SERIES ANATOLICA ET INDOGERMANICA 5

Gods and Languages in Ancient Anatolia

Mariona Vernet, Ignasi-Xavier Adiego, José Virgilio García Trabazo, María-Paz de Hoz, Bartomeu Obrador-Cursach (eds.)



Table of Contents

Foreword 11
Mariona Vernet

The character and gender of the Anatolian deity Pirwa and other Ancient Near Eastern deities associated with horses 15
Birgit Christiansen

Hittite Divinities of the Underworld and the Night Goddess of Šamuḫa: An interpretation from their hybrid cosmological background 33
José Virgilio García Trabazo

Hittite ideas about the body as stimulus, stage and landscape of human and divine emotions. A textual approach 55
João Paulo Galhano

The cult of ^{D}LAMMA ^{KUŠ}*kuršaš in the Luwian and Hittite religious spheres* 103
Natalia Lodeiro Pichel

The Āššiya- Deities 119
H. Craig Melchert

Good gods and evil gods: the role of Hittite deities through their epithets 137
Laura Puértolas Rubio

Gods and rulers in Neo-Hittite Tabal 165
Tatiana Frühwirt

Sonne Mond Sterne und Kubaba 185
Diether Schürr

Nikarawas Reconsidered 205
Zsolt Simon

Apollo Tyrimnos: origin, names, attributes, and cult of the patron god of Thyateira 217
Juan Pablo Sánchez Hernández

The Lydian god Qλdãns 239
Ilya Yakubovich

Xenophon of Ephesus, Ephesiaca 1.2.2-9: *a real pompe?* 263
Consuelo Ruiz Montero

Zeus, Apollo, and their epithets in the Lykos Valley 281
Francesco Guizzi – Michela Nocita

Zeus Osogōs, Zeus Osogō, Zeus Osogōa? *The adventures of a Carian god name* 301
Ignasi-Xavier Adiego

Zeus of Labraunda and his epicleses: a chronological distribution 321
Manuela Anelli

Iasos and its cults of Zeus between the Greek and the Carian World (6th-4th century BC) 353
Roberta Fabiani

Give a god a bad name and beg him: the Lycian theonym Σουμενδις/Σομενδις 375
Florian Réveilhac

An oracle of Ares Kiddeudas in southern Anatolia? 391
Héctor Arroyo-Quirce

Doumoi, *sacred villages, and indigenous gods in Roman Asia Minor* 405
María-Paz de Hoz

A formal approach to the Sidetic signs for d *and* l 437
Gem Ferrer Pérez

The 1pl. and 2pl. personal pronouns in Luwian, Anatolian, and Indo-European 453
Alwin Kloekhorst

Luw. ḫu(wa)mm-*: a new word family and its PIE etymology* 483
Elisabeth Rieken

A new tessera iudicis *in Sidetic* 497
Recai Tekoğlu

Carian q *and Luwic* *H 511
Miguel Valério – Ignasi-Xavier Adiego

Word Index 531
Bartomeu Obrador-Cursach

Citation Index 547
Bartomeu Obrador-Cursach

The *Āššiya-* Deities

H. Craig Melchert
University of California, Los Angeles

§ 1. *Introduction*[1]

These deities are of extremely limited attestation: they occur only in *KUB* 2.8 and duplicates (pre-NH/NS), as part of the AN.DAḪ.ŠUM^{SAR} Festival (per Steitler 2020: 327, likely days 25/26, but in any case in Tauriša in the temple of the ^{d}LAMMA of Tauriša).

The previous sparse discussion in the literature totally misrepresents the facts: per Laroche (1947: 72), this divine name is the participle of the Hittite verb *āššiya-*, thus 'beloved', but the latter could only be †^{d}*Āššiyant-*. Haas (1994: 309) in fact falsely cites the wholly unattested †^{d}*Aššiyant-* „Geliebte", with an aberrant comparison with Hurrian *Allani*. Starke (1990: 453–454) wrongly posits a stem †^{d}*Āšši-*, claimed to be a deification of the base of CLuw. *āššiwant-* = Hitt. *ašiwant-* 'poor' (though of indeterminate meaning). However, such a stem could only have as its accusative plural †^{d}*Āššinza*. Steitler (2020: 329–331), nonplussed by the determinative ^{d} on a Luwian plural, improbably against all syntactic evidence analyzes ^{d}*Āššiyanza* as a Hittite nominative singular participle used as a stem form!

1. I wish to thank multiple members of the Barcelona audience for their spirited objections to various aspects of the oral presentation of this paper, which identified the weak points requiring much stronger argumentation. Whether this heavily revised and augmented version persuades any doubters or not, it is much the better for their constructive interventions. I am indebted to Andrew Merritt for bringing my attention to the Slavic word for 'riverbank' that matches, in one way or another, the problematic CLuwian *papparkantaimman-*, and to José Virgilio García Trabazo for his assistance with loanwords into Basque. I naturally am solely responsible for the formulations presented here.

Barcino. Monographica Orientalia 25 – Series Anatolica et Indogermanica 5 (2024) (ISBN: 978-84-1050-054-9)

§ 2. *Formal Aspects*

The actual attested forms show unequivocally that the word is a Luwian common gender stem in *-iya-*: Acc Pl ^{d}*A-aš-ši-ya-za KUB* 2.8 v 22; Nom Pl ^{d}*A-aš-ši-ya-zi* in direct object function *KBo* 13.176 RC 4; Dat-Loc Pl ^{d}*A-aš-ši-ya-an-za KUB* 2.8 ii 2, ^{d}*A-aš-ši-ya-za* ibid. i 22 and ii 40. As in Hittite, "nasal reduction" is commonplace in CLuwian in the sequence /-Vnt^{s}(V)/.

This divine name belongs to a well-attested class of Luwian deities of the same shape: ^{d}*Ḫilaššitiya-*, ^{d}*Immaršiya-*, ^{d}*Kināliya-*, ^{d}*Warwaliya-*. Even when the immediate base is less than transparent, these clearly show the appurtenance suffix **-iyo-* plus "individuating" (and substantivizing) **-eh$_2$*.[2] Thus ^{d}*Āššiya-* likewise points to a base **āšš*(*a*)-. *Pace* Steitler, use of the determinative ^{d} with a CLuwian plural is entirely normal: cf. Nom Pl ^{d}*I-it-ma-ri-in-zi KUB* 35.82 i 6 and Dat-Loc Pl ^{d}*I-it-ma-ri-an-za KUB* 6.37 Ro 16.17.[3]

§ 3. *Functional Profile*

The nature of the ^{d}*Āššiya-* deities is not immediately determinable from context, given their entirely passive role as recipients of drink and food offerings,[4] but their associations are highly consistent: in all occurrences they appear in the company of Ḫašamili and the Storm-god of the forest and in three also of the spring Kuwannaniya. In *KBo* 13.176 RC 3–6 they and the others are explicitly said to belong to the ^{d}LAMMA of Tauriša. Outside of this text and lists of tutelary deities the latter most notably appears in the mythologem of the feast of the Sun-god to which he fails to invite "the great god". ^{d}LAMMA of Tauriša reports to *his father* the Sun-god the unhappiness of the uninvited deity and its consequences (text in Steitler 2017: 388–399).

