

Российский государственный гуманитарный университет
Russian State University for the Humanities



Russian State University for the Humanities
Institute of Linguistics of the Russian Academy of Sciences

Journal of Language Relationship

International Scientific Periodical

Nº 19/1



Moscow 2021

Российский государственный гуманитарный университет
Институт языкознания Российской Академии наук

Вопросы языкового родства

Международный научный журнал

№ 19/1

ВЯР

Москва 2021

Advisory Board:

H. EICHNER (Vienna) / Chairman
W. BAXTER (Ann Arbor, Michigan)
V. BLAŽEK (Brno)
L. HYMAN (Berkeley)
F. KORTLANDT (Leiden)
A. LUBOTSKY (Leiden)
J. P. MALLORY (Belfast)
A. YU. MILITAREV (Moscow)
V. F. VYDRIN (Paris)

Editorial Staff:

V. A. DYBO (Editor-in-Chief)
G. S. STAROSTIN (Managing Editor)
T. A. MIKHAILOVA (Editorial Secretary)
A. V. DYBO
M. A. MOLINA
M. N. SAENKO
I. S. YAKUBOVICH

Founded by Kirill BABAEV

Редакционный совет:

Х. АЙХНЕР (Вена) / председатель

В. БЛАЖЕК (Брно)

У. БЭКСТЕР (Анн Арбор)

В. Ф. ВЫДРИН (Париж)

Ф. КОРГЛАНДТ (Лейден)

А. ЛУБОЦКИЙ (Лейден)

Дж. МЭЛЛОРИ (Белфаст)

А. Ю. МИЛИТАРЕВ (Москва)

Л. ХАЙМАН (Беркли)

Редакционная коллегия:

В. А. ДЫБО (главный редактор)

Г. С. СТАРОСТИН (заместитель главного редактора)

Т. А. МИХАЙЛОВА (ответственный секретарь)

А. В. ДЫБО

М. А. МОЛИНА

М. Н. САЕНКО

И. С. ЯКУБОВИЧ

Журнал основан К. В. БАБАЕВЫМ

Вопросы языкового родства: Международный научный журнал / Рос. гос. гуманитар. ун-т; Рос. акад. наук. Ин-т языкознания; под ред. В. А. Дыбо. — М., 2021. — № 19/1. — xii + 70 с.

Journal of Language Relationship: International Scientific Periodical / Russian State University for the Humanities; Russian Academy of Sciences. Institute of Linguistics; Ed. by V. A. Dybo. — Moscow, 2021. — No. 19/1. — xii + 70 p.

ISSN 2219-3820

<http://www.jolr.ru/>
gstarst1@gmail.com

Дополнительные знаки: С. Г. Болотов
Add-on symbols by S. G. Bolotov

Подписано в печать 10.03.2021. Формат 60×90/8.
Усл. печ. л. 11,0. Уч.-изд. л. 7,2. Заказ № 1288.
Тираж 1050 экз.

Издательский центр
Российского государственного гуманитарного университета
125993, Москва, Миусская пл., 6
www.rggu.ru
www.knigirggu.ru

Table of Contents / Содержание

Table of Contents / Содержание	vii
Contributors / Сведения об авторах	viii
Note for Contributors / Будущим авторам	ix
In memory of Merritt Ruhlen (1944–2021)	xi
Памяти Мерритта Рулена (1944–2021)	xii

Articles / Статьи

<i>Stephen Pax Leonard</i> . Hipponyms in Indo-European: using register to disentangle the etyma.	1
[Стивен Пакс Леонард. К вопросу о гиппонимах в индоевропейских языках: языковые регистры как ключ к решению проблемы синонимов]	
<i>Tatyana Mikhailova</i> . <i>Night-mare</i> : on the origin of a trope in Celtic and Germanic (A response to Stephen Pax Leonard)	15
[Т. А. Михайлова. <i>Night-mare</i> : о происхождении одного тропа в кельтских и германских языках (ответ С. П. Леонарду)]	
<i>Alice Mouton, Илья Yakubovich</i> . Where did one speak <i>luwili</i> ? Geographic and Linguistic Diversity of Luwian Cuneiform Texts.	25
[Алис Мутон, Илья Якубович. Где говорили <i>luwili</i> ? Географическое и лингвистическое многообразие лувийских клинописных текстов]	
<i>Bartomeu Obrador Cursach</i> . Hypotheses of interference between Greek and the languages of Ancient Anatolia: the case of patronymics	54
[Бартомеу Обрадор-Курсак. Гипотезы о взаимодействии греческого языка с языками Древней Анатолии (на примере патронимики)]	

Contributors

Steven Pax Leonard — Ph.D, professor, Moscow State Linguistic University, s.leonard@linguanet.ru

Tatyana Mikhailova — doctor of sciences (Philology), professor, Department of Germanic and Celtic Studies, Faculty of Philology, Lomonosov Moscow State University, tamih.msu@mail.ru

Alice Mouton — research director, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Paris, alice.mouton@cnrs.fr

Bartomeu Obrador-Cursach — PhD, lecturer, Institut del Pròxim Orient Antic, Universitat de Barcelona, obradorcursach@gmail.com

Ilya S. Yakubovich — doctor of sciences (Philology), leading researcher, Institute of Oriental Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences, sogdiana783@gmail.com

Сведения об авторах

Леонард, Стивен Пакс — Ph.D, профессор Московского государственного лингвистического университета, s.leonard@linguanet.ru

Михайлова, Татьяна Андреевна — доктор филол. наук, проф. кафедры германской и кельтской филологии филологического факультета МГУ (Москва), tamih.msu@mail.ru

Мутон, Алис — ведущий науч. сотрудник Национального Центра научных исследований (Париж), alice.mouton@cnrs.fr

Обрадор-Курсак, Бартомеу — PhD, преподаватель Института древнего Ближнего Востока, Университет Барселоны, obradorcursach@gmail.com

Якубович, Илья Сергеевич — доктор филол. наук, ведущий науч. сотрудник Института востоковедения РАН, sogdiana783@gmail.com

Note for Contributors

Journal of Language Relationship welcomes submissions from everyone specializing in comparative-historical linguistics and related disciplines, in the form of original articles as well as reviews of recent publications. Articles are published preferably in English or Russian, although publication of texts in other major European languages (such as French or German) may be considered by the Editorial Board.

All submissions should be uploaded electronically in MS Word and PDF format, using the online *Manuscript Submission Form* at the official website of the Journal (<http://jolr.ru>). Each article should be accompanied with information about the author(s) (names, affiliations, contact information), an abstract (not exceeding 300 words) and relevant keywords.

For more detailed guidelines on article submission and editorial policies, please see our website (<http://jolr.ru>) or address the Editorial Board directly at gstarst1@gmail.com. Inquiries may also be sent by regular mail to the official address of the Journal:

Journal of Language Relationship
Institute for Oriental and Classical Studies
Russian State University for the Humanities
125993 Moscow, Russia
Miusskaya Square, 6

Будущим авторам

Журнал *Вопросы языкового родства* принимает заявки на публикацию оригинальных научных статей, а также рецензий от всех, кто специализируется в области сравнительно-исторического языкознания и смежных дисциплин. Предпочтительные языки публикации — английский или русский, хотя по согласованию с редакционной коллегией возможна также публикация статей на других крупных европейских языках (французский, немецкий и т. п.).

Подача материалов для публикации (в форматах MS Word и PDF) осуществляется через *Электронную форму подачи рукописей* на официальном сайте журнала (<http://jolr.ru>). К каждой статье обязательно прикладываются сведения об авторах (имена, аффилиации, контактная информация), краткое резюме (не более 300 слов) и список подходящих ключевых слов.

Подробнее о требованиях к оформлению рукописи, редакционной политике журнала и т. п. вы можете узнать на нашем сайте по адресу: <http://www.jolr.ru> или непосредственно от редакционной коллегии по электронной почте (gstarst1@gmail.com). По различным вопросам с редакцией журнала можно также связаться по обычной почте:

125993 Москва
Миусская площадь, д. 6
Российский государственный гуманитарный университет
Институт восточных культур и античности
В редакцию журнала «Вопросы языкового родства»

In memory of Merritt Ruhlen (1944–2021)



Frank Merritt Ruhlen was born on May 10, 1944. His father, also Frank Merritt Ruhlen (1909–1997), was an administrative law judge for the Civil Aeronautics Board, and the family lived in Virginia, near Washington, D.C. His mother was Florence Ennis (Ruhlen) (1911–2007), who had worked as an administrative assistant before marriage. The couple had three children: the twins Merritt and Marian, and a younger daughter Janet. Merritt (junior) studied at Rice University, the University of Paris, the University of Illinois, and the University of Bucharest as a Fulbright fellow, and received his PhD in 1973 from Stanford University with a dissertation on the generative analysis of Romanian morphology. Subsequently, Ruhlen worked for several years as a research assistant on the Stanford Universals Project directed by Joseph Greenberg and Charles Ferguson.

Beginning in 1994 Ruhlen, was a lecturer in Anthropological Sciences and Human Biology at Stanford University. In 2001 Merritt Ruhlen, together with Murray Gell-Mann of the Santa Fe Institute and Sergei Anatolyevich Starostin of the Russian State University of the Humanities, co-founded the Evolution of Human Languages Project, based at the Santa Fe Institute. Since 2005 Ruhlen had been on the advisory board of the Genographic Project and held an appointment as a visiting professor at the City University of Hong Kong. He had also been a Correspondant of the Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle in Paris, and served as a U.S. State Department interpreter in French and Romanian. Ruhlen knew and worked with Joseph Greenberg for several decades, and after Greenberg's passing in 2001 Ruhlen became the primary advocate and defender of Greenberg's methods of language classification.

Ruhlen was the author of several books, including *A Guide to the Languages of the World* (1975), *A Guide to the World's Languages, Vol. 1: Classification* (1987; second edition 1991), *The Origin of Language: Tracing the Evolution of the Mother Tongue* (1994), *On the Origin of Languages: Studies in Linguistic Taxonomy* (1994), and numerous articles in journals, books, and encyclopedias. *The Origin of Language* was translated into French by Pierre Bancel and has been published as *L'Origine des langues – Sur les traces de la langue mère* (1997 and 2007); in Portuguese as *A Origem da Linguagem: Reconstituindo a Evolução da Língua Mãe* (1998); in Italian as *L'origine delle lingue* (2001); and in Turkish as *Dilin Kökeni: Ana Dilin Evriminin İzinde* (2006).

After a long battle with a serious illness Merritt Ruhlen suffered an accident at home, and passed away a week later on January 29, 2021.

Anca Ruhlen (*Palo Alto, California*)

Pierre Bancel (*Association for the Study of Language in Prehistory, Cambridge, MA;*
Association d'études linguistiques et anthropologiques préhistoriques, Paris, France)

John D. Bengtson (*Association for the Study of Language in Prehistory, Cambridge, MA;*
Evolution of Human Languages Project, Santa Fe Institute, NM)

William Croft (*University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM*)

An extended version of this obituary, including a complete list of Merritt Ruhlen's publications, may be found online at: https://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/personal/galeria/ruhlen_scholarly_obit.pdf. The Editorial Board of the Journal of Language Relationship, several of the members of which had the honor to personally know and work with Dr. Ruhlen, joins the authors of the obituary in expressing their condolences for his passing.

