

# Iron Age Luwian in its Anatolian and Syro-Mesopotamian Contexts

*Federico Giusfredi and Valerio Pisaniello*

## 1 Introduction

The topic of the present chapter is represented by the areal relationships of Iron Age Luwian with the languages of Asia Minor, Syria and Mesopotamia. Sources on Iron Age Luwian can be first divided into two main groups: on the one hand, we have many direct sources (i.e., Hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions from Anatolia and Syria); on the other hand, Luwian is also indirectly attested in loanwords and proper names contained in inscriptions in other languages. We also know of hieroglyphic inscriptions recording a language different from Luwian, namely inscriptions on jar fragments from ALTINTEPE probably dating to the 8th century (which record only liquid measures in the Urartian language) and two short Urartian inscriptions on two bronze objects from the same site.<sup>1</sup>

Iron Age Hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions, furthermore, can be classified according to different parameters, such as the languages involved, their geographical distribution, their material supports, and their content. Although most Iron Age Luwian inscriptions are monolingual (that is, they include only a Luwian text in hieroglyphic script), a small group of multilingual (usually bilingual) inscriptions can be found (Fig. 3.2). Two Luwian–Phoenician bilingual inscriptions are found in Cilicia. One is the long inscription of KARATEPE, dated to the reign of the ruler Azatiwada, whose Luwian and Phoenician texts are inscribed twice on two city gates—the Upper Gate and the Lower Gate—in the fortifications of the site (with a third, slightly different Phoenician text on a divine statue inside the Upper Gate).<sup>2</sup> The other is the bilingual inscription of ÇİNEKÖY, issued by the ruler Warika, written on a monument representing the Storm God on a chariot driven by oxen.<sup>3</sup> From Cilicia also comes the trilingual stele of İNCİRLİ, by the same ruler Warika, with two short Luwian and Assyrian texts on the front face and a longer Phoenician inscription running on

1 Cf. Klein 1974. On the jar fragments, see also CHLI I:588–589.

2 Cf. CHLI II; CHLI I:45–68; CHLI III:178–186.

3 Cf. Tekoğlu et al. 2000; CHLI III:108–113.

all four sides of the stele.<sup>4</sup> Two monolingual Phoenician inscriptions have also been found in Cilicia, at Hasanbeyli and Cebelireis Dağı, both featuring Luwian personal names (see below). Another Luwian–Phoenician bilingual inscription, İVRİZ 2, still unpublished, comes from Tabal and is dated to the reign of Warpalawa (late 8th century BCE).<sup>5</sup> Finally, from Tell Ahmar comes the trilingual Luwian–Assyrian–Aramaic building inscription of ARSLANTAŞ, written on a portal lion, but the Luwian inscription is quite fragmentary and unclear, while the other two texts are still unpublished.<sup>6</sup> Duplicates of the three inscriptions have been also identified on a second portal lion from the same site.<sup>7</sup>

From a geographical point of view, Iron Age Hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions have been found in a large area covering central, southern, and south-eastern Anatolia, as well as northern Syria, whose boundaries can be roughly identified as the river Kızılırmak to the north (although some inscriptions have been found north of the Kızılırmak),<sup>8</sup> the Türkmen-Karahöyük mound in the Konya plain to the west, the site of Tell Halaf/Guzana in northern Mesopotamia to the east, and the Hama region to the south (Fig. 3.1). This large area has been divided by Hawkins into ten regions, which, following the order of his *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions*, include Cilicia, Karkemiš, Tell Ahmar, Maraş, Malatya, Commagene/Kummuh, Amuq, Aleppo, Hama, and Tabal. Outside of this area, Hieroglyphic Luwian documents have been found at Assur, namely seven letters written on lead strips, for which a connection with Karkemiš has been suggested, perhaps when it was an Assyrian province.<sup>9</sup>

As to the material support of inscriptions, most Hieroglyphic Luwian texts are written on stone: steles, statues, altars, monuments, column bases (NİĞDE 1), but also stone bowls (BEIRUT, BABYLON 2 and 3), door jambs (HAMA 4), and the like. A limited number of texts are written on clay (e.g., the KARKAMIŞ sherd, the ALIŞAR ostrakon, the PERSEPOLIS bowl sherd, the HAMA fragment 6, and the ALTINTEPE pithoi with Urartian liquid measures in hieroglyphic script). Other inscriptions on clay include some bullae (e.g., HAMA fragments 7–10, and the bullae of LİDAR) and one clay tablet (NINEVEH 1). Texts written on metal support include, for example, the KULULU lead strips and fragments, the ASSUR letters and the KİRŞEHİR letter, the TRAGANA bronze bowl

4 Luwian and Assyrian texts are badly preserved and thus still unpublished, whereas the Phoenician text has been published by Kaufman (2007). In fact, there is a fourth text on the stele, written in Greek in Byzantine times and unrelated to the others.

5 Cf. CHLI I:526; CHLI III:158–159.

6 Cf. CHLI I:246–248.

7 Cf. CHLI I:226.

8 For a more detailed discussion on the northern border, see Simon 2017a.

9 Cf. CHLI I:533–534 and Dillo 2017, with references.

and the NIMRUD silver bowl, and a horse frontlet from Miletus.<sup>10</sup> Finally, some short inscriptions from Hama are written on shell fragments (HAMA 9, HAMA fragment 5).

### 1.1 *The Corpus of Iron Age Luwian Inscriptions*

The classification of Hieroglyphic Luwian texts according to their content is more problematic and far less trivial, because the type of categorization is necessarily influenced by the perspective from which the text is observed.

As a good starting point, we may consider the typology provided by Giusfredi (2010:23–24), who divided hieroglyphic inscriptions into the following categories:

- 1) Royal inscriptions, issued by kings of the different states, with celebrative and propagandistic purpose. A sub-categorization is possible in: (a) war inscriptions, mostly concerned with military campaigns and internal power struggles; (b) religious inscriptions, concerning the institution or restoration of cults; (c) building inscriptions, which is the major group, with emphasis on building activities of rulers and dedication to gods;
- 2) Vassal inscriptions, made by rulers who do not bear royal titles, whose content may be analogous to the one of royal inscriptions;
- 3) Funerary inscriptions of commemorative nature (e.g., TILSEVET, KARKAMIŠ A5b);
- 4) Economic texts (e.g., KULULU lead strips).

Some considerations are in order. First of all, the distinction between royal and non-royal inscriptions, although undoubtedly important, can be set aside here because vassal texts may show content similar to the royal texts. Instead, differences may concern certain elements in their structure. Furthermore, of course, such a typology cannot be clear-cut, especially with regard to royal and vassal inscriptions and their possible sub-categorizations. Indeed, different elements may co-occur in the same inscription, such as KARKAMIŠ A11a, a building inscription in which the ruler Katuwa celebrates the construction of temples for the local Storm God, which also contains brief historical paragraphs concerning a revolt against Katuwa.<sup>11</sup>

Even more challenging are those cases where the type we would be inclined to assign to a given inscription, based on structural elements, seems not to reflect its likely primary purpose. For example, KARKAMIŠ A11b+c is a building inscription with instruction for sacrifices to deities (cf. the deictic ref-

10 See Simon 2019a:128 fn. 3; CHLI III:171–172.

11 See CHLI I:94–100.

erence in §15: *|za-zi-ha-wa/i-mi-i (DOMUS.SUPER)ha+ra/i-sà-tá-ni-zi pa-ti-i-\*a* (“ANNUS”) *u-si |AEDIFICARE.MI-ha*, “*These balconies I built myself in that year*”), but the historical account of Katuwa’s military exploits is far more extensive than the section actually concerning the ruler’s building activity, such that it may be regarded as a war inscription, as it is in Giusfredi (2010:23). Similarly, KULULU 4 is a funerary stele erected for Ruwa by his brother Hul(1)i, but it contains a posthumous royal inscription narrated in the first person (quite unusually, in the past tense: *EGO-wa/i-mi ru-wa/i-sa<sub>4</sub> IUDEX-ní-sa á-sá-ha*, “*I was the righteous Ruwa*”).

Therefore, one should probably distinguish between (1) a functional classification, based on the primary aim of the inscription, which also may not always be straightforward, given that inscriptions may sometimes have multiple purposes, and (2) a structural analysis, for which a modular approach is perhaps more appropriate, instead of assigning the text as a whole to a given category.

Indeed, Hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions include a number of different thematic sections, each of which may or may not be present and be given more or less space in the architecture of the text. These blocks, occurring in a relatively fixed order, include: (a) an introduction with the name of the “author” of the inscription or the person for whom the monument was built, optionally followed by (b) titles and genealogy; (c) a statement of divine favor, often connected with (d) military exploits of the ruler and other successful actions, generally presented as evidence of divine blessing; (e) foundation and building activities; (f) institution of cults; (g) instructions for offerings and sacrifices to deities (and possibly to the deceased, in case of funerary inscriptions); and (h) blessing and curse formulae.

Because (as mentioned) each of these structural elements may be given more or less space, regardless of the main motivation of the inscription, a functional classification should not consider them, but should instead focus on identifying the primary goal of the inscription. Therefore, we may provisionally assume the following functional typology:

- 1) War inscriptions, where the narrative of the ruler’s exploits represents the main purpose;
- 2) Building inscriptions, which commemorate the building activity of the rulers;
- 3) Cultic inscriptions, primarily concerned with the institution of cults;
- 4) Votive inscriptions, concerning the dedication of objects to the deity;
- 5) Funerary inscriptions, whose main purpose is the commemoration of a deceased person;
- 6) Economic texts, concerning economic matters.

In addition to the more or less elaborate inscriptions belonging to the above-mentioned types, seals should of course be mentioned, although they are far fewer in the Iron Age than in the Bronze Age, in which they represent the predominant category of hieroglyphic texts.<sup>12</sup>

As for indirect sources on Iron Age Luwian, most consist of Luwian proper names included in inscriptions written in different Semitic languages from various areas, namely:

- 1) Inscriptions from the reign of Yadiya/Sam'al (Zincirli), where kings and officials bore both Luwian and Semitic names and wrote inscriptions in Phoenician, Sam'alian (a local Aramaic dialect, possibly influenced by Luwian), Old Aramaic, and Hieroglyphic Luwian;<sup>13</sup>
- 2) Phoenician inscriptions: besides Phoenician versions of Hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions from KARATEPE, ÇİNEKÖY, İNCİRLİ, İVRİZ 2, and the monolingual Phoenician inscription of *KLMW* (= Kilamuwa/Kulamuwa) at Zincirli, two other monolingual Phoenician inscriptions attesting Luwian names have been found at Cebelireis Dağı<sup>14</sup> and Hasanbeyli<sup>15</sup> in Cilicia;
- 3) Assyrian annalistic texts and steles dealing with Neo-Hittite states;
- 4) Imperial Aramaic inscriptions from Cilicia during the Achaemenid period (e.g., Saraïdin, 6th–5th c.; Hemite, 4th c.; Kesecek Köyü, 4th c.; and Yukarı Bozkuyu, 4th c.).