That the Luwian noun ^{d}*Āššiya-* is derived from the same base as the Hittite medio-passive verb *āššiya-* 'to be dear to' and its far more frequent participle *āšši-*

2. First identified by Hajnal (1994: 152). See further Melchert 2014: 262 and Sasseville 2014/2015.

3. Against the oral presentation of this paper, the Nom Pl ^{d}*I-it-ma-ri-in-zi* shows that the attested Luwian forms are adjectives in *-iya/i-* with "*i*-mutation", but cf. Hittitized ^{d}*Itmariuš* KUB 6.37 obv. 14. These divinized cult vessels appear only in the plural (van Gessel 1998: 208). The base stem in this case may be in *-i-* or *-iya-*.

4. Nor can we tell whether they are gods or goddesses. That they seem to occur only in the plural is at best a very weak indicator of the latter and by no means determining.

yant- ‘dear, beloved’ seems undeniable. The ambiguity of the appurtenance suffix allows for Luwian *āššiya-* either ‘favored, dear, beloved’ or ‘favoring, bringing well-being’. The former is conceivable only if the referent is ^{d}LAMMA of Tauriša, but the position of plural ^{d}*Āššiya-* in lists among named individual deities argues against this: why should some otherwise unidentified subgroup of dependent deities alone be characterized as ‘dear’ to him?

That a class of deities would be described as ‘dear, beloved’ to humans is not credible. For the Hittites gods and humans did not stand in an equal, reciprocal relationship: gods were the source of all favor and well-being, and fortunate humans were the recipients. Per the narrative of Ḫattušili III, Ishtar chose him at her initiative. Likewise, Muwattalli was “recognized, exalted, and favored” by the Storm-god of Lightning (*KUB* 6.45 iii 74–75). As per Gérard (2004), the Empire and Iron Age HLuwian transitive verb *á-za-* ‘to favor, love’ is used exclusively of gods as subject and humans as object.[5] Finally, deities are asked to protect humans or to turn to them *āššuli* ‘for well-being’; Anitta was *āššu-* ‘dear’ to the Storm-god and was successful due to the latter’s favor. I assert that the *Āššiya-* deities are ‘ones of good, weal, well-being’ in the sense ‘bringers of’.[6] For similar reasons the *Ilaliyant-* deities (associated with fate deities) are surely ‘gods of desire’ in the sense ‘who bring one’s desires’, not ‘the ones desired’ (by humans). It would have been presumptuous, if not hubristic, for humans to define any gods as ‘desired’. We have no reason for doubting that the speakers of Luwian or Lycian shared the same attitude.

§ 4. *Good and Bad as Bestowed by Gods and Received by Humans*

The *Āššiya-* deities are not the only reflex in Luwian of the world view that the gods are the source of good and bad for humans.[7] A frequent topos in the bles-

5. I should explicitly emphasize here that HLuw. *aza-* has no connection to *āššiya-* or *āššā-*^{ri}, *contra* Melchert (1987: 200). As seen by Gérard (2004: 306), the verb is not only transitive but is clearly a verb of seeing, having LITUUS or OCULUS as determinative (facts that cannot be set aside, *pace* Sasseville, eDiAna ID 1309). It thus means ‘to have regard for’, hence ‘to favor’, just like CLuw. *mimma-* (for which see Melchert 1988: 218–220).

6. One may compare the almost exclusively agent-noun sense of Hittite and Luwic substantives in **-é-leh$_2$* to appurtenance adjectives in **-é-lo-* (Sasseville 2014/2015).

7. For Hittite one need cite only *inter alia* the passage from the “Second Plague Prayer” of Muršili II, which describes how the Storm-god first supported his father Šuppiluliuma I against the Egyptians, but then punished him and the Hittites for having violated the treaty that the Storm-god had imposed (§§4–5, KUB 14.8 Ro 13–34; see Singer 2002: 58–59).

sing and curse formulas of Iron Age HLuwian inscriptions is that gods are 'to come well' (/wa:su(wa) awi:-/) or 'to come fatally (lit. for death)' (/wala awi:-/) for various individuals (see Hawkins 2000: 444 and 486 respectively with refs.).

In the Festival for All the Tutelary Deities we find among the many epithets of ^{d}*Āla-* that of *aššattaššiš* (*KUB* 2.1 iii 44). Laroche (1959: 33) correctly compared Lycian AB *ehetehi*/*esetesi*, including the latter as a paired epithet of the Storm-god: *trqq*[*i*]*z*: *esetesi*=[*k*]*e er*[*b*]*besi*=*ke*: (TL 44d, 12–13). Neumann (1984: 90) argued correctly that these epithets must likewise be antithetical ("polar") and cited similar expressions in the Bible, Homer, and elsewhere for the power of a supreme god to bestow good and bad. However, despite offering for *esete-* „Erfolg, Heil, Glück" (adopted in Hajnal 1994: 144), he then added specifically „Sieg", almost certainly influenced by his view that *erbbe-* meant „Niederlage, Mißerfolg", following Laroche. So while confusingly adducing the more general „Unheil, Schaden" for *erbbe-*, he tentatively concluded with „Trqqiz, der Besitzer der Macht über Sieg und Niederlage".[8] I argued in the oral presentation of this paper for the very general 'of good and bad fortune', but the antonymic relationship is hardly as strict as implied, and one must make due allowance for the possibility of a semantic shift in Lycian, the texts for which postdate both Bronze Age CLuwian and Hittite as well as Iron Age Luwian by centuries. A full review of the evidence is called for.