Памяти Мерритта Рулена (1944–2021)

Фрэнк Мерритт Рулен родился 10 мая 1944 года. Его отец, которого также звали Фрэнк Мерритт Рулен (1909–1997), был судьей по административным делам Совета по гражданской авиации, и семья жила в Вирджинии, недалеко от Вашингтона, округ Колумбия. Его мать — Флоренс Эннис (Рулен) (1911–2007); до брака она работала помощником по административным вопросам. В семье было трое детей: близнецы Мерритт и Мэриан и младшая дочь Джанет. Мерритт (младший) учился в Университете Райса, Парижском университете, Иллинойском университете и Бухарестском университете, был стипендиатом программы Фулбрайта, а в 1973 году получил докторскую степень в Стэнфордском университете, защитив диссертацию по генеративному анализу румынской морфологии. Впоследствии Рулен несколько лет работал научным сотрудником в Стэнфордском проекте универсалий под руководством Джозефа Гринберга и Чарльза Фергюсона.

Начиная с 1994 года Рулен читал лекции по антропологии и биологии человека в Стэнфордском университете. В 2001 году Мерритт Рулен вместе с Мюрреем Гелл-Манном (Институт Санта-Фе, Нью-Мексико) и Сергеем Анатольевичем Старостиным (Российский государственный гуманитарный университет) основали проект «Эволюция человеческих языков» (Evolution of Human Languages) на базе института Санта-Фе. С 2005 года Рулен входил в консультативный совет Генографического проекта и занимал должность приглашенного профессора в Городском университете Гонконга. Он также был внештатным сотрудником Национального музея естественной истории в Париже и работал переводчиком с французского и румынского языков в Госдепартаменте США. Рулен был знаком с Джозефом Гринбергом и работал с ним в течение нескольких десятилетий, а после его кончины в 2001 году стал главным сторонником и защитником методов классификации языков Гринберга.

Рулен написал несколько книг, в том числе *A Guide to the Languages of the World* (1975 г.), *A Guide to the World's Languages, Vol. 1: Classification* (1987; второе издание в 1991 г.), *The Origin of Language: Tracing the Evolution of the Mother Tongue* (1994), *On the Origin of Languages: Studies in Linguistic Taxonomy* (1994), а также многочисленные статьи в журналах, книгах и энциклопедиях. *The Origin of Language* было переведено на французский язык Пьером Банселем и опубликовано как *L'Origine des langues – Sur les traces de la langue mère* (1997 и 2007); на португальском языке как *Origem da Linguagem: Reconstituindo a Evolução da Língua Mãe* (1998); на итальянском языке как *L'origine delle lingue* (2001); и на турецком языке как *Dilin Kökeni: Ana Dilin Evriminin İzinde* (2006).

Мерритт Рулен скончался 29 января 2021 года у себя дома после несчастного случая, связанного с долгой и тяжелой болезнью.

Анка Рулен (Пало-Альто, Калифорния)

Пьер Бансель (Ассоциация изучения языка в первобытную эпоху, Кембридж, Массачусетс;
Association d'études linguistiques et anthropologiques préhistoriques, Париж, Франция)

Джон Д. Бенгтсон (Ассоциация изучения языка в первобытную эпоху, Кембридж, Массачусетс;
Проект «Эволюция человеческих языков», Институт Санта-Фе, Нью-Мексико)

Уильям Крофт (Университет Нью-Мексико, Альбукерке, Нью-Мексико)

Расширенная версия некролога, включая полный список публикаций М. Рулена, располагается он-лайн по адресу: https://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/personal/galeria/ruhlen_scholarly_obit.pdf. Редакционная коллегия журнала «Вопросы языкового родства», многие члены которой имели честь быть лично знакомыми и даже работать вместе с профессором Руленом, присоединяется к авторам некролога с соболезнованиями по случаю его кончины.

Hipponyms in Indo-European: using register to disentangle the etyma

What was the distinction between the **márkos* and **h₁é̑k_u-* etyma for horse in Indo-European? It is argued that the distinction could be explained by a register based hierarchy that is likely to have existed in the proto-language. There is good evidence for the **h₁é̑k_u-* reflex being used in *Göttersprache* like semantic associative networks. The **h₁é̑k_u-* word is associated with the divine and appears in lexically identical poetic formulae and fixed locutions. On the basis of the multiple terms for horse in a number of the IE daughter languages, it is likely there was more than one term for horse in the IE period. A differentiation on the basis of register may have been a possibility, even at this early stage.

Keywords: hipponyms; language registers; Indo-European languages; etymology.

1. Introduction

The significance of the horse as an icon in the culture and myth of the Indo-Europeans has long been recognised.¹ The early written records concerning the horse are abundantly substantiated by archaeological finds. In the last few decades in particular the horse has gained an importance in scholarship following the publication of archaeological research suggesting that the horse was probably domesticated earlier than previously thought and that the Indo-Europeans may have been riders (Anthony 2007: 194–220; Mallory and Adams 1997: 276; Nobis 1971). The horse, as an emblem of speed, may have been the vehicle by which the Indo-European language disseminated, facilitating its break-up into the respective dialects (Anthony 2007: 26).

Given that the horse was so embedded in the culture of the earliest Indo-Europeans, it is surprising that hipponyms have attracted so little linguistic commentary.² The majority of the literature on the subject can be divided into purely etymological accounts, and treatments which aim to explain in cultural-historical terms the role the horse played in Indo-European society. The purpose of this article is to further the discussion on the problematic etymology of **h₁é̑k_u-* and to tease apart the semantic distinctions between the different etyma for horse by using the sociolinguistic notion of register.

2. Overview of the proto-lexicon: the PIE horse

Benveniste's semantic reconstruction of **pé̑ku* first as 'movable wealth,' 'personal chattels' then 'livestock' and not the chronological reverse was a significant reinterpretation: deriving the

¹ The research was supported by the British Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC). I am very grateful for all the help and support I have received from Prof. Andreas Willi who has taken great care to read the article and ensure all my references and etymologies are correct and up-to-date. I appreciated very much all the feedback from the Indo-European philology seminar in Oxford where an earlier draft of this material was presented. The usual disclaimer applies regarding any outstanding errors.

² I use the term hipponym to denote kinds of horses as well as proper names. I realise my use of the word may be irregular: anthroponyms tend to refer to personal names and hydronyms names for rivers. Other uses of '-onym' suggest this need not be the case, however, and there is a degree of terminological inconsistency.

word for ‘livestock’ from ‘movable wealth’ and distinguishing between **wih_xrós* (Mallory and Adams 2006: 544) or **wī-ro-* ‘man’ (Watkins 2000: 101) and **péku* underpinned the pre-eminence of Indo-European nomadic pastoralism (Benveniste 1973: 40–51). It is perhaps no coincidence that the clear significance of livestock as ‘movable wealth’ correlates with generally strong etymological evidence for the word-field implicative of PIE stockbreeding: a number of the key etyma survive as semantically unshifted cognate reflexes into the historically attested daughter languages of Indo-European. This is clearly evidenced in **g^wōus* ‘cow’ (Gmc. **kōuz*, OE *cū*, Lat. *bōs* also represented in Slav. **govędo* ‘head of cattle’); **k(u)wōn-* ‘dog’ (Goth. *hunds*, OIce. *hundr*, Lat. *canis*) and **sū-s* ‘pig’ (Eng. *swine*, Lat. *sus*, Skt. *su-*) (Mallory and Adams 2006: 530; 532; 549).

Paradoxically, this is not the case with **h₁ék_uo-* ‘horse’ where the well-attested form has undergone considerable diatopic variation, leading to a displacement in just about every modern European language (only the fem. Sp. *yegua*, Rom. *iapă* ‘mare’ and Sc. G. *ech* ‘horse’ remain) (Wodtko et al. 2008: 231–3).³ This displacement has left considerable internal diversity within specific sub-groups of Indo-European as in the case of Germanic (Eng. *horse*, NHG *Pferd*, Sw. *häst*), which is particularly perplexing as it concerns a relatively small geographical area.

The absence of relics marking the lexical opposition between the wild and domestic horse has, however, a number of ethno-historical repercussions for PIE homeland theories since the horse is employed as a major marker of the Indo-Europeans.⁴ Gamkrelidze-Ivanov (1995: 464) and Buck (1949: 167) claim that we can be reasonably sure that the horse was at least partially domesticated by the Indo-European period based on the very wide attestation of the **h₁ék_uo-* form. Cited as additional evidence is the fact that it figures prominently in the personal names of the earliest Indo-Europeans: Skt. *Aśva-cakra*, OPers. *Vist-aspa*, Gr. *Hípp-arkhos* and Phil-*ippos*, Gaul. *Epo-pennus* and OE *Eomaer* (Mallory 1989: 119). To be added to these European *reliktwörter* from **h₁ék_uo-* should be Lithuanian *ašva* ‘mare’ and *ašvienis* ‘workhorse’; Venetic *ekvon* ‘horse’ and Old Cornish *ebol* ‘foul’ (Wodtko et al. 2008: 230–31). It is interesting to note that the words for ‘mare’ seem more resistant to replacement than those for ‘stallion’ or ‘horse’. Moreover, the word is also extended to deities such as the divine twins of Indic religion, the *Aśvin* (Skt. *áśva*) (Wodtko et al. 2008: 230–31) and the Gaulish goddess *Epona* (Gaul. *epos*) (Delmarre 2003: 163–164). We are unable to infer, however, from the proto-form **h₁ék_uo-* alone anything about horse-domestication. We can be sure that the horse was definitely known to the Indo-European people before the language split into its respective dialects, i.e. before c. 3000 B.C. but any observations beyond this are likely to be speculative. The attestation does not imply that horses were domesticated, let alone possessed, ridden or used for food or in any other way. We would have to rely on archaeological data for that.

2.1. The **h₁ék_uo-* etymon

The etymology of **h₁ék_uo-* (Wodtko et al. 2008: 230) is a persistent problem and has incited a considerable amount of debate amongst scholars. The philological issues pertaining to this particular proto-form is well endowed with descriptive and exegetic matter and I will not at-

³ One might also posit **h₁ék_wos* (Mallory and Adams 2006: 50). The Anatolian evidence makes it quite clear that **h₁ék_wos* is a post-Anatolian innovation and that Proto-Anatolian (and PIE also) had **h₁ék_u-*, and **h₁ék_wos* was a thematization thereof.