## 2 Lexical Interference

In the following sections, we will offer an overview on lexical borrowings, from and into Hieroglyphic Luwian, with specific reference to the contacts occurring at the Syro-Anatolian and Syro-Mesopotamian interfaces. The material is not particularly rich, probably as a consequence of the conservative and rather idiosyncratic character of the Hieroglyphic Luwian scribal tradition in the context of the Early Iron Age, and the quite standardized character of the inscriptions.

### 2.1 *Luwian as the Model Language*

Identifying Luwian loanwords in languages with which Luwian was presumably in contact in the first millennium BCE (Assyrian, northwest Semitic lan-

<sup>12</sup> Cf. CHLI 1:572–587.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Giusfredi and Pisaniello 2021b.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Mosca and Russell 1987; Lemaire 1989; Röllig 2008; Bordreuil 2019; Giusfredi 2024.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Lemaire 1983.

guages, possibly Greek and Phrygian) is not an easy task, also because of the limited documentation. Leaving aside the complex issue of Luwian loanwords in Greek (cf. Chapter 14), assured Luwian words in texts in other languages are represented almost exclusively by proper names—either personal names, theonyms, or toponyms (see below).

An assured Luwian loanword in Akkadian (Neo-Assyrian), perhaps through Amorite intermediation, is *hilānu*, probably from the Hieroglyphic Luwian *hīlan(a)*- ‘gate, palace’ (cf. Hittite *hila*- ‘courtyard’),<sup>16</sup> occurring in the expression *bīt hilāni* ‘portico’ (*vel sim.*), sometimes associated with the Hittites (i.e., the Neo-Hittite states) in the texts,<sup>17</sup> cf., e.g., *bīt appāte tamšil ekal Hatti ša ina lišāni Amurri bīt hilāni išassūšu*, “a room with windows like (that) of a Hittite palace, which, in the language of Amurru, is called *bīt hilāni*” (Annals of Senacherib, RINAP 3 1:82).<sup>18</sup>

It has been suggested that the Urartian verb *šu-*, probably ‘fill’,<sup>19</sup> only occurring with <sup>(É)</sup>*ari-* ‘silo’ as object, may be a borrowing from the Luwian verb *suwe/a-* ‘fill,’ also occurring in very similar contexts. Given that Urartian *šu-* appears not to have inner-Hurro-Urartian *comparanda* and its domain of use is limited to a formulaic context, the likelihood that it was in fact a loanword increases.<sup>20</sup>

A likely loanword—which is, however, a divine epithet—can be found, unsurprisingly, in the *KTMW* stele from Zincirli, written in a diastatic variant of Sam’alian (Giusfredi and Pisaniello 2021b). In the list of deities receiving offerings, the first place is occupied by an elsewhere unattested hypostasis of the Storm God, the quite obscure Hadad *QR/DPD/RL*, which has been tentatively explained by Yakubovich (2011:175) as reflecting Luw. \**harpatalli-* ‘ally,’ which is, however, so far unattested in Luwian inscriptions.

In the *KTMW* stele, some calques may also be identified. Besides divine names, which will be dealt with below, we should first discuss here the case of *NBŠ* ‘soul.’ At the end of the offering list, the last offer is due to *KTMW*’s *NBŠ*. This word has different meanings in Aramaic, the basic ones being ‘life, breath, soul.’ Therefore, according to Pardee (2009), the text would say: “a ram for my

16 See eDiAna s.v. Hieroglyphic Luwian */hīlan-/*, *PORTA-la-na-* ‘gate, palace’ (<https://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary.php?lemma=3683>).

17 Cf. Bossert 1933–1934; Meissner 1942; Singer 1975.

18 Other passages can be found in CAD H:184–185. The alleged occurrence in an OB letter from Mari (ARM 1 3 rev. 10’) is probably to be read É.[D]AM-*ni*.

19 See Christiansen 2019a:137.

20 See Kossian 1997:29–30; Christiansen 2019a:138; and Bonfanti 2022:134–135. On the Luwian stem, see eDiAna s.v. Hieroglyphic Luwian */suwa.<sup>(i)ʔ/</sup>*, *su-wa/i-* ‘to fill’ (<https://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary.php?lemma=802>).

*soul* that (will be) in this stele,” suggesting that the soul of the deceased actually lives in the stele after death. The same explanation is offered by Masson (2010) and Melchert (2010a), the latter stressing that the idea of a living soul independent from the body has a clear Anatolian background, occurring in a Hittite text that describes the journey of the soul after its departure from the body. However, such a text proves only that an idea of soul existed; there is no indication that the soul lived in the stele after death. Therefore, this idea could be an Iron Age innovation, supported by the twofold value of *NBŠ* in Aramaic, indicating both the ‘soul/life’ and the ‘funerary monument,’ as is clear from later Aramaic inscriptions.

More recently, Hawkins (2015a) suggested a different solution. According to him, *NBŠ* would be a calque on Luwian *atr(i)-*, appearing to mean both ‘self’ and ‘image,’ so that the offerings would not be due to the ‘soul’ of *KTMW* living in the stele, but to the ‘image’ of *KTMW* represented *on* the stele. No idea of an immortal soul would thus be involved. Hawkins’s suggestion is noteworthy, and would find corroboration in some Luwian texts where offerings are prescribed for the statue of the owner of the inscription (cf. KARKAMIŠ A1A, MALPINAR). However, the word for *statue* occurring in these contexts is *tarud-*, whereas offerings to the *atr(i)-* are never mentioned. Thus, even though the hypothesis of a calque is tempting, it does not seem very likely.

Because neither the Hittite–Luwian nor the Semitic tradition appear to support the idea of the soul living in the stele, the interpretation of *NBŠ* in the *KTMW* inscription remains quite problematic. It may be the image of *KTMW* on the stele, as per Hawkins, although we should likely abandon the hypothesis of a calque on Luwian *atr(i)-*, which is unsupported by the Luwian sources. Otherwise, we could consider that *NBŠ* generically meant ‘funerary monument,’ as in later Aramaic inscriptions—and, in this case, its collocation would obviously be *by* the stele rather than *in* or *on* the stele.

Also note that at the end of the offering section in the Ördëkburnu stele, offerings appear to be prescribed for the owner of the monument, as well as at the end of the *KTMW* stele (Lemaire and Sass 2013):

(6) ... LY (7) SL' MNḤ- BRKB'L . Š'(8)YN . LYM . WBKBB . Š'YN . LYM (9)  
WBMQM . MLKY . Š'YN . LY

“... Let him *present an offering*: for Rākib-El two sheep for the day, and for Kubaba two sheep for the day, and in the *place of the kings* (= royal necropolis) two sheep for me.” (Ördëkburnu 6–9)

The text appears to be asymmetric, because this last sentence shows a different structure compared to the preceding ones:

1. *BRKB'L . Š'YN . LYM* = “for Rākib-El two sheep for the day”
2. *WBKBB . Š'YN . LYM* = “for Kubaba two sheep for the day”
3. *WBMQM . MLKY . Š'YN . LY* = “in the *place of the kings* two sheep for me”

However, a symmetry can be recovered through a slight addition that modifies the meaning of the clause, giving: *WBMQM . MLKY . LY<M>*, “to the *place of the kings* two sheep for the day,” where the *place of the kings* may be a periphrasis for the tomb or the funerary monument. Otherwise, the beneficiary of the offerings may be the *MQM*, literally the ‘standing object’ of the kings, which may indicate the statues or the stelae. In any case, it may represent a possible equivalent to *NBš* in the *KTMW* stele, whether it means ‘image’ or ‘funerary monument.’

A further calque on Luwian found in the *KTMW* stele may be *w'T* ‘and now’ (*w*- + ‘*T*’) in line 6, which is not attested elsewhere in Sam’alian. Masson (2010:55) suggested that it may correspond to Luw. *zila* and *ziladuwa/zilatiya* ‘then, subsequently,’ although Pardee (2009:63) notes that the similar form *wk'T* occurs in Sfire Old Aramaic (KAI 224:24), and the use of the conjunction *w-* plus the word ‘now’ is well attested in northwest Semitic to mark the transition between topic and comment.

Finally, some potential Luwian loanwords may be found in Phrygian, namely *imroy* ‘field(?)’ from Luwian *im(ma)r(i)*- ‘open country’,<sup>21</sup> (α)τεαμα(ς), from Luwian *tiyamm(i)*- ‘earth’; and perhaps ουταν ‘punishment, spell,’ from Luwian *utar/utn*- ‘word, spell,’ although it may instead be a cognate (for a discussion and references, see Chapter 8).

## 2.2 *Luwian as the Target Language*

Although Iron Age Luwian inscriptions have been found in areas where other languages were present, and the Neo-Hittite states had contacts with other populations, the number of foreign lexical items currently identified in Luwian hieroglyphic inscriptions is surprisingly limited, if we exclude proper names. Indeed, only some Semitic (mostly, if not exclusively Akkadian) loanwords can be found, some of them not entirely assured, which generally belong to two categories: (1) titles and professional names, and (2) goods subject to commercial exchange. Thus, in a sense they are technical terms that appear only occasionally in Luwian texts, and this does not necessarily imply a full integration into the vocabulary of the language. It is perhaps not surprising that they are mostly

21 See also eDiAna s.v. *im(ma)ra(i)*- (<https://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary.php?lemma=2062>), in which the meaning ‘estate, demesne’ is suggested for the Phrygian *imro-*.

*hapax legomena*, although this may also depend on the quality of the available documentation.