We may begin with the negative member of the opposition. Luwian *arpā-* is manifestly 'misfortune, adversity' with Puhvel (1984: 168) and Beal (1999: 50). It cannot mean 'tumult, confusion, strife' or 'strife, war, battle' (Melchert 1993: 30 and 2004: 16) or 'unrest' (Sasseville and Rieken eDiAna ID 2312, 3. Reconstruction). First of all, in the oracular inquiry KUB 5.1 iii 46, 49, and 67 the expression used is *ŠA* MÈ (DUGUD-*un*) *arpan* "(serious/heavy) misfortune in (lit. of) battle" (with Beal 1999: 50–51). Likewise ibid. iii 33: KARAŠ.ḪI.A TA MÈ *arpašāi* "will the troops suffer misfortune by/through battle? (with Beal, loc. cit.). It is clear that *arpa-* is a possible (negative) result of battle, but cannot itself mean 'war' or 'battle'. There is strikingly also no 'Storm-god of war/battle' (†*kururaš*, *zaḫḫa*/*iyaš* ^{d}10/IŠKUR or ^{d}10/IŠKUR ZÈ) anywhere in Hittite sources. Nor any †*arpaš*/*arpaššiš* ^{d}10/IŠKUR.[9]

8. Then in turn undercutting this with a citation of Hitt. *parā ḫandandatar* 'predestination, providence', which he interprets as having a general sense „das göttliche Walten". Neumann's wavering has led to his being cited as support for quite divergent interpretations of both *es*/*hete-* and *erbbe-*.

9. There is a *takšulaš* ^{d}10/IŠKUR, a minor avatar of the Storm-god attested only in the OH monthly festival (van Gessel 1998: 778 and 659). There is no evidence for a Luwian counterpart.

Furthermore, the same verb *arpaša*- is also used to describe how things went badly for Ḫattušili III when out of envy Arma-Tarḫunta and others made false accusations against him before his brother, King Muwattalli (text in Otten 1981: 6–7). The context is of a court case, and there is no reference whatsoever to battle or war. Since Ḫattušili III was in fact proven innocent, a sense 'to suffer defeat' and hence 'defeat' for the Luwian noun is also excluded (*contra HW*^{2} 1.339 et al.). Finally, *pace* Sasseville and Rieken, loc. cit., the figurative use of *arpa*- and *arpaša*- is in fact undoubtedly derived from the concrete sense of the base **arp*- 'to be steep, slanted, bent' (in *arpatta*- 'steep slope', *arpuwant*- 'steep', but also 'adverse' of omens, etc.). For the range of meanings, one need only compare German *schief*. The expression in Ḫattušili III's "Apology" may be idiomatically rendered as "Es ging mir schief". Nowhere is any explicit agent present, though the world view of the Hittites and Luwians cited above naturally implies that both good and bad events are the result of divine will.

In the face of this unequivocal evidence for Luwian *arpa*- one must critically reexamine that for Lycian *erbbe*-. One must first be clear that not a single attestation of the noun occurs in a passage where there is a consensus on the syntactic or semantic interpretation of the context. One need merely read and compare the works cited in Sasseville eDiAna ID 2312 under the sections 3. Meaning. Nevertheless, despite serious disagreement about identifying the subject(s) and object(s), there is unanimity that TL 44a, 46–48 (and surrounding text) is describing military actions, and the same is reasonably sure for TL 44b, 19. Thus for the issue at hand the motivation for the renderings of *qastte…erbbedi* and *erbbedi tubei*[*te*] as "crushed…in battle" and "defeated in battle" by Sasseville (2020: 234, 418) and similar interpretations by others is clear enough. We have seen that 'battle' is quite impossible for the CLuwian cognate, but since the actions described in the Lycian were committed by identifiable human agents, describing them as happening due to 'misfortune' sounds odd. However, a more concrete "destroyed through/struck with disaster/ruin(ation)" would fit, since disaster/ruin(ation) is often brought by human actions, including military ones.

The difficulty is that I and others have without justification extrapolated a sense 'battle' for Lycian *erbbe*- from the military contexts to others where there is no basis for such. *Pace* Sasseville, eDiAna ID 2312, 1.3. Meaning, and the authors cited (including me), there is *no* evidence to suggest a military context in TL 44b,

There is conversely a *ŠA Labarna zaḫḫiyaš* ^{d}LAMMA 'tutelary deity of battle of the L.' (van Gessel 1998: 695), but this clearly is a personal deity of the Hittite king. No evidence suggests paired avatars of 'war' and 'peace' for the Storm-god or any other deity.

35. To the extent that surrounding vocabulary is interpretable, we are facing rather building activities (*urubli*[*j*]*edi*, *qehñ*[*n*]*i m̃me*, *arawazija*).[10] There is also no obvious military context in TL 29, 3–4:

se ñtemlẽ: *qastte teli*: *erbbe*: *me=ti ñtẽmlẽ*: *przze*: *astte* [...] *se*(*j*)*=ahata*: *astte*:

As we will see below, the last clause cannot possibly mean "and made peace" (*contra* Sasseville 2020: 453). It is also far from obvious that Ikuwe, the author of the text, having described his building a burial chamber for his immediate family, would then with no transition say that he had committed the desecratory act of destroying a sanctuary "in battles". It seems rather more likely that he says that he replaced a sanctuary that had been "smashed to ruins" or similar.[11]

As properly emphasized by Schürr (2012: 125), the interpretation of *ahata* and related forms as 'peace' is entirely based on the false sense 'war' attributed to *erbbe-* (partly through misguided efforts of mine). I must further agree with him that a reference to a 'precinct of peace' and 'gods of peace' in TL 44b, 48–49 (thus Eichner 2005: 32) seems incongruous in an inscription glorifying the military exploits of a dynast.[12] There is a further reason for rejecting 'peace' for *ahata* in TL

10. The totally arbitrary emendatory insertion of <*tebe/ẽti*> in TL 44b, 36 by Schürr (2012: 114) has no justification. The unclear status of the immediately preceding word in the sequence *ñta*[.]°*m̃mezezi*: *erbbi*: *sttãti*: *teli*: precludes any definitive interpretation of *erbbi*. But *if m̃mezezi* is complete, then a relationship to *m̃me/i-* 'building' or similar (Melchert 2004: 42, Sasseville eDiAna ID 245) would allow for: "where the buildings/installations stand *in ruin*". But I must emphasize the very tentative status of such an analysis. I cite it merely to show that a viable alternative exists to the contextually entirely unsupported military interpretation.

11. I do not mean to claim that any Lycian verb showing the historically medio-passive preterite endings may be interpreted as a synchronic passive, but an impersonal "one had smashed/destroyed" would surely have been expressed as *qastte*. It would be clear enough to readers that Ikuwe had not committed such a sacrilege. I do not see how Sasseville, loc. cit., derives a sense "restored" from *przze astte*. The word *przze/i-* means fundamentally 'front-, foremost', but as suggested in Melchert 2004: 52, in this context one should also consider "prior ones", i.e., "forebears". The reflexive supports this interpretation. In any case, the second clause refers to Ikuwe having built a new sanctuary. We will return to the sense of the third clause below.

