A COMPANION TO ANCIENT NEAR EASTERN LANGUAGES

BLACKWELL COMPANIONS TO THE ANCIENT WORLD

This series provides sophisticated and authoritative overviews of periods of ancient history, genres of classical literature, and the most important themes in ancient culture. Each volume comprises between twenty-five and forty concise essays written by individual scholars within their area of specialization. The essays are written in a clear, provocative, and lively manner, designed for an international audience of scholars, students, and general readers.

A Companion to Latin Literature
Edited by Stephen Harrison
A Companion to the Ancient Near East
Edited by Daniel C. Snell
A Companion to Ancient Epic
Edited by John Miles Foley
A Companion to Greek Tragedy
Edited by Justina Gregory
A Companion to the Roman Empire
Edited by David S. Potter
A Companion to the Roman Republic
Edited by Nathan Rosenstein and Robert Morstein-Marx
A Companion to the Classical Greek World
Edited by Konrad H. Kinzl
A Companion to Roman Rhetoric
Edited by William Dominik and Jon Hall
A Companion to Roman Religion
Edited by Jörg Rüpke
A Companion to the Classical Tradition
Edited by Craig W. Kallendorf
A Companion to Greek Rhetoric
Edited by Ian Worthington
A Companion to Catullus
Edited by Marilyn B. Skinner
A Companion to Classical Receptions
Edited by Lorna Hardwick and Christopher Stray
A Companion to Greek and Roman Political Thought
Edited by Ryan K. Balot
A Companion to the Roman Army
Edited by Paul Erdkamp
A Companion to Greek Religion
Edited by Daniel Ogden
A Companion to Ancient History
Edited by Andrew Erskine
A Companion to Ovid
Edited by Peter E. Knox
A Companion to Archaic Greece
Edited by Kurt A. Raaflaub and Hans van Wees
A Companion to Late Antiquity
Edited by Philip Rousseau
A Companion to Julius Caesar
Edited by Miriam Griffin
A Companion to Hellenistic Literature
James J. Clauss and Martine Cuypers
A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language
Edited by Egbert J. Bakker
A Companion to Byzantium
Edited by Liz James
A Companion to Horace
Edited by Gregson Davis
A Companion to Ancient Macedonia
Edited by Joseph Roisman and Ian Worthington
A Companion to Families in the Greek and Roman Worlds
Edited by Beryl Rawson
A Companion to Greek Mythology
Edited by Ken Dowden and Niall Livingston
A Companion to the Latin Language
Edited by James Clackson
A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography
Edited by John Marincola
A Companion to the Punic Wars
Edited by Dexter Hoyos
A Companion to Women in the Ancient World
Edited by Sharon L. James and Sheila Dillon
A Companion to Sophocles
Edited by Kirk Ormand
A Companion to Marcus Aurelius
Edited by Marcel van Ackeren
A Companion to the Archaeology of the Ancient Near East
Edited by Daniel T. Potts
A Companion to Augustine
Edited by Mark Vessey
A Companion to Roman Love Elegy
Edited by Barbara K. Gold
A Companion to Greek Art
Tyler Jo Smith and Dimitris Plantzos
A Companion to Persius and Juvenal
Edited by Susanna Braund and Josiah Osgood
A Companion to Tacitus
Edited by Victoria Emma Pagán
A Companion to Ancient Greek Government
Edited by Hans Beck
A Companion to the Neronian Age
Edited by Emma Buckley and Martin Dinter
A Companion to the Archaeology of the Roman Republic
Edited by Jane DeRose Evans
A Companion to Terence
Edited by Antony Augoustakis and Ariana Traill
A Companion to Roman Architecture
Edited by Roger B. Ulrich and Caroline K. Quenemoen
A Companion to the Ancient Novel
Edited by Edmund P. Cueva and Shannon N. Byrne
A Companion to Ethnicity in the Ancient Mediterranean
Edited by Jeremy McInerney
A Companion to Sport and Spectacle in Greek and Roman Antiquity
Edited by Paul Christesen and Donald G. Kyle
A Companion to Greek and Roman Sexualities
Edited by Thomas K. Hubbard
A Companion to Plutarch
Edited by Mark Beck
A Companion to Ancient Thrace
Edited by Julia Valeva, Emil Nankov, and Denver Graninger
A Companion to the Archaeology of Religion in the Ancient World
Edited by Rubina Raja and Jörg Rüpke
A Companion to Ancient Aesthetics
Edited by Pierre Destrée and Penelope Murray
A Companion to Food in the Ancient World
Edited by John Wilkins and Robin Nadeau
A Companion to Ancient Education
Edited by W. Martin Bloomer
A Companion to Greek Literature
Edited by Martin Hose and David Schenker
A Companion to Greek Democracy and the Roman Republic
Edited by Dean Hammer
A Companion to Livy
Edited by Bernard Mineo
A Companion to Ancient Egyptian Art
Edited by Melinda K. Hartwig
A Companion to Roman Art
Edited by Barbara E. Borg
A Companion to the Etruscans
Edited by Sinclair Bell and Alexandra A. Carpino
A Companion to the Flavian Age of Imperial Rome
Edited by Andrew Zissos
A Companion to Roman Italy
Edited by Alison E. Cooley
A Companion to Science, Technology, and Medicine in Ancient Greek and Rome
Edited by Georgia L. Irby
A Companion to Greek Architecture
Edited by Margaret M. Miles
A Companion to Josephus
Edited by Honora Howell Chapman and Zuleika Rodgers
A Companion to Assyria
Edited by Eckart Frahm
A Companion to Ancient Greece and Rome on Screen
Edited by Arthur J. Pomeroy
A Companion to Euripides
Edited by Laura K. McClure
A Companion to Sparta
Edited by Anton Powell
A Companion to Greco-Roman and Late Antique Egypt
Edited by Katelijn Vandorpe
A Companion to Ancient Near Eastern Languages
Edited by Rebecca Hasselbach-Andee

A COMPANION TO ANCIENT NEAR EASTERN LANGUAGES

Edited by

Rebecca Hasselbach-Andee

WILEY Blackwell

This edition first published 2020
© 2020 John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, except as permitted by law. Advice on how to obtain permission to reuse material from this title is available at http://www.wiley.com/go/permissions.

The right of Rebecca Hasselbach-Andee to be identified as the author of the editorial material in this work has been asserted in accordance with law.

Registered Office
John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 111 River Street, Hoboken, NJ 07030, USA

Editorial Office
111 River Street, Hoboken, NJ 07030, USA

For details of our global editorial offices, customer services, and more information about Wiley products visit us at www.wiley.com.

Wiley also publishes its books in a variety of electronic formats and by print-on-demand. Some content that appears in standard print versions of this book may not be available in other formats.

Limit of Liability/Disclaimer of Warranty
While the publisher and authors have used their best efforts in preparing this work, they make no representations or warranties with respect to the accuracy or completeness of the contents of this work and specifically disclaim all warranties, including without limitation any implied warranties of merchantability or fitness for a particular purpose. No warranty may be created or extended by sales representatives, written sales materials or promotional statements for this work. The fact that an organization, website, or product is referred to in this work as a citation and/or potential source of further information does not mean that the publisher and authors endorse the information or services the organization, website, or product may provide or recommendations it may make. This work is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering professional services. The advice and strategies contained herein may not be suitable for your situation. You should consult with a specialist where appropriate. Further, readers should be aware that websites listed in this work may have changed or disappeared between when this work was written and when it is read. Neither the publisher nor authors shall be liable for any loss of profit or any other commercial damages, including but not limited to special, incidental, consequential, or other damages.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication data applied for

9781119193296 (Hardback)