The title (LIGNUM)*ha-za-ni-* occurring in CEKKE §14 (8th century BCE) has been convincingly related to the Akkadian title *hazan(n)u* ‘mayor, burgomaster’;<sup>22</sup> also attested as an Akkadogram, <sup>LÚ</sup>HAZANNU, in Hittite texts, and as a loanword in Hurrian, *ha-zi-ya-na* in KBo 32.14 iii 25 (CTH 789, MS), matching <sup>LÚ</sup>*utniyašhan* in the Hittite translation.<sup>23</sup> A variant of the same title may occur in BULGARMADEN §10, *ha-<sup>L</sup>zi<sup>L</sup>-ia-ni-*, although the reading of the second sign is very uncertain. Although the loanword status of this title in Luwian and its ultimate Akkadian origin are quite assured, the exact path of transmission cannot be determined: the form *hazani-* in CEKKE clearly depends on the most common variant *hazan(n)u*, but it may have entered Luwian through Hittite intermediation, rather than via direct contact with Akkadian, while *haziyani-*, if it actually exists, appears to reflect either the MAss. variant *haziānu* or the variant *haziannu* rarely attested at Nuzi (besides *hazannu*) and also reflected in Hurrian, as mentioned (also note the unique—as far as we know—Akkadographic spelling <sup>LÚ</sup>HA-AZ-ZI-YA-AN-NI in the ritual of Allaiturahhi, KUB 24.13 iii 21’, belonging to the Hurrian milieu). Thus, a uniform borrowing scenario cannot be established.<sup>24</sup>

Another title with a convincing Akkadian explanation is the hapax (“\*474”) *sa-ri+i-ia-si-* occurring in the inscription ANCOZ 4, although unfortunately in fragmentary context. Because the hieroglyphic sign \*474 determines only the title *wassinass(i)-/ussinass(i)-* ‘attendant, servant,’<sup>25</sup> lit. ‘(he) of the body’ (a genitival adjective built on the noun *wassina(/i)-* ‘body’), Hawkins (CHLI I:349) suggested the derivation of (“\*474”) *sa-ri+i-ia-si-* from Akkadian *ša rēši* ‘(he) of the head > servant, eunuch,’ also suggesting an explanation of Luwian *wassinass(i)-/ussinass(i)-* as a calque on the same Akkadian title.<sup>26</sup> As for the unex-

22 Cf. CHLI I:149–150; Giusfredi 2012:155–155.

23 Cf. Neu 1996:182. Despite this connection, it is problematic to regard <sup>LÚ</sup>*utniyašha-* (= Sum. EN KUR<sup>77</sup>) as the Hittite reading concealed behind Akkadographic <sup>LÚ</sup>HAZANNU (see the discussion in Weeden 2011:215–218). Instead, it is possible that the title underwent semantic shift in Hurrian.

24 The specific meaning of the title cannot be assessed, which would also be helpful in order to evaluate the possibility of a borrowing intermediated by Hurrian for alleged *haziyani-* in BULGARMADEN, given the likely semantic shift of this title in Hurrian.

25 See the ACLT2 for the occurrences.

26 Conversely, the alleged calque DOMINUS-*nin zalalasin* from Akkadian *bēl narkabti* ‘chariot-  
teer’ (ASSUR letter D §9) quoted by Dardano (2018:367) most likely does not exist, because DOMINUS-*ni-wa/i* is best explained as a dat.sg. and thus cannot agree with the following genitival adjective.

pected change /e:/ > /ija/, one may imagine either a sporadic breaking<sup>27</sup> or a re-analysis as a Luwian genitival adjective in *-assa/i-*.<sup>28</sup>

The title (“LIGNUM”) *su-ka-la-* (occurring only in EĞRIKÖY §3) probably reflects Akkadian *š/sukkallu* ‘minister’ (*vel sim.*), which in turn is a loanword from Sumerian *sugal*.<sup>7</sup> The title is attested as a Sumerogram in Hittite and was also borrowed in Hurrian and regularly adapted as an *i*-stem, *šukkalli-* (cf. Richter 2012:408). Thus, Luwian thematization in *-a* appears to preclude a Hurrian path, although the precise borrowing scenario remains unclear.<sup>29</sup>

The noun (PUGNUS+PUGNUS) *i-ka+ra/i-* occurring in the inscription KARKAMIŠ A24a (9th–8th century BCE) has been recently traced back to Akkadian *ikkāru* ‘farmer’, also a loanword from Sumerian *engar* ‘id.’<sup>30</sup>

Far more uncertain is the origin of the title *la-hi-na-la-* occurring in KULULU lead strip 2 §§1, 3, which has been tentatively explained as a borrowing from Akkadian (*a*) *lahhinu* (an administrative official) by Hawkins (CHLI I:513), adapted in Luwian by adding the native suffix *-alla-* that builds agent nouns.<sup>31</sup> The loss of initial /a-/ would not be problematic, because the variant *lahhinu* actually exists in NAss. and aphaeresis is often found in the adaptation of foreign material in Iron Age Luwian.<sup>32</sup> However, perhaps a full Anatolian explanation cannot be excluded, because an element *lahina-*<sup>o</sup> is also attested in Anatolian (seemingly Luwian) onomastics, cf. <sup>m</sup>*La-hi-na-LÚ* (= Lahinazidi) in KUB 13.35+ iii 22 (NS, CTH 293) and <sup>URU</sup>*La-hi-na-aš-ši-iš* in KUB 17.35 iv 18 (NS, CTH 526.18),<sup>33</sup> whose etymology is, however, unclear. Were the base Anatolian, it might be somehow related to the noun *lāhh-* ‘military campaign’ (cf. Hittite <sup>LU</sup>*lahhiyala-* ‘campaigner’),<sup>34</sup> although the existence of a stem *\*lahhin-* clearly connected with this noun cannot be independently proven.<sup>35</sup> We would

27 Cf. perhaps the personal name <sup>1</sup>*ia-hi-la-ti-sa-pa-* in KARKAMIŠ A7 §13, if it reflects the Hurrian name Ehli-Teššub.

28 See also Giusfredi 2012:157.

29 Cf. Giusfredi 2012:158. Earlier claims on a sporadic value *li* for the sign <la> (cf., e.g., Marazzi 1990:157 with previous references) seem to be no longer acceptable.

30 See Bauer and Yakubovich 2023:21–23. See also eDiAna s.v. Hieroglyphic Luwian /ikkara- (i)-/, (PUGNUS+PUGNUS) *i-ka+ra/i-* ‘peasant (?), farmer (?)’ (<http://www.dwaks.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dev/dictionary.php?lemma=952>).

31 On this suffix, see Sasseville 2014–2015.

32 Cf. Melchert 2019b:359–360.

33 Cf. Laroche 1966a:104, 272.

34 See perhaps also the PN <sup>1</sup>*la-hi-ia-sá* in KULULU lead frag. 2.

35 One may possibly imagine an original adjective derived from the oblique stem of the noun *lahhiyatar* ‘campaign’, *\*lahhiyannalli-* (cf. Hittite *kattawannalli-*, Luwian *kattawatnalli-*, both adj. <*kattawatar* ‘enmity’), but this is a very unlikely solution because, although a sporadic change /-ija-/ > /-i-/ is attested in Luwian (cf. Melchert 2003b:183), Luwian

instead exclude a connection with the Hittite noun *lahni-* (a water-soluble substance), because the Hieroglyphic Luwian spelling *la-hi-na-la-* and the onomastic occurrences of *la-hi-na-*<sup>o</sup> mentioned above (if related) make it unlikely that the medial *-i-* is a merely graphic element.<sup>36</sup>

It has been suggested that the Luwian noun (\*265)*mi-zi-na-la-* occurring in KARKAMIŠ A2+3 should be explained as an agent noun in *-alla/i-* meaning ‘brewer’, derived from a base that ultimately trace back to Akkadian *miz’u*, denoting a type of beer and wine. However, its derivational pattern remains partly unclear, and a full Indo-European etymology also remains possible.<sup>37</sup>

Turning to commercial goods, some terms occurring in the ASSUR letters have been traced back to Akkadian, but they are generally more uncertain than the titles dealt with above. The noun *ku-ru-pi* (ASSUR letter B §5; F+G §37) has been explained as a borrowing from Akkadian (Babylonian) *kuruppu* by Giusfredi (2010:214 fn. 427; 2012:155), denoting a basket. The previous connection with “OVIS”-*ru-pi* in BULGARMADEN §11, with a consequent explanation as a kind of sacrificial sheep (CHLI I:544, with references), has no grounds other than a partial formal similarity.

More unclear is the origin of the noun (\*472)*ma<sup>(-i)</sup>-sa<sub>5</sub>+ra/i-* (or perhaps \*472(-)*ma<sup>(-i)</sup>-sa<sub>5</sub>+ra/i-?*) found in ASSUR letter A §10, D §7, which has been tentatively connected with Akkadian *mašru* ‘teasled (cloth)’ < *mašāru* ‘to teasel cloth’ by Giusfredi (2010:212 fn. 420) and explained as a textile.<sup>38</sup> Less likely is a connection with *mašrû* ‘wealth’ (cf. Giusfredi 2012:157).

Following a brief comment by Yakubovich (2016a:87), Giusfredi (2020a) suggested that the noun *ka-mara/i<sup>+ra/i</sup>*, found in ASSUR letter F+G §§28, 31, may reflect the Assyrian noun *gammalu* ‘camel’ (only in NASS) borrowed in Luwian, showing rhotacism of original /l/ between vowels. Assyrian *gammalu* is generally regarded as a West Semitic loanword; therefore, Luwian *ka-mara/i<sup>+ra/i</sup>* may also directly depend on a West Semitic source, provided that the identification with ‘camel’ is correct.

---

does not show assimilation in the cluster /tn/. An Indo-European etymology is defended in the eDiAna s.v. /lahhinalla-/, *la-hi-na-la-* (<https://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary.php?lemma=742>), translated as ‘soldier’ and explained as a derivative of an unattested verb \* /lahhina- / < /lahhi- / ‘to campaign.’

36 On these possibilities, see also the discussion in Giusfredi 2012:155–157.

37 See the discussion in Bauer and Yakubovich 2023:23–27 and eDiAna s.v. Hieroglyphic Luwian /mizzinalla-/, (\*265)*mi-zi-na-la-* ‘brewer, wine maker (?)’ (<http://www.dwaks.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dev/dictionary.php?lemma=3173>).

38 See also eDiAna s.v. Hieroglyphic Luwian /masr(i)-?, (\*472)*ma-sa<sub>5</sub>+ra/i-* ‘(a commodity)’ (<https://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary.php?lemma=1163>).

Beyond titles and commercial goods, another possible Akkadian loanword is the noun *ki-tara/i-sa* ‘share, bequest’ or the like,<sup>39</sup> allegedly \*/kitrid-/ + the neuter particle =*sa*, found in CEKKE §§13, 16, perhaps from Akkadian *kitru*, *kiterru* ‘preferential share (of an estate),’ occurring only at Nuzi and thus regarded as a Hurrian loanword, although currently not attested in Hurrian texts.<sup>40</sup> Furthermore, the Iron Age Luwian *irwi-* ‘gazelle’ most likely has a Semitic origin (cf. Akkadian *arwium*, *armû* ‘id.’), although Hurrian intermediation is likely.<sup>41</sup>

Recently, Giusfredi (2020b:273–274) suggested that the Luwian verb (LOCUS) *pi-ta-ha-li-ya-*, explained as *pithaliya-*, found in KARKAMIŠ A1b+C §4, is a Luwian derivative from an unattested noun \*/pithala/i- borrowed from Akkad. *pēthallu* ‘cavalry.’<sup>42</sup> Thus, the meaning of the Luwian verb would be ‘supply troops’ (*vel sim.*).