12. Nor can I accept the conclusion of Réveilhac (forthcoming, section 7) that first-millennium personal names in Greek transmission with second members in °ασητας/°ασατης/°ασατας argue for a sense 'peace'. First, it is hardly credible that such a variety of deities as Ea, the Moon-god Arma, the god(s) of the land Mira, various gods of might (*muwa-*), 'all (the gods)' (*puna-*) and still others appearing as first members would all be characterized as possessors or sources of peace. Second, such an association is decidedly implausible for first-member reflexes of 'armed one' or '(divine) weapon' (*warpalla*/*i-*) and the likely **tubar*(*i*)- 'comrade in arms, (divine) ally' (see for all these Réveilhac, section 5). I assert that it is far more plausible to suppose possessive compounds 'having the

29, 4 cited above. While ‘to make peace’ may seem natural to speakers of modern European languages, all direct objects of the Lycian verb *a*(*i*)- in clear contexts refer to concrete entities: physical objects (*adaije*-‘sum of *ade*-’, *a*/*erawazije*- ‘monument’, *hrm̃ma*- ‘temenos’, *isb*/*pazije*- ‘bench’, *qla*- ‘precinct’, *tama*- ‘building’, *sttala*- ‘stele’, *tukedri*- ‘statue’, *xupa*- ‘grave’), or actions and their results (*mẽte*- ‘harm’, *tese*- ‘oath’, *xtta*- and *xtbba*- ‘violence’, *zum̃ma*/*e*- ‘damage (or sim.)’).[13] The parallelism with *s=ed=de ahata ha*[*de*/*ẽ*] *ẽnẽ* “he laid down/deposited *ahata*” in TL 44b, 47–48 likewise confirms a concrete sense for *ahata*: *astte*: in TL 29, 4.[14]

I concede at once that these facts argue equally against an abstract sense ‘good fortune’ for *ahata*, and the passages in TL 29, 3–4 and TL 44b, 47–49 in fact preclude it, since in both passages the agent of the action “he made *ahata*” is a human. However, this in no way refutes the idea that the reference is not to ‘peace’, but to ‘(what is) good’. The Hittites, as well as Luwian speakers of both the Bronze and Iron Age, regarded the gods as those “from whom all blessings flow”, but they likewise firmly believed in and practiced the principle of *dō ut dēs*. In Iron Age Luwian the synonymous /wa:su-/ and its derivatives refer not only to the gods bringing weal/well-being to humans, but also to the latter reciprocating. In ŞIRZI, §2 (8thC, text in Hawkins 2000: 323) we find:

|*wa*/*i-ta* |*á-mi-i-na* DOMINUS-*ni-na i-mára*/*i* (DEUS)CERVUS$_3$-*ia-na* (“LIGNUM”)*ha-zi-wa*/*i+ra*/*i-ti* |*u-sa-nu-sa-ha*

“I blessed my lord, Runtiya of the Open Country, with ritual.”

The preceding context makes clear that the referents of “I blessed my lords well” in KULULU 4, §10 are also the gods (text in Hawkins 2000: 445).[15]

favor/blessing of X’. Likewise, Lycian *Ehetẽme*- is ‘(divinely) favored, blessed’, not ‘of (a/the god/goddess of) peace’.

13. It is also used twice in N320 (under Greek influence?) in the factitive sense ‘to make X Y’: of making someone a priest (lines 8–11) and of making objects sacred to gods (lines 22–25).

14. Restoration of *ha*[*de*/*ẽ*] after Schürr (2012: 124). Note that the geminate in *sedde* requires the presence of both a proleptic pronoun *and* the local particle *-de*. The latter confirms that the action is performed on something concrete.

15. Overly influenced by my having heard the English verb used of humans overwhelmingly in the context of a benediction, I find the translations given odd, but this very narrow view of the word’s meaning is a matter of my idiolect. For the use of ‘to bless’ in the sense of ‘to confer good (things) on’, including humans as subjects and gifts as direct object, see *OED* s.v. III 7, especially III 7.b.

I therefore see no difficulty in supposing that likewise Lycian *ehete-* (for this as the likely stem see below) and its cognate **āššatta-* in CLuwian mean fundamentally 'good (thing)', with a range of usage similar to that of the English noun 'good' (for which see *OED* "good, adj., n., adv., int."). This may have included 'well-being', but I know of no attestation that proves this. It is arguably fitting for *xzzãtã=pe*: *trqqi*[*z*]: [*t*]*rmmile*: *zmpde eseti xerigazñ* in the Milyan (Lycian B) passage in TL 44d, 44–45. If Schürr (1997: 134 and 2012: 125) is correct in identifying *xzzãta-* as Xanthos, then we may suppose "The Storm-god (has) _ed the Xanthos of Keriga to/for the Lycians in well-being/for (their) good". As usual in Milyan, however, the opacity of most of the lexicon, in this instance that of the verb *zmpde*, leaves this as a mere hypothesis.[16]

We have a much more solid basis for supposing that it refers to something beneficial given by either gods or humans. As per above following Neumann, the paired epithets in *trqq*[*i*]*z*: *esetesi*=[*k*]*e er*[*b*]*besi=ke*: (TL 44d, 12–13) can only be antithetical: "the Storm-god of blessing(s)/good and misfortune". Lycian (A) *ehetehe*/*i-* as an epithet of the gods in *se mahãna*: *ehete*[*he*] in TL 44b, 48–49 also fits well as "and for the gods of blessing(s)/good"—because they are the recipients of the *ahata* offered by a grateful human (presumably Keriga). These 'good things, blessings' are effectively offerings/gifts (an obsolete but attested sense of English 'good', notably including 'God's good'; see *OED* s.v. "good, adj., n., adv., int." III.11): *s=ed=de*: *ahata ha*[*de*/*ẽ*] *ẽnẽ*: *qla*=(*e*)*bi*: *ehetehi*: *se mahãna*: *ehete*[*he*] *arñna*: *tuminehi*: *kerθθi*: *xãkbi*: "And he has laid down/deposited blessings in this precinct of blessings and for the gods of blessing(s) in Xanthos, Tymnessos, Kerθθi (and) Kandyba". I assert that this sense also fits TL 29, 3–4: *me=ti ñtẽmlẽ*: *przze*: *astte* [...] *se*(*j*)*=ahata*: *astte*: "He made himself a sanctuary for the *forebears*, and he made blessings" (for blessings as including quite concrete things bestowed see *OED* s.v. 4.a and 4.b). The use of the pluralactional stem *as-* suggests that these were habitual, as one would expect.[17] The provision in TL 118, 4 *se=ije*: *ahatahi*: *ñtata me ñtepi*: *ta*[*s*]*ñti* […] also likely means "and (there is) therein a chamber for giving/blessing. They shall put in […]", since an upper chamber for burial of the tomb builder and his wife has already been mentioned in the opening lines along

16. For reasons given in note 18, one also cannot entirely exclude "in/for victory". Whether *ahãma-* means 'occupation' or 'victory' is also indeterminate: see Melchert 2004: 2 for references to the equally plausible competing interpretations. The dynasty of Keriga was intrusive to Xanthos, but he also had great military success.

