SOME LUWIAN WORDS OF INDO-EUROPEAN ORIGIN

TERUMASA OSHIRO

Hittite has some archaic features because of the early time of its records, so that this language has been proved to be one of the most important languages for Indo-European linguistics. Among the Hittite cuneiform texts are found two other related languages, that is, Cuneiform Luwian and Palaic. Further, the related language inscribed with a hieroglyphic script is designated as Hieroglyphic Luwian. Lydian, Milyan and Lycian are also now assumed to be related to Hittite. The entire group is identified as Anatolian, a separate branch of the Indo-European family. Among these languages, Cuneiform Luwian (CL.), Hieroglyphic Luwian (HL.), Milyan (Mil.) and Lycian (Lyc.) apparently form the Luwian group which is a subgroup of the Anatolian branch. Hittite is certainly considered as an important language for the comparative study of I–E. languages, but we can also state that the Luwian languages have various remarkable features which we can not attest in the Hittite texts. These features are found in some nouns and pronouns of I. E. origin. The aim of this paper is to point out such Luwian words and to elucidate their formation from the viewpoint of the I–E. comparative study.

In the Luwian languages we can point out some notable nominal forms of I. E. origin in the following examples:

(1) HL. asuwa- ‘horse’; Lyc. esbe- ‘cavalry’ (*ekwo-, IEW.(1) p. 301.)

As the word for ‘horse’ in Hittite is always represented by the ideogram ANŠE.KUR.RA, we can not understand the full phonetic form for ‘horse’

in this language. Among the Luwian languages, however, we find the words denoting 'horse', such as asuwa- in Hieroglyphic Luwian and esbe- in Lycian.

HL. asuwa- is attested in the following text:

1) **KARATEPE, VIII:**

\[(ANIMAL. EQUUS) [d\text{-}s\text{-}u\text{-}w\text{a}/i\text{-}ta (EQUUS) d\text{-}s\text{-}u\text{-}w\text{a}/i \text{SUPER+RA/I\text{-}ta i\text{-}zi\text{-}i\text{-}ha}

"and I made horse(asu(wa)) upon horse(asuwa)."

The word \(d\text{-}s\text{-}u\text{-}w\text{a}/i\) in \((ANIMAL. EQUUS) d\text{-}s\text{-}u\text{-}[w\text{a}/i\text{-}i\text{-}ta or (EQUUS) d\text{-}s\text{-}u\text{-}w\text{a}/i\) in this passage is interpreted as the nom. -acc. sg. neuter of the -a-stem noun *asuwa-, and this word evidently suggests the palatalized form comparable to Skt. áśva- or Av. aspa- (<*-ekwo-). Thus asuwa- is possibly considered as a loanword from Old Indic, due to the similarity between -w- in HL. asuwa- and -v- in Skt. áśva- (cf. Gr. ἀκός, Lat. equus).(2)

On the other hand, as Lyc. esbe- (TL. 44a, 36; 128, 1) contains the biconsonantal cluster -sb-, we can not assume intimate relation between this word and HL. asuwa-. Rather the relation to Iranian can be assumed on the basis of the correspondence between -b- (<*-p-) in esbe- and -p- in Av. aspa- (cf. OP. asa-).(3) Therefore, this word is probably considered as a loanword from Old Iranian.

(2) CL. hawi-; HL. hawi-; Lyc. čawa- ‘sheep’ (*owi-, IEW. p. 784)

As the word for ‘sheep’ in Hittite is always represented by the ideogram UDU, we can not tell its full phonetic form. In the Luwian languages, however, we can attest the words for ‘sheep’ such as CL. hawi-, HL. hawi- and Lyc. čawa-.(4) Therefore, we can assume the reconstructed form *hawi- ‘sheep’ in Pre-Luwian. Based on this assumption we can say that the initial sound of the common I. E. word for ‘sheep’ will in all probability have a laryngeal element (cf. Skt. áwi-, Gr. ἄφις, Lat. ovis). Further, we may also regard the initial h- of hov-iw ‘shepherd’ in Armenian as a reflex parallel to the sign h- in Anatolian, but this sound is generally considered as unstable in Armenian.(5) Thus it seems impossible to explain this sign as the laryngeal element of I.-E. origin.