As for possible loanwords from languages different from Akkadian, it has been tentatively suggested that Luw. (“SCALPRUM”) *ka-ti-na-*, denoting an unidentified dedicatory object, reflected Hurr. *kadinni* (a weapon), but other solutions are possible.<sup>43</sup>

### 3 Grammatical Interference

Whereas lexical borrowing represents a rather superficial interference phenomenon that does not require a situation of close linguistic contact between different communities of speakers, structural interference—which concerns grammatical structures—is something much deeper that occurs only when two or more language communities are in a situation of intense language contact (see Volume 1, Chapter 15).

As far as Iron Age Luwian and its neighboring languages are concerned, the different potential situations of language contact are often difficult to analyze because of the scant quantity and poor quality of the documentation (cf., e.g., the situation of Old Aramaic, mostly attested by isolated inscriptions scattered

39 See CHLI I:149 for the meaning.

40 Cf. CAD K:468; CHLI I:149; Giusfredi 2012:155, eDiAna s.v. Hieroglyphic Luwian /*kitrid-*/, *ki-tara/i-* ‘share, bequest (?)’ (<https://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary.php?lemma=1491>).

41 See Simon 2023a:229.

42 Akkadian origin is granted by the phrase *halla petû*, lit. ‘open the *hallu* (i.e., the region between the thighs),’ denoting the act of sitting on a horse (cf. CAD H:45).

43 See eDiAna s.v. Hieroglyphic Luwian /*kaTin-?*/, (“SCALPRUM”) *ka-ti-na-* ‘(a dedicatory object), bowl?’ (<http://www.dwaks.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dev/dictionary.php?lemma=585>).

across the Syro-Mesopotamian area and very different from one another from a dialectal point of view), because of our imperfect knowledge of the languages involved, and because grammatical interference is sometimes difficult to positively detect. Indeed, except for very rare phenomena such as the morpheme induction, grammatical interference does not necessarily introduce something strikingly new or create obvious agrammatical structures in the target language that would be easy to identify (provided, of course, that one had an adequate knowledge of the grammar of that language), but instead may simply determine the selection of a given morpheme or structure over another, perhaps more rare or marginal, but nonetheless grammatical. Therefore, clearly, in order to suggest the existence of a language contact scenario, the simple presence of the two (or more) languages in the same territory is, although necessary, not a sufficient condition. With this premise in hand, we will now proceed to review some of the possible evidence for phenomena of grammatical interference in the available corpus.

### 3.1 *The Special Case of the Cilician Area*

The previous Chapter (Chapter 4) contained a thorough historical discussion about Cilicia, with important considerations about the problem of the peoples that inhabited during the Iron Age. In this section, instead, we will briefly summarize the related (and still ongoing) discussion about its sociolinguistic situation.

As already pointed out by Yakubovich (2015a, with reference to previous literature), Iron Age Cilicia represents a special case with respect to interference, because the data emerging from the analysis of the complex bilingual materials, such as the KARATEPE and ÇİNEKÖY inscriptions, testify to a problematic sociolinguistic interaction between Phoenician and Luwian, with possible (but frequently overestimated) hints of the presence of a Greek demographic component in the region, even though this emerges only indirectly from the contents of the texts and from some local onomastic data.

The main sources that may be used to examine the sociolinguistic situation of Iron Age Cilicia can be divided into multilingual and monolingual texts. The multilingual texts are the Luwo-Phoenician inscriptions from Karatepe (KARATEPE 1, or simply KARATEPE) and ÇİNEKÖY (the İNCİRLİ trilingual is in such condition that it is impossible to safely compare the different texts).<sup>44</sup> The

44 KARATEPE 1 is published in CHLI I:45–68, while ÇİNEKÖY is published by Tekoğlu et al. 2000 and included now in CHLI III:108–113. On the İNCİRLİ stele, see Kaufman 2007 and Na'aman 2019.

monolinguals, on the other hand, are the minor Luwian and Phoenician fragments from Karatepe (KARATEPE 2–4; KARATEPE Pho/S.I.),<sup>45</sup> the also fragmentary Phoenician Hasanbeyli boundary stone,<sup>46</sup> and the Phoenician inscription from Cebelireis Dağı.<sup>47</sup>

The monolingual texts contain no clear evidence of linguistic interference on the grammatical level. Those written in Luwian are all very short and contain isolated clauses or parts of clauses. The structure of the available phrases appears to be fully compatible with the grammar of Luwian, and no obvious calque of a Semitic grammatical structure is apparent. As for the Phoenician texts, Hasanbeyli is quite short, and its only significant feature is the presence of the name of King *'WRK* (on which cf. Chapters 3 and 4). Also in this case, no peculiarities of the grammar of the text indicate influence from a non-Semitic language. Similar is the case of the historically understudied text from Cebelireis Dağı, which was probably also a boundary stone: here, most of the personal names (if not all of them) appear to be Anatolian, but the grammatical structure of the Phoenician language appears to be respected, and even the most problematic passages do not admit an explanation based on interference. An attractive—but far from proved—exception may be represented by the use of the sentence connector *'P* in 3–4:

*W'P · WL|WY · YTN · LMTŠ · BWRKLY · W'P · (4) MTŠ · YTN · LKLŠ · ŠD · Z|BL*  
 “He then gave *WLWY* near *WRYKLY* to *MTŠ* and to *KLŠ*. And, again *MTŠ* gave to *KLŠ* the field *ZBL*” (Cebelireis Dağı 3–4<sup>48</sup>)

It is not inconceivable that this serial use of the connector may have calqued the sequences of clauses introduced by the semantically similar and formally almost-matching Luwian adverbial *api*.<sup>49</sup> Yet nothing precludes the construction in Cebelireis Dağı from being simply a perfectly regular Phoenician construction.

Bilinguals are, on the contrary, more generous in terms of unusual patterns that may or may not be explained by language interference. In an inspired article published in 2015, Yakubovich successfully demonstrated that some of the structures in the Luwian versions of KARATEPE and ÇİNEKÖY are calqued

45 Editions in CHLI I:68–71; CHLI II:50–81.

46 Edition in Lemaire 1983.

47 Edition Mosca and Russell 1987; see now also Giusfredi 2024, with references.

48 The translation generally follows the edition by Giusfredi 2024. See also the first edition in Mosca and Russell 1987.

49 On the function of *api* in Luwian, see Giusfredi 2020c:55; Waal 2021.

from Phoenician, thereby obliterating the former general idea that Luwian represented the original language of the bilingual. The calqued constructions include clauses with non-final predicates as well as replacement of a Phoenician list of gapped noun phrases by a full clause in Luwian.

An example of the former phenomenon is the following, in which, as noted by Melchert (2021), the verbal fronting of the verb *itiwi* “I (shall) delete,” in Luwian is not accompanied by the grammatically obligatory presence of an additive or contrastive marker (*-ha* or *-pa*):<sup>50</sup>

ARHA-wa/i-ta (“\*69”)i-ti-wa/i  
 (LITUUS)a-za-ti-wa/i-ta-sa a-la/i-ma-za PORTA-la-na-ri+i zi-na  
 “I shall delete Azatiwada’s name from this gate.” (KARATEPE 1 Hu. § 63)

In spite of some differences in the organization of the text discourse-wise which reflect in the mismatch of verbal persons, the position of the verbal head is obviously the same as in the Phoenician version, which follows an unproblematic West Semitic clause architecture (cf. the translation in Krahmalkov 2000:41):

YMḪ ṢM ’ZTWD BŠ’R Z  
 “he shall delete Azatiwada’s name from this gate.”<sup>51</sup> (KARATEPE 1 Pho § 63)

As regards gapping vs. full clause repetition, as Melchert showed, these do not truly represent interference or *translationese*, because Luwian simply had no other way to express the required semantics. We may add that what would have represented interference would have been the very opposite case: if the Luwian text contained listed noun phrases in a barely grammatical fashion, this would have demonstrated Phoenician interference, just like the agrammatical fronting in the example above implied calquing a Semitic syntax. Nonetheless, for sake of completeness, we include an example of this phenomenon, too:

wa/i-ta (EQUUS.ANIMAL)zú-na (EQUUS)zú-wa/i |SUPER+ra/i-ta |i-zi-ia-ha  
 EXER[CITUS.LA/I/U-za-pa-wa-/i-ta] EXERCITUS[.LA/I/U-ni] |SUPER+ra/i-ta |i-z[i]-ia-h[a]  
 “I made horse upon horse, I made army upon army.” (ÇİNEKÖY § 3–4)

50 Melchert 2021:362.

51 CHLI I:57.

vs. Phoenician:

*WP'L 'NK SS 'L SS WMḤNT 'L MḤNT*

“I made horse upon horse and army upon army.” (ÇİNEKÖY Pho 6–7<sup>52</sup>)

The other traces of a translation process that Yakubovich proposes are lexical and do not involve proper interference, especially at the grammatical level, so any discussion of them would be outside the scope of the present discussion. Melchert (2021), however, added some other examples that indicate Phoenician-like features in the Luwian text, as well as a number of examples of the opposite process, with Phoenician apparently depending on Luwian.

An important addition to the instances of Semitic structures borrowed in Luwian is the use of *kwadi* as a final subordinator, as pointed out by Melchert (2021:364). Final clauses in Anatolian are not subordinates; they are built using the infinitive or with simple coordination. Therefore, the use of a causal subordinator in KARATEPE:

*á-<sup>\*</sup>429-wa/i-sa-wa/i(URBS) || | kwa/i-ti | (BONUS)wa/i+ra/i-ia-ma-la | SO-  
LIUM.MI-í*

“... so that Adanawa might dwell in peace.”<sup>53</sup> (KARATEPE 1 Hu. § 24)

must be a grammatical calque of the Phoenician version:

*LŠBTNM DNNYM LNḤT LBNM*

“so that the *DNNM* might dwell in peace of their heart.”<sup>54</sup> (KARATEPE 1 Phu/A i 17–18)

Melchert (2021), however, did not limit himself to further investigating the cases in which the Phoenician text appears to be primary. Rather, he highlighted cases in which the Semitic structures do not match the Luwian ones, which, in turn, cannot be considered to be translations. Although most of the cases in question are in fact simple mismatches, a couple of them feature structures that appear to be calques of Luwian. One of them is the use of *l* as a reflexive pronoun, likely calquing a Luwian reflexive construction (Melchert 2021:366–367; Pardee 1987). This use is attested in KARATEPE 1:

52 Tekoğlu et al. 2000:968.

53 CHLI I:51.

54 CHLI I:51; Melchert 2021:364.

WYP'L L Š'R ZR

"and he will build for himself another gate." (KARATEPE 1 Phu/A iii 16)

The Luwian version, quite interestingly, does not contain a reflexive personal pronoun, but rather a construction with the adjective *waralla/i-* 'own' (Melchert 2021:367):

*wa/i+ra/i-la-ia-wa/i* "PORTA"-*la-na i-zi-i-wa/i*

"and I will make my own gate."<sup>55</sup> (KARATEPE 1 Hu. § 69)

This implies that, if the Phoenician scribes employed a construction calqued from Luwian, they did so not because of a mechanical translation process, but rather because the form was truly part of the grammar of Cilician Phoenician. It would, therefore, be a rare case of true contact-induced grammatical change.