Cover Design: Wiley
Cover Image: © swisshippo/Getty Images

Set in 10/12.5pt Galliard by SPi Global, Pondicherry, India

Printed in the United States of America

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Contents

List of Illustrations ix
List of Tables xi
Notes on Contributors xv
Preface xix

PART I Writing Systems 1

1 The Decipherment of Ancient Near Eastern Languages 3
Peter T. Daniels

2 The Emergence of Cuneiform Writing 27
Christopher Woods

3 The Development of Egyptian Writing in the Fourth and Early Third Millennium BCE 47
Ludwig Morenz

4 The Emergence of Alphabetic Scripts 65
Christopher Rollston

PART II Ancient Near Eastern Languages 83

5 Sumerian 85
Piotr Michalowski

6 Egyptian 107
Matthias Müller

7 Akkadian 129
Rebecca Hasselbach-Andee

8 Eblaite 149
Amalia Catagnoti

9 Elamite 163
Jan Tavernier

10 Amorite 185
Viktor Golinets

11 Hurrian 203
Dennis R.M. Campbell

12 Hittite 221
Ilya Yakubovich

13 Luwian 239
Craig Melchert

14 Ugaritic 257
Robert Hawley

15 Ancient Hebrew 279
Seth Sanders

16 Phoenician and Punic 297
Françoise Briquel Chatonnet and Robert Hawley

17 Old and Imperial Aramaic 319
Christian Stadel

18 Ancient South Arabian 337
Peter Stein

PART III Ancient Near Eastern Languages Used as Administrative Languages or *Linguae Francae* 355

19 Akkadian as a *Lingua Franca* 357
Juan Pablo Vita

20 Aramaic as *Lingua Franca* 373
Margaretha Folmer

PART IV Language Contact in the Ancient Near East 401

21 Sumerian and Akkadian Language Contact 403
C. Jay Crisostomo

22 Language Contact of Ancient Egyptian with Semitic and Other Near Eastern Languages 421
Thomas Schneider

23 Hebrew and Aramaic in Contact 439
Aaron Koller

24 Multilingualism and Diglossia in the Ancient Near East 457
Rebecca Hasselbach-Andee

PART V The Development of Literary Languages and Literary Contact 471

25 Standard Babylonian 473
Christian W. Hess

26 Standardization in Egyptian 489
Antonio Loprieno

27 The "Influence" of Sumerian on Hittite Literature 505
Mark Weeden

28 Ancient Near Eastern Literary Influences on Hebrew Literature and the Hebrew Bible 521
Michael Wingert

Index 537

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

Luwian

Craig Melchert

Textual Evidence

Luwian is attested from the sixteenth through the eighth century BCE from central, western, and southern Anatolia and northern Syria, in a cuneiform script borrowed from Mesopotamia and a hieroglyphic script developed within Anatolia in the context of the Hittite Empire, which due to its multi-ethnic and multi-lingual character may be better referred to after its own designation as the Empire of Hattusha (see for the scripts Hawkins 2003 and Payne 2015).

This brief characterization seriously oversimplifies the facts of the attestation of Luwian. I must first emphasize that all of our extant evidence for Luwian in cuneiform comes from the state archives of the Hittite capital Hattusha in central Anatolia (sixteenth to thirteenth centuries BCE). The overwhelming bulk of this material falls into two quite distinct groups. There are on the one hand Luwian incantations embedded in therapeutic rituals originating in Kizzuwatna (classical Cilicia Pedias) in southeastern Anatolia, and on the other scattered Luwian words in Hittite texts. As shown by Yakubovich (2010, 15–73), the language of the incantations reflects a ritual koine developed in Kizzuwatna (Kizzuwatna Luwian), while the Luwianisms in Hittite contexts belong to another koineized dialect (Empire Luwian), developed under and promulgated by the central administration of the Empire of Hattusha.

The ritual incantations are edited in transliteration by Starke (1985), who showed that the numerous incomplete manuscripts represent copies of no more than a dozen compositions. Although these rituals are presented as being dictated by named practitioners, some said to come from Kizzuwatna, Miller (2004, 469–511), Christiansen (2006, 22–30), and others have convincingly argued that the rituals as we have them are the product of a

A Companion to Ancient Near Eastern Languages, First Edition. Edited by Rebecca Hasselbach-Andee.
© 2020 John Wiley & Sons, Inc. Published 2020 by John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

complex redactional process by Hattusha scribes. Some may be dated by linguistic criteria to "early Middle Hittite" (fifteenth century), while others are surely from the early Empire period (fourteenth century). Nevertheless, the grammatical consistency of the language of the incantations supports the idea that they ultimately reflect dictation by Luwian practitioners from Kizzuwatna, even if the ritual instructions in Hittite likely do not (thus with Yakubovich 2010, 280).

Since it is now undisputed that there are already Luwian loanwords in Old Hittite (see below), one must restrict the notion of "Luwianism" in Hittite context to words showing unequivocally Luwian inflection. Such forms displaying features agreeing with those of the Empire hieroglyphic Luwian texts and differentiating them from Kizzuwatna Luwian are restricted to New Hittite (Empire) compositions (Yakubovich 2010, 54–62). There are some Luwian-inflected words in Middle Hittite texts, but they become commonplace only in New Hittite (summary in Melchert 2005, 448–52, now in need of revision). A complete up-to-date collection of the Luwianisms in Hittite is currently lacking, but it is unlikely that the present picture will change substantially.

A few lines of Luwian occurring in texts belonging to the state cult of the Old Kingdom of Hattusha (sixteenth to fifteenth centuries BCE) are too fragmentary to be assigned to any particular dialect. There is also tantalizingly at least one fragment of a letter, arguably two (Starke 1985, 368–9). Their use of the clause-initial conjunction *pā* agrees with Kizzuwatna Luwian vs. the Empire koine, but since this feature is likely an archaism (with Yakubovich 2010, 62–3), it alone is insufficient to identify the dialect. A few features of the "songs" of Istanuwa and Lallupiya suggest they belong to a dialect (or dialects?) different from the Kizzuwatna and Empire koines (Melchert 2003a, 174–5), but these texts (actually mere incipits of ritual songs) are too short and difficult of interpretation to allow for any definitive conclusions. Their principal importance lies in reminding us that many more dialects of Luwian surely existed than our very limited and selective evidence attests (see for these texts Starke 1985, 294–353).

Inscriptions in the Anatolian hieroglyphs are attested from the thirteenth to eighth centuries BCE and over a broad geographic range: from Karabel, Karakuyu (Torbalı), Sipylos, and Latmos in the far west of Anatolia, from Hattusha and other sites in central Anatolia, from as far to the southeast as Ancoz in Commagene, and from as far south as Hama and Restan in Syria (map in Hawkins 2003, 142). Once again this blanket description requires significant elaboration. Chronologically, these texts may be usefully divided into three periods (Hawkins 2013a, 26): (i) those of the thirteenth century from the last part of the Empire of Hattusha; (ii) those of a transition period roughly 1200–1000; (iii) those of the post-Empire, Iron Age "Neo-Hittite" states from southern Anatolia and northern Syria dating from 1000–700.

Most inscriptions from the Empire period consist only of names and titles, the latter written logographically, and the *language* in which they are to be read can only be inferred, not proven. See the careful discussion by Hawkins (2003, 140–41), who adds that the same remark applies to most seal impressions, making them almost entirely irrelevant as evidence for the Luwian language (for a few post-Empire exceptions with isolated Luwian words see texts XIII 1, 4 and 11 in Hawkins 2000, 574–81). However, we do have a few Empire texts of considerable length, in Luwian, from the last two Hittite kings, Tuthaliya IV and Suppiluliuma II. These are fundamentally dedicatory in nature, but include

accounts of royal military exploits and building activities. The texts from Emirgazi and Yalburt, in west central Anatolia, are assuredly by Tuthaliya IV, but both present many problems of reading and interpretation. One may receive an accurate impression of their content from the editions by Hawkins (1995, 66–102) – for Yalburt see also the *editio princeps* by Poetto (1993) – but revisions have already been made (e.g. Hawkins 2006, 54–9), and there will be more. No adequate edition of the badly weathered Nişantaş text of Suppiluliuma II exists, while both the interpretation and even the attribution of the Südburg inscription to him are highly controversial (see Payne, 2015, 78–84, with references).

