 for further discussion). There are clearly falling diphthongs /a:y/ and /a:w/. Corresponding short /ay/ and /aw/ are likely, but difficult to prove.

Certain facts about the placement of the accent may be inferred from the prehistoric and synchronic rules cited in the preceding two paragraphs, but the evidence is limited, and the risk of circularity of argument is high.

3.3 Synchronic variation

In addition to the vowel-lengthening rules referred to above, synchronic rules include the loss of word-final /-d/ in certain noun paradigms and the insertion of /-s/ between dental stops (*aztūwari* "you (pl.) eat" < /ad-tuwari/), the latter rule inherited from Proto-Indo-European.

3.4 Phonotaxis

Phonotactic restrictions apply chiefly to initial and final consonants. Only /s/, /l/, /r/, and /n/ appear word-finally, with /-(n)ts/ the only final cluster. All consonants appear regularly word-initially except /r/, for which HLuvian shows a single example. For the possibility that only voiceless obstruents appear word-initially see Melchert 1994a:18ff. The very limited evidence regarding consonant clusters is summarized by Melchert 1994a:248ff. Vowels occur freely in all positions. There are no assured cases of hiatus.

4. MORPHOLOGY

4.1 Nominal morphology

Luvian is a typical older Indo-European language with a well-developed, almost exclusively suffixing derivational and inflectional morphology. The noun inflects for two numbers, singular and plural. Some animate nouns have a collective beside a count plural: *dušduma* "(set of) vouchers" beside unattested **dušduminzi* "vouchers" to *dušduma/i*-. Reference to more than one collective set requires a special "individualizing" suffix *-ant*-: for example, /tawa/ (collective plural) "eyes" (of one person), but /tawanta/ "sets of eyes." There are

two genders, animate and inanimate. The former is in most stem-classes marked not only by a distinct set of endings, but also by an obligatory /-ī-/ inserted between stem and ending just in the nominative and accusative cases (see Starke 1990:59ff.). The origin of this latter feature is a matter of lively debate. CLuvian has five cases: nominative, vocative, accusative, dative-locative, and ablative-instrumental. The vocative is rare and restricted to the singular. The inanimate gender expectedly has a single nominative and accusative, and the ablative-instrumental does not distinguish number. HLuvian merges the animate nominative and accusative plural. CLuvian replaces the genitive entirely with a "relational adjective" modifying the head noun: "divine favor" for "favor of the god(s)." HLuvian uses both the modifying adjective and a true nominal genitive case, sometimes combining them in remarkable ways (see the examples cited in Melchert 1990:202ff.). Both dialects permit use of the relational adjective even when a noun phrase includes a second genitive dependent on another ("the son of the lord of the country"), in which case both genitives are expressed by adjectives agreeing in case and number with the head noun (see Neumann 1982).

A disadvantage of the relational adjective is that it cannot express the number of the possessor. CLuvian has partially remedied this situation by developing a marker *-anz-* which is inserted between the stem and nondirect case endings in the relational adjective to mark the possessor as plural: *waššaraḫitati maššanaššanzati* "by the favor of the gods" (see Melchert 2000).

In HLuvian the inanimate nominative-accusative singular of nouns is obligatorily marked by a postposed particle *-sa/-za*. This marker is also frequent in CLuvian, where some trace of an original anaphoric or deictic function seems visible (see Arbeitman 1992:22ff. for discussion).

The suffixes marking number, gender, and case are mostly recognizable as inherited from Proto-Indo-European: for example, animate nominative singular /-s/ and accusative singular /-n/ < *-*m*. However, Luvian has innovated significantly in the plural, building a new system apparently based on the old animate accusative plural *-*ons*: animate nominative plural /-Vntsi/, animate accusative plural /-Vnts/, dative-locative plural /-ants/.

4.2 Pronouns

The personal pronouns, as far as attested, are recognizable as inherited from Proto-Indo-European, with the peculiar Anatolian *u*-vocalism in the first person singular: HLuvian *amu* "I, me." Luvian also shows the characteristic Anatolian demonstratives *apā-* "that" and *za/i-* "this" (the latter equaling Hittite *ka/i-*) and the inherited relative-interrogative *kui-*. Inflection appears to follow that of the noun more closely than in Hittite, but evidence for the nondirect cases is sparse.