⁴ For almost a hundred years, almost every region between western Europe and the Hindu-Kush, Central Asia, and the Levant has been claimed as the PIE homeland. See Anthony & Brown (2011: 131–160); Mallory and Adams (2006: 443–460); Anthony (2007).

tempt to summarize the entire history of the research since there is a degree of agreement regarding the derivation. The nature of the etymological problem is as follows: the form **h₁ék_u-* is often cited as a base word (Pokorny 1959: 301–302) and yet the form must be derived from some other underlying root; the etymology is obscure and no verbal root has thus far been posited. **h₁ék_u-* is generally derived from the lengthened *o* grade adjective **ōku-* ‘swift’ or ‘the swift one’ (Watkins 2000: 23) giving us Gr. *ὠκύς* ‘swift’, Lat. *ocius* ‘swifter’ (Ernout and Meillet 1979: 457); Lat. *acupedius* (Ernout and Meillet 1979: 7) ‘swift-footed’. Wodtko et al. (2008: 230) posit **HeHk̂* (‘quick’), possibly a derivative of the lost *u*-stem **h₁óék_u-* (‘speed’). Anatolian shows the *u*-stem of the horse-word directly, the morphological “difficulty” is plain thematization. Anatolian seems to directly attest to a *u*-stem **(h₁)ék_u-* ‘horse’, so it is likely this had been the original form while core Indo-European was renewed by thematization (see above all Kloekhorst 2008: 239; 224 on Ved. *āśu-* < **h₁o-h₁k̂_u-*).

In the absence of any posited verbal root (and I suspect that none will be forthcoming), Hamp’s argument that the basis of derivation is an adjective, not a verbal base and that the phonological shape of the IE adjective is assured by the cognates: Skt. *āśú*, Avest. *āsu*, Gr. *ὠκύς*, is undoubtedly the most convincing (Hamp 1990: 213–216). The reconstruction of the IE adjective **ōku-* is idiosyncratic: ‘it cannot be the zero grade of any base and the antonymic adjective fails to conform to the canonical shape of its class’ (Hamp 1990: 212). Hamp may be correct in this regard: the vowel grade in the adjective is curious as indeed is that of the noun itself and this may relate directly to the point that there is no discernible underlying verbal root. In terms of ‘not conforming to the canonical shape of its class,’ the rationale here is that the principal formation for IE antonymic stative adjectives was a suffix *ú* (with zero grade of the base).⁵ One potential pitfall of Hamp’s argument is that **h₁ék_u-*, at the time the form was created, would only have meant something like ‘rapid’ or possibly ‘the rapid one’. If Hamp is correct, this may mean that the Indo-Europeans needed a term they could use whenever they wanted to refer to ‘animal’. Bammesberger (1994: 33–53) adopts this hypothesis and takes it to the next logical stage in suggesting that there must have been another word meaning ‘animal’ and that this term may have been used in conjunction with the **h₁ék_u-* word. Perhaps the horse was referred to as the **h₁ék_u- X* and over time the *X* was omitted, leaving **h₁ék_u-* being used in an elliptical sense. In my opinion, it suffers from one major weakness: we should not assume that there *needed* to have been a PIE term for ‘animal’. Had there been such an etymon, it is not clear what its derivation would have been. A study of the generic word ‘animal’ would show considerable cross-linguistic variation in terms of etyma. Languages do not seem to share or inherit words for this. Greek uses *zōon*, but this might be a recent formation. It is the exact equivalent of TchB. *śaiyye* ‘sheep/goat,’ TchA. *śāyu* some sort of ‘animal’ [species unknown] (< PIE *g^wyéh₃wyom* ‘animal’) (Mallory and Adams 2006: 136). The Tocharian meanings would be innovatively narrowed. Latin uses *bestia* and has quite different connotations; Germanic languages tend to use the ‘deer’ word, cf., NHG *Tier*, but it is often specialized to a greater or lesser extent.

Pârvulescu’s argument that **h₁ék_u-* or **ékwos* (as he posits) represents a ‘work-horse’ or a ‘nag’ is unconvincing. His argument is based on the premise that most of the words for horse derive from terms designating pack or draft horses (Lat. *caballus*, NHG *Pferd*, Lith. *arklys*) (Pârvulescu 1993: 71–74). And yet, none of these words are **h₁ék_u-* reflexes but are, in the case of NHG *Pferd* at least, much later innovations in the language. The other premise for this argument is the fact that the Armenian *ēš* means ‘ass’ and not ‘horse’, ignoring all the other attesta-

⁵ Indo-European did not allow adjectives in **ú* to be employed as final elements in a compound, making **ōku-* divergent in its structural form and its grammatical behaviour.

tions that cross language family boundaries and consistently refer to a horse. The fact that one reflex in one language may have undergone a kind of semantic shift should surely not be used as an argument for the generic term for horse to mean a work-horse. Furthermore, we have almost no clarity on such relatively small semantic discrepancies between 'horse' and 'ass' in the IE period. There are admittedly linguistic difficulties (as previously mentioned) with the posited derivation; it is, however, by far the most plausible etymology and the evidence from Indo-European poetry is actually quite compelling with the significance of the 'swift' notion being present cross-linguistically to a degree in attested poetic forms.

2.2. Multiplicity of etyma for horse

There is a body of literature that addresses the question of posited etyma for the word for horse in Indo-European. The most comprehensive studies of the PIE lexicon have been undertaken by Wodtko et al. (2008), Mallory and Adams (2006), Benveniste (1969; 1973) and Gamkrelidze-Ivanov (1995). Benveniste's account was a landmark ethno-semantic study of the proto-lexicon and addressed a number of wide-ranging issues relevant to Indo-European society but failed to discuss horses. Gamkrelidze-Ivanov's and Wodtko et al. (2008) are the most comprehensive analyses of the proto-lexicon that include a discussion on horses. Wodtko et al. (2008) is an etymological dictionary of PIE nominals.

The majority of the scholarship to date has focused on either the difficulties of identifying the **h₁éǵu-* etymon or the distinction between **h₁éǵu-* and **márkos*. As previously mentioned, it is clear from the level of cross-linguistic attestation that **h₁éǵu-* or a similar form was the word used for horse before the splitting up of Indo-European into its respective dialects. It is also evident that **márkos* was a Celto-Germanic etymon whose etymology and semantic distinction from **h₁éǵu-* remain problematic. These are generally speaking the only regularly posited etyma for the generic word for horse; only one of these, the **h₁éǵu-* form, can claim uncontroversially to be Indo-European as it is the only form attested in more than two of the IE daughter languages. Admittedly, Gamkrelidze-Ivanov and Mallory-Adams also posit **ǵ^hei-* (Rix 2001: 174) as the root of Arm. *ji* and Skt. *háya*: the root **ǵ^hei-* has the sense of 'impels, stimulates, drives' (Mallory-Adams 1997: 274). The other etymology to be found in Mallory-Adams is **mendios* which is posited as the derivation for Rom. (< Dac.) *mânz* 'colt', Thrac. *Μεζηναι* (name of horse riding divinity), Illy. *mandos* 'small horse', Mess. *Iuppiter Menzanas* (name of divinity to whom horses were sacrificed), Alb. *mëz* 'foal' cf. Lat. *mannus* 'small horse' (Mallory-Adams 1997: 274). Beside *háya-lji* and **mendios*, we should put the English *foal*, Greek *pōlos* 'foal', Albanian *pelë* 'mare' (as if < **pōlnah₂-*) and now apparently TchB. *peliye* 'mare's' [adj.] group. Albanian *pjell* 'give birth [of animals]' (< **pele/o-*); the Albanian meaning presumably generalized from 'to foal'.

It is clear from these examples that there may have been several etyma giving us a number of reflexes which may have been subsequently lost in the Indo-European daughter languages. These scattered lexical relics, such as Rom. *mânz*, are significant since they do not represent synonyms for **h₁éǵu-* and its reflexes, but are motivated instead by basic characteristics such as size and age of the horse. It is reasonable to argue that such onomasiological distinctions may have been present during the Indo-European period since there were presumably occasions when a higher degree of semantic specificity was required. Specificity is clearly a very vague notion in the Indo-European semantic context. One might speculatively posit a number of other roots that could have given us other terms that have been subsequently lost. These etyma can be tabulated as follows:

Etyma/roots	Comments and reflexes
* <i>h₁ék̑u-</i>	<p>Uncontroversially IE. Attested in every IE sub-group except for Slavic and Albanian (Lat. <i>equus</i>, Skt. <i>ásvā</i>, Av. <i>aspa</i>, OIce. <i>jór</i>, OE <i>eoh</i> etc.). Generally derived from the lengthened <i>o</i> grade adjective *<i>ók̑u-</i> ‘swift’ or ‘the swift one’</p> <p>Form has undergone considerable diatopic variation, leading to the displacement of the *<i>h₁ék̑u-</i> etymon in every modern European language (exceptions Sp. <i>yegua</i>, Rom. <i>iapă</i> ‘mare’ and Scottish Gaelic <i>ech</i>). The *<i>h₁ék̑u-</i> reflex is still used in modern Iranian dialects</p> <p>Contrary to Gamkrelidze-Ivanov (1995: 464) and Buck (1949: 167), all we can infer from *<i>h₁ék̑u-</i> form is that the horse was definitely known to the IE people before the language split into its respective dialects, i.e. c. 3000 B.C. The linguistic form itself or its attestation does not tell us anything about horse-domestication</p>
* <i>márkos</i>	<p>Celto-Germanic isogloss (Ir. <i>marc</i>, Wels. <i>march</i>, Eng. <i>mare</i> etc.), but often treated as IE. A *<i>mh₂érkos</i> reconstruction seems untenable</p>
* <i>mendios</i> (Mallory-Adams 1997: 274)	<p>> Rom. (< Dac.) <i>mânz</i> ‘colt’, Thrac. <i>Μεζηναι</i> (name of horse riding divinity), Illy. <i>mandos</i> ‘small horse’, Mess. <i>Iuppiter Menzanas</i> (name of divinity to whom horses were sacrificed), Alb. <i>mëz</i> ‘foal’. Cf. Lat. <i>mannus</i> ‘small horse’</p>
* <i>ǵ^hei-</i> ‘to impel; to stimulate; to drive’ (Rix 2001: 174)	<p>> Arm. <i>ji</i> and Skt. <i>háya</i> ‘horse’</p>
* <i>h₂erh₃-</i> ‘to plough’ (Rix 2001: 272)	<p>> Lith. <i>ariù</i> ‘to plough’ > Lith. <i>arklys</i> ‘horse’</p>
* <i>orghi-</i> ‘scrotum’ (Pokorny 1959: 782) (Cf. * <i>h₁endros</i> ‘scrotum’ Mallory and Adams 2006: 553)	<p>> Lith. <i>eržilas</i> ‘stallion’: Arm. <i>orji-k</i>; ‘scrotum’; Arm. <i>orji</i> ‘not castrated’ (Pokorny 1959: 782)</p>
* <i>d^hreg^h-</i> (Rix 2001: 154) ‘to pull; to tug’	<p>> Lett. <i>dragât</i> ‘to tear, to rip’ (Pokorny 1959: 209) > Lett. <i>drigelts</i>, <i>drigants</i> ‘stallion’, Lith. <i>drigântas</i> ‘stallion’⁶</p>
* <i>horsam</i> (Skeat 1910: 277) < * <i>kers</i> ‘to run’ (Rix 2001: 154) /*(s)ker ‘to jump’ (Rix 2001: 556): Lat. <i>cursus</i> (Pokorny 1959: 583); (Ernout and Meillet 1979: 160)	<p>> OHG (<i>h</i>)<i>ros</i>, OIce. <i>hross</i>, NHG <i>Ross</i>, Eng. <i>horse</i></p>
* <i>hānhista-</i> ‘the fastest or the best at jumping’ (Jóhannesson 1956: 179) < * <i>keh₂k-</i> : Lit. <i>šóku</i> ‘to jump’ (Rix 2001: 319)	<p>> OHG <i>hengist</i>, OIce. <i>hestr</i>, NHG <i>Hengst</i></p>

Table 1: Multiplicity of etyma for horse

2.3. **h₁ék̑u-* and **márkos*

Previous literature on the question of the distinction between the two widely reconstructed forms for horse (**h₁ék̑u-* and **márkos*) can be divided into purely descriptive statements and treatments which aim to explain the distinction in the context of a more all-embracing philological or cultural-historical theory. Examples of the former include Martinet (1987: 241); Meid (1989: 14); Sergent (1995: 173) and Green (1998: 148). Both Martinet and Sergent consider **márkos* to be the most ancient term for horse without giving any explanation and Meid thinks the **h₁ék̑u* form could itself be a loanword from a region near the eastern Steppes.⁷ Green

⁶ Pokorny (1959: 210): a loan word from Polish *drygant*.