Hawkins (2003, 146–7) already suggested that the previous perception of a "dark age" of two to three centuries between the fall of the Empire of Hattusha around 1200 BCE and the "revival" of Hittite culture by the smaller polities of southeastern Anatolia and northern Syria needed serious revision. Recent discoveries have further strengthened the case for assuming rather that there was a considerable degree of continuity in terms of culture and the writing of Luwian in hieroglyphs through the transitional period of the twelfth and eleventh centuries. Orthography, phraseology, and content argue for dating the Karahöyük inscription to the twelfth century (Hawkins 2000, 289–90), likewise the set of inscriptions by Hartapu from Tabal, however the discrepancy with the dating of the accompanying sculpted figure is to be explained (Hawkins 2000, 429, 434 and 438–9). Use of the archaic phrase DEUS *430+*RA/I* for "every god" or "all the gods", but with rhotacism (/ponara/i-/), in the recently published Karakuyu (Torbali) inscription (thus with Oreshko 2013, 377 vs. ibid. 378) recalls the same combination of features in the Hartapu inscriptions (DEUS-*na/i* *430 and [*t*]*u-pi+ra/i* "strikes/struck" – see Hawkins 2000, 438) and suggests a similar immediate post-Empire dating (Oreshko 2013, 386 argues on different grounds for ca. 1250–1150 BCE).

The Malatya inscriptions previously argued by Hawkins (2000, 187–8 and 296) to date from no later than the eleventh and tenth centuries (arguably the late 12th) have now been joined by the newly published stele of Suhi I from Karkemish (Dinçol et al. 2014a), which on orthographic and historical grounds must be dated to the end of the eleventh century or beginning of the 10th (Dinçol et al. 2014b, 130). Also datable to the eleventh century are the Aleppo temple inscriptions of Taita, self-designated King of Palishtin (see for text, dating, and historical context Hawkins 2011). The new Arsuz inscriptions of a Suppiluliuma, likewise with the title King of Walishtin, now permit a likely sequencing of texts from Amuq forming a continuum from the eleventh to the ninth centuries (Dinçol et al. 2015, 62–3). Finally, because of its notoriety I should mention the "Ankara" silver bowl inscription (probably of Syrian origin) that on epigraphic grounds should be dated to the transitional period, whether or not it alludes to much earlier historical events (see for the most recent discussion Payne 2015, 84–98).

While these welcome recent discoveries have done much to fill the previous gap from the twelfth and eleventh centuries, the overwhelming majority of Luwian hieroglyphic texts date from the tenth–eighth centuries and originate in the various minor "Neo-Hittite" states from southeastern Anatolia and northern Syria that formed after the fall of the Empire of Hattusha. While the term "Neo-Hittite" may seem confusing, it is fully justified, since these states were, and presented themselves as, the political and cultural heirs of the Hittites. Most of the texts represent inscriptions on stone, both natural rock faces and man-made structures. Like the inscriptions of the late Hittite kings, they are

largely dedicatory in nature, but also describe military exploits and building activities of their authors (as seen by Cancik 2002, their textual composition imitates the practices of Assyrian royal inscriptions). There are also a few inscriptions on bowls of stone and metal (see Hawkins 2000, texts XII 3, 14, 15 and 16).

Of a very different nature are the few texts incised on soft lead strips (which could be rolled up for preservation and transport). Those attested thus far are of two genres. First, we have personal letters, those found in Assur, but almost certainly originating from Karkemish or vicinity (Hawkins 2000, 533–55), and the Kırşehir (Yassıhöyük) letter from Tabal (Akdoğan and Hawkins 2010 and Weeden 2013). Second, there are the economic documents from Kululu (Tabal) that record lists of commodities to be distributed to various individuals (Hawkins 2000, 503–13).

Sociolinguistic Status of Luwian

It is commonplace that the written records of ancient corpus languages that have come down to us present a very partial and skewed picture of their sociolinguistic situation. Our documents tend to be the products of social elites and to show a strong bias towards political, administrative, and hieratic content. It should be clear from the preceding summary that our documentation for Luwian is no exception.

Nevertheless, we may make some reasonable hypotheses about the presence of Luwian speakers and the use of Luwian as a spoken and written language – with the caveat that their degree of plausibility varies markedly for different times and places and that new discoveries may require that they be modified or replaced.

Our first (indirect) evidence for Luwian comes from Akkadian texts of the twentieth to eighteenth centuries BCE from the Assyrian trading colonies in central Anatolia, most notably Kanesh (modern Kültepe) on the Upper Halys River. Since personal names may be borrowed for various reasons, the attestation of a modest number of Luwian names in these texts (see most recently Yakubovich 2010, 208–23) does not assure the presence of Luwian speakers. However, we also find several loanwords in the Old Assyrian texts that on phonological and morphological grounds must be of Luwian origin: *ḫiniššannum* and *kulitannum* (names for vessels), *targumannum* "interpreter", and *upatinnum* "royal land grant" (Dercksen 2007, 31–5 and Yakubovich 2010, 208, note 2). While some of these could have been borrowed through Hittite, there is no evidence for a Hittitized variant of Luwian *kullit-* (*contra* Dercksen 2007, 33). It is also noteworthy that Luwian *tarkumm(a)i-* (and its Hittitized variant) only means "report, pass on (verbally)" and never "translate" (thus with Starke 1990, 273–5), suggesting that the Akkadian sense reflects use of the Luwian word in a face-to-face multilingual contact situation that *did* involve translation. We may tentatively conclude that at least some Luwian speakers were present in the area of Kanesh at the beginning of the second millennium BCE (compare Yakubovich 2010, 223).

Yakubovich (2010, 227–39) has argued for a Luwian superstrate in Old Hittite. The evidence is limited and subject to more than one interpretation. It is at least noteworthy that prehistoric Luwian loanwords into Hittite include minimally the respective titles for the king and queen, *tabarna-* and *tawananna-* (see Melchert 2003a, 18–20 and for the first also Yakubovich 2010, 229–32). Rieken (2016a) has now argued that the title

tuḫukant(i)- for the crown prince is likewise a loanword from Luwian. For a discussion of the significance of Luwian personal names in the Old Hittite Kingdom, including those of kings, see Yakubovich (2010, 248–53). It remains difficult to assess just how many Luwian speakers had been integrated into Old Hittite society.

We are on firmer ground when we come to the Early Empire (Tuthaliya I to Suppiluliuma I). The prevalence of Luwian onomastics, the treatment of Luwian in instruction texts aimed at members of the bureaucracy and the military, and above all a series of unmistakably contact-induced changes in Hittite grammar together argue that by this period many if not most Hittite speakers were Luwian bilinguals. Luwianisms (unassimilated Luwian words) also appear in our bureaucratic documents (see van den Hout 2007, 234, revising Melchert 2005), but their still low number suggests that Luwian was primarily a spoken idiom, regarded as unsuited for official written use (see *in extenso* Yakubovich 2010, 260–72).

Events of the second half of the fourteenth century brought dramatic changes. First, Suppiluliuma I annexed portions of northern Syria and resettled large numbers of inhabitants to Hattusha and surrounding areas (Bryce 2005, 163; full text in Beckman 1996, 39–40). A few years later, Mursili II defeated the western Anatolian kingdom of Arzawa in a campaign that reached the Aegean coast and likewise forcibly transferred thousands of people to the Hittite homeland (Bryce 2005, 194–7). As often (compare Melchert 2007, 529), there was a slight time lag between the concomitant societal changes and their linguistic effects, and the language of Suppiluliuma I is that of the early New Kingdom ("late Middle-Hittite") – see Neu 1979. However, the language of his son Mursili II is transitional, showing the first signs of a series of major innovations in Hittite grammar, some of them attributable to Luwian influence – as well as the first use of the "Glossenkeil" (◀) to explicitly mark Luwianisms in Hittite texts.