(3) **HL. suwani- ‘dog’ (*kuwo(n)-, IEW. p. 632)**

Since the word for ‘dog’ in Hittite is always represented by the ideogram UR. GI7, we can not indicate the full phonetic form for ‘dog’ in this language. In Hieroglyphic Luwian, however, the word suwani- for ‘dog’ can be attested in the following example:
ii) ASSUR, b, 2:
("CANIS") suwa/i-ni-zi ha-wa/i à-pa-zi REL-ri+i ã-sa-ti
"and if there are those dogs(suwani(n)zi), ......"
For the similar examples, see KARKAMIS, A 4a, 2 and KULULU I, 4.
HL. suwani- surely shows the palatalized form like asuwa- 'horse' discussed above, and thus this word is also to be recognized as one of the loanwords from Old Indic (cf. Skt. ś(u)va-, śvānam (acc.), Gr. ἀῦναρ, Lat. canis).(6)
Similarly, HL. surni- 'horn' (<*ker-(e)n, IEW. p. 574) is also explained as another instance of palatalization in this language (cf. Skt. śṛṇga-, Lat. cornū).

iii) ASSUR, g, 3–4:
A-la-wa/i-a+ra/i-ti-ha-wa/i-mu(URBS) ("CORNU") su+ra/i-ni BIBERE-u-na-sa sa-na-wa/i-ia MAGNUS+RA/I-ia VIA-wa/i-ni
"Send me big good drinking-horns (surni, n.-a. pl. n.) from Alawara."
Besides the god’s name (DEUS) CERVUS-ti-ia-sa with the hieroglyphic sign of “horn” (HH, no. 103) may possibly suggest the form comparable to Hit. karawar ‘horn’, due to the following change: *k(e)runt->*hrunt->ru(n)t-/ ru(n)z- (cf. Hit. karu: HL. ruwan ‘formerly’). Therefore the phonetic value of the sign CERVUS is regarded as ru, that is, (DEUS) CERVUS-ti-ia-sa = *ru(n)tiyas.

CL. tapassa-; HL. tipas- ‘heat, heaven’ (*tep-, IEW. p. 1069)
These Luwian words apparently show the forms derived from the I. E. root *tep- ‘be warm’ or *tepos ‘heat’ (cf. Skt. tāpati, tāpas-, Lat. tepeō), while the Hittite word nepis ‘heaven’ surely reveals the form inherited from another I. E. root *nebhos ‘cloud, heaven’ (IEW. p. 315, cf. Skt. nābhas-, Gr. νῆφος). Therefore there is a clear difference between the Luwian and Hittite on the formation of the word for ‘heaven’. (8)

CL. titaimi ‘suckling’; Lyc. tideimi ‘child, son’ (*dhe-, IEW. p. 241)
As the word for ‘child, son’ in Hittite is always represented by the ideogram DUMU, we can not indicate the full phonetic form for ‘child, son’ in this language. The Luwian words cited above are probably derived from the I. E. reduplicated verbal stem *dhidhē- ‘suckle’ with the addition of the passive participle element -mi- (9) (cf. Skt. dhāyati, Gr. διδόω, Lat. fēmina). On the other hand, Hieroglyphic Luwian has the word nimuwa(n)za- for ‘son’ and this word can be analysed into the negative element ni+muwa- ‘strength, power’ + the suffix element -ntio, that is, this word originally means ‘not-strong (one)’. Besides the Pre-Luwian form *ni-walli-s ‘child’ reconstructed by N. Oettinger is
not valid, because the word *INFANS-li-sa in the TOPADA inscription cited by him must be correctly read as HEROS-li-sa 'hero'.

(6) HL. tuwatari-; Lyc. kbatra- ‘daughter’ (*dhugheter, IEW. p. 277)

As the word for ‘daughter’ in Hittite is always represented by the ideogram DUMU.SAL, we can not understand its full phonetic form. On the other hand, we find the word tuwatari/i- for ‘daughter’ in Hieroglyphic Luwian: e. g. TELL AHMAR I, 7: (FILIA)tū-waǰ-tara/i-na (acc. sg.). This word with the alternative syllabogram -tara/-tari is probably reconstructed as *tuwatari- in view of the -i-stem preference for the Luwian nouns.