17. The parsing of *ehetehi* in TL 44a.33–34 is not fully clear, but the context is one of sacrifices and rites, so 'of giving, blessing' or similar is appropriate there as well.

with the usual prohibition on burying anyone else in it. If the second chamber were to bury further individuals, this would have been stated, and this provision would have preceded the curse formulas. This interpretation would also explain the unique form of the adjective: it is built directly on the Nom-Acc Pl *ahata*, assuredly attested thus far only in a concrete sense 'good things, blessings'.[18]

We may and should interpret ^{d}*Ālaš aššattaššiš* (*KUB* 2.1 iii 44) similarly as 'Āla of (= who brings) good/weal/blessing(s)'. McMahon (1991: 109) interprets ^{d}*Ālaš āššulaš* (*KUB* 2.1 iii 33) as 'Ala of favor', making it the direct Hittite match for the Luwian, but the use of *āššul* in greeting formulas suggests rather 'well-being', the result for humans. I admit that this may be mere hair-splitting: Āla is in any case a bringer of what is good.

Hajnal (1994: 144) correctly posits as the base the root **h₁es-* 'to be' in the derived sense 'real', 'true', thus 'good' (against Puhvel 1984: 205). Hajnal assumes a common gender stem in **-e/ot-*, but *asata* in TL 29, 4 is not a nominative singular, but nominative-accusative plural and object of *ade*. More likely then is a neuter stem with a secondary suffix **-to-* of the type of HLuw. /istarta-/ 'throne' (Starke 1987: 251 n. 33), CLuw. *ḫuipa*(*ya*)*tta-* 'wickedness, cruelty', *irḫatta-* 'circle', and *šarlātta-* 'exaltation' (see Melchert 1999: 370). The first example is clearly denominative, but the others may be denominative or deverbative (the last from /sarla/i-/ attested in HLuw. SUPER-*la*/*i-* or from the verb *šarl*(*ā*)*i-* 'to exalt'). As we shall see, the same ambiguity applies to CLuw. *āššatta-** = Lycian AB *ehete-/esete-* < **h₁és-o-to-* (the Nom-Acc Pl *ahata* naturally shows regular Lycian umlaut).

18. I do concede that, taken by itself, Neumann's alternative for *qla*=(*e*)*bi ehetehi se mahãna ehetehe* „im Heiligtum(?) hier des Sieges und bei den Göttern des Sieges" (1984: 91) would be entirely appropriate in a public inscription celebrating the military exploits of a dynast. However, the concrete sense of *s=ed=de: ahata ha*[*de*/*ẽ*] *ẽnẽ*: "laid down/deposited victories" would be odd, and I must insist that several contexts do not justify 'defeat' for *erbbe-*. Nor is a 'chamber of victory' likely in TL 118, 4. The complete absence of *ehete-* in *assured* military contexts is also unexpected, if the word meant 'victory'. However, what was stated above regarding the contexts of *erbbe-* applies equally to those for *ehete-* and its adjective. The arguments I have made are probabilistic, not ironclad: only knowledge of what "they shall put in" the chamber in 118, 4 would truly decide the matter, and whether *θurtta-* in TL 29, 2 refers to further family members or to members of a profession. Bronze Age *arpa-* and *arpaša-* are used where 'defeat' is the contextual sense, and the preoccupation of Hittite kings with military success and failure was surely shared by the lesser kings and local rulers of the Iron Age. I do not entirely exclude that high-profile use of both terms in such contexts led to a narrowing in Lycian to 'victory' and 'defeat' (cf. note 15). I insist only that the Bronze Age CLuwian cognates applied far more broadly to 'good' and 'bad'.

§ 5. *Further evidence for* *āšš- *'good' in CLuwian*

The verb *āššā-* is generally taken to be Hittite (Neu 1968: 19, Puhvel 1984: 189, Kloekhorst 2008: 215) and interpreted as 'to be good, dear, favored'. In view of the clear Luwian status of *aššattašši-* the separation from the morphologically parallel CLuw. *≺waššā-* 'to be pleasing' is entirely arbitrary, but the attested context of *āššā-* supports 'to be favorable', not 'to be dear':

KBo 22.126 Ro 4'–6' ?/NS (restored from parallel KUB 59.50 iii 3'–5'):[19]

[… (*maḫḫan* DINGIR.M)]EŠ-*aš antuḫšaš≠a āššantari* […DINGIR.M]EŠ-*aš* ZI-*anza anda QATAMMA* SIG$_5$-*anza ēštu* […*and*]*a*$^{?}$ *QATAMMA āššiyanza ēštu*

"As the [ ] are favorable to gods and humans, may the soul/will of the gods likewise be favorable towards […the king (cf. Ro 3')], and may he likewise be dear [to the gods]."

The fact that the immediate parallel to the *āššā-* clause is the favor of the will of the gods towards someone (almost certainly the king) requires likewise "are favorable" for *āššantari* in this simile.[20] With Oettinger (p. c.) both *āššā-* and *waššā-* are denominative, but the bases are likely **h$_1$és-o-* and **(h$_1$)wés-o-* 'good, favorable' (for the type see Nussbaum 2017a: 246), vs. expected **(h$_1$)us-ó-* 'idem', the base of factitive *ušā-* 'to make prosper' (Rieken eDiAna ID 3117) and of the derivatives of **ušant-* 'bountiful, prospering' (Starke 1990: 377). That base is likely attested in the substantivized neuter *≺u-ša-an* 'bounty' in KUB 21.15 iv 3 beside *miyatar* 'abundance'. Čop's Law explains the root vocalism and consonantism of the base adjectives **h$_1$és-o-* and **(h$_1$)wés-o-*, whose vocalism and consonantism are carried over to the medio-passive verbs accented on the suffix: (< merely virtual

19. KUB 59.50 directly follows KBo 22.126 and contains the same comparison with a missing singular comparandum and hence *āššāri* in the first clause.