A connection between the historical events and the linguistic changes has long been acknowledged, but there has been much debate about just what conclusions should be drawn regarding the sociolinguistic status of Hittite and Luwian in the later Empire of Hattusha. Already Rosenkranz (1938, 282) proposed that by this time Hittite existed only as a language of the imperial court and chancery (written and spoken), no longer natively transmitted. Reception of this characterization has been mixed: see the summaries by van den Hout (2007, 227–30) and Yakubovich (2010, 304–6), including reference to my own skeptical stance (Melchert, 2003a, 12–14 and 2005, 457–8). However, van den Hout (2007, 235–42) has now persuasively argued that the concentration of the use of the "Glossenkeil" in texts of an ephemeral nature requires the presence of large numbers of Luwian speakers and either extensive bilingualism or diglossia. Yakubovich (2010, Chapter Five) has progressed much further, making a strong case for what he terms (2010, 307) asymmetrical bilingualism in Hattusha and nearby areas in the late Empire of Hattusha, where a minority of Hittite native speakers fully bilingual in Luwian coexisted with a larger set of Luwian native speakers with varying competence in Hittite, and with monolingual Luwian speakers. Naturally, our official texts reflect only the first two groups centering on the imperial court and chancery; the existence of the third group may only be inferred. However, since the mass deportations from Luwian-speaking areas cited above surely included all social classes, there can be little doubt that they were present, surely in substantial numbers.

Convergent factors argue that the area known in Hittite times as the "Lower Land" southwest of the Halys River and near the Salt Lake (modern Tuz Gölü) was a predominantly Luwian area from the late third millennium (Yakubovich 2010, 243–8) through to the first millennium, when it was part of Tabal (Bryce 2005, 353–4 and 2012, 141). The economic documents of the Kululu lead strips suggest that northeastern Tabal was Luwian-speaking at least by the eighth century BCE.

The Luwian incantations in the Hattusha rituals from Kizzuwatna testify to Luwian presence there from the Early Empire period, though one must reckon with competition from Hurrian (see in detail Yakubovich 2010, 272–85). For arguments for continued use of Luwian in post-Empire Cilicia (Que) by the non-elite population see Yakubovich 2015a.

The extent of the use of Luwian as a spoken language in the other Neo-Hittite states east of Tabal and Que, i.e., in southeastern Anatolia, the Upper Euphrates, and northern Syria remains uncertain. Bryce (2012, 52–60) expresses justified skepticism about large movements of Luwian-speaking refugees into these areas after the fall of the Empire of Hattusha and argues that any Luwian presence there reflects earlier settlement under the Hittite administration. However, one may question whether his final conclusion that "the Luwian-speaking inhabitants of these kingdoms probably constituted only a minority of their populations" applies equally to all of the areas in question.

Also controversial is the status of Luwian as a spoken language in western Anatolia during the second millennium. Yakubovich (2010, Chapter 2) argued at length against the presence of any significant numbers of Luwian speakers, suggesting that the aristocracy of the area spoke Proto- (or Pre-) Carian, rather than Luwian. This claim elicited the sharpest criticism of any portion of his monograph and began an extended debate: see in part Hawkins 2013a, Oreshko 2013, 401–9, Yakubovich 2013, 108–21, and Hawkins 2013b. A full discussion is impossible here, but some remarks are in order. First, I must emphasize that we have no means to securely identify the spoken language of even the elites of western Anatolia in the second millennium, so all hypotheses must depend on arguable indirect evidence. Second, it is hard to believe that the mass deportations from Arzawa by Mursili II did not play a major role in the Luwianization of Hattusha and surrounding areas from the fourteenth century onwards. In particular, the formation of an Empire koine quite distinct from that of the Kizzuwatna rituals argues for the influx of large numbers of speakers of *multiple* Luwian dialects, not just that of Kizzuwatna. Finally, none of the arguments of Yakubovich (2010 and 2013) are incompatible with the assumption of migrations of Luwian speakers *westward* in the first centuries of the second millennium, just before the Luwians appear in Hittite sources. The question must for the present simply be left open.

Contact between Luwian and Other Languages

Before treating the issue of possible contact effects between Luwian and other specific languages, we should note that Luwian shares in at least two phonological "areal features" of the region of its attestation. First, aside from two secondary examples due to loss of an initial dorsal stop – Iron Age Luwian /ruwan/ "formerly" and the name of the Stag-god *Runtiya-* (Melchert 1994, 256 with references) – Luwian has no word-initial /r-/, a

restriction common to all of the Indo-European Anatolian languages as well as Greek, Armenian, and non-Indo-European Hattic and Hurrian. Second, due to what must be a post-Proto-Anatolian innovation that spread through the individual Indo-European Anatolian languages, Luwian in its attested form has only voiceless obstruents in word-initial position, as seen also in Hurrian (Melchert 1994, 18–20, *pace* Kloekhorst 2010).

The question of contact effects between Luwian and the other Indo-European Anatolian languages is complicated by two factors: first, it is unlikely that pre-Luwian speakers ever lost direct contact with the other prehistoric dialects; second, the evidence for and our understanding of the languages beyond Hittite and Luwian is seriously limited. It is thus often difficult to distinguish between shared common innovations (modeled in terms of a "Stammbaum" or of dialect geography) and borrowings from one of the already differentiated dialects into another (lexical and grammatical). On the general problem of shared common innovations see Melchert 2003b, and on developments in the reflexive enclitic pronoun Yakubovich 2010, 173–82. The results of both investigations point to a geographically central prehistoric position of Luwian with respect to the other dialects. The focus in what follows, however, will be on clearly post-differentiation borrowings and interference effects.

All truly compelling examples of *post-differentiation* contact effects between Luwian and another Indo-European Anatolian language involve Hittite, and except for a very few arguable cases they are unidirectional – from Luwian to Hittite. As per the preceding section, effects of Luwian on Hittite from the fourteenth century BCE have long been acknowledged. It was the merit of Starke (1990) to show that already our oldest attested Hittite contains a substantial number of lexical borrowings from Luwian, far more than previously recognized.

Yakubovich (2010, Chapter Three, especially 182–205) further demonstrated that the Hittite reflexive particle *-z(a)* is the result of borrowing from Luwian through a complex series of developments that presupposes a longer and more intense prehistoric contact between Luwian and Hittite than required by mere lexical borrowing. The weight of this *linguistic* argument in support of his claim (2010, 243) that the prehistoric center of gravity of the Luwians was the Konya plain ("Lower Land" in Hittite sources) or alternatively (2013, 114–5) the valley of the Sakarya (classical Sangarios) has not been properly appreciated in the subsequent debate about the Luwians in western Anatolia. Goedegebuure (2008, 171–5) has argued for significant effects of Luwian on Hattic, but the evidence adduced is limited and debatable.

As discussed in the preceding section, Luwian linguistic effects on Hittite during the Old Kingdom (leaving aside onomastics) are arguable. One should note, however, that there are some Luwianisms (NB: not loanwords) in Middle and New Script copies of assured Old Hittite texts of various genres (see Melchert 2005, 448–9 for examples marked with ^{L}). It is far from obvious that all or even most of these represent interpolations by the copyists (even if use of the "Glossenkeil" is such).

I identified (Melchert 2007) eight innovations that occurred in "Middle Hittite" (late Old to early New Kingdom). Yakubovich (2010, 268–71) argued that all of these can and most should be analyzed as due to contact with Luwian. At least four are compelling: (i) the required use of the reflexive particle *-z(a)* in nominal sentences or with the verb "to be" *just* with the first and second persons (totally unmotivated within Hittite);

(ii) replacement of common gender nominative plural enclitic *-e* "they" with *-at* (matching *-ata* in Luwian); (iii) leveling of *ammuk* "me" for *ūk* "I" (but notably not of *tuk* "thee" for *zik* "thou", just as in Luwian); (iv) confusion of the common gender nominative and accusative plural case endings (notably agreeing with Empire and Iron Age Luwian, not Kizzuwatna Luwian). See on the last three features also Rieken (2006, 274–7).

As described above, the second half of the fourteenth century brought a massive new influx of Luwian speakers into the Hattusha court and chancery. Yakubovich (2010, 308–67) argues that a number of New Hittite innovations beginning with Mursili II are due to interference effects reflecting the (imperfect) second-language acquisition of Hittite by Luwian native speakers. These include: (i) a lexically diffused replacement of [e] by [i] due not to regular sound change but to hypercorrection by Luwian speakers whose own language had no phonemic contrast between /e/ and /i/; (ii) diffusion of the Luwian pattern of "*i*-mutation" in nominal paradigms; (iii) nominative-accusative common gender plurals in *-aš*; (iv) clitic iteration (e.g., *n=at=ši(y)=at* "and it to him/her it", with redundant repetition of the direct object pronoun). For the last see already Rieken (2006, 278).