Further, as Lyc. kbatra- ‘daughter’ surely corresponds to HL. tuwatari-, this word will be assumed as the Pre-Lycian form *dwatra- (cf. *dw->Lyc. kb-: e. g. *dwi- ‘2’>Lyc. kbī-, Mil. tbi-, HL. tuwi-). On this basis, therefore, we can possibly reconstruct *d(u)watari- in Pre-Luwian and *d(u)war- in Proto-Anatolian (cf. Skt. duhítṛ, Gr. ὄμηρη, Goth. daúhitār).

(7) HL. wawa-; Lyc. uwa-/wawa- ‘ox’ (*gwou-, IEW. p. 482)

As the word for ‘ox’ in Hittite is always represented by the ideogram GUD, we cannot understand the full phonetic form for ‘ox’ in this language. On the other hand, HL. wawa- and Lyc. uwa-/wawa- (TL. 26, 18; 44b, 45; 111, 4 etc.) surely indicate the forms inherited from the I. E. root *gwou- ‘ox’, though, of course, the phonetic change *gw- to w- occurred in these languages.

HL. wawa- is attested in the following text:

iv) KULULU I, 2:
wa/i-na (“ANIVUS”)u-si-na (“ANIVUS”)u-si-na (“BOS”)wa/i-wa/i-ti-i III (“OVIS”)ha-wa/i-ti sa-sa5+ra/i-la-wa/i “I sacrifice to him with ox and 3 sheep yearly.”

For the similar example, see KARATEPE, XLVIII (Ho).

Furthermore, in the Luwian languages, mainly in Hieroglyphic Luwian, we can point out some pronominal forms of I. E. origin:

(8) HL. poss. adj. tuwi- ‘your (2. sg.)’ (*t(0)we-, IEW. p. 1097)

HL. tuwi- is obviously considered as the second person singular of the possessive adjective, which is inherited from the I. E. root *t(0)we-. On the other hand, Hittite does not have the orthotonic possessive pronominal form parallel to HL. tuwi-, but the enclitic possessive -ti- is usually used and in late Hittite texts this form is mostly replaced by tuël, the genitive form of the orthotonic personal pronoun zik: e. g. attaš-tiš ‘your father’>tuël attaš, etc.
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v) ASSUR, g, 2:
\[ti-ha-wa/i-za tu-wa/i-na INFANS-ni-na CUM-ni *77+RA/I-ti-sa\]
"You(ti) promised your(tuwin) child to us."

For the similar examples, see ASSUR, e, 4 (tuwin) and f, 2 (tuwari <*tuwati, abl.).

In this passage we can understand the word \[tu-wa/i-na\] (=*tuwin) as the accusative of the possessive adjective tuwi-. Besides we can also attest the word \[ti\] (<*te) in \[ti-ha-wa/i-za\] as the 2nd. sg. nom. of the orthotonic personal pronoun. This word apparently corresponds to Hit. zik (<*tik), which can be analysed into *ti and the enclitic element -*k. Furthermore, we find HL. \[tu\] (<*tu) as the 2nd. sg. acc. of the orthotonic personal pronoun: e.g. ASSUR, f, 3: \[tu-u VERSUS-na(17) "in your presence."\] This word corresponds to the word tuk (acc.) in Hittite, which also contains the enclitic element -*k. Therefore the Hittite pronouns zik (<*tik) and tuk cited obviously reveal the innovated forms with the addition of the element -*k, whereas the Hieroglyphic Luwian words such as tuwi-, ti and tu cited above in all probability suggest the original forms inherited from PIE. *t(0)we-, *te and *tu respectively.

(9) HL. poss. adj. \[a(n)zi\] 'our (1. pl.)' (*nsme-, IEW. p. 758)

HL. \[a(n)zi-\] (written as \[a-zi-\]) is the first person plural of the possessive adjective form. On the other hand, in Hittite the enclitic possessive -*summi- is surely attested and in late Hittite texts this form is practically replaced by anzêl, the gen. form of the orthotonic personal pronoun wêš, just like in the case of the 2nd. sg. form -*ti-/tuel already mentioned above.