4.3 Verbal morphology

The verb has the expected three persons and two numbers. There are only two moods, indicative and imperative. Evidence for a medio-passive beside the active voice is limited, but use of the middle of *a(ya)-* "make, do" effectively as a passive ("be made, become") suggests that the functions of the medio-passive are of the expected sort. Tenses are limited to a present-future and a preterite. The basic verb-stem is unmarked for aspect, but there is also an imperfective marked with the suffixes *-sa-* and *-za-*. Luvian shows the same division into *mi-* and *ḫi-* conjugations as Hittite (see Ch. 18, §§4.4.7, 4.4.9; Morpurgo Davies 1979). The verbal endings are mostly clearly inherited, but there may have been a noteworthy

replacement of the preterite third-person active endings by the medial endings (see Yoshida 1993).

Luvian has a single participle formed with the suffix *-a(i)mma-*, with a past passive value for transitive verbs and a stative one for intransitives, and an infinitive in *-una*.

4.4 Derivational morphology

Luvian shows a rich set of derivational suffixes in both the noun and verb. Even the massive study of Starke (1990) covers systematically only the consonant stems in the noun.

4.5 Compounds

There are no assured compounds among appellatives, but examples in personal names suggest that further analysis and additional evidence will reveal some.

4.6 Numerals

Knowledge of numerals in Luvian is limited by their frequent spelling with logograms. See Eichner 1992 for what is known.

5. SYNTAX

5.1 Word order and clause structure

The functionally unmarked word order is SOV (Subject–Object–Verb), but any major constitutent may be fronted to initial position for emphasis, and elements may also be extraposed to the right of the verb for the same purpose. Relative clauses typically precede the main clause with a resumptive pronoun, but postposed relatives also occur. Luvian has several subordinating conjunctions marking temporal or conditional clauses. There are no coordinated clauses in the strict sense, but the enclitic conjunction *-ha* which conjoins noun phrases can be used to mean "also." Like Hittite (see Ch. 18, §5.1), Luvian links sentences in narration with prosecutive conjunctions, *a-* (functionally = Hittite *nu-*) or *pā/-pa* (= Hittite *-ma*, marking change of topic, lightly adversative). Adjectives, including demonstratives and relational adjectives, typically precede their head noun. Luvian appears to have both prepositions and postpositions, as well as local adverbs which occur independently and as preverbs.

As in the other Indo-European Anatolian languages, anaphoric pronouns, conjunctions, and various particles regularly appear in Luvian as enclitics, attached to the first accented element in a clause by *Wackernagel's Law*. The conjunction *-ha* "and" which conjoins noun phrases is also an enclitic (like Latin *-que*), and note the particle *-sa/-za* cited above (§4.1).

5.2 Syntactic miscellanea

HLuvian shows at least one example of the Anatolian construction in which the direct object of an infinitive is unexpectedly in the dative: *za-ti CASTRUM-si AEDIFICARE+MI-na* "this (dat.) fort (dat.) to build" = "to build this fort." This usage is comparable to the "double dative" of Sanskrit. Examples with the expected accusative also occur in HLuvian.

The syntax of cardinal numerals is complex. They may occur as adjectives agreeing with nouns in number and case, but one also finds singular nouns with numbers above one (see Eichner 1992, *passim*).

6. LEXICON

Luvian core vocabulary appears to be for the most part inherited from Proto-Indo-European, but evidence is limited: of the fifty-one words from the Swadesh-Voegelin hundred-word list which are known, thirty-nine or 80 percent are of Proto-Indo-European origin. The only major source of loanwords is Hurrian, from which many terms in various technical fields such as divination passed into Luvian and then into Hittite.