Before leaving the topic of Luwian influence on Hittite, we should also indicate that from the prehistoric period through to the end of the Empire of Hattusha Luwian not only was the direct source of loanwords into Hittite, but also played an important intermediary role in transmitting loanwords from other languages, mostly but not exclusively Hurrian. As shown by Starke (1990, 210–21), the *-t-* that appears sporadically in the oblique cases of such words in Hittite does not reflect any Hurrian morpheme, but rather the suffix *-it-* that Luwian used to adapt most loanwords. One should also stress that these words include Wanderwörter whose ultimate source is unknown.

In contrast to the extensive demonstrated effects of Luwian upon Hittite, from prehistoric times to the end of the Empire of Hattusha – examples for Hittite influence on Luwian are limited to a mere handful of alleged lexical borrowings, all thus far arguable. In a Kizzuwatna ritual context we find the hapax ^{GIŠ}*kattaluzzi=ša* "threshold". This *may* reflect a genuine Luwian neuter noun with a stem **kattaluzzit-* borrowed from Hittite common gender *kattaluzzi-* (Starke 1990, 214), but a Hittite loanword for this vocabulary item in Kizzuwatna Luwian (not Empire Luwian!) seems odd, and one may wonder whether it is instead a hybrid created by the Hittite copyist. Since the Luwian word for "ruler, king" is acknowledged to be /xandawad/t(i)-/, Iron Age Luwian /xassuss(a)ra-/ "queen" has been alleged to be a borrowing of Hittite *ḫaššuššara-*, transparently derived from *ḫaššu-* "king". This is not implausible for an official title, but the implied premise that Luwian could not natively have such an asymmetry between "king" and "queen" is hardly assured. I have argued (Melchert 2013) that the Iron Age Luwian expression /wanaxa/ "away from" identified by Yakubovich is a borrowing of the matching Hittite *awan arḫa*, but for a very different analysis see Yakubovich (2012). Even if one accepts all suggested Hittite loans into Luwian, their number remains miniscule.

There is a widespread view that the Lydians in the second millennium were situated in the northwest of Asia Minor and only moved southward into their classical location later, presumably entering into a super- or substrate relationship with the Luwians: see among others Beekes (2002, 205–17). Yakubovich (2010, 112–7) has challenged this scenario, but even if it is true, one must state emphatically that thus far the only effects demonstrated are limited to a few personal names (most convincing is Lydian *Tiwda-*, surely based on a Luwian theophoric *Tiwada-* "Sun-god", since the native Lydian reflex of **diw-* appears in

ciw- "god"). There will thus be no further discussion here of putative contact effects between Luwian and Lydian.

An adequate discussion of possible Luwian loanwords into Greek is not feasible here. A new critical reassessment updating Neumann 1961 is much needed. I note only that such borrowings involve both native Luwian lexemes and words transmitted by Luwian from other languages. For reasons discussed by Yakubovich (2015a, 36–41), the likely place of transmission is Cilicia.

Kizzuwatna is a culturally and linguistically mixed Luwian-Hurrian region since our earliest sources. Hence the presence of Hurrian loanwords and Hurrianisms in many of the therapeutic Luwian rituals originating in Kizzuwatna. Yakubovich (2010, 47–53) has made plausible arguments that the creation *just in* Kizzuwatna Luwian of agglutinative forms in *-aššš-anz-* of the relational adjective in *-aššša-* to mark plurality of the possessor results from interference from Hurrian, in a situation where Hurrian native speakers were learning Luwian as a second language.

The most notable loanword from Semitic into Luwian is *ḫalāl(i)-* "pure", attested thus far in Kizzuwatna Luwian (though its absence in Iron Age Luwian may be accidental). Surely a factor in its adoption was that it could be fit easily into the native nominal morphology: compare *ādduwal(i)-* "wicked, evil". We also find just once in Iron Age Luwian /sariyassi-/ "eunuch" < Akkadian *ša rēši* (lit. "he of the head"), whose shape has likely been influenced by the more usual calque /wassinassi-/ "he of the body/person" (see Hawkins 2000, 349). On Phoenician as the primary language of the Karatepe and Çineköy Phoenician-Luwian bilingual texts from Cilicia and interference effects on the Luwian version see Yakubovich (2015a, 44–8).

Grammatical Sketch

The following description applies to both Kizzuwatna and Empire/Iron Age Luwian unless noted otherwise. We know too little of the Istanuvian dialect to take it into account here.

Phonology

The Luwian phonemic inventory consists of the following as in Table 13.1:

Table 13.1 Luwian phonemic inventory.

Stops:	/p/	/t/		/k/	/k^w/
	/b/	/d/		/g/	/g^w/
Affricate:		/t^s/			
Fricatives:		/s/		/x/	/x^w/
				/ɣ/	/$ɣ^w$/
Nasals:	/m/	/n/			
Liquids:		/r/, /l/			
Glides:	/w/		/j/		
Vowels:	/i/, /i:/			/u/, /u:/	
			/o/, /o:/		
		/a/, /a:/			

The exact nature of the contrast in the stops and the pairs of dorsal fricatives remains difficult to determine; it may well have been fortis versus lenis instead of voiceless versus voiced. In any case, in cuneiform the voiceless or fortis set are spelled as geminates in intervocalic position, and they certainly closed a preceding syllable (Melchert 1994, 13–21 and Kloekhorst 2014, 544–7). The voiced dorsal stops /g/ and /g^w/ are rare, being restricted to position after sonorants. The dorsal fricatives may well have been uvular rather than velar; for the existence of labialized /x^w/ and /g^w/ see Kloekhorst (2006, 97–101) and Melchert (2011). There is a contrast between /s/ and /ss/ and between simple and geminate nasals and liquids in intervocalic position.

It is likely, though not strictly provable, that intervocalic *[d] became a flap or some kind of coronal continuant already in the prehistory of Luwian. In any case, *only* in Iron Age (first millennium) Luwian the result alternated with [l], and both of these (and occasionally [n]) in turn alternated with [r] (Morpurgo Davies 1982–3 and Rieken and Yakubovich 2010).

There is no doubt that Luwian has phonetically both short and long vowels, but due to a series of prehistoric changes (Melchert 1994, 239–47, following Eichner and Morpurgo Davies) the environments for a phonemic contrast are quite limited. Positing of the vowels /o/ and /o:/ distinct from /u/ and /u:/ is based entirely on the spelling contrast between <u> and <ú> in Luwian written in cuneiform, which follows the same basic pattern as in Hittite with differences in detail (Rieken 2016b). While there is no reason not to infer the existence of /o/ and /o:/ also for Empire/Iron Age Luwian written in hieroglyphs, it should be stressed that Luwian short [o] was likely of restricted distribution, and the *phonemic* contrast between /o/ and /u/ and /o:/ and /u:/ was also limited in scope.

Nominal Inflection

Luwian nouns and adjectives inflect for gender, number, and case. There are two genders, common and neuter, and two numbers, singular and plural. At least Empire Luwian shows a contrast between count (distributive) and collective (set) plural for some common gender nouns: e.g. nom. sg. *lalamiš* "receipt" with collective nom.-acc. pl. *lalāma* beside unattested count nom.-acc. pl. *lalaminzi**. Luwian has a maximum of seven cases: nominative, accusative, vocative, ergative, genitive, dative-locative, and ablative-instrumental. Note that Empire/Iron Age Luwian has merged the common gender nominative and accusative plural. The rare vocative singular is attested only in Kizzuwatna Luwian; otherwise the nominative is used. The existence of a genitive case in Kizzuwatna Luwian is debated, and the existence of a genitive ending /-as(s)a/ in Iron Age Luwian is unprovable due to limitations of the hieroglyphic orthography. See on the complex situation of the use of the genitive and the relational adjective to mark possession Melchert (2012) with particular reference to Yakubovich (2008). For the distribution of the dative-locative singular endings see Yakubovich (2015b, section 6.2). The ablative-instrumental does not distinguish number. The Luwian endings may be schematized as in Table 13.2:

Table 13.2 Luwian nominal inflection.