20. The fact that the simile with *waššā-* points rather to 'may be dear to' (KUB 17.12 iii 13–15, text in Neu 1968: 192) makes it likely that the comparison to some concrete object that is 'good, beneficial' in the view of humans (and thus also their anthropomorphic gods) could be employed to illustrate either aspect of the 'favorable towards'/'dear to' relationship, just like Hitt. *āššu-*. See also Yakubovich 2002: 197–9 on the variable sense of derivatives of /wass-/ in HLuwian (but his arguments for this possibly reflecting a difference in diathesis are outdated).

**h₁es-ó-* and **(h₁)wes-ó-*). Note that for 'to be dear (to)' this passage uses the medio-passive of *āššiya-*.[21]

The incomplete Nom-Acc Sg Nt ˹*a*˺-*aš-šu-wa-al* in KUB 35.48 iii 18 supports its restoration also in the following:

KUB 35.108(+)35.87 iv 21'–23' (join per Rieken and Sasseville 2019: 525–6, but restorations and interpretation are mine):

ḪUR.SAG.ḪI.A-*in-zi ḫu-wa-al-pa-*[*ni*ʔ*-in*ʔ*-z*]*i* KI.MIN[!] *ḫa-a-pí-iš Ma-a-la-aš a-aš-š*[*u-wa*ʔ*-l*]*i*ʔ*-iš ar-ú-wa-a-li-iš* [*p*]*a*ʔ*-pár-kán-ta-a-im-ma* [--]

"The humpbacked mountains likewise. The beneficent Mala elevated with respect to its banks (likewise)."[22]

Against Rieken and Sasseville, loc. cit., all the other natural phenomena in the passage are *nouns*. Thus, I assume likewise 'mountains' with 'humpbacked' as an epithet (the precise form of the adjective is uncertain). The space between the two fragments also seems too large to restore just *a-aš-*[*šu*]-˹*ú*˺-*i-iš*. An adjective in *-ali-* is supported by ˹*a*˺-*aš-šu-wa-al* and following *ar-ú-wa-a-li-iš*. The word *paparkantaimma* is Nom-Acc Pl of an *n*-stem noun, an accusative of respect depending on *aruwāliš*, just like MUŠ-*iš ša-kal-da-am-ma* ibid. iv 19'. The reference is to the annual enriching seasonal flooding of the Euphrates.

The morphology of *āššuwāli-* is in strict terms ambiguous, given the presence in Luwian of both denominal possessive *-wali-* and a denominal *-ali-* that *inter alia* extends *u*-stem adjectives: *aru*(*w*)*ali-* 'elevated' cited above, *ḫuitwali-* 'alive' based on **ḫuitu-* = Hitt. *ḫuišu-*, and probably **ḫapa*(*n*)*zuwali-* 'obedient, loyal' seen in Hitt. *ḫapazuwalanni* 'in obedience'. But the likelihood that the base of an adjective

21. The Luwian status of the verb *āššā-* means that the noun *āšša/ātta-** may be denominal to the same base **āšša-* like the verb or deverbal to the latter. Lack of plene spelling of the first two vowels in *aššattaššiš* means nothing in a hapax.

22. The context demands '(river)bank' for *paparkantaimman-*, which may be analyzed as a neuter *men*-stem to an adjective derived from a reduplicated base noun **paparkant-* 'idem', which the derivative has likely replaced synchronically. A semantically plausible derivation from **bherǵʰ-* 'high' is hard to reconcile with loss or assimilation of the dorsal stop in *parraya*/*i-*, the attested CLuwian word for 'high'. The ultimate base **park*(*a*)- is a striking match for OCS *brěgъ* 'bank, shore, steep slope' and Slavic cognates, whose putative derivation from **bherǵʰ-o-* to **bherǵʰ-* 'high' presents similar problems (Derksen 2008: 37). One must either assume a suspiciously coincidental independent "Gutturalwechsel" or give up the respective derivations and posit a separate **bherg*^{h}*-o-* 'riverbank'. For such an Anatolian-Slavic isogloss cf. Hitt. *dampu-* = OCS *tǫpъ* 'dull, blunt'.

in *-wali-* would be a thematic **h₁és-o-* or perhaps **h₁és-eh₂* (see Nussbaum 2017b: 241–245) argues against this alternative: cf. without deletion of the thematic vowel *taraššawali-* 'litigious' (or similar), almost certainly to a substantivized *-aššа/i-* adjective, and even CLuw. *zunauli-* 'hound master, hunter' and unsyncopated HLuw. /tˢunawali-/ 'idem', where the awkward sequence /-nw-/ was avoided by a "thematization" of the *n*-stem /tˢun-/.[23] Certainty is not achievable, but an extended *āššu*(*w*)*-āli-* like the others cited above seems more likely (the *hapax legomena a-aš-šu-u-ut-t*[*i*(-)] in *KUB* 35.100 Vo 3 and *a-aš-šu-ya-an-za* at *KBo* 39.179:5 obviously have no probative value). Finally, note that the alternative reading *āš*[*šuw*]*īš* to an extended *āššuw-iya*/*i-* would still assure a CLuwian base **āššu-*.

§ 6. *Hittite* āššu-

The clear presence of the root **h₁es-* in the sense 'good' in Luwian and the very likely existence of an adjective **āššu-* inevitably recall the extremely vexed issue of Hittite *āššu-* 'good'. No extant analysis has been able to provide a plausible account of either the root vocalism or geminate sibilant in native Hittite terms. Discussion is not required, and mere references will suffice: Eichner 1973: 54, Puhvel 1980, Weitenberg 1984: 96–97, Melchert 1994: 302–303, Kloekhorst 2008: 223–224. For further attempts see the references in Tischler 1983: 88–89 and Puhvel 1984: 204. While they are recessive, it is assured that Luwian had ablauting *u*-stem adjectives: cf. *mannu-*, *mannaw-* 'virile, fecundating' (sense with Rieken 2021: 467–468, but with a false denial, ibid. 468–469, of the ablauting adjective). Nothing precludes a prehistoric loanword into Hittite: the Luwian phonology is impeccable with Čop's Law: **h₁ésu-*, **h₁és-ow-* > *āššu-*, *āššaw-*. The mediopassive verb *āššiya-* 'to be dear, beloved' could also be a loanword (a Luwian factitive to the adjective **āššiya*/*i-*, the base of ^{d}*Āššiya-*) or an inner-Hittite creation.