⁷ Since most IE languages share the same **h₁ék̑u-* form and it does not appear to be a loan-word or a *Wanderwort* in them, this is unlikely but not impossible.

claims that **h₁ék_uo-* was a draught-animal and that **márkos* was a horse used for riding, better suited for combat. Furthermore, Green claims that **márkos* was borrowed from Germanic into Celtic and not *vice versa* because Germanic underwent the sound-shift of *g* to *k* and certain animal names were formed with a *g* suffix.⁸ Beckwith (2009: 397) believes **márkos* meant originally a ‘chariot warrior’s horse’ based on the correspondence between the ‘young warrior words’ from the PIE zero grade root **mr / o-grade root *mor* (‘die, death, mortal, youth’) and the derived word **márkos* ‘horse’.

Work aimed at providing specifically a theory that attempts to explain the difference in the two etyma has been undertaken by Gamkrelidze-Ivanov (1995: 464–478) and Mallory-Adams (1997: 273–274). The two respective hypotheses can be summarized as follows:

Mallory-Adams (1997: 274): it is implied that **márkos* is the ‘wild horse’ and that **h₁ék_uo-* (Mallory-Adams posit **ékwos* and not **h₁ék_uo-*) is the ‘domesticated horse’. The explanation is a philological one: Mallory-Adams contend that a derived feminine in **-eh_a-* denotes a ‘domestic animal’ and a derived feminine in **-ih_a-* denotes a ‘wild animal’ (cf. **ulkwíh_a-* ‘she-wolf’). They suggest that **márkos* may have referred to a ‘wild horse’ in the western IE dialects in opposition to **h₁ék_uo-*, the ‘domesticated horse’. They are sceptical about **márkos* being an Asiatic loan as they would expect the form to be more widespread than the Celto-Germanic reflexes suggest.

Gamkrelidze-Ivanov (1995: 473–474): the distinction is accounted for by the fact that **h₁ék_uo-* (Gamkrelidze-Ivanov posit **ékwos* and not **h₁ék_uo-*) is a ‘harnessed horse’ and **márkos* is a ‘riding horse’; **márkos* is considered to be an Altaic loan that can be dated back to the first millennium B.C., ruling out the possibility that it was borrowed from Hunnic. The Altaic loan explains the prevalence of the **mor* reflexes in Altaic and various other Asian languages.

In my view, neither the descriptive statements nor the proposed theories provide us with an adequate explanation for the difference between these two terms. The difference may have been just diatopic and so they would not have been competing forms.⁹ Both hypotheses demonstrate how difficult it is to control the material.¹⁰ In terms of the Mallory-Adams hypothesis, there is one key observation to be made: in the absence of any strong supporting evidence, it seems that suffixes do not easily map onto semantic load and it is especially difficult to establish a relationship between a suffix and a tame/wild distinction. It is unclear what the connection could be between the quoted suffix and the horse. With the **ulkwíh_a-* ‘she-wolf’ example, the suffixed form may denote a derived feminine but the corresponding masculine form is not suffixed: it is the **luk^{vo}o-* > Lat. *lupus* (Watkins 2000: 102) ‘wolf’ word, which is a perfectly straightforward IE *o* stem and has no relevance to the domesticated *versus* wild distinction. The wild/domesticated distinction is a valid way to approach the problem though as there is often a difference between terminology referring to wild and domesticated animals. Wild animals often only have one name (bear, wolf, beaver etc.), whereas there is a wealth of distinctions in the case of domesticates and they are referred to by multiple terms such as ‘horse’ / ‘stallion’ / ‘gelding’ or ‘sheep’ / ‘ram’ / ‘wether’. This clearly reflects the fact that domesticated

⁸ It is not clear how this argument works since Germanic does not have a *k* suffix; its form of the root ends in *h* (or a voiceless velar fricative), which is derived from IE **k̑*. It would seem that if the Celtic form has come through Germanic, it has come from a form completely unattested in Germanic. Note that in Germanic it is the feminine derivative of this word which remains (*mare*), not the masculine.

⁹ There may have been more than two IE words for horse. The other posited forms may have been more widely attested at an early stage in the language but we are left with only a small number of reflexes.

¹⁰ Both accounts make the false assumption that **márkos* was an IE term, but there is no linguistic evidence for it.

animals are used for economic needs (food source) and are thus subjected to ‘biological interventions’ such as castration (Pârvulescu 1993: 70).

The other problem with their reasoning is that it would be surprising to evidence, in the Celto-Germanic isogloss at least, a wild animal being referred to as the generic for a domesticated horse; this would be akin to the ‘zebra’ word being the generic form for horse in English. However, Mallory-Adams’ scepticism regarding the **márkos* Altaic loan hypothesis is justified: it is difficult to reconcile the western distribution of the IE cognates with the eastern distribution of its putatively non-IE sources.

Gamkrelidze-Ivanov’s hypothesis starts with the dubious distinction between a ‘riding horse’ and ‘harnessed horse’: the two terms appear to be bordering on the same concept. The idea that the IE sub-groups inherited the **h₁éǵu-* term but that the **márkos* form came into Celtic and Germanic as a loanword when horse-riding was introduced in the first millennium B.C. (ultimately from the non-IE languages of Eurasia) is convenient since it suggests that the new term must have some marked functional difference if it was to be useful and therefore adopted. It is self-evident that a new term entering the language is likely to be marked in some way to differentiate it from the existing term and the perceived need for this semantic distinction seems to be the basis for their argument. There can be, however, no linguistic explanation for their alleged semantic derivation, i.e. the ‘riding’ *versus* the ‘harnessed’ distinction. Implicit in this assumption is also the fact that the Celts were not riding horses at the time of the first millennium B.C. and yet we cannot be sure this is the case (Green 1995: 5). If they were riding horses at that time then that does of course remove the requirement to have a neologism in the language to designate this specifically, since the existing term would have presumably sufficed.¹¹ Alternatively, if the Proto-Celtic people of the Urnfield culture were not horse riders, then it too seems surprising that they would adopt the term ‘riding horse’ as their own generic term, if they did not carry out the activity themselves.

Ultimately, Gamkrelidze-Ivanov undermine their own argument that **márkos* is an Altaic loan and represented the ‘riding horse’ when the reader is informed that Asia is ruled out as a centre of horse domestication as the Przewalski horse has sixty-six pairs of chromosomes whilst the domestic horse has sixty-four pairs, implying that the Asian horses were not domesticated and therefore presumably not ridden. It is also stated that the Altaic form **mor* must have originally referred to the same domesticated horse known further west.¹² Consequently, the domesticated horse entered Central Asia from the west and not from the east. Assuming the above is correct, the **márkos* form would actually represent a Celtic or Celto-Germanic loan and not an Altaic loan. The Gamkrelidze-Ivanov argument is then a *circulus vitiosus*: they wish the **márkos* etymon to be an Altaic loan and represent a ‘riding horse’ and yet, based on their own assumptions, the **mor* form referred to a domestic horse and the horse was probably not domesticated in Asia. It is difficult to see how their hypothesis could be accurate if either of these assumptions were correct.

Notwithstanding this, Gamkrelidze-Ivanov argue that the Celto-Germanic isogloss **márkos* and Chinese *ma* < **mra-* were derived from the Altaic (specifically, in Mongolian, the Tungusic family and Korean) **mor*. It is difficult to disprove the Gamkrelidze-Ivanov theory but the al-

¹¹ I am not necessarily assuming this: it seems plausible that they did use horses but they may not primarily have ridden them (Celtic horses were relatively slender). They could have been beasts of burden or drawn vehicles of some sort.

¹² **márkos* derives from Altaic **mor*, attested in *marin* in Mongolian and *murin* in Tungusic. No explanation is, however, given for the *k(h)* extension to the root in both Germanic and Celtic, a derivation which does not seem to work by itself.

leged linguistic evidence (Mongolian **mori-*, Korean *mal*, Manchu-Tungus *murin*, Burmese *murān*, Tibetan *mra*) should be viewed very critically as there is no proof of a concrete linguistic or non-linguistic relationship between Celto-Germanic and these Asian and Altaic languages. Janhunen (1998: 415–420) dismisses the Altaic hypothesis entirely because none of the relevant East Asian languages show any evidence of being derived from a Pre-Proto-Mongolian reconstruction of the type **mor-ka* or **morkin*. Furthermore, there is no evidence of linguistic contact between Mongolian and an early form of Indo-European, the earliest documentable linguistic contact in this area being between Tocharic and Sinitic and Tocharic and Turkic. Janhunen is unable to find any plausible linguistic explanation for the similarity between **márkos* and **mor* and considers the resemblance purely ‘coincidental’. It would seem the major language families in East Asia, Japanese, Korean and Tungusic borrowed the word from Mongolian, the main mediator of Central Asian influences to Northeast Asia (Janhunen 1998: 419).

We are unable to say with any certainty what the distinction (if there needs to be one) between **márkos* and **h₁éǵuo-* could have been exactly: we can only opine on what was most probable given the limited linguistic and archaeological evidence that is available to us. The basic conclusions from this discussion can be summarized as follows: a) the **márkos*/**h₁éǵuo-* distinction is unlikely to reflect the wild/domesticate distinction; b) there is no linguistic or non-linguistic evidence for **h₁éǵuo-* being a ‘harnessed horse’ or **márkos* representing a ‘riding horse’; c) the Altaic loan hypothesis is flawed as there is no evidence of contact between the Mongolian and the early Indo-European people and we know that the East Asian reflexes are derived from the proto-Mongolian form; d) the similarity between **márkos* and **mor* is probably coincidental and is not explained by an Altaic, Asiatic or Celtic loan scenario. Janhunen has advanced the discussion in one key respect: we are now confident that **márkos* is not an Altaic loan. We are still left uncertain as to what its origin can be and how it related to **h₁éǵuo-*. In assessing its origin, we need to attempt to establish the likelihood of the etymon being a loan: an argument can be made for it being a loan word and potentially having a non-Indo-European component. The form does not etymologise well and it is attested only in Celto-Germanic; it would need to be an early loan since the term has undergone the relevant sound changes in Germanic at least. Furthermore, if **márkos* were not a loan but an Indo-European relic, one would probably expect it to have survived in other isolated, marginal and archaic varieties of Indo-European. If it survived in, say, Celtic, Germanic and Hittite, that would be much stronger support than it being a lexical relic in just Celtic and Germanic. It is difficult to perceive how an ancient, arguably generic term, would have survived in just these two language families just as it would be challenging to explain why an East Asian word for horse derived from Indo-European would be based on any lexeme other than **h₁éǵuo-*.