	Singular		*Plural*	
	KLuwian	*E/I-ALuwian*	*KLuwian*	*E/I-ALuwian*
Nom.C.	/-s/	/-s/	/-nt^{s}i/	/-nt^{s}i/
Acc.C.	/-n/	/-n/	/-nt^{s}/	/-nt^{s}i/
Voc.	-Ø	---	---	---
N-ANt.	-Ø, /-n/	-Ø, /-n/	/-a/, -Ø	/-a/
Erg.	/-antis/	/-antis/	/-antint^{s}i/	/-antint^{s}i/
Gen.	/-as(s)i/, /-assa/[2]	/-as/, /-as(s)i/	---	/-as/, /-as(s)i/[2]
Dat.-Loc.	/-i/, /-a/	/-i/, /-a/	/-ant^{s}/	/-ant^{s}/
Abl.-Inst.		/-adi/		

Two further phenomena should be noted. First, frequently in Kizzuwatna Luwian and virtually obligatorily in Empire/Iron Age Luwian the neuter nom.-acc. singular is followed by a particle /-sa/, which appears as /-t^{s}a/ after the *a*-stem ending /-an/. Second, by the feature known as "*i*-mutation" many stems obligatorily insert an *-i-* between the stem and ending *just* in the nominative and accusative of the common gender (see Starke 1990, 56–64 for a synchronic description, but compare also the reformulation by Yakubovich 2015b, section 6.4).

Pronouns

The near-deictic demonstrative in Luwian is /t^{s}á:-/, while /abá:-/ serves as the far-deictic demonstrative and the orthotonic third person pronoun. Our understanding of their inflection has been much advanced by Goedegebuure (2007) and (2010), the gist of whose synchronic analysis is followed here. Table 13.3 shows the paradigm of /abá:-/, with unattested forms assured by those of /t^{s}á:-/:

Table 13.3 Luwian demonstrative pronouns.

	KLuwian	*E/I-ALuwian*		*KLuwian*	*E/I-ALuwian*
NSgC	/abá:s/	/abá:s/	NPlC	/abí:nt^{s}i/*	/abá:nt^{s}i/
ASgC	/abá:n/	/abá:n/	APlC	/abí:nt^{s}/	/abá:nt^{s}i/
N-ASgNt	/abá:/*	/abá:/	N-APlNt	/abá:/*	/abá:ya/, /abá:/
Dat-LocSg	/abáti/	/abáti/	Dat-LocPl	/abátant^{s}/*	/abátant^{s}/
Abl-Inst	/abá:di(n)/	/abín/		/abá:di(n)/	/abín/

The inflection is entirely that of an *a*-stem: on the common gender nominative and accusative plural forms in Kizzuwatna Luwian and the neuter nom.-acc. plural in Empire/Iron Age Luwian, which do *not* show "*i*-mutation", see Melchert (2009). Thus far, possession is expressed in Kizzuwatna Luwian with the relational adjective /abassa-/. Empire/Iron Age Luwian also attests a genitive /abasi/. The ablative-instrumental forms also serve as adverbs "thus, in that way" and "there".

As in Hittite, the nominative and accusative of the relative-interrogative stem /kʷi-/~/kʷa-/ show true *i*-stem inflection. The only exception is that in Empire/Iron Age Luwian the neuter nom.-acc. singular appears as /kʷan-tˢa/ by "reverse *i*-mutation", versus expected /kʷi:/ in Kizzuwatna Luwian (the latter is still preserved in Empire/Iron Age Luwian as a subordinating conjunction "when"). The rest of the paradigm shares the endings of the demonstratives (for the dative-locative and ablative-instrumental see again Goedgebuure 2007 and 2010). See Table 13.4:

Table 13.4 Luwian relative-interrogative pronouns.

	KLuwian	*E/I-ALuwian*		*KLuwian*	*E/I-ALuwian*
NSgC	/kʷi:s/	/kʷi:s/	NPlC	/kʷi:ntˢi/	/kʷi:ntˢi/
ASgC	/kʷi:n/	/kʷi:n/	APlC	/kʷi:ntˢ/*	/kʷi:ntˢi/
N-ASgNt	/kʷi:/	/kʷan-tˢa/	N-APlNt		/kʷaya/
Dat-LocSg	/kʷati/	/kʷati/	Dat-LocPl		/kʷatantˢ/
Abl-Inst	/kʷadi(n)/	/kʷadi/		/kʷadi(n)/	/kʷadi/

As in Hittite, the orthotonic personal pronouns of the first and second person show a limited inflection. Due to the nature of the text corpora, most of our evidence comes from Iron Age Luwian. The use of the non-subject forms also as subjects except in the second singular has already been mentioned. For the reading of the Iron Age Luwian first and second plural as ending in /-antˢ/ (not /-untˢ/ as previously given) see Yakubovich (2010, 66–9). See Table 13.5:

Table 13.5 Luwian orthotonic personal pronouns of 1st and 2nd person.

	KLuwian	*E/I-ALuwian*		*KLuwian*	*E/I-ALuwian*
1stSg			1stPl		
Nom.		/amu/	Nom.		/a:ntˢantˢ/
Dat.-Acc.		/amu/	Dat.-Acc.	/a:ntˢ(as)/	/a:ntˢantˢ/
2ndSg					
Nom.	/ti:/ʔ	/ti:/	Nom.		/u:ntˢantˢ/
Dat.-Acc.		/tu:/	Dat.-Acc.	/u:ntˢ(as)/	/u:ntˢantˢ/
Abl.-Inst.		/tuwari/	Abl.-Inst.		/u:ntˢari/

It is doubtful that there is any functional difference between the Kizzuwatna Luwian plural forms with and without the final /-as/, but we cannot be sure of this. The attested Iron Age ablative-instrumental forms show "rhotacism" with /-ari/ < /-adi/.

We have virtually no evidence for the first and second person enclitic personal pronouns in Kizzuwatna Luwian. In Empire/Iron Age Luwian the first person singular enclitic /-mu/ is attested in both dative and accusative function, and we may safely assume the same for second singular /-du/, first plural /-antˢ/, and second plural /-mmantˢ/, thus far attested as datives. In the third person Kizzuwatna Luwian preserves the more archaic common gender accusative plural /-as/ and dative plural /-mmas/. These have been

renewed as /-ada/ and /-mant^{s}/ in Iron Age Luwian. The rest of the paradigm is the same in both dialects as in Table 13.6:

Table 13.6 Luwian enclitic personal pronouns.

	KLuwian	*E/I-ALuwian*		*KLuwian*	*E/I-ALuwian*
NSgC	/-as/	/-as/	NPlC	/-ada/	/-ada~-ara/
ASgC	/-an/	/-an/	APlC	/-as/	/-ada~-ara/
N-ASgNt	/-ada/	/-ada~-ara/	N-APlNt	/-ada~-ara/	/-ada~-ara/
DatSg	/-du/	/-du~-ru/	DatPl	/-mmas/	/-mmant^{s}/

Empire/Iron Age Luwian has special enclitic reflexive forms in the singular for all three persons, /-mi/, /-di/, /-di/ (the latter appear also as [-ri]). Kizzuwatna Luwian also attests reflexive /-di/ for the third singular. The plural enclitic personal pronouns serve as reflexives at least in Iron Age Luwian: /-ant^{s}/, /-mmant^{s}/ and /-mmant^{s}/. In Iron Age Luwian first singular /-mu/ competes with /-mi/ in use as a reflexive.

Verbal Inflection

The Luwian finite verb is inflected for the expected three persons, singular and plural number, active and medio-passive voice, and indicative and imperative moods. The formal distinction between the "*mi*-conjugation" and the "*hi*-conjugation" known from Hittite is preserved only in the third person singular. For the distribution of the alternating endings with initial /t/ and /d/ see Morpurgo Davies (1982–3). As she indicates, those with initial /d/ are subject to alternation with /r/ in Iron Age Luwian. The nature of our corpora leads to significant gaps in our knowledge of the personal endings in both dialects, especially for the medio-passive. Table 13.7 shows what is currently known:

Table 13.7 Inflection of finite verbs in Luwian.