7. READING LIST

Marazzi 1990 offers a thorough bibliography for HLuvian along with a grammatical sketch which is mostly valid also for CLuvian, and a partial lexicon. Werner 1991 is also useful and reliable. HLuvian text editions are currently scattered through secondary works. A complete new edition of the HLuvian texts of the first millennium is now available in Hawkins 2000. The older standard works by Meriggi and Laroche (cited in Marazzi) are now rendered almost useless by the outdated phonetic values of several crucial signs. Starke 1985 gives the available CLuvian texts in transliteration. Melchert 1993 offers a complete lexicon for Starke 1985 plus selected Luvianisms in Hittite contexts. The lexicon and grammatical sketch of Laroche 1959 are still useful, but must be read in conjunction with the works cited above.

Bibliography

Arbeitman, Y. 1992. "Luwian *za-* and *-sa* (/*-za*): how I have changed my mind (with ruminations on Palaic)." *Linguistique balkanique* 35:3–58.

Čop, B. 1970. "Eine luwische orthographisch-phonetische Regel." *Indogermanische Forschungen* 75:85–96.

Eichner, H. 1992. "Anatolian." In J. Gvozdanović (ed.), *Indo-European Numerals*, pp. 29–96. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hawkins, D. 1975. "The negatives in Hieroglyphic Luwian." *Anatolian Studies* 25:119–156.

_____. 1986. "Writing in Anatolia: imported and indigenous systems." *World Archaeology* 17:364–376.

_____. 2000. *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions. Volume I. Inscriptions of the Iron Age.* Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.

Hawkins, D., A. Morpurgo Davies, and G. Neumann. 1974. *Hittite Hieroglyphs and Luwian: New Evidence for the Connection.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht.

Laroche, E. 1959. *Dictionnaire de la langue louvite.* Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve.

Marazzi, M. 1990. *Il geroglifico anatolico. Problemi di analisi e prospettive di ricerca.* Rome: Università "Sapienza."

Melchert, H. C. 1987. "PIE velars in Luvian." In C. Watkins (ed.), *Studies in Memory of Warren Cowgill*, Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.

_____. 1989. "New Luvo-Lycian isoglosses." *Historische Sprachforschung* 102:23–45.

_____. 1990. "Adjective stems in **-iyo-* in Anatolian." *Historische Sprachforschung* 103:198–207.

_____. 1992. Review of *Untersuchung zur Stammbildung des keilschrift-luwischen Nomens*, by Frank Starke. *Historische Sprachforschung* 105:309–312.

_____. 1993. *Cuneiform Luvian Lexicon.* Chapel Hill: self-published.

_____. 1994a. *Anatolian Historical Phonology*. Leiden Studies in Indo-European 3. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
_____. 1994b. "'Čop's Law' in Common Anatolian." In J. Rasmussen (ed.), *In honorem Holger Pedersen*, pp. 297–306. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert.
_____. 1996. "Anatolian Hieroglyphs." In P. Daniels and W. Bright (eds.), *The World's Writing Systems*, pp. 120–124. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press.
_____. 2000. "Aspects of Cuneiform Luvian nominal inflection." In Y. Arbeitman (ed.), *The Asia Minor Connexion: Studies on the Pre-Greek Languages in Memory of Charles Carter*, pp. 173–183. Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters.
Morpurgo Davies, A. 1979. "The Luwian languages and the Hittite *-ḫi* conjugation." In B. Brogyanyi (ed.), *Studies in Diachronic, Synchronic and Typological Linguistics. Festschrift for Oswald Szemerényi on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, pp. 577–610. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
_____. 1982–1983. "Dentals, rhotacism, and verbal endings in the Luwian languages." *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung* 96:245–270.
Neumann, G. 1982. "Die Konstruktionen mit Adiectiva genitivalia in den luwischen Sprachen." In E. Neu (ed.), *Investigationes philologicae et comparativae: Gedenkschrift für Heinz Kronasser*, pp. 149–161. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
Starke, F. 1985. *Die keilschrift-luwischen Texte in Umschrift*. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 30. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
_____. 1990. *Untersuchung zur Stammbildung des keilschrift-luwischen Nomens*. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 31. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
Werner, R. 1991. *Kleine Einführung in das Hieroglyphen-Luwische*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht.
Yoshida, K. 1993. "Notes on the prehistory of preterite verbal endings in Anatolian." *Historische Sprachforschung* 106:26–35.