We can refer to HL. \[a(n)zi-\] in the following example:

vi) ASSUR, f, 2:
\[REL-sa^-*wa/i-sa^- a-zi-sa ha-lu-*ra/i-sa\]
“What is this, our \[a(n)zi, nom.\] letter?”

For the similar example, see ASSUR, e, 2 \[a(n)zi-a, dat.\].

HL. \[a(n)zi-\] is probably derived from PIE *nsme- with the following sound change: -*sm- in *nsme->-*ms- (metathesis)>-*ns>-*(n)za- and, of course, the vocalic change of the initial \[n-\] to \[a-\] also occurred (note that for the 'orthotonic' personal pronominal forms derived from the same root, we can refer to Hit./CL. anzâš and HL. \[aZUza (=*a(n)za(n)za,.(20)\]

(10) HL. poss. adj. \[u(n)zi-\] 'your (2 pl.)' (*nsme-, IEW. p. 514)

HL. \[u(n)zi-\] is the second person plural of the possessive adjective form,
whereas in Hittite the enclitic possessive -šmi- is usually used and in late Hittite texts this form is virtually replaced by šumēl, the gen. form of the orthotonic personal pronoun šumēl. It is thus to be noted that such tendency is generally attestable in the history of the Hittite language.

We can refer to HL. u(n)zi- in the following:

vii) ASSUR, a, 1-2:

\[ u-nu-ha-wa/i-tu-u-ta u-za-ri+i ARHA-\ 'pa+ra/i-à+ra/i-ha \]

"Now, I asked you with your (u(n)zari<*unzati, abl.) (letter)."

For the similar examples, see ASSUR, a, 3 (u(n)zari) and ASSUR, e, 1 (uzin, acc.).

HL. u(n)zi- appears to be the form inherited from the I. E. root *usme- with the sound change parallel to that of HL. a(n)zi- stated above (i. e. -*sm-in *usme->-*ms->-*ns->-(n)z-). The word ami-/mi- in this language is already known as the 1st. sg. of the possessive adjective form, which surely corresponds to Lyc./Lyd. ēmi-. Accordingly it is important to notice that Hieroglyphic Luwian essentially provides the valuable evidence for the possessive adjective of I. E. origin. (22)

(11) CL. ortho. pers. pron. u(n)zaš; HL. uZUza ‘your (2. pl. nom.)’ (*usmes, IEW. p. 514)

The Luwian words cited above are the second person plural of the ‘orthotonic’ personal pronoun, which we can trace back to the I. E. root *usmes: (23)

viii) CL. KUB IX, 31, II, 32: (24)

\[ la-la-an-ti-pa-a u-za-åš a-da-ri-la-an \]

"You (u(n)zaš) should taste with the tongues."

ix) HL. ASSUR, e, 1:

\[ wa/i-ma.za u-ZU-za ha-tu-à+ra/i å-sa-ta-ni \]

"You (uZUza) yourselves are to write (a letter)."

For the similar examples, see ASSUR, c, 2 and ASSUR, e, 3.

The phonetic value of the sign ZU (HH, no. 432) is not clear, but we can possible regard the pronominal form uZUza as *u(n)za-(n)z, which will functionally correspond to CL. u(n)zaš. (25) These Luwian words derived from PIE. *usme- are formed with the similar change to the formation of HL. u(n)zi- as already discussed above. Further, we can also understand Hit. šumēl (nom.) as the orthotonic personal pronoun derived from the same root *usmes, though this form is created merely through the metathetic change of the initial *us- in *usmes to su-. Thus it is to be noted that on the formation of the 2nd. pl.
form of the orthotonic personal pronoun there is a marked difference between the Luwian and Hittite.