Borrowing of such a basic item of vocabulary is manifestly exceptional, but it does occur. By one account Basque *on* 'good, goods' reflects Latin *bonus, bonum* (Agud and Tovar 1989–1995: 7.979). This derivation is by no means assured, but Basque *arbole* and *arbola* 'tree' as based on Latin *arbor* seems secure (Agud and Tovar 1989–1995: 1.908).[24] Such parallels merely permit and in no way prove the same for the very different circumstances of Luwo–Hittite contact. I can only point to other Luwian loanwords in the moral sphere: *nū*(*t*)- 'approval' and *tummantiya-*

23. There is also no deletion of the stem vowel in *maraḫšiwali-* 'stained, specked' or similar, for which cf. "Hittite" *mariḫši-* and variants (Puhvel 2004: 72).

24. Though a native word *zuhaitz* has now supplanted it (José Virgilio García Trabazo, p. c.).

'obedience' (with Rieken 2006: 284–297, against Kassian and Yakubovich 2007: 446–447). Likewise, clearly borrowed from Luwian is (𒀸)*tapar-*/*tapariya-* 'to rule, govern', regardless of how one etymologizes it. As Norbert Oettinger has suggested to me (p. c.), the native Hittite word for 'good' may be *lazzi-*, which is scarcely attested (once in the Nom Sg Com *lazziš* in KUB 31.143a iii 2, OH/OS), while the derived verb *lazziya-* 'to rectify' (active), 'to be good, favorable' (medio-passive) is well attested throughout the history of Hittite.[25] This discrepancy may well reflect entirely internal developments, but it is also characteristic of partial lexical replacement due to borrowing. The English verb 'to wield' (exercise control of) once had a matching noun 'wield', effectively non-existent in Modern English, supplanted by 'control', 'power', 'dominion' (all loanwords). The connection lives on only in that the three borrowed nouns are among the common direct objects that one wields. The most serious problem for the claim that Hittite *āššu-* 'good' is a loanword from Luwian is the verb *aš*(*ša*)*nu-*, which with Puhvel (1984: 192 and 205) definitely is fundamentally 'to make good' (against *HW*^{2} 1.383 and Kloekhorst 2008: 217–218).[26] The very broad range of its attested usage presupposes a thorough integration into the language that in turn suggests a very early loan. I obviously cannot adequately treat here the issues of its derivation or semantics.

§ 7. *Conclusion*

I believe that I have presented strong evidence that the *Āššiya-* deities are merely one of an entire set of reflexes of a root ***āšš-*** 'good' in Luwian and in Lycian (whatever the synchronic sense may be in the latter): *āššā-* 'be good, favorable', *āššatta-** 'good, blessing', ^{d}*Āššiya-* 'bearer(s) of good/blessing', *āššuwali-* 'beneficent'. The claim in the preceding section that Hittite *āššu-* 'good' and all its

25. The suggestion of Kloekhorst (2008: 523) that the sparse attestation of *lazzi-* is due to use of SIG_5 to spell it is improbable. There is no evidence anywhere for an *i*-stem adjective †SIG_5-*i-*. Whether the military rank $^{LÚ}SIG_5$-*i-* represents a substantivization of *lazzi-* is unknowable (see for the word Beal 1992: 509–513). All other forms spelled with SIG_5 in OH/OS, MH/MS and NH as well as NS copies represent forms of the derived verb *lazziya-* or other verbal stems such as *lazziēšš-** or *lazziyaḫḫ-*. The frequent adverb *lazzin*/SIG_5-*in* 'well' is a lexicalized form of the syncopated Nom-Acc Sg Nt participle *lazziyan* (see Hoffner and Melchert 2008: 32). It patently cannot be a neuter form of the *i*-stem *lazzi-*.

26. However, the sense with 'gods' as object is not 'to propitiate' (Puhvel 1984: 192), but rather 'to benefit, bless, treat well', entirely like HLuw. /usnu-/ cited above.

derivatives reflect a prehistoric loan from Luwian remains merely an unverified and likely unverifiable hypothesis.

§ 8. *References*

AGUD, M. and TOVAR, A. 1989–1995. *Diccionario Etimológico Vasco*. San Sebastián: Diputación Foral de Guipúzcoa.

BEAL, R. 1992. *The Organisation of the Hittite Military*. Heidelberg: Winter.

BEAL, R. 1999. "Seeking Divine Approval for Campaign Strategy KUB 5.1 + KUB 52.65". *Ktéma* 24, 41–54.

DERKSEN, R. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of the Slavic Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.

eDiAna = O. HACKSTEIN, J. L. MILLER and E. RIEKEN (eds.). *Digital Philological-Etymological Dictionary of the Minor Ancient Anatolian Corpus Languages*. München/Marburg. http://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de. All citations based on visitations of August 2023.

EICHNER, H. 1973. "Die Etymologie von heth. *mehur". *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 31, 53–107.

EICHNER, H. 2005. "Die philologische Evidenz". In: J. Borchhardt, H. Eichner and K. Schulz (eds.), *KERTHTHI oder der Versuch, eine antike Siedlung der Klassik in Zentrallykien zu identifizieren*. Antalya: Suna-İnan Kiraç Akdeniz Medeniyetleri Araştirma Enstitüsü, 19–37.

GÉRARD, R. 2004. "Louvite hiéroglyphique *aza-* «aimer»". In: M. Mazoyer and O. Casabonne (eds.), *Antiquus Oriens. Mélanges offerts au professeur René Lebrun* (volume I). Paris: L'Harmattan, 305–315.

HAAS, V. 1994. *Geschichte der hethitischen Religion*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.

HAJNAL, I. 1994. "Die lykischen *a*-Stämme: Zum Werdegang einer Nominalklasse". In: J. E. Rasmussen (ed.), *In honorem Holger Pedersen: Kolloquium der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 26. Bis 28. März 1993 in Kopenhagen*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 135–171.

HAJNAL, I. 1995. *Der lykische Vokalismus*. Graz: Leykam.

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

HOFFNER, H. A. Jr. and MELCHERT, H. C. 2008. *A Grammar of the Hittite Language*. Part I: Reference Grammar. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

HW^2 = J. FRIEDRICH, A. KAMMENHUBER *et al*. (eds.). 1974-2017. *Hethitisches Wörterbuch*. Zweite, völlig neubearbeitete Auflage auf der Grundlage der edierten hethitischen Texte. Heidelberg: Winter.

KASSIAN, A. and YAKUBOVICH, I. 2007. "Muršili II's Prayer to Telipinu (CTH 377)". In: D. Groddek and M. Zorman (eds.), *Tabularia Hethaeorum: Hethitologische Beiträge Silvin Košak zum 65. Geburtstag*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 423–454.

KLOEKHORST, A. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.

LAROCHE, E. 1947. "Recherches sur les noms des dieux hittites". *Revue hittite et asianique* 7, 7–139.