The other case of Luwian influence on a Phoenician form is less compelling. It deals of the use of the prepositional phrase *BRBM* with the meaning 'plentifully,' to translate the Luwian adverbial *man*, 'much,' in KARATEPE §§ 56–58 // Phu/A 9–11. Although it is true that the Phoenician phrase is rare, whereas the use of the Luwian adverbial is very common and perfectly grammatical, another occurrence of *BRBM* exists in late Punic, with the meaning 'many times, often' (KAI 68:5; Krahmalkov 2000:125). Assuming that semantic calquing is at work implies considering the meaning 'many times' to be primary with respect to 'much, plentifully,' but there are no compelling reasons to do so. Therefore, in this case we can support Melchert's claim that the Luwian version is not derived from Phoenician, and can even entertain the possibility that Phoenician struggled to render a Luwian expression, but there is no compelling evidence that the use of *BRBM* attested in KARATEPE is an *ad hoc* formation influenced by a Luwian adverbial.

In general, it is very difficult to say a final word about the problem of the *original version* of the Cilician bilinguals. Certainly, Yakubovich (2015a) made a worthy contribution by identifying several instances that disprove the outdated idea that the Luwian text was primary and that the Phoenician text was derived from it. Melchert's analyses (2021), on the other hand, showed that the Luwian text is, in several cases, underived or even primary, and that the Phoenician one occasionally appears to follow it. A yet to be published reply to Melchert's observations is contained in Yakubovich (forthcoming),

55 CHLI I:57.

which, along with offering a new discussion of some lexical borrowings and calques, also challenges the two cases of grammatical interference mentioned above.

In general, regarding the sociolinguistic situation of Iron Age Cilicia, some conclusions can be drawn based on the evidence presented above. First of all, based on the available documents, the languages of the region appear to be Luwian and Phoenician (even though some features of their status and mutual relationships are still open to debate). Whether a Greek elite were already present in the area during the 7th century, on the other hand, remains an open question, as no conclusive pieces of evidence exist to support the claim (see Chapters 3 and 4 of the present volume for historical discussion).

### 3.2 *Luwian as the Model Language*

Outside the problematic area of Cilicia, the one case in which Luwian appears to have *influenced* a Semitic language in northern Syria is represented by the Sam'alian dialect of Aramaic. In Giusfredi and Pisaniello (2021), we argued that some peculiarities of the Sam'alian dialect were, indeed, attributable to the preservation of archaic features due to the feedback and influence of Anatolian. The first would be the lack of development of the so-called “Aramaic article,” another name for the peculiar emphatic state of the noun, which is employed to mark definiteness. The suffix *-'*, present in Old Aramaic with a function similar to the Canaanite and Phoenician article *H*, was never used in the inscriptions from Yadiya/Sam'al until the late King Bar-Rākib abandoned the local dialect to use a standard version of Aramaic. Because both Old Aramaic and Phoenician, the two Semitic languages of the area, had a strategy to mark the definiteness of a noun (phrase), Luwian is the only language in the area that patterns with Sam'alian in lacking a morphologically overt way to do the same.

The other peculiarity of Sam'alian is the retention of the nominal inflection, lost in all other Northwest Semitic languages. This too, being absent in Phoenician and in Old Aramaic, is a feature that Sam'alian areally shares only with Luwian.

Due to the limits of the available corpus, this is destined to remain a hypothesis—albeit one that is linguistically sound and well-founded from the chronological and areal perspectives. The use of Luwian personal names by the rulers of Yadiya *KLMW* (Kulamuwa) and *PNMW* (Panamuwa or Punamuwa) I and II, as well as the presence of Luwian lexical and cultural elements in the inscription of the official *KTMW* (see above), who also bears a Luwian name, combined with the historical presence of Luwians in the northern areas of transeuphratic Syria ever since the Final Bronze Age, testify to the language

having been endemic to the region for a time long enough to have triggered an interaction with the earliest phases of development of the local variety of Aramaic.<sup>56</sup>

### 3.3 *Luwian as the Target Language*

Because Iron Age Luwian was a very compact and geographically consistent code employed mostly for official purposes and royal inscriptions, there are very few cases in which unusual patterns emerge that might be explainable in terms of grammatical interference.

#### 3.3.1 Masuwari: The elusive Arslan Taş trilingual(s)

In general, in spite of the high likelihood of a mixed population and culture, the Luwian inscriptions<sup>57</sup> from the Luwian-Aramaean kingdom of Masuwari/Til Barsip show no significant traces of interference. Information regarding the mixed culture and population of the city and region are historical and contextual (see Chapter 4), while the Luwian of the hieroglyphic texts contains no unusual patterns that would hint at grammatical interference from Aramaic.

A single case that may warrant attention is the last preserved sentence of the Luwian version of the Arslan Taş trilingual inscription on one of the gate lions, published by Hawkins (CHLI I:246–248). The Arslan Taş texts appear to be generally dictated by the Assyrian local governor Ninurta-bēlu-uşur, so the *terminus post quem* is the mid-8th century BCE.<sup>58</sup> If, as Hawkins persuasively suggests, the reference to the foundation of the city of Hadattu in the Luwian text (§ 2) is parallel to a similar passage in the cuneiform Akkadian version, the Arslan Taş Luwian text would be the only known case of Luwian inscription certain to have been dictated by an Assyrian official. In any case, because the *terminus post quem* is certain (because the toponym *Hadattu* is unquestionably present in the Luwian text as well), the context of production of the text was most likely that of a former Luwian-Aramaic polity to which an Assyrian political and linguistic superstrate was added.

Bearing this in mind, one may now turn to the Luwian inscription. Although it is only fragmentarily preserved, it contains few unclear passages, with the exception of the last readable line:

56 On Luwo-Aramaic presence in Yadiya, see Giusfredi and Pisaniello 2021b; Osborne 2021: 44–47, both with references to previous scholarship. Although the views on the reasons for the choice of specific languages and scripts in the monumental texts may diverge in different scholarly works, the coexistence of Aramaic and Luwian elements appears unquestionable in the area under discussion.

57 CHLI I:224–248; Hawkins *apud* Bunnens 2006:11–32.

58 There are no absolute dates for the activity of Ninurta-bēlu-uşur as a governor, but he certainly acted during the reign of Tiglathpileser III.

*wa/i-’ a-wá/i “4”-wa/i-zi (“BOS”)wa/i-wa/i-ti-i-ha “x”(-)sa-mi-zi \*286-na*

First of all, the meaning is obscure, and no parallel passages from the other Aramaic or Akkadian texts can help shed any light. If the second word, *a-wá/i*, is indeed a first person singular of the verb ‘to make,’ its position would be clause-initial instead of clause-final. Furthermore, the numeral ‘4’ is, as expected in the morphosyntax of Luwian,<sup>59</sup> inflected in plural, but the case is mistaken, as *wawa/i-*, ‘oxen,’ undoubtably its head noun, is inflected in ablative/instrumental, whereas “4”-*wa/i-zi* is either a nominative or an accusative.

Although the context and meaning remain elusive, the verb *a-*, ‘to make,’ does occur with instrumental in sacrificial contexts (HISARCIK §2), with the beneficiary of the sacrifice in accusative (a role that could be assigned to either of the final two unknown words “I will honor the X with four oxen.” However, if this interpretation is correct, three problems remain. Two of them have already been mentioned: the position of the verb (which is clause-initial) and the mistake in the agreement of the numeral. The third is the absence of the dative-reflexive pronoun *-mu*, which is expected to occur in this idiomatic construction with the verb *a-* (reminiscent of Hittite *-za iya-*).

Can these agrammatical patterns be explained in terms of contact? As a matter of fact, it is possible. A clause-initial verb and the agreement mistake may be due to Aramaic interference, as Old Aramaic is mostly verb-initial and has lost nominal inflection (neither condition applies to Akkadian). The missing pronoun, on the other hand, may merely reflect imperfect competence of Luwian by a non-native or bilingual scribe.

### 3.3.2 The building inscriptions HAMA 1–3, 6 and 7

A case of unusual clause structure appears to emerge in the Hama inscriptions by King Uratammi, in which a rather formulaic sentence occurs in the texts HAMA 1 (restored), 2, 3, 6 and 7.<sup>60</sup> The formula is as follows:

*a-wa/i || á-mu AEDIFICARE+MI-ha za-’ (“CASTRUM”)ha+ra/i-ni-sà-za*  
 “and I built this fortress.” (HAMA 3 §2)

The clause features an SVO order of the sentence constituents, with AEDIFICARE+MI- being the clause-medial predicate, as opposed to the expected order for Luwian, which would be SOV. Even if one wanted to consider this construction

59 Bauer 2015:71–83.

60 Text in CHLI I:413.

an emphatic one, with the subject *amu* in topical or focal position, the position of the verb would be highly unusual.<sup>61</sup>

The pattern is unparalleled in the other texts from the area. The last blocks of sentences in the longer text HAMA 4, by Uratammis's father Urahilana, are admittedly obscure and do feature some non-final verbs; however, these verbs are not followed by direct objects but rather by adverbial elements, so the structure may be more genuinely seen as grammatical in Luwian.

The unusual clauses in Uratammis's building formulae are, thus, quite isolated, and one may wish to investigate whether they in fact reflect a specific sociolinguistic scenario. Even at a glance, the idea of contact-induced patterns is certainly alluring. The central Syrian area would appear, indeed, as an obvious candidate for interference between the Luwian and Northwest Semitic components. A situation of alleged coexistence of Luwian and Semitic, however, cannot be conclusively invoked to immediately explain the unusual structures in the Hama building texts as induced by contact. Indeed, their unusual pattern may be derived by interference with Old Aramaic, but only if one considers the presence, in this language, of the order *svo*, which is a minority order compared to the prevalent and unmarked *vso*.<sup>62</sup> On the other hand, assuming that Luwian was not the native language of the scribe or scribes who composed the short texts may explain the production of unusual structures merely as a consequence of non-native competence in the language, especially if one considers that the context of the quoted clauses is that of a relative clause:

*a-wa/i* || *á-mu* AEDIFICARE+MI-*ha za'* ("CASTRUM")*ha+ra/i-ni-sà-za*  
 ("\*218")*ku-su-na-la-zi*(REGIO) *kwa/i-za i-zi-ia-ta*  
 "and I built this fortress, which the inhabitants of Kusunalla (physically)  
 made." (HAMA 3 §§ 2–3)

For a speaker of a non-Anatolian language, the almost correlative structure of the Luwian relative clauses would have appeared artificial and difficult to process, and the irregular *svo* order of the main clause could be driven by an attempt to dislocate the direct object closer to the relative clause it refers to.