It is almost impossible to determine the semantic motivation behind the **márkos* form and how it differentiated itself from **h₁éǵuo-* and any proposal is likely to be speculative. There is reasonably good evidence, however, for **h₁éǵuo-* representing the generic term for horse: the word is widely attested in almost all of the Indo-European language families; it is found across nearly all the divisions within Indo-European and so is likely to antedate them; it is an ancient term in Indo-Iranian too since it shows all the expected early linguistic development and geographically it is unlikely to be a *Wanderwort* there; the **h₁éǵuo-* word has early mythological associations in Indo-Iranian and seems to be fairly basic to the early religion and cultural traditions of the Indo-Iranians.¹³ If the distinction was not simply diatopic, this would leave **márkos* referring to some other kind of horse — a work horse, a plough horse, a nag, a war horse,

¹³ One thinks of the important Vedic kingship ritual involving horse sacrifice, the *Ásvamedha*. There are two traditional *comparanda* to this event: the Roman *October Equus* and the Irish kingship inauguration rite known as *feis*.

a steed or a charger, perhaps. The possibilities are endless and little would be gained by entertaining such speculation, but Beckwith's (2009: 397) suggestion is not implausible.

3. The meta-linguistic tradition of the Indo-European *Göttersprache*

The idea that there was a binary or multiple register-based synchronic hierarchy in the lexicon with the top echelon labelled an Indo-European *Göttersprache* goes back to Güntert (1921: 1–55) and may assist us in our analysis. The identification of these formulae initiated further research by Lazzeroni (1957: 1–25); Schmitt (1967: 142–195); Campanile (1977; 1987); Toporov (1981: 189–251); Watkins (1970: 1–17); (1982: 104–120); (1992: 391–419); (1995: 179–193) and Hájnal (2008: 457–81) into the so-called Indo-European poetic tradition and in particular the Indo-European *Dichtersprache*.¹⁴

A number of linguistic equations have been proposed and Güntert observed that these formulaic sequences were often characterised by a lexicon which for reasons relating to the culture had an immanent semantic charge or mark. These semantically marked terms were generally assigned to the 'language of gods', a special stylistic register, and the unmarked 'language of men' (Watkins 1970: 2), creating a binary lexical opposition. The result of this hierarchy in the lexicon was that precisely the same referent was often described in two very distinct levels of discourse.

The notion of language and its users being linguistically segregated on the basis of register is well-established: one thinks of the complex Celtic hierarchy of poets and their language (seven grades of Filidh and eight grades of Bard), or of the alleged *Geheimsprache* of the Shetland fishermen,¹⁵ not to mention runes.¹⁶ The *Göttersprache* with which I am concerned has a number of clear characteristics. Firstly, it is a system of poetical metaphor and cryptic kenings. The semantically and aesthetically marked 'language of the gods' may be repeated as a formulaic expression (sometimes comprising semantically charged epithets). The 'language of the gods' has the effect of 'distancing the poetic message from ordinary human language' and often avoids the unpoetic stigmatized lexicon of the 'language of men' by using its own special vocabulary, as in the names of things in Irish *bérta fortchide na filed*, 'obscure language of the poets' or the Vedic *devānām gúhyā nāmāni*, 'secret names of the gods' (Watkins 1995: 182–183).¹⁷ The obscurity is almost certainly intentional with the aim being to protect the spoken, poetic message and thus maintain its divine secrecy. The *Göttersprache* referents often have considerable cultural weight attached to them and may have been associated with other culturally salient icons, creating associative semantic networks by which words and concepts were interconnected.

It can be argued that this poetical doctrine would have conceivably been present in Indo-European society as a spoken tradition (Anthony 2007: 466). The work of Watkins (1970; 1982; 1992; 1995) and Schmitt (1967) in particular has illustrated how widely attested these poetic

¹⁴ The distinction between *Dichtersprache* and *Göttersprache* is to be clearly understood. *Dichtersprache* refers simply to the poetic language that is attested as cross-linguistic phrasal correspondences. *Göttersprache* concerns itself with a clear dichotomy between 'language of gods' and 'language of men'.

¹⁵ It is claimed that the fishermen of the Shetlands had a secret code and a system of synonyms and metaphors not dissimilar to that of the *Alvíssmál*.

¹⁶ Other genres of oral traditions that appeal to certain registers may include: folk tales, oral poetry, riddles, language of rituals, language of hunting/fishing, healing language, Japanese respect register (honorifics), language of mantra/incantations etc.

¹⁷ The most highly marked form of discourse in Irish was that which is was archaic, uniquely poetic and obscure.

formulaic sequences were with aesthetically marked versus aesthetically unmarked appellations of the same entity appearing in Greek, Vedic, Old Norse, Old Irish, Avestan and Anatolian. Examples from Ancient Greek may include: ὄν Βριάρεων καλέουσι θεοί, ἄνδρες δὲ τε πάντες Αἰγαίων (Iliad 1 V 403) ‘which the gods call Briareos, but men Aigaion’; ὄν Ξάνθον καλέουσι θεοί, ἄνδρες δὲ Σκάμανδρον (Iliad 20 V 74) ‘which the gods call Xanthos, but men Skamandros’. We have also an example repeated in *Yajurvedic* and *Brāhmana* passages (TS 7.5.25.2): *hayo bhūtva devān avahad vājī gandharvān arvā ásurān ásvo manúsyān* ‘as steed he carried the gods, as charger the Gandharvas, as courser the Asuras, as horse men’ (Watkins 1995: 38).¹⁸

It is reasonable to contend that *Götterwörter* or even a similar register-based hierarchy may have existed in the proto-language. Attempts to reconstruct this would only be meaningful in examples where there is a strong consensus regarding the accuracy of the reconstructed form. To date, there has been no clear and concerted attempt to examine the proto-language for these stylistic features with only the occasional example appearing in the literature: the Indo-European collocation for ‘master’ as **dems pótis*, which Watkins terms as a ‘dead metaphor’ or even **péku* denoting the totality of ‘movable wealth’ (Watkins 1982: 116). Relevant to this research will be the observation that Watkins made: lexical items in various Indo-European languages must assume the prior existence of a fixed formula of noun and epithet, such as: DRY (**ters*) land → LAND (Lat. *terra*); MORTAL (**mór-to-*) man → MAN (Vedic *márta-*); EARTHLY (**dhghom-io-*) man → MAN (Irish *duine*) (Watkins 1992: 400–401). It is relevant since a similar system of noun and epithet may have been used in the Indo-European *Göttersprache* for the word for horse, namely SWIFT (**h₁ék_u-*) horse → HORSE (OE *eoh*).

3.1. **h₁ék_u-* as *Göttersprache*: a special register

It is worth examining whether the *Göttersprache* notion can be applied to the proto-form for horse, i.e. whether the supposed generic word for horse in the Indo-European period may have been a semantically marked term. The distinction between the posited proto-near-synonyms **h₁ék_u-* and **márkos* (if there need be one) and other proto-forms for horse may be one of register. There are a number of reasons for believing this may be the case: (a) the iconic status of the horse as an object of worship and sacrifice (kingship rituals) may have been such that the generic term itself (assuming this was the generic) may have been a *Götterwort*; (b) the **h₁ék_u-* reflex is on occasions collocated with other culturally important iconic symbols such as the sun, creating a *Göttersprache* like a semantic associative network; (c) the Greek ὠκέες ἵπποι ‘swift horses’ appears as a clear poetic formula and is supported by evidence of a formulaic cognate in Sanskrit *ásuàso* [...] *āsávo* as well as appearing as a leitmotif in Avestan; (d) it has been claimed that **a* tends to be employed in popular lower-register forms, perhaps suggesting that the **a* of the near-synonym **márkos* may have been indicative of *Menschen-sprache*.

The horse appears frequently as the centre-piece of IE myth and ritual, and as a *Götterwort* the **h₁ék_u-* form may have been akin to a ritual utterance. There is evidence that it was the **h₁ék_u-* form and not an alternative item that was employed in *Göttersprache*. It is the **h₁ék_u-* word that is associated with the divine, the magical and other culturally important symbols such as the sun.¹⁹ This particular association is evidenced in Avestan (Yt. 10. 3) where the ‘sun’

¹⁸ Skt. *háya* is a poetic term only and not the common term for horse (**h₁ék_u-* > Skt. *ásva*).

¹⁹ There are many cultic and cultural references to the sun and the horse. One key find testifying the iconography of the Germanic tribes is the horse-drawn gold plated wheel known as the Trundholm sun chariot. See also de Lamberterie (2003: 213–34).

can be described as *auruuat.-aspa-* ‘im Besitz schneller Rosse’ or as *huuara yat aməšəm raēm auruuat.aspəm* ‘die Sonne, die unsterbliche prächtige, die schnelle Rosse hat’ (Schmitt 1967: 166).

The most compelling evidence for **h₁ék_u-* belonging to a certain register comes, however, from **h₁ék_u-* reflexes that appear in lexically identical poetic formulae and fixed locutions, that one may term *Götterdichtung*. **h₁ék_u-* meaning ‘the swift one’ is collocated in certain daughter languages with the epithet ‘swift’, becoming not a tautology but a leitmotif running through the literature, making it difficult to deny the verbal, pragmatic and cultural-historical cognateness of the basic formula. The Ancient Greek ‘swift horses’ formula $\acute{\omega}\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\epsilon\varsigma \text{ ἵπποι}$ appears thirty-one times in the *Iliad* alone with the alternative $\text{ἵπποι } \acute{\omega}\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\pi\omicron\delta\epsilon\varsigma$ appearing eighteen times in the same work. De Lamberterie (1990: 561–562) likens the $\text{ἵπποι } \acute{\omega}\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\pi\omicron\delta\epsilon\varsigma$ formula to a bird of prey, both horses and falcons being emblems of speed.

The Ancient Greek poetic formula $\acute{\omega}\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\epsilon\varsigma \text{ ἵπποι}$ and the Sanskrit equivalent *ásuàso* [...] *āśávo* undergo little change in transmission and maintain their essential identity. This is a characteristic of *Göttersprache* itself: poetic divine formulae tend to be constantly repeated. The preservation of the word becomes a corollary which is a manifestation of the formulaic diction. People say the same thing the same way when the same message is repeated and retold. The ‘swift horses’ formula is the canonical representation of this, the collocation of two almost identical written words appearing sequentially and in doing so reinforcing the real cultural semantic nexus.