LAROCHE, E. 1959. *Dictionnaire de la langue louvite*. Paris: Maisonneuve.

MCMAHON, G. 1991. *The Hittite State Cult of the Tutelary Deities*. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.

MELCHERT, H. C. 1987. "PIE velars in Luvian". In: C. Watkins (ed.), *Studies in Memory of Warren Cowgill* (*1929–1985*)*: Papers from the Fourth East Coast Indo-European Conference, Cornell University, June 6–9, 1985*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 182–204.

MELCHERT, H. C. 1988. "Luvian Lexical Notes". *Historische Sprachforschung* 101, 211–243.

MELCHERT, H. C. 1993. *Cuneiform Luvian Lexicon*. Chapel Hill NC: self-published.

MELCHERT, H. C. 1994. "'Čop's law' in Common Anatolian". In: J. E. Rasmussen (ed.), *In honorem Holger Pedersen: Kolloquium der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 26. Bis 28. März 1993 in Kopenhagen*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 297–306.

MELCHERT, H. C. 1999. "Two problems of Anatolian nominal derivation". In: H. Eichner and H. C. Luschützky (eds.), *Compositiones Indogermanicae in memoriam Jochem Schindler*. Prague: Enigma, 365–375.

MELCHERT, H. C. 2004. *A Dictionary of the Lycian Language*. Ann Arbor/New York: Beech Stave.

MELCHERT, H. C. 2014. "PIE **-eh₂* as an "Individualizing" Suffix and the Feminine Gender". In: S. Neri and R. Schuhmann (eds.), *Studies on the Collective and Feminine in Indo-European from a Diachronic and Typological Perspective*. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 257–271.

NEU, E. 1968. *Interpretation der hethitischen mediopassiven Verbalformen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

NEUMANN, G. 1984. Beiträge zum Lykischen VI. *Die Sprache* 30, 89–95.

NUSSBAUM, A. 2017a. "Agentive and Other Derivatives of "τόμος-type" Nouns". In: C. Le Feuvre, D. Petit and G.-J. Pinault (eds.), *Verbal Adjectives and Participles in Indo-European Languages Adjectifs verbaux et participes dans les*

langues indo-européennes: Proceedings of the conference of the Society for Indo-European Studies (*Indogermanische Gesellschaft*)*, Paris, 24th to 26th September 2014*. Bremen: Hempen, 233–266.

NUSSBAUM, A. 2017b. "The PIE Proprietor and His Goods". In: H. C. Melchert, E. Rieken and T. Steer (eds.), *Munus amicitiae Norbert Oettinger a collegis et amicis dicatum*. Ann Arbor: Beech Stave, 228–254.

OED = Oxford English Dictionary, Oxford University Press, July 2023, https://doi.org/10.1093/OED/4101948276. Visited 6/8/2023.

OTTEN, H. 1981. *Die Apologie Hattusilis III. Das Bild der Überlieferung*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

PUHVEL, J. 1980. "On the Origin and Congeners of Hittit *aššu-* 'good'". *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung* 94, 65–70.

PUHVEL, J. 1984. *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*. Vol. 1 *Words beginning with A*. Vol. 2 *Words beginning with E and I*. Berlin/New York/Amsterdam: Mouton.

PUHVEL, J. 2004. *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*. Volume 6 *Words beginning with M*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

RÉVEILHAC, F. forthcoming. "Anatolian Names in °ασηταϛ/°ασατης/°ασαταϛ, CLuw. **aššatta-*, Lyc. B **asata-* and Lyc. A *ahata-*". *News from the Lands of the Hittites* 7, 195-211.

RIEKEN, E. 2006. "Zur Etymologie von luwisch *nū*(*t*)-". In: G. Carling (ed.), $^{GIŠ.ḪUR}$*gul-za-at-ta-ra: Festschrift for Folke Josephson*. Göteborg: Meijerbergs institut för svensk etymologisk forskning, 284–297.

RIEKEN, E. 2021. "Anatolische Fruchtbarkeit, urindogermanische Männer, und die Wurzel **men-* ‚hervorragen'". In H. A. Fellner, M. Malzahn and M. Peyrot (eds.), *lyuke wmer ra. Indo-European Studies in Honor of Georges-Jean Pinault*. Ann Arbor: Beech Stave, 462–476.

RIEKEN, E. and SASSEVILLE, D. 2019. "Die Wurzeln für „Schneiden" im Luwischen". In: N. Bollati Guzzo and P. Taracha (eds.), *"And I Knew Twelve Languages": A Tribute to Massimo Poetto on His 70th Birthday*. Warsaw: Agade Bis, 524–535.

SASSEVILLE, D. 2014/2015. "Luwian and Lycian Agent Nouns in **-é-leh$_2$*". *Die Sprache* 51, 105–124.

SASSEVILLE, D. 2020. *Anatolian Verbal Stem Formation*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.

SCHÜRR, D. 1997. "Nymphen von Phellos". *Kadmos* 36, 127–140.

SCHÜRR, D. 2012. "Zum Agora-Pfeiler in Xanthos III: Vom Wettergott und dem Dynasten *Teiθθiweibi*". *Kadmos* 51, 114–142.

SINGER, I. 2002. *Hittite Prayers*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

STARKE, F. 1987. "Die Vertretungen von uridg. **d*^{h}*ug-tér*- „Tochter" in den luwischen Sprachen und ihre Stammbildung". *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung* 100, 243–269.

STARKE, F. 1990. *Untersuchung zur Stammbildung des keilschrift-luwischen Nomens*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

STEITLER, C. W. 2017. *The Solar Deities of Bronze Age Anatolia: Studies in Texts of the Early Hittite Kingdom*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

STEITLER, C. W. 2020. "Offerings to the *Loci Numinosi*. Distinctive Features of Sacred Spaces and Cult Practices". In: S. Görke and C. W. Steitler (eds.), *Cult, Temple, Sacred Spaces: Cult Practices and Cult Spaces in Hittite Anatolia and Neighbouring Cultures. Proceedings of the First International HFR Symposium, Mainz, 3–5 June 2019*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 317–343.

TISCHLER, J. 1983. *Hethitisches Etymologisches Glossar* (Teil I a –k). Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

VAN GESSEL, B. H. L. 1998. *Onomasticon of the Hittite Pantheon*. Leiden/New York/Köln: Brill.

WEITENBERG, J. J. S. 1984. *Die hethitischen U-Stämme*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

YAKUBOVICH, I. 2002: "Nugae Luvicae". In: V. V. Shevoroshkin and P. Sidwell (eds.), *Anatolian Languages*. Canberra: Association for the History of Language, 189–209.