To defend this hypothesis, it is necessary to check whether the data we possess about the linguistic demography of Hama is potentially consistent with

61 Cf. for instance ÇİNEKÖY §9 for a subject pronoun *amu* in topical position, with no alteration of the position of the verb. On marked informational structures, see in general Giusfredi 2020c.

62 Fales and Grassi 2016:59.

the idea that Luwian was an official language used for display texts in a predominantly Semitic environment. The Hieroglyphic Luwian material provides few additional pieces of information apart from the presence of the Phoenician divine name *Ba'lat*, (DEUS)*pa-ha-la-ti-*, which maintains the Semitic feminine but is treated as an *i*-themed substantive (a very plain path of morphological integration).

As for the Old Aramaic documents, the short ones from Hama, already discovered during excavations in the first half of the 20th century CE,<sup>63</sup> do not contain clear indications of a multilingual environment, and because they deal with bullae or weights, they are more likely to reflect the real-life situation compared to a royal inscription by a ruler who bears a Luwian name. The personal names in these texts are generally Aramaic or else problematic, with only one that might be Anatolian. Indeed, the Hieroglyphic Luwian bulla HAMA 7 contains the name of a scribe that is probably spelled *a-la-ni* (although the signs are quite ruined). This name may be the same as in the Aramaic bulla HAMA 8, 'N, and, contrary to Hawkins's claim (CHLI I:422), nothing indicates that the name was necessarily Aramaic.

Thus, the situation in Hama can be described as follows: apart from the names of the two kings, Urahilana and Uratammi (and possibly the name of a scribe), the absolute majority of the evidence would point to a predominantly Semitic population, which is also consistent with the geographical collocation of the site and with the divine names that appear even in the official Luwian inscriptions (the West Semitic *Ba'lat* and the Anatolian Storm God). Cases are known in which dynasts bearing Luwian names ruled in cities that were mostly Aramaean. The case of Sam'al immediately comes to mind, but the Luwian minority was, in that instance, probably large enough to compete with the Aramaic one, as attested by the contents of the Kulamuwa inscription (cf. Giusfredi and Pisaniello 2021b). So too does the case of Masuwari, if the names of the rulers of the Hamiyata dynasty are indeed to be interpreted as Semitic. However, the combination of different cultural elements appears to yield different results in each of these areas: in Sam'al, Aramaean rulers bear Luwian names and write in (Sam'alian) Aramaic (and, in one case, Phoenician); in Masuwari, Semitic rulers with likely Semitic names write in Luwian; and in Hama, rulers with Luwian names write their display inscriptions in Luwian, while many shorter inscriptions in Aramaic are attested.

Politically, Hama in the 9th century appears to orbitate in the Damascus area, to which several connections are attested in the narrative sources. Data

---

63 Otzen 1990.

regarding the previous phases of the Hamatean history are not available: as argued by Giusfredi (2018), the hypothesis that the 11th–10th century kingdom of Palastin included the Hama region are based on two inscriptions, MEHARDE and SHEIZAR, which were found out of context and are unlikely to have been composed there.

All in all, apart from the choice of Luwian as an official language, no evidence indicates that the penetration of the Luwian cultural, linguistic and political element in Hama was a stable one in the *longue durée*, and whatever the role of the northern Orontes valley, the dynasty of Urahilana and Uratammi should in all likelihood be interpreted as a relic of a Luwian cultural and linguistic penetration dating back to the Final Bronze Age and to the Dark Age. This scenario appears consistent with a situation in which scribes with imperfect competence in Luwian produced the unusual patterns attested in the Hama building inscriptions—which do not, however, properly qualify as cases of grammatical *interference*.

## 4 Onomastics

### 4.1 *Luwian names in Foreign Sources*

As mentioned, most Luwian lexical items occurring in non-Luwian sources are proper names, whether personal names, theonyms, or toponyms. Some of them can be found in texts dating to the time when Iron Age Luwian was directly attested by inscriptions (up to the 7th century BCE), while some other are found in later sources when contemporary Luwian inscriptions were, as far as we know, absent. Of course, as far as names attested later are concerned, the label *Luwian* need not be understood in the strict sense of the term: such names could actually be Luwian, possibly surviving as relics, which does not imply that Luwian was still alive at that time—but they could also reflect different linguistic varieties, not attested by direct sources, derived from, or parallel and strictly connected to, the Luwian language directly attested (if not actually spoken) in former times in the areas involved. This clearly changes the linguistic analysis of these names, because any divergences from their attested or reconstructed Luwian models can be simply explained, in the former case, in terms of adaptation in different linguistic and writing systems, with the possibility of alteration in transmission over time, whereas, in the latter, one should perhaps primarily take into account change and variation, besides adaptation strategies.

Some Luwian personal names are attested in the inscriptions from Zincirli, referring both to the kings of the reign of Sam'al/Yadiya (*KLMW*, *PNMW*, and

perhaps also *QRL*) and to officials (*KTMW*). Although *KLMW* should be probably explained as Kulamuwa, based on a plausible connection with the Luwian noun *kwalan-* ‘army’ and on the Greek rendering Κολαμοα in an inscription from Delphi, the vocalization of the other names is quite problematic because Luwian data are missing or inconsistent. *PNMW* may reflect either Panamuwa or Punamuwa because, on the one hand, Assyrian sources provide us with <sup>m</sup>*pa-na-am-mu(-u/ú)* and the Luwian personal name *Panamuwatti* is attested in the inscription BOYBEYPINARI 1 and 2; on the other hand, *Punamuwe* is attested in Lycian, also adapted as Ποναμοα in a Greek inscription from Limyra, *punm[-]ś* is found in Carian, and Luwian *punad(a/i)-* ‘all’ may be a good Luwian base. *QRL* may perhaps reflect the Luwian personal name *ha+ra/i-li-sa* attested in CEKKE (Har(r)alli or Harli), while *KTMW* has been explained as Kuttamuwa, Kat(t)umuwa, or Katimuwa, albeit without compelling arguments.<sup>64</sup>

Many Luwian personal names in non-Luwian sources come from Cilicia and can be found in Phoenician, Aramaic, and Greek inscriptions. Besides a few names occurring in multilingual documents including a Luwian text (e.g., *'ZTWD = Azatiwada* in the Phoenician version of KARATEPE inscription), which also provides us with the right vocalization, most of them are attested in monolingual inscriptions, and their analysis is not always straightforward.

The Phoenician inscription of Cebelireis Dağı, presumably dated to the second half of the 7th century BCE,<sup>65</sup> includes Anatolian (sometimes specifically Luwian) names such as *šLPRN*, (perhaps Assulaparna),<sup>66</sup> *MSN(')ZMš* (= Mas-sanazammi, cf. <sup>1</sup>DEUS-na-(OCULUS)*á-za-mi-sá-* in KARATEPE 4 § 2), *MTš* (cf. perhaps Mita or Mutta; see Laroche 1966a:119, 122), *NNMTš* (cf. perhaps <sup>1</sup>*na-ni-mu-ta-* in KULULU lead strip 1), *'ZWšš* (containing the *aza-* element), *PHL(')š* (= Pihali?), and *KLš* (cf. perhaps Κιλίς in Greek sources, cf. Chapter 4).<sup>67</sup>

Some Imperial Aramaic inscriptions from Cilicia dated to the Achaemenid period also feature Luwian personal names. The Saraïdin inscription, dated to the 6th–5th centuries BCE, includes the names *wšWNš* (= Wasuwani), *'PWšY* (cf. the Cilician prince Appuašu in the Babylonian Chronicles,<sup>68</sup> perhaps

64 On Luwian names of Sam'alian kings, cf. Giusfredi and Pisaniello 2021b with references. On the name *KTMW*, see Younger 2009a.

65 Cf. Lipiński 2004:128–130; Röllig 2008; Giusfredi 2024.

66 One may compare the *PN Ašula* in Old Assyrian tablets from Kültepe (cf. Laroche 1966a:47) and the *PN 'šWLKRTY* in Saraïdin Aramaic inscription (although *'šW* and *LKRTY* should perhaps be divided). According to Lipiński (2004:129–130), it may be a compound name including Phoen. *'š* ‘man’ and Anat. *LPRN* ‘Labarna’ (= ‘King’s man’).

67 On the possibility that names ending in *-š* should be interpreted as Luwian nominative singular names in */-is/*, see Chapter 4.

68 Wiseman 1956.

matching the second-millennium personal name Happuwaššu),<sup>69</sup> and possibly *šWLKRTY* (cf. *šLPRN* in Cebelireis Dağı inscription). *SRMPY* (= Sarmapiya) is attested in the 4th century Hemite and Yukarı Bozkuyu inscriptions, the latter also including the personal name *TYLWD/RMW*, seemingly a Luwian name ending in *-muwa*, while the 4th century Kесеcek Köyü inscription features the unclear personal names *NNŠT* and *'D/RM/RSW/PK/N/R* (perhaps Arma ...?).

A number of Luwian personal names are also found in Greek inscriptions from Cilicia, which stretch chronologically far beyond the period during which Luwian texts are attested. Some of them are clearly recognizable as theophoric names, including Luwian theonyms such as Tarhunta or Sanda (cf. Σανδάτιος, Σανδαζαμης, Τροκομβίγρεμης/Ταρκυμβίγρεμης, Τροκονβιας, Τροκοναζας, etc.), or Hurrian theonyms like Šarruma, well integrated in the Luwian world (cf. Ἰαζάρμας, Ῥωζάρμα, Τροκοζάρμας, etc.), unless the element *-ζάρμα* in these names should be explained as reflecting Luwian *zalma-* ‘protection.’<sup>70</sup> Others include well-known Luwian nouns frequently occurring in onomastics, such as *μοα-* = *muwa-* ‘strength’ (Κουαριμός,<sup>71</sup> Οὐαξαμός, Πορδαμοας, etc.).