The horse is frequently associated with speed in the *Rig-Veda* (RV 2.35.1), the Sanskrit **h₁ék_u-* reflex being invariably employed. The Indic figure Apām Napāt has the epithet *ásuheman* (RV 2.35.1) and in the Iranian *auruuat.aspa-* ‘having swift horses’ (Yašt 19.51). There are many references to the ‘swift horses’ *ásü aspá* formula in the Avestan hymns (Yašt 17.12; Yašt 10.125; Yasna 30.10). The function of the basic formula is indexical and memorative. It might make reference to a myth and call it to the mind of the listener and at the same time makes reference to and reminds the listener of all the other instances of the basic formula. The function of **h₁ék_u-* and its inherited formulae in the IE daughter languages may, however, be simply to act like an idiomatic cipher, protecting the poetic message of the gods.

Whilst I believe register would have been the most salient variable differentiating between near-synonyms, the hypothesis has its weaknesses. If **h₁ék_u-* were the ‘language of gods’, then what comprises the ‘language of men’? In addition, there does not appear to be evidence of the ‘swift horses’ formula based on the **h₁ék_u-* reflexes in Celtic and Germanic. It would be convenient to label **márkos Menschensprache* but the evidence is likely to be fragmentary and whilst OE *eoh* appears seldom in the literature, Old Norse *jór* is not unequivocally collocated with the notion of ‘swiftness’.²⁰ The respective hypotheses are summarized in table 2.

Conclusion

In this article, I set out to investigate an under-researched set of semantic differentiations in Proto-Indo-European, those of register differences. Proto-Indo-European was a normal language and thus had register differences. However, establishing particular registers is admittedly difficult. Register differences are of course not unknown, the most famous perhaps being the set of “daevish” words in Avestan. And register differences, not always so systematic as in Avestan, seem universal in language. Thus the supposition that Proto-Indo-European

²⁰ The swift notion appears a few times in Old Norse but tends to use the *hestr* and *hross* words: *Það var allra hrossa skjótast* (*Landnámabók* ch 62) ‘That was the fastest of all horses’; *skjótan hest* (*Fóstbræðra saga* ch 8) ‘fast horse’.

Mallory-Adams (1997)	Gamkrelidze-Ivanov (1995)	Register: Current hypothesis
<p><i>*h₁ék̑uo-</i> is the ‘domesticated horse’ and <i>*márkos</i> the ‘wild horse’</p> <p>Derived feminine in <i>*-eh_a-</i> denotes a ‘domestic animal’ and a derived feminine in <i>*-ih_a-</i> denotes a ‘wild animal’ (cf. <i>*ulkwih_a-</i> ‘she-wolf’)</p>	<p><i>*h₁ék̑uo-</i> is a ‘harnessed horse’ and <i>*márkos</i> is a ‘riding horse’</p> <p><i>*márkos</i> is considered to be an Altaic loan that can be dated back to the first millennium B.C. Altaic loan explains the prevalence of the <i>*mor</i> reflexes in Altaic and various other Asian languages</p>	<p><i>*h₁ék̑uo-</i> may belong to a special register, the ‘language of gods’</p> <p><i>*h₁ék̑uo-</i> reflexes appear in lexically identical poetic formulae and fixed locutions: Gr. ὠκέες ἵπποι; Skt. <i>ásuáso</i> [...] <i>āsávo</i>; Av. <i>āsu.aspəm</i>, all meaning ‘<i>*orǵhi-</i>, horses’</p> <p>The <i>*h₁ék̑uo-</i> reflex is collocated with culturally important iconic symbols such as the sun, creating semantic associative networks</p> <p>The <i>*a</i> may be indicative of more popular, lower-register forms, perhaps differentiating <i>*h₁ék̑uo-</i> from <i>*márkos</i></p>
Comments	Comments	Comments
<p>Valid way to approach the problem. There is often a distinction in wild : domesticated animal terminology (bear, wolf, beaver etc. <i>vs</i> horse/stallion/gelding).</p> <p>Suffixes do not easily map onto semantic load. Difficult to establish relationship between a suffix and a tame : wild distinction and the suffix and the horse.</p> <p>With the <i>*ulkwih_a-</i> ‘she-wolf’ example, the suffixed form may denote a derived feminine but the corresponding masculine form is not suffixed: it is the <i>*luk^wo-</i> > Lat. <i>lupus</i> ‘wolf’ word.</p>	<p>Argument is convenient since it suggests that the new term must have some marked difference if it was to be useful and therefore adapted.</p> <p>No linguistic explanation for the alleged semantic distinction.</p> <p>No proof of concrete linguistic relationship between Celto-Germanic and Altaic languages: <i>*márkos</i> and <i>*mor</i> resemblance is probably only coincidental.</p> <p>Unable to assume that the Celts were not riding horses by the first millennium B.C.</p>	<p>If <i>*h₁ék̑uo-</i> were <i>Göttersprache</i>, we would need a term for <i>Menschen-sprache</i>. It is not clear what that term would have been.</p> <p>No apparent evidence of the ‘swift horses’ formula in Celtic and Germanic using the <i>*h₁ék̑uo-</i> reflex.</p>

Table 2: **h₁ék̑uo-* and **márkos*

word(s) for ‘horse’ might show such differences would not be unexpected. One might adduce English *steed vs. horse* as an illustration. There are relatively few clear-cut conclusions that can be drawn from the posited proto-forms denoting horses. However, it may be that the **h₁ék̑uo-* etymon belonged to a special, divine register. The reasons underpinning this view are: the iconic status of the horse in the Indo-European period, the nature of the Indo-European poetic tradition and the existence of cross-linguistic poetic formulae relating to horses employing the **h₁ék̑uo-* etymon. On the basis of the multiple terms for horse in a number of the IE daughter languages, it is likely that there was more than one term for horse in the IE period. A differentiation on the basis of register may have been a possibility, even at this early stage.

The co-existence of a deep-rooted Germanic poetic tradition of synonymy and a complex multi-layered register provides a case-study in the instability of the lexicon. Synonymy appears to be an unstable phenomenon in language: speakers put in place strategies to avoid it. Strategies may result in a change in denotative meaning for one of the synonyms in the synonym-pair. Such a distinction arose between other animal terms: cow-beef, pig-pork, deer-

venison. The effect will be more frequently though, in the context of Old Norse at least, a connotative one. We can witness this in the *hestr/hross* distinction where the *hross* word was used as a more neutral term to denote horse and was thus employed in the context of legal language whilst *hestr* tended to be collocated with high-register items such as kings and gods.

References

- Anthony, David. 2007. *The Horse, the Wheel, and Language: How Bronze-Age Riders from the Eurasian Steppes Shaped the Modern World*. Princeton University Press.
- Anthony, David, Dorcas Brown. 2011. The Secondary Products Revolution, Horse-Riding, and Mounted Warfare. *Journal of World Prehistory* 24(2–3): 131–60.
- Bammesberger, Alfred. 1994. Did the “Indo-Europeans” collide with “pre-Indo-Europeans”? *Lituanus* 40/1: 33–53.
- Beckwith, Christopher I. 2009. *Empires of the Silk Road: A History of Central Eurasia from the Bronze Age to the Present*. Princeton University Press.
- Benveniste, Émile. 1969. *Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes* 1–2. Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit.
- Benveniste, Émile. 1973. *Indo-European Language and Society*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Buck, Carl Darling. 1949. *Dictionary of Selected Synonyms in the Principal Indo-European languages: a Contribution to the History of Ideas*. University of Chicago Press.
- Campanile, Enrico. 1977. *Ricerche di cultura poetica indoeuropea*. Pisa: Giardini.
- Delamarre, Xavier. 2003. *Dictionnaire de la Langue Gauloise*. Une approche linguistique du vieux-celtique continental. Paris: Editions Errance.
- Ernout, Alfred, Antoine Meillet. 1979. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine: Histoire des mots*. 4th edition. Paris: Éditions Klincksieck.
- Gamkrelidze, Thomas V., Vjaceslav V. Ivanov. 1995. *Indo-European and the Indo-Europeans*. Trends in Linguistics (Studies and Monographs 80). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Green, D. H. 1998. *Language and History in the Early Germanic World*. Cambridge University Press.
- Green, Miranda J. (ed.). 1995. *The Celtic World*. London / New York: Routledge.
- Güntert, Hermann. 1921. *Von der Sprache der Götter und Geister*. Halle: Verlag von Max Niemeyer.
- Hajnal, Ivo. 2008. Indogermanische Dichtersprache und die Grenzen der Rekonstruktion. In: B. Huber, M. Volkart, P. Widmer (eds.). *Chomolangma, Demawend und Kasbek. Festschrift für R. Bielmeier*, Bd 2: 457–481. Halle (Saale): International Institute for Tibetan and Buddhist Studies.
- Hamp, Eric P. 1990. The Indo-European Horse. In: John Greppin, Thomas L. Markey (eds.). *When Worlds Collide: Indo-Europeans and Pre-Indo-Europeans*: 211–226. Michigan: Karoma Publishers.
- Janhunen, Juha. 1998. The Horse in East Asia: reviewing the Linguistic Evidence. In: Victor H. Mair (ed.). *The Bronze Age and Early Iron Age Peoples of Eastern Central Asia*. Vol. 1. *Archaeology, Migration and Nomadism, Linguistics*: 415–430. Washington: Institute for the Study of Man.
- Jóhannesson, Alexander. 1956. *Isländisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern: A. Francke AG Verlag.
- Kloekhorst, Alwin. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden / Boston: Brill.
- Lamberterie, Charles de. 1990. *Les adjectifs grecs en -vç. Sémantique et comparaison*. Louvain-la-Neuve.
- Lamberterie, Charles de. 2003. Traces de la langue poétique indo-européenne dans le lexique arménien. In: Georges-Jean Pinault, Daniel Petit (eds.). *La langue poétique indo-européenne: Actes du Colloque de travail de la Société des Etudes Indo-Européennes*. Paris, 22–24 octobre 2003: 213–234. Leuven / Paris: Peeters.
- Lazzeroni, Romano. 1957. Lingua degli dei e lingua degli uomini. *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa. Serie II*, 26(1/2): 1–25.
- Mallory, J. P. 1989. *In Search of the Indo-Europeans: Language, Archaeology and Myth*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Mallory, James P., Douglas Q. Adams. 1997. *Encyclopedia of Indo-European Culture*. London: Fitzroy Dearborn.
- Mallory, James P., Douglas Q. Adams. 2006. *The Oxford Introduction to Proto-Indo-European and the Proto-Indo-European World*. Oxford University Press.
- Martinet, André. 1987. *Des Steppes aux Océans: L’Indo-Européen et les “Indo-Européens”*. Paris: Payot.
- Meid, Wolfgang. 1989. *Archäologie und Sprachwissenschaft. Kritisches zu neueren Hypothesen der Ausbreitung der Indogermanen*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität.
- Nobis, Günter. 1971. *Vom Wildpferd zum Hauspferd. Fundamenta Reihe B, vol 6*. Köln: Bohlau Verlag.