Present Indicative Active					
	KLuwian	*E/I-ALuwian*		*KLuwian*	*E/I-ALuwian*
1stSg	/-wi/	/-wi/	1stPl	/-unni/	
2ndSg	/-si/, /-ti/$^{?}$, /-tis/$^{?}$	/-si/, /-tis/	2ndPl	/-tani/	/-tani/
3rdSg	/-ti/~/-di/, /-ai/	/-ti/~/-di/, /-ai/	3rdPl	/-anti/	/-anti/
Present Indicative Medio-passive					
	KLuwian	*E/I-ALuwian*		*KLuwian*	*E/I-ALuwian*
2ndSg			2ndPl	/-tuwar(i)/	
3rdSg	/-ar(i)/, /-tari/		3rdPl	/-antari/	

(*Continued*)

Table 13.7 (Continued)

Preterite Indicative Active					
	KLuwian	*E/I-ALuwian*		*KLuwian*	*E/I-ALuwian*
1stSg	/-xa/~/-ɣa/	/-xa(n)/~/-ɣa(n)/	1stPl		
2ndSg		/-ta/~/-da/	2ndPl		
3rdSg	/-ta/~/-da/	/-ta/~/-da/	3rdPl	/-a(w)nta/	/-a(w)nta/
Imperative Active					
	KLuwian	*E/I-ALuwian*		*KLuwian*	*E/I-ALuwian*
1stSg	/-lu/ʔ				
2ndSg	-Ø	-Ø		/-tan/	/-tanu/~/-danu/*
3rdSg	/-tu/~/-du/	/-tu/~/-du/		/-antu/	/-antu/
Imperative Medio-passive					
	KLuwian	*E/I-ALuwian*		*KLuwian*	*E/I-ALuwian*
3rdSg	/-aru/, /-taru/	/-aru/	3rdPl	/-antaru/	/-antaru/*

Mention should also be made of the Iron Age Luwian preterite mediopassives formed by addition of a reflexive particle /-si/ (Rieken 2004 with references). Both dialects of Luwian attest an infinitive in /-una/ and a participle in /-mma-/ (which shows "*i*-mutation"). Iron Age Luwian also has a form in /-min(a)/ used predicatively in deontic function: "(is/are) to be __ed".

Syntax

It is reasonably certain that the functionally unmarked word order is S O V. The sentence negation and preverbs regularly appear directly before the finite verb. Demonstratives, attributive adjectives and adnominal genitives usually appear before their head noun, but exceptions in Empire/Iron Age Luwian are not rare (for a comprehensive analysis of word order in noun phrases see now Bauer 2014).

As in Hittite, clause-level enclitics, including anaphoric pronouns and various particles, appear attached either to interclausal conjunctions or the first accented word in their clause by so-called "Wackernagel's Law". The order within the "clitic chain" is fixed: quotative particle+dative/reflexive+nominative/accusative+local particle. Most constituents of the clause may also undergo "fronting", appearing in absolute initial position or following an interclausal conjunction plus clitics. This word order marks some kind of focus or topicalization (or both), but the precise discourse function of pure "fronting" is not yet clear. Fronting is most frequent when a constituent is marked for additive focus by the enclitic /-xa/ "also; even" or for contrastive focus by the enclitic /-ba/.

Agreement within noun phrases is regular (see Bauer 2014). Collective plural subjects take a singular verb, and in the case of multiple subjects the verb is often singular, agreeing with the nearer subject, as does any predicate adjective.

The use of nominal cases and verbal categories mostly follows expected patterns, but the complex interplay of genitive case and relational adjective in marking possession is noteworthy (see Melchert 2003a, 202 with references).

All previous descriptions of relative clause syntax in Luwian must be radically revised (Melchert 2016).

REFERENCES

Akdoğan, R. and Hawkins, J.D. 2010. "The Kırşehir Letter: A new Hieroglyphic Luwian Text on a Lead Strip." In *VII. Uluslararasi Hititoloji Kongresi Bildirileri Çorum 25-31Ağustos 2008 / Acts of the VIIth International Congress of Hittitology Çorum, August 25-31, 2008*, edited by A. Süel, 1–16. Ankara: T.C. Çorum Valiliği.

Bauer, A.H. 2014. *Morphosyntax of the Noun Phrase in Hieroglyphic Luwian*. Leiden: Brill.

Beckman, G. 1996. *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

Beekes, R. 2002. "The Prehistory of the Lydians, the Origins of the Etruscans, Troy and Aeneas." *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, 59: 205–41.

Bryce, T. 2005. *The Kingdom of the Hittites*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bryce, T. 2012. *The World of the Neo-Hittite Kingdoms: A Political and Military History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cancik, H. 2002. "Die luwische Historiographie." In *Die Hethiter und ihr Reich: Das Volk der 1000 Götter*, 78–81. Stuttgart: Theiss.

Christiansen, B. 2006. *Die Ritualtradition der Ambazzi. Eine philologische Bearbeitung und entstehungsgeschichtliche Analyse der Ritualtexte CTH 391, CTH 429 und CTH 463*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Dercksen, J.G. 2007. "On Anatolian Loanwords in Akkadian Texts from Kültepe." *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, 97: 26–46.

Dinçol, A.†, Dinçol, B., Hawkins, J.D. et al. 2014a. "A Stele by Suhi I from Karkemish." *Orientalia NS*, 83: 143–53.

Dinçol, A.†, Dinçol, B., Hawkins, J.D. et al. 2014b. "The New Luwian Hieroglyphic Stele from Karkemish: At the Origins of the Suhi-Katuwa Dynasty." In *Karkemish*, edited by N. Marchetti, 127–31. Bologna: Ante Quem.

Dinçol, B., Dinçol, A. †, Hawkins, J.D. et al. 2015. "Two new inscribed Storm-god stelae from Arsuz (İskenderun): ARSUZ 1 and 2." *Anatolian Studies*, 65: 59–77.

Goedegebuure, P. 2007. "The Hieroglyphic Luwian demonstrative ablative-instrumentals *zin* and *apin*." In *VI Congresso Internazionale di Ittitologia, Roma, 5-9 settembre 2005*, edited by A. Archi and R. Francia (eds.), 319–34. Rome: CNR.

Goedegebuure, P. 2008. "Central Anatolian Languages and Language Communities in the Colony Period: A Luwian-Hattic Symbiosis and the Independent Hittites." In *Anatolia and the Jazira during the Old Assyrian Period*, edited by J.G. Dercksen, 137–80. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten.

Goedegebuure, P. 2010. "The Luwian Demonstratives of Place and Manner." In *ipamati kistamati pari tumatimis: Luwian and Hittite Studies Presented to J. David Hawkins on the Occasion of his 70th Birthday*, edited by Itamar Singer, 76–94. Tel Aviv: Institute of Archaeology Tel Aviv University.

Hawkins, J.D. 1995. *The Hieroglyphic Inscription of the Sacred Pool Complex at Hattusa (SÜDBURG): With an Archaeological Introduction by Peter Neve*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Hawkins, J.D. 2000. *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions. Volume 1: Inscriptions of the Iron Age*, Berlin: de Gruyter.

Hawkins, J.D. 2003. "Chapter Four: Scripts and Texts." In *The Luwians*, edited by H. Craig Melchert, 128–69. Leiden: Brill.

Hawkins, J. D. 2006. "Tudḫaliya the Hunter." In *The Life and Times of Ḫattušili III and Tutḫaliya IV: Proceedings of a Symposium Held in Honour of J. De Roos, 12-13 December 2003, Leiden*, edited by T.P.J. van den Hout, 49–76. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten.

Hawkins, J.D. 2011. "The inscriptions of the Aleppo temple." *Anatolian Studies*, 61: 35–54.