Luwian personal names also occur in Akkadian sources, for example, the name of the Sam’alian king *ṁpa-na-am-mu(-u/ú)* in Assyrian annals or the name of the Cilician prince Appuašu found in the Babylonian Chronicles.<sup>72</sup> Furthermore, it has been suggested that the Urartian king name Rusa (unexpected in Urartian because of the phonologically impossible initial /r-/) may be the adaptation of the Luwian name Runza.<sup>73</sup>

Luwian divine names are generally not found in non-Luwian sources outside theophoric personal names (except for Kubaba—which is not originally Luwian—and Sanda<sup>74</sup>), but calques are attested instead. Thus, in the Phoenician version of the KARATEPE inscription, the Storm God Tarhunta is consistently matched by Ba’al (sometimes with the epithet *KRNTRYŠ*, for which different explanations have been suggested)<sup>75</sup> and the Stag God Runtiya by *RŠP*

69 Cf. Laroche 1966a:60.

70 See Adiego 2019. However, Simon (2020a) is skeptical about both Šarruma and *zalma-*.

71 Cf. *ḫwa/i+ra/i-mu-wa/i-* in KULULU lead strip 1.

72 For a list of Luwian names in Assyrian sources, see Simon 2018c:127–129.

73 See Bonfanti 2022:135–136, with references.

74 See Rutherford 2017.

75 Phu/A ii 19, iii 2–3, 4; Pho/B ii 6; PhSt/C iii 16, 17, 19, iv 20 (see the edition in CHLI II). Against the often accepted hypothesis by Schmitz (2009), who suggested that it reflected a Greek epithet to be reconstructed as *\*χορρητήριος* ‘mace-bearing,’ see, among others, the alternative suggestions by Matessi (Chapter 10), who, based on previous references, explained it as reflecting the toponym Kelenderis, and Melchert (Chapter 4), who instead

šPRM ‘Rešep of the goats.’<sup>76</sup> Similarly, in the *KTMW* stele from Zincirli, the list of deities receiving offerings clearly reflects a Luwian local pantheon (rather than the official one of the Sam’alian kings), but Luwian deities occur in their Semitic guises: *HDD QR/DPD/RL* ‘Hadad/Tarhunta the ally’ (if *QR/DPD/RL* reflects Luw. \**harpatalli-*, see above), *šMš* ‘Šamaš/Tiwad,’ *HDD KRMN* ‘Hadad/Tarhunta of the vineyards’ (a calque on Luw. *tuwarsassi-* *Tarhunta-*, occurring in SULTANHAN and BOR inscriptions), *KBBW* ‘Kubaba’ (seemingly Kubābu, with Assyrian vocalization), and the puzzling *NGD/R šWD/RN*, which could be explained either as *NGR šWDN* ‘Nikaruhas/Nikarawas of the hunters’ (Masson 2010:53) or as *NGD šWDN* ‘official of the hunts,’ i.e., Runtiya (Fales and Grassi 2016:208).<sup>77</sup>

As for place names, their linguistic belonging is often difficult to grasp, so the identification of toponyms of Luwian origin in non-Luwian sources is a complicated task. Assured cases are *’ZTWDY* = Azatiwadaya, occurring in the Phoenician version of the *KARATEPE* bilingual (§§ 39, 46), and *WRYKY* = Warikiya,<sup>78</sup> found in the Phoenician inscription of Cebelireis Dağı (l. 3). Both are Luwian adjectival formations in *-ya-* derived from personal names, but while Azatiwada is an assured Luwian personal name, the ultimate origin of Awariku / Warika is unclear (see § 4.2).

Some other place names are attested in the inscription of Cebelireis Dağı, but their origin is unknown: *YLBš* (l. 1; perhaps matching Gr. Βολβόσος on the Pamphylian border, as suggested by Lipiński 2004:129); *TMRS* (l. 1);<sup>79</sup> *KR* (l. 2; Kurra?);<sup>80</sup> *’DRWZ* (l. 2; perhaps Adrassos).<sup>81</sup> Conversely, *KW* (l. 3) may correspond to the Assyrian *Qawe/Que* (Babylonian *Hume*), from Luwian *Hiyawa*, which is generally regarded as derived from *Ahhiyawa* through aphaeresis (usually assumed to match the Greek \**Ἀχαιῶι*).<sup>82</sup> However, the same toponym occurs as *QWH* in the Aramaic inscription of Zakkur (A:6),<sup>83</sup> showing a different

---

suggested that it was the Phoenician rendering of a Luwian epithet, \**harna-tarrawiyassis* ‘of establishing the fortified city.’

76 See also Frühwirth 2021:221–222.

77 On the divine list of the *KTMW* stele, see Giusfredi and Pisaniello 2021b.

78 Previously read *WRYKLY* = Warikliya, but see Bordreuil 2010:227 fn. 3.

79 On this (alleged) toponym, see the discussion in Giusfredi 2024:34.

80 See Bordreuil 2019:76.

81 But see Kottsieper 2001:185. Because of the presence of <w>, Giusfredi (2024:34) suggests identifying this toponym with \**Aturassa* (with metathesis in the Phoenician rendering), a locality whose existence might be assumed based on the occurrence of a mountain named *Aturassaliya* in *MARŠ 4* (§ 5).

82 See Oreshko 2018a:23–25, with references. Against the derivation of *Hiyawa* from *Ahhiyawa*, see Gander 2010:48–56. On the possibility that *Ahhiyawa* corresponded to the island of Chios rather than the Greek *Ἀχαιῶι*, see Egetmeyer 2022.

83 See Fales and Grassi 2016:127.

phonological adaptation. Therefore, it has been suggested by Simon (2011:260–261) that the toponym *KW* occurring in Cebelireis Dağı rather reflected a different Luwian place name, *Kawa*, possibly denoting a city in the region of Hiyawa.<sup>84</sup>

Similarly, the Phoenician city name *P'R*, found in KARATEPE 1 § 7, matching *pa-há+ra/i-<sup>o</sup>* in the Luwian version (and probably corresponding to NAss. *Pahri*),<sup>85</sup> is of unclear origin.

A rather complex issue concerns the toponym *Adana* and allegedly related forms. KUR<sup>URU</sup> *Adaniya* is found in Hittite sources of the 15th–14th centuries BCE related to Kizzuwatna, which, however, cannot grant the linguistically Anatolian origin of the city name.<sup>86</sup> In the bilingual inscription of KARATEPE, one finds *á-ta-na-* and *á-<sup>\*</sup>429-wa/i-*, the latter traditionally read as *á-TANA-wa/i-* = Adanawa; this has been challenged by Oreshko (2013; 2015; 2018a), who suggested the reading *á-HIYA-wa/i-* = Ahhiyawa, thereby eliminating the problematic form *Adanawa*. However, his hypothesis has not been unanimously accepted.<sup>87</sup> In the Phoenician version of KARATEPE, Adana is regularly matched by *'DN*, but the ethnic *DNY(M)* also occurs (as well as in the Phoenician inscription of Kulamuwa), which is often related to the Danuna mentioned in the Amarna letter EA 151 and in KBo 28.25, the Egyptian *d3-jnjw(-n3)*, the Greek *Δαννοί*, and others, although there is no consensus among scholars as to which terms should be included in or excluded from the series.<sup>88</sup> Whether Adan(iy)a and Danuna had the same base is also debated: some scholars believe that the two names cannot be traced back to the same root,<sup>89</sup> whereas others defend an etymological connection.<sup>90</sup>

#### 4.2 Foreign names in Luwian sources

In Luwian inscriptions of the Iron Age, several proper names can be found whose origin is likely foreign, although their exact linguistic belonging cannot always be positively identified.<sup>91</sup>

As far as foreign personal names are concerned, they are represented mainly by Semitic and Hurrian names. Semitic names should mostly reflect contacts

84 See also Giusfredi 2024:34–35.

85 See Hawkins 2006–2008:191.

86 The name is also found in Ugaritic (*'DNY*) and Greek (*ἸΔαννα*).

87 The hypothesis was rejected by Hawkins (2015b:54, 2016) among others, but positively received by Yakubovich (2015b). See also Chapter 4.

88 See Oreshko 2018a for an overview on the issue.

89 See, e.g., Jasink 1988:94–97 and Oreshko 2018a.

90 See, e.g., Laroche 1958:263–275 and Hawkins 2015b:55.

91 For a broader discussion on foreign names in Hieroglyphic Luwian, see Giusfredi and Pisaniello 2022, with references.

with Semitic populations in the different areas where Luwian was widespread, whereas Hurrian names are probably better explained as inheritance from the traditional “Hittite” onomastics that can be traced back to the second millennium BCE, where the Hurrian element was strongly represented.

Possible Semitic names include: *a-mu-* (CEKKE §17), perhaps reflecting the kinship term *H/‘ammu-* ‘uncle,’ frequently occurring in the Amorite onomastics;<sup>92</sup> *ara/i-pa-* (ALEPPO 2 §§1, 25), possibly matching *Araba’u* (cf. ABL 273 rev. 2, ABL 1244 rev. 7, etc.), although a Luwian explanation cannot be entirely excluded;<sup>93</sup> *ha-mi-ya-ta* (TELL AHMAR 1, 2, 5, etc.), either from ‘*ammi-Addu*, ‘Adad is the paternal uncle’ (Giusfredi 2012:162, with references), or ‘*ammi-yaṭa*, ‘the paternal uncle saved’ (Younger 2016:142);<sup>94</sup> *ha-pi+ra/i-* (KULULU lead strip 1, §3), if reflecting *habiru*, a term referring to nomadic people, mostly in the Syrian area;<sup>95</sup> *ka-mara/i-* (CEKKE §17), to be probably explained as *kamari(ya)-* ‘of the camels > camel rider’ (Giusfredi 2020a; see also above for the name of the ‘camel’ as a loanword in Iron Age Luwian), which may be further supported by the occurrence of the personal name <sup>m</sup>*Kammaliya* in the Hittite inventory texts KBo 16.83+ ii 8’ (CTH 242.8, NS) and KUB 42.11 vi 4’ (CTH 241.7.A, NS); *ni<sub>x</sub>-nu-wa/i-ya-* (KARKAMIŠ A11b+c §2), plausibly corresponding to the Assyrian *Ninuāyu* (cf. Giusfredi 2020b); *pa+ra/i-ki-pa-*, the name of the Sam’alian king Bar-Rākib, attested only on a gold signet ring from Zincirli.