- Pârvulescu, Adrian. 1993. The Indo-European Horse. A Linguistic Reconstruction. *Word* 44: 69–76.
- Pokorny, Julius. 1959. *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern: Francke.
- Rix, Helmut. 2001. *LIV, Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben: die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstammbildungen*. 2nd Edition. Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- Schmitt, Rüdiger. 1967. *Dichtung und Dichtersprache in indogermanischer Zeit*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Sergent, Bernard. 1995. *Les Indo-Européens: Histoire, langues, myths*. Paris: Payot & Rivages.
- Simek, Rudolf. 1996. *Dictionary of Northern Mythology*. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer.
- Skeat, Walter. 1910. *An Etymological Dictionary of the English Language*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Toporov, Vladimir N. 1981. Die indoeuropäische Poetik und ihre Ursprünge. *Poetica* 13: 189–251.
- Watkins, Calvert. 1970. Language of gods and language of men: Remarks on some Indo-European metalinguistic traditions. In: Jaan Puhvel (ed.). *Myth and Law among the Indo-Europeans*: 1–17. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Watkins, Calvert. 1982. Aspects of Indo-European Poetics. In: Edgar C. Polomé (ed.). *The Indo-Europeans in the Fourth and Third Millennia*: 104–120. Ann Arbor: Karoma Publishers.
- Watkins, Calvert. 1992. The comparison of formulaic sequences. In: Edgar C. Polomé, Werner Winter (eds.). *Reconstructing Languages and Cultures*: 391–418. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Watkins, Calvert. 1995. *How to kill a Dragon: Aspects of Indo-European Poetics*. Oxford University Press.
- Watkins, Calvert. 2000. *The American Heritage Dictionary of Indo-European Roots*. 2nd edition. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Wodtko, Dagmar S., Britta Irslinger, Carolin Schneider. 2008. *Nomina im Indogermanischen Lexikon*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.

Стивен Пакс Леонард. К вопросу о гиппонимах в индоевропейских языках: языковые регистры как ключ к решению проблемы синонимов

В чем могло заключаться различие между индоевропейскими этимонами **márkos* и **h₁ékwo-*, использовавшимися для выражения значения 'лошадь'? В настоящей статье предпринята попытка ответить на этот вопрос через идею иерархически организованных языковых регистров, которые, скорее всего, использовались в праиндоевропейском языке. В частности, имеются серьезные аргументы в пользу того, что термин **h₁ékwo-* мог быть свойственен т.н. «языку богов», основанному на разветвленной сети семантических ассоциаций, поскольку он регулярно проявляется в лексически идентичных поэтических формулах и застывших идиоматических выражениях. Учитывая, что во многих дочерних языках праиндоевропейского зафиксированы многочисленные синонимы со значением 'лошадь', аналогичная синонимия, скорее всего, должна быть спроецирована и на праиндоевропейский уровень, где одно из наиболее вероятных объяснений для нее — распределение по языковым регистрам.

Ключевые слова: гиппонимы; языковые регистры; индоевропейские языки; этимология.

Night-mare: on the origin of a trope in Celtic and Germanic **(a response to Stephen Pax Leonard)**

This paper has been conceived as a response to Stephen Pax Leonard's article "Hipponyms in Indo-European". The idea of contrasting names for 'horse' in the 'language of the gods' and the 'language of men' certainly seems interesting. Nevertheless, empirical diachronic study of the use of the relevant terms in Continental and Insular Celtic is conducive to a different hypothesis. Analysis of the cognates of PIE **márkos* in Germanic and Celtic makes me propose the idea of semantic convergence between **markos* and the name of the female demon **mara* as a result of paronymic attraction.

Keywords: Indo-European reconstruction; horse names; borrowing; wandering words; Celto-Germanic isoglosses; Altaic languages; etymology; metaphors; semantic shifts.

Stephen Pax Leonard's paper on "Hipponyms in Indo-European" is concerned with the subject of a very long-standing, more than well studied, and yet still relevant issue: reconstruction of several synonyms with the general meaning 'horse' reflected in a variety of IE dialects. The author's proposal to distinguish between the reflexes of IE **h₁ék'uo-* and **márkos* as respectively going back to the 'language of the gods' versus 'language of men' seems intriguing, yet one can hardly accept it at face value. Without any intention to engage in direct polemics, but rather in the spirit of further elaboration of the many observations made in this paper, I would like to contribute my own, somewhat different, view on the problem set out by the author.

In Celtic and Germanic, there is a word for 'saddle-horse' and/or 'female horse', attested only in these two language families and reconstructed by Julius Pokorny at the PIE level as **mark-o-* (IEW 700; see also Watkins 2011: 52). A similar etymon is suggested in the *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Celtic* by Ranko Matasović who cites data from all extant and extinct Celtic languages (OIr. *marc*, MW *march*, OBret. *marh*, MoBret. *marc'h*, OCo. *march*, Gaul. *markan*), admitting, however, cross-linguistic differences in the use of this lexeme (Matasović 2009: 257). Thus, already in the Middle Irish period *marc* "is a rare, poetic word, but the derivative *marcach* 'horseman' is attested in OIr." [ibid.]. Nevertheless, in Goidelic the noun has survived into the present, and, moreover, produced the abstract noun *marcachas* 'riding' as well as a pseudo-verbal noun derived from the non-existent verb *marcadheacht*, which in some dialects also refers to riding a donkey and even to traveling by cart, by car, or sometimes even to sailing; see also Scottish Gaelic *marcachd* 'act of riding'. Despite the relatively frequent use of this lexeme (or perhaps because of it), it has acquired the generic meaning 'transport' rather than 'horse' or even 'saddle-horse'. In Brittonic languages, the derivatives of **márko-* are well represented; however, Middle Welsh *march* is not the basic word 'horse' but rather a narrow term for 'saddle-horse' (cf. also Welsh *marchog* 'horseman, knight', while epic and poetic texts would rather use the generic term *ceffyl*, see Jones 1997). In Breton, *marc'h* designates 'horse' as such (see LEIA III: 20). In other words, while this lexeme is present in nearly all the Insular Celtic languages, its connotations differ.

Furthermore, according to Patricia Kelly,

"The simple contrast of OIr. *ech* versus MW *march* implied here must, however, be modified to accommodate an Early Irish form of **marko-*, namely *marc*, and the associated *marchach* 'rider'.

Greene (1972), observing the contrast between the societies depicted in the two insular literatures, concluded that riding, and the terms denoting it, were borrowed into Ireland from Britain. According to this theory, OIr. *marc* is not inherited from Continental Celtic, but is a Welsh loan-word, and *marcach* a calque on W. *marchawc* ‘rider’” (Kelly 1997: 46).

But this supposed borrowing into Irish has not superseded the old Indo-European term reflected in Proto-Celtic as **ek^wos* > OIr. *ech* ‘horse’, MW *ebol* ‘colt’ (cf. Latin *equus* ‘horse’, Greek *híppos* with the same meaning, Sanskrit *ásva*, Old English *eoh*, Lithuanian *ašvà* ‘female horse, mare’); the PIE form for all these cognates is usually reconstructed, with some degree of approximation, as **h₁ek^wo-* (see Mallory and Adams 2006: 139, 154, and, for a survey of literature on the subject, Pereltsvaig and Lewis 2015: 170–171). In Irish, the generic term *ech* was later superseded by *capall*, whose primary meaning was ‘carthorse, draught horse’. The origin of the latter is not quite clear. Although a folk etymology interprets it as a Latin loanword, Joseph Vendryes believed that Latin *caballus* was itself borrowed from Celtic (see Gaulish *Nomina Loci Cabillonum*, *Caballio* etc.), while the rare Greek word *καβάλλης* was also borrowed from the Celtic-speaking Galatians (LEIA VI: 33–34). In addition, Welsh *ceffyl* (also dialectal *cafal* and *carall*) is attested with the generic meaning ‘horse’. Naturally, there is a possible link with Russian *kobyła* ‘mare’ and Lithuanian *kumėle* of the same meaning, but it seems hard to establish either regular correspondences or a scenario of borrowing in this case. J. Loth once wrote a paper on the functional history of this noun and the evolution of its phonetic variants (Loth 1933). He suggested to analyze it in the context of the entire group of Slavonic lexemes like *konj-i*, *komon’*, *kobyła* and made a number of hypotheses on possible sources of borrowing of the root under discussion, without settling on any of them definitely. As a cautious guess, he offered parallels with Finn. *hebo* ‘mare’ and Norv. *hoppe* ‘mare’. In my opinion, we are dealing here with a Wanderwort in the European area, and tracing its ultimate source is likely impossible: a designation of such an important domesticated animal is expected to migrate from dialect to dialect, becoming part of the so-called “cultural lexicon”, whose status is language-independent (see also **kobyła* in Trubachev 1983: 93–98; Derksen 2008: 231–32)).

In this particular case, I do not focus on the actual origin of the word or ways of its expansion, but rather stress that it seems to have become a successful competitor of the generic term for ‘horse’, with the prevalent meaning of ‘draught horse’. Thus, in Goidelic the opposition between different words for ‘horse’ conveys both functional and sociolinguistic differences. This opposition could indeed be treated as an equivalent of “Gods’ vs. Men’s language”, just as Leonard proposes, but it is formally expressed through different lexemes, of which at least one has no reliable PIE etymology.

Incidentally, almost the same observations apply to the PIE word for ‘horse’. What seems to be an unequivocally Indo-European and archaic term for ‘horse’, **(h₁)ek^wo-*, at a deeper level is often tracked down to the stem **ək^wú* ‘quick’ (Hamp 1990: 212); at the same time, Sergei Starostin (1988) has offered strong arguments in favor of the word having been loaned from Proto-North Caucasian **h₁[n]čwĩ-* with some phonetic adaptation; this borrowing must have occurred at the earliest stage of Indo-European, i.e. even before the split with Anatolian. The original meaning seems to have denoted a ‘beast of burden’, cf. Sumerian *anšu* ‘donkey’, also a loanword from an unknown language (Kullanda 2008: 674). At the same time, in the Brittonic languages the cognates of this PIE stem were gradually marginalized and survived only in the words for ‘foal’ (MW *ebawl*, Bret. *ebol*, OCo. *ebol*) and in the old tribal name *Epidii*.

Summing up, it is likely that in Insular Celtic we are dealing on every occasion not with the dichotomy **ek^wo-* ~ **marko-*, but with a more sophisticated distribution of three stems: **ek^wo-*, **marko-* and **kobil-* (?). In the course of language evolution, one of the three words had to shift to the semantic periphery, as it happened to *marc* in Goidelic and *equos* in Brittonic, while the

remaining two became competitors, both surviving into the present with the status of either synonyms or dialectal variants. In Irish it is *each* vs. *capall*, while in Welsh it is *march* vs. *ceffyl*.

Some aspects of the portrayal of the horse in Celtic Insular culture

Designations of ‘horse’ are often borrowed, possibly in order to specify the exact referent: ‘horse’ as an animal, a type of transport, as a unit of metaphorical phraseology etc. This is quite natural if we consider the importance of the horse in migrations and the overall life of humanity for almost six millennia, alongside the fact that the technique of saddling (for both riding and packing) must also have migrated from culture to culture.