Hawkins, J. D. 2013a. "Luwians versus Hittites." In *Luwian Identities: Culture, Language and Religion between Anatolia and the Aegean*, edited by A. Mouton, I. Rutherford, and I. Yakubovich, 25–40. Leiden: Brill.

Hawkins, J.D. 2013b. "A New Look at the Luwian Language." *Kadmos*, 52: 1–18.

Kloekhorst, A. 2006. "Initial Laryngeals in Anatolian." *Historische Sprachforschung*, 119: 77–108.

Kloekhorst, A. 2010. "Initial stops in Hittite (with an excursus on the spelling of stops in Alalaḫ Akkadian)." *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, 100: 197–241.

Kloekhorst, A. 2014. *Accent in Hittite: A Study in Plene Spelling, Consonant Gradation, Clitics, and Metrics*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Melchert, H.C. 1994. *Anatolian Historical Phonology*. Leiden and Boston: Rodopi.

Melchert, H.C. 2003a. "Chapter Five: Language." In *The Luwians*, edited by H.C. Melchert, 170–210. Leiden: Brill.

Melchert, H.C. 2003b. "The Dialectal Position of Lycian and Lydian within Anatolian." In *Licia e Lidia prima dell'Ellenizzazione. Atti del Convegno internazionale Roma, 11-12 ottobre 1999*, edited by Mauro Giorgieri, Mirjo Salvini, Marie Claude Trémouille, et al., 265–72. Rome: CNR.

Melchert, H.C. 2005. "The Problem of Luvian Influence on Hittite." In *Sprachkontakt und Sprachwandel: Akten der XI. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, 17.–23. September 2000, Halle an der Saale*, edited by G. Meiser and O. Hackstein, 445–60. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Melchert, H.C. 2007. "Middle Hittite Revisited." In *VI Congresso Internazionale di Ittitologia Roma, 5–9 settembre 2005*, edited by A. Archi and R. Francia, 525–30. Rome: CNR.

Melchert, H.C. 2009. "The Animate Nominative Plural in Luvian and Lycian." In **$h_2$nr: Festschrift für Heiner Eichner* (= *Die Sprache* 48), edited by R. Nedoma and D. Stifter, 112–17. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Melchert, H.C. 2011. "The PIE Verb for 'to pour' and Medial *h_3 in Anatolian." In *Proceedings of the 22nd Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference*, edited by S.W. Jamison, H.C. Melchert, and Brent Vine, 127–32. Bremen: Hempen.

Melchert, H.C. 2012. "Genitive Case and Possessive Adjective in Anatolian." In *Per Roberto Gusmani: Linguistica istorica e teorica*, edited by V. Orioles, 1.273–86. Udine: Forum.

Melchert, H.C. 2013. "Hittite and Hieroglyphic Luvian *arha* 'away': Common Inheritance or Borrowing?" *Journal of Language Contact*, 6: 300–312.

Melchert, H.C. 2016. "Relative Clauses in Anatolian." In *»dat ih dir it nu bi huldi gibu« Linguistische, germanistische und indogermanistische Studien Rosemarie Lühr gewidmet*, edited by S. Neri, R. Schuhmann and S. Zeilfelder, 287–95. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Miller, J.L. 2004. *Studies in the Origins, Development and Interpretation of the Kizzuwatna Rituals*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Morpurgo Davies, A. 1982–3. "Dentals, rhoticism and verbal endings in the Luwian languages." *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung*, 96: 245–70.

Neu, E. 1979. "Zum sprachlichen Alter des Ḫukkana-Vertrages." *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung*, 93: 64–84.

Neumann, G. 1961. *Untersuchungen zum Weiterleben hethitischen und luwischen Sprachgutes in hellenistischer und römischer Zeit*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Oreshko, R. 2013. "Hieroglyphic Inscriptions of Western Anatolia: Long Arm of the Empire or Vernacular Tradition(s)?" In *Luwian Identities: Culture, Language and Religion between Anatolia and the Aegean*, edited by A. Mouton, I. Rutherford, and I. Yakubovich, 347–420. Leiden: Brill.

Payne, A. 2014. *Hieroglyphic Luwian: An Introduction with Original Texts*. 3rd Revised Edition. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Payne, A. 2015. *Schrift und Schriftlichkeit: Die anatolische Hieroglyphenschrift*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Plöchl, R. 2003. *Einführung ins Hieroglyphen-Luwische*. Dresden: Technische Universität Dresden.

Poetto, M. 1993. *L'iscrizione luvio-geroglifica di Yalburt: Nuove acquisizioni relative alla geografia dell'Anatolia sud-occidentale*. Pavia: Iuculano.

Rieken, E. 2004. "Das Präteritum des Medio-Passivs im Hieroglyphen-Luwischen." *Historische Sprachforschung*, 117: 179–88.

Rieken, E. 2006. "Zum hethitisch-luwischen Sprachkontakt in historischer Zeit." *Altorientalische Forschungen*, 33: 271–85.

Rieken, E. 2016a. Zum luwischen Ursprung von heth. ^{LÚ}*ta/uḫ(uk)kanti-* 'Kronprinz'. In *Anatolica et Indogermanica: Studia linguistica in honorem Johannis Tischler septuagenarii dedicata*, edited by H. Marquardt, S. Reichmuth, and J.V. García Trabazo, 267–77. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck.

Rieken, E. 2016b. "Word-internal Plene Spelling in Kizzuwatna Luwian: with a Focus on and <u> vs. <ú>." Paper presented at the Thirty-Fifth East Coast Indo-European Conference, University of Georgia, Athens, GA, June 6, 2016.

Rieken, E, and Yakubovich, I. 2010. "The New Values of Luwian Signs L 318 and L 172." In *ipamati kistamati pari tumatimis: Luwian and Hittite Studies Presented to J. David Hawkins on the Occasion of his 70th Birthday*. edited by I. Singer, 199–219. Tel Aviv: Institute of Archaeology Tel Aviv University.

Rosenkranz, B. 1938. "Die Stellung des Luwischen im Hatti-Reiche." *Indogermanische Forschungen*, 56: 265–84.

Starke, F. 1985. *Die keilschrift-luwischen Texte in Umschrift*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Starke, F. 1990. *Untersuchung zur Stammbildung des keilschrift-luwishen Nomens*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

van den Hout, T. 2007. "Institutions, Vernaculars, Publics: The Case of Second-Millennium Anatolia." In *Margins of Writing, Origins of Cultures*, edited by S.L. Sanders, 221–62. Chicago: The Oriental Institute.

Weeden, M. 2013. "A Probable Join to the "Kırşehir Letter"." *Anatolian Archaeological* Studies, 18: 15–17.

Yakubovich, I. 2008. "The Origin of the Luwian Possessive Adjective." In *Proceedings of the 19th Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference*, edited by K. Jones-Bley, M. Huld, A. Della Volpe, and M. Robbins Dexter, 193–217. Washington DC: Institute for the Study of Man.

Yakubovich, I. 2010. *Sociolinguistics of the Luvian Language*. Leiden: Brill.

Yakubovich, I. 2012. "The Reading of Luwian *ARHA* and Related Problems." *Altorientalische Forschungen*, 39: 321–39.

Yakubovich, I. 2013. "Anatolian Names in *-wiya* and the Structure of Empire Luwian Onomastics." In *Luwian Identities: Culture, Language and Religion between Anatolia and the Aegean*, edited by A. Mouton, I. Rutherford, and I. Yakubovich, 87–123. Leiden: Brill.

Yakubovich, I. 2015a. "Phoenician and Luwian in Early Iron Age Cilicia." *Anatolian Studies*, 65: 35–53.

Yakubovich, I. 2015b. "The Luwian Language." *Oxford Handbooks Online*. Accessed 6/13/2016. http://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199935345.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199935345-e-18?rskey=8oLdqb&result=2

FURTHER READING

Plöchl (2003) and Payne (2014) offer excellent introductions to Empire/Iron Age Luwian. The latter is in lesson format and includes an introduction to the script. For Kizzuwatna Luwian see Melchert (2003a) and Yakubovich (2015b), but the former must be used with the correctives given here and by Yakubovich.