Assured Hurrian personal names are not numerous. Four theophoric names containing the Hurrian name of the Storm God Teššub (written as *-ti-sa-pa-*, probably reflecting /tispa/ or /tis(s)apa/; see below) are attested in the inscription KARKAMIŠ A7 (9th–8th centuries BCE), identifying the figures sculpted on the orthostats: *ma-li-i-TONITRUS-pa-* (§7), *tara/i-ni-ti-sa-pa-* (§9), *i-si-ka+ra/i-ti-sa-pa-* (§10), and *ia-hi-la-ti-sa-pa-* (§13). The first members of these compound names are not fully clear, but Hurrian origin is plausible: although *ma-li-i-* remains unparalleled, the element *i-si-ka+ra/i-* in *i-si-ka+ra/i-ti-sa-pa-* may be perhaps compared with the Hurrian *eš-kar-ri* (KUB 27.38 iv 9), *iš-ga-ri* (KUB 32.52 iii 14’), meaning unknown; for *tara/i-ni-ti-sa-pa-* we may recall either the Hurrian *tari* ‘fire’ (cf. *tarinni*, meaning unknown) or the alleged root *tarn-*, although its existence is quite uncertain; finally, *ia-hi-la-ti-sa-pa-* could be a variant of the common Hurrian name Ehli-Teššub/Ehel-Teššub, if we admit

92 A Luwian explanation, which would imply a connection with the first singular personal pronoun, seems unlikely.

93 Cf. perhaps Luw. *arpa-* ‘unlucky (vel sim.)’ and the personal names Αρβησσις, and Αρβασσις in Greek inscriptions from Asia Minor; see KPN 88.

94 The name *ha-mi-ya* in KULULU lead fragment 1 may be a hypocoristic variant of this name.

95 See also the name Hapiri occurring in HKM 48 obv. 3, 5.

a secondary breaking /e/ > /ja/.<sup>96</sup> A fifth name on the same inscription, *si-ka-ra+a-* (§ 11), may perhaps be connected to the Hurrian root *šeg=ar-* (meaning unknown), occurring in the personal name Šegar-Teššub.

Also possibly Hurrian are the names *ara/i-ya-hi-na-* and *ha-pa-ti-la*, both occurring in TELL AHMAR 1.<sup>97</sup> The latter may be related to the Hurrian divine name Hebat and can be explained as a Luwian derivative name Habadili or a purely Hurrian name Hebat-tilla, although one cannot exclude the possibility that it instead represented a Semitic name *ʿAbd-Ila* ‘servant of El/god’.<sup>98</sup> Ariyahina may contain the well-attested Hurrian element *ari-*, although the general analysis of the name remains obscure, and a Semitic interpretation is also available.<sup>99</sup>

Other likely non-Anatolian names are attested in the Iron Age hieroglyphic corpus, but their origin and analysis are unclear. Consider, e.g., *á-wa/i+ra/i-ku-* and *wa/i+ra/i-i-ka-*, attested in Cilicia, for which either Greek (= Ἐυαρχος and Ποιχός/Πάχιος), Hurrian, and Luwian origins have been invoked,<sup>100</sup> *mu-ka-sa*, again from Cilicia, corresponding to Mopsus in Greek sources (cf. Phoen. *MPŠ* in the bilingual inscription from KARATEPE),<sup>101</sup> which is connected to the Phrygian world; *ku+ra/i-ti-*, possibly Phrygian and connected to Gordion;<sup>102</sup> *si-pi-sa*, perhaps also Phrygian;<sup>103</sup> *ta-i-ta-*, a king of Palastin, unconvincingly explained either as Hurrian (*tahhe=ta* < *tahhe* ‘man’) or Indo-European and related to David.<sup>104</sup>

Some foreign divine names—Mesopotamian, West Semitic, and Hurrian—are also attested in Iron Age Luwian inscriptions. The Hurrian Sun Goddess Hebat occurs as *hi-pu-ta-* (ANCOZ 1, ANCOZ 9, ÇİFTLİK, KULULU 5, TELL AHMAR 6), with metathesis of vowels in the two final syllables, vs. *ha-pa-tu* at YAZILIKAYA and *°ha-pa* in personal names from the second millennium (see also PN *ha-pa-ti-la* mentioned above). However, the variant with <hi>, *hi-pa-tú-*, is already attested in the late second millennium inscriptions of GÜRÜN (probably late 12th century) and DARENDE (perhaps 11th–10th century). The

96 See the discussion on (“\*474”) *sa-ri+i-ia-si-* above.

97 See Giusfredi and Pisaniello 2022:196–197 with references.

98 See Hawkins *apud* Bunnens 2006:87.

99 Hawkins *apud* Bunnens 2006:87.

100 See, e.g., Goetze 1962:53; Forlanini 1996; Jasink and Marino 2007:407–409; Simon 2014a; Simon 2017b.

101 This identification has been rejected by Simon (2021b:185–186).

102 Cf. Simon 2017c.

103 Cf. Simon 2022a, also including a critical discussion of other alleged Phrygian names in Luwian.

104 On these and other uncertain names, cf. Giusfredi and Pisaniello 2022 with references.

Hurrian Storm God Teššub occurs only in syllabic writing in some personal names attested in KARKAMIŠ A7 (see above),<sup>105</sup> where <sup>o</sup>-*ti-sa-pa* may reflect either /-tispa/ or /-tis(s)apa/ (cf. the Urartian Teišeba), vs. *ti-su-pi* at YAZILIKAYA and FORTIS-*su-pa-* in TELL AHMAR 1 (10th–9th century), with vowel /u/ as in cuneiform occurrences.

Mesopotamian deities in Luwian inscriptions include the god Ea (*i-ia-* in ÇİFTLİK and *i-LITUUS-* in TÜNP 1), Damki(an)na (*ta-mu-ki-na-* in ÇİFTLİK), and perhaps Marduk (*ma-ru-ti-ka-* in ERKİLET 1),<sup>106</sup> although the interpretation of *ma-ru-ti-ka-* has been recently challenged by Simon (2023b:337–340), who suggests that it represented a Palaic form corresponding to the Luwian *Marwainzi*-deities. Such a hypothesis, however, appears less likely from a historical point of view. Furthermore, the form *i-tà-* in TÜNP 1 §4 may represent the hieroglyphic adaptation of the god El, where the sign <à> (/da/) may point to the flapping of original /l/ (cf. Yakubovich 2010b). Finally, the Semitic goddess Ba'lat occurs in Hieroglyphic Luwian as *pa-ha-la-ti-(i)-* (HAMA 4).

Place names, as mentioned, are generally more difficult to assign to a specific language, and their etymology quite often remains unexplained. However, in Iron Age Luwian texts, some place names can be identified that almost surely cannot be explained as Luwian.<sup>107</sup> Excluding logographically written place names, Semitic toponyms include (*A*)*surīya* 'Assyria' (nom.sg. *su+ra/i-ia-saha*(URBS) in ÇİNEKOY §6, acc.sg. *a-sú+ra/i(REGIO)-ia-na-*'(URBS) in KARKAMIŠ A24a2+3 §7), \**Il(a)pa* 'Aleppo' (cf. the derivative adjective *i-la-pa-za-* 'of Aleppo' in KARKAMIŠ A24a2+3 §§6, 11),<sup>108</sup> \**Imatu* 'Hama' (cf. adj. *i-ma-tu/tú-wa/i-ni-* 'of Hama' in several inscriptions from Hama),<sup>109</sup> and perhaps also *Mizri* 'Egypt' ("MÍ.REGIO")*mi-za+ra/i(URBS)* in KARKAMIŠ A6 §4)<sup>110</sup> and \**Zura* 'Tyre' (cf. adj. *zú+ra/i-wa/i-ni-* in KARKAMIŠ A15b). Among foreign names of uncertain origin, it is possible to mention *W/Pal(a)stin(a/i)-*, attested in inscriptions from Hama, Aleppo, and especially Amuq, Gurgum (*ku+ra/i-ku-ma-*) in MARAŞ 8 §3, and Mukiš (*mu-ki-sa-*) in SAMSAT 2. Among the ethnonyms, one should certainly mention Muški 'Phrygian' (*mu-sà-ka-*) in KARKAMIŠ A6 §6, of unclear origin.

105 Less certain is the alleged compound LITUUS+*ta-sa-pa-CERVUS-wa/i-ti-i-sa* (KARKAMIŠ A6), perhaps /tasparuntiya-/ 'of Teššub and Runtiya' (cf. CHLI 1:125).

106 Cf. Giusfredi 2012:164.

107 Cf. Giusfredi 2012:164–165.

108 This city name is otherwise written logographically.

109 On the unexpected initial <i> instead of <a> in \**Il(a)pa* and \**Imatu*, see Simon 2023a.

110 If related to Akkadian *mišru* 'border, frontier,' but the etymology remains unclear (cf. Röllig 1993:265).

Recently, d'Alfonso (2019:144–145) suggested that the toponym *pa+ra/i-zu-ta<sub>x</sub>* occurring in the inscription of TOPADA may be read as Prizunda, explained as an Anatolian formation in *-wanda* from a base *priz-* < *prik-* with a problematic palatalization of the velar stop. This base is compared by d'Alfonso to the stem *βριγ-* found in *Βρίγες*, the name that the Phrygian had in their Macedonian homeland according to Herodotus (7.73), which, however, has been equated by Anfosso (2020) to the Phrygian form *vrekes* occurring in the Phrygian tablet found in the Persepolis Fortification Archive.<sup>111</sup> *Βρίγες* and *vrekes* can be traced back to a preform *\*wreg/k-*, the former being the regular Macedonian outcome and the latter, the regular Phrygian one.<sup>112</sup> Were this the case, if we assume that the Hieroglyphic Luwian *pa+ra/i-zu-ta<sub>x</sub>* was somehow related to the Phrygians, it could hardly reflect the original Phrygian form, but should be derived from the Macedonian outcome of the root, which appears less likely. Furthermore, d'Alfonso's hypothesis has also been critically discussed and rejected by Simon (2022:155–157) on phonological grounds.

## 5 Concluding Remarks

Despite the strong impermeability of the Hieroglyphic Luwian epigraphic culture—virtually no use of cuneiform is attested before the conquest by Assyria in the single kingdoms—the mosaic of languages and cultures of Syria and southern Anatolia resulted in a limited number of cases of interference that emerge at both the lexical and grammatical levels.

The deeper interactions appear to occur with the local Semitic languages—and even among those, leaving aside the case of Cilicia, the examples of grammatical interference are very few—while loanwords occasionally come from Akkadian, thereby indicating a distinction in the type of sociolinguistic relationship with the local languages and with the language of Assyria. It should be emphasized, however, that all these observations pertain only to the official language used in inscriptions: to what extent Luwian was actually spoken and to what extent it was influenced by other languages remains, and likely will remain, an unanswered question.

If lexical and grammatical borrowings are present but not numerous, and sometimes opaque, foreign onomastics emerges quite clearly in the sources,

111 Anfosso's suggestion has been rejected by Simon (2022a:156–157 fn. 3). For different explanations, see Obrador-Cursach 2020a:243–244.

112 Conversely, the other name of the Phrygians, *Φρύγες*, is traced back to the root *\*b<sup>h</sup>rug-*.

with a number of interesting adaptation strategies. This may indicate the presence of different peoples but, once again, it is necessary to emphasize that the language from which a personal name derives does not necessarily correlate with the linguistic profile of a person who bears that name.