Returning to the words for ‘horse’ in Insular Celtic languages, we must note that the Medieval Irish tradition typically portrays the hero riding a chariot, while horse-riding was rather perceived as an otherworldly activity. This was pointed out, for instance, by Ann Ross in her book “Everyday Life of the Pagan Celts” (1970) with reference to the tale *Togail Bruidne Da Derga* (“The Destruction of Da Derga’s Hostel”):

“Conaire the King, at a significant moment in the drama, sees ‘the three Reds’. These are three men having red hair, dressed entirely in red, and riding red horses” (Ross 1970: 72).

The horsemen who cannot be overtaken lure the protagonist king into the Otherworld where he is to die. Naturally, they are referred to as *marcach*. The horse-riding character who serves as a mediator between the Otherworld and the human world survived into later Celtic folklore where he would often be linked to the motif of water (a river or a lake where the hero is carried by a supernatural riding-horse, see, for instance O’Reilly 1991: 83–90).

The Welsh tradition is somewhat different; its medieval legends often portray horse-riding as a conventional and unmarked activity (which, in my opinion, is a later influence of the French chivalric tradition, see Davies 1997). Nevertheless, it also describes a supernatural horsewoman on a white mare who cannot be overtaken. Thus, the tale *Pwyll, Prince of Dyvet* belonging to the Mabinogi epic contains the following episode (Thomson 1957: 8):

Ac wal y bydynt yn eisted, wynt a welynt gwreic ar uarch canwelw miwr aruchel, a gwisc eureit llathreit o bali amdanei, yn dyuot ar hyt y prifford a geredei hab law y’r orsed “As they were sitting, they saw a woman dressed in shining gold brocade and riding a great pale horse approaching on the highway which ran past the hill”.

This was the goddess Rhiannon, who arrived from the Otherworld. Later she married the king, was wrongly accused of their son’s death and had to offer as punishment for herself to carry guests and strangers to the king’s court on her back for seven years.

Most importantly, modern Welsh folklore has a character called *march gwynn* ‘white horse’, a demonic apparition in the form of a white horse waylaying travelers on the roads at night. Thus, the rider as well as the horse itself act as liminal characters, mediators between worlds, and personifications of a female deity and of fertility.

The link between the female horse and the female deity was described as a “common-place” in the Celtic tradition.¹ It may be substantiated by the story of a local goddess named Macha competing with the king’s horses in *The Debility of the Ulidians*” (Hull 1968), or by the Irish ritual involving a white mare, described by Giraldus Cambrensis in the treatise *Topographia Hibernica* in the late 12th century and compared with the Indian *asvamedha* ritual by

¹ Literature on the subject is quite vast; I would limit the references to Tatár 2007, which sums up numerous conclusions and observations by the earlier authors and draws multiple, sometimes unconventional, parallels.

F. R. Schröder (1927). According to him, the king of Ulidians had to perform a ritual sex act with a white mare at his inauguration ceremony, then to slaughter her and boil her meat in a cauldron. Comparison with Old Norse examples leads the authors of a monograph on Horse sacrifice in Indo-European cultures to the following idea:

“In the same way as the Irish sacrifice described by Gerald of Wales (Giraldus Cambrensis) in the 12th century, the horse sacrifice and the ritual eating of the horse’s flesh appear to have been a religious act that forged special bonds between the king and his people” (Kaliff & Oestigaard 2020: 225).

The author of “Hipponyms in Indo-European” also refers to this well-known source, drawing further parallels from the Vedic *asvamedha* and the Roman *October Equus*. It is perhaps worth noticing that Giraldus in his description of the ritual sacrifice of the horse goddess refers to her not as *equa* ‘mare’ (a term from the ‘language of the gods’), but rather as *jumentum*, in Classical Latin ‘an animal used for pulling or carrying, beast of burden’ (Glare 1968: 981). However, taking into consideration that the text was compiled in the late 12th century and, moreover, by someone certainly familiar with Old French, where by that time the Latin stem had acquired the meaning of ‘female horse’ (*jument*), we can assume that this was the meaning intended by the author, especially given the overall erotic context of the scene. This case, in my opinion, supports the dynamic nature of various lexemes with the overall broad semantics of ‘horse’. Note that the discussion above features parallel examples of semantic change involving the reconstructed PIE basic term.

Horse in Continental Celtic

In Gaulish dialects, both competing hipponyms are well represented, and it is quite difficult to determine which of the two can be called the generic term. The linguistic evidence is widely dispersed both in time (from the 3^d century BC to the 3^d century AD) and in space. For instance, the following piece of evidence is offered by Pausanias in his “Description of Greece” (2nd c. AD):

καὶ ἵππον τὸ ὄνομα ἴστω τις μαρκάν ὄντα ὑπὸ τῶν Κελτῶν (Paus. 10. 19.11)
 “for I would have you know that **marca** is the Celtic name for a horse”.

This remark follows the description of a Galatian military unit consisting of three horsemen and three horses and called *trimarkisia*. According to Loth 1933, this implies that *marcos* meant ‘saddle-horse’, although the generic meaning ‘horse’ cannot be ruled out either. We should also consider Gaulish place-names *Marco-durum*, *Marco-magus*, *Marco-lica* (Delamarre 2003: 217) and personal names *Marco-marus*, *Marco-sena*, *Marco-mani*, *Marcus*, *Marcula* (Schmidt 1957: 123; Delamarre 2007: 226), whose precise meaning cannot be reconstructed. Thus, according to A. Falileyev, the toponym *Marcomagus* means ‘horse market’ (Falileyev 2010: 157), yet it is impossible to determine whether it was a market for saddle-horses or for horses in general, which is probably more likely.

There is also a Gaulish inscription MARCOSIOR – METERNIA (Lambert 2002: 117), where *marcosior* is interpreted as 1sg. fut. dep., derived from a hypothetical verb meaning *‘to ride’ > ‘to copulate’ with the desiderative suffix. This implies that the meaning ‘saddle-horse’ had already developed a metaphorical aspect, and that, therefore, the word under discussion was already firmly established in the language. At the same time, it is worth noting that in the Gallo-Latin tradition Apollo, the sun and healer deity, is accompanied by horses; in Mauvières (Indre), Apollo is called by the Celtic surname of ‘Atepomarus’ or ‘great horseman’ (Green 1986: 172). This epithet is again compatible with the designation of ‘saddle-horse’.

Yet this Continental Celtic stem is less frequent than reflexes of the PIE root **h₁ékʷo-*. Witness the abundance of proper names containing the element *epo-*: *Epasnactus*, *Epaticus*, *Epato*, *Epetina*, *Epillius*, *Eporedorix*, *Eposognatus*, *Epotsorouidus*, *Eppamaigus* etc. (see Evans 1967: 197–198). Ellis Evans also observes “the sporadic alternation with *-ku-*” in a number of personal names (ibid. 197), e.g. *Equaesus*, *Equesus*, *Equonus*, as well as the name of the ninth month in the Coligny Calendar – EQUOS (Olmsted 1992: 199). This phenomenon can be explained by either dialectal variation or archaization, or, rather, phonetic conservation of the sacralized form in some lexemes. For instance, the proper name *Equaesus* has two identifiable components *equo-* ‘horse’ and *aesus* ‘Aesus, theonym’, which implies the literal interpretation “horse of (the god) Aesus”. Contrast the ‘regular’ names like *Eporedorix* “king of riders”, *Eposognatus* “one who knows horses” etc.

In its derived feminine form, the PIE stem produced the name of the Celtic horse-deity *par excellence* and one of the most popular Gaulish deities in general, *Epona*, whose identity is dependent upon the presence of the horse emblem. She appears on nearly three hundred stone monuments in Gaul, being favored particularly in the east, side-saddle, astride or between two horses or foals. One of her major functions was that of a mother-goddess (Green 1986: 173).

Thus, we can reconstruct a Proto-Celtic female horse deity, certainly having fertility functions, whose cult traces survived in Insular Celtic legends as well (see above). However, this mythical figure seems not to have been tightly linked with any specific stem for ‘horse’, since in Welsh, for instance, her name is derived from **marco-* (see Green 1986: 72–102).

Germanic data

The Indo-European stem **marko-* has clear reflexes in Germanic (Proto-Germ. **marxaz* according to Orel 2004: 261), which occur in West as well as North Germanic: Old Norse *marr*, Old English *mearh* (m.), *mere* (f.), Old High German *marah* ‘horse’, *maraha* ‘mare’, and Middle High German *Marah* > *Mähre* f. (cf. Old French *marahscal* > French *maréchal* ‘marshal’, borrowed from Germ. **marha-skalkaz* ‘horse-servant’, Watkins 2011: 52). In Germanic, there is partial conflation of the meanings ‘saddle-horse’ and ‘mare’ (**marhjōn-*), and in Old English one finds the same obscene meaning that we have suggested for Gaulish (see above): ‘to ride’ > ‘to copulate’.

F. Kluge hypothesized that all the Germanic derivatives originated from Proto-Germanic **marhī-*, which supposedly was the generic term for ‘horse’ at an earlier stage (Kluge 1957: 454). As a basic word, in English and German it would be superseded by later innovations (German *Pferd*, English *horse*). Presumably, the reflexes of Old Germanic **marhī* had already been specialized and could not be used to denote ‘horse’ in general. This opinion is shared by Mallory and Adams, who believe that at least in Proto-Germanic, this word could have been basic, but that it was later extended with additional suffixes denoting animals of different sex; in particular, the word for ‘mare’ got the suffix **-eh_a* (Mallory & Adams 1997: 274).

Furthermore, in Germanic languages this stem has become conflated with the word for ‘female ghost’, *Mare* (ON. *mara*, OE. *mare*, Mod. Germ. *mahr* ‘nightmare’) through some kind of paronymic attraction. The Germanic forms can be reconstructed as **marā*, going back to the Celtic-Germanic stem **morā* f. ‘witch, malicious supernatural female being’ (IEW 736; De Vries 1962: 379). In Middle English the two stems were conflated, yielding *nightmare* ‘night-fiend’, literally “night (female) horse”. On the face of it, this conflation seems accidental, but if we take seriously the idea of the Freudian Ernest Jones that the white mare represents the most archaic symbol of deep-seated human fears (see Jones 1971: 241–341), it becomes logical. The designation of the ghost horse may now be interpreted as an overlap of two semantic fields,

‘female horse / saddle horse’ and ‘female ghost’. Jones proposed a tentative etymology for both Germanic words, deriving them from a more archaic element **M-R* with a broader semantic field also involving such concepts as ‘death’ and ‘moisture’ (see Jones 1971: 327–8). Admittedly, this part of Jones 1971 belongs to the domain of “folk linguistics”, which does not, however, imply that his observations are to be dismissed easily and unequivocally (cf. the final section).

In Celtic, a reflex of the PIE stem **morā* is attested in the name of the war and death goddess, *Morrígain* (LEIA III: 64), but one should also compare the aforementioned Welsh folklore character of the white mare attacking travellers at night. In my opinion, it is hardly possible to tell which of the two meanings is present in the line below, which belongs to the well-known Old English “Journey charm”, believed