In conclusion, we can indicate that some nominal and pronominal forms attested in the Luwian languages appear to offer valuable evidence for the study of Indo-European linguistics. In the process of the pronominal forms of Hittite-Luwian languages, the element -k is attached to some Hittite personal pronominal forms such as ammu-k, zi-k and tu-k, whereas the Luwian pronouns show the peculiar forms innovated from the I. E. roots as already stated above. In Hieroglyphic Luwian and Lycian, further, some words clearly reflect the forms borrowed from Indic or Iranian. Thus we can recognize their influence on the southern region of Asia Minor where the Luwian languages cited were spoken in the first millennium B.C. In this paper, therefore, we have confirmed the important position of the Luwian languages for the Indo-European comparative study, as well as the need of the more detailed study of the Luwian languages.

Notes

(1) See J. Pokorny, Indogermanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch, Bern, 1959 (abbreviated IEW.)


Further, refer to Lyc. sttálí sttálás (TL, 44c, 5; 9) "He stands the stele." (Lyc. sttálás may be the loanword from Gr.-Doric: Dor. στάλατα, Att. στελή <*stel- 'put, stand', IEW. p. 1019) and further Lyc. τριήρε 'trireme' from Gr. τριήρης.

(4) On the initial χ- (<*h-) in Lycian, refer to the examples such as Lyc. χυγα-/Hit. huha- 'grandfather', Lyc. χυνα-/Hit. hanna- 'grandmother', etc.; and see E. Laroche, "Comparaison du louvite et du lucien", BSL, 62, 1967, pp. 59–61.; and further, see S. Kimball, "*H3 in Anatolian", Fs. for H. Hoentjswald, Tübingen, 1987, p. 185, (5).


(7) Cf. KARATEPE, XL.: (DEUS) CERVUS-za-sa (=*ru(n)zaz) and further, see J. Tischler, op. cit., pp. 500–502; HHL. p. 182.
(8) HHL. pp. 181–182; J. Friedrich points out the word tapassa- as the loanword from Indic (Hethitisches Wörterbuch, Heidelberg, 1952, p. 211), but it is not clear; further, E. Laroche, Dictionnaire de la langue louwite, Paris, 1959, p. 92.


(10) N. Oettinger, Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbums, Nürnberg, 1979, p. 490, (84) (HEROS = HH, no. 21). And Hit. verb. tittja- 'suckle?' (KBo, XIV. 98, 1, 17) is not clear (cf. CL. tititai- 'suckle').


(12) On the interpretation of the Lycian numerals proposed such as kʰəššāta, aššāta, nukšāta, sīhā kmma sīhā, see T. R. Brice and J. Zahle, op. cit., p. 81, (87): “none of them are at all certain”; on Lyc. kʰɪmma, O. Carruba, “Sui numerali de “1” a “5” in anatolico e indoeuropeo”, Fs. O. Szemerényi, Amsterdam, 1979, pp. 191–205.

(13) Cf. GUD.AB ‘cow’; GUD.MAH ‘bull’.


(15) For the loss of velars in the Luwian, we can refer to the instances such as Hit. kəššār, CL. issari, HL. istari, Lyc. izzi <*g'etār ‘hand’; Hit. gim(ma)ra-, CL. immari – ‘field’; Hit. tekan, CL. tijannī <*d₃egʰəm ‘earth’ etc.


(17) HL. VERSUS-na (=*tawijan) is the postposition governing the accusative.

(18) G. Schmidt, op. cit., pp. 121–124; in Palaic, we can indicate ti (2. sg. nom.) and tā (written as tu-a, 2. sg. dat. -acc.); O. Carruba, Das Palaische Texte, Grammatik, Lexikon, Wiesbaden, 1970, p. 44.

(19) In Hieroglyphic Luwian, preconsonantal -n- is never written and -s- after -n- or -l- always changes into -z-.


(22) The HL. possessive adjectives: 1. sg. (a)mi-; S. sg. tuwi-; 3. sg. (a)pasi-; 1. pl. a(n)zi-; 2. pl. u(n)zi-; 3. pl. (a)pasi- The 3. sg./pl. form cited is originally considered as the demonstrative (cf. Hit./CL. a(t)a- and Lyc. ebe- ‘that’).

(23) G. Schmidt, ibid.


(25) Cf. KARKAMIŠ, A. 6, 7: uZUsa as *u(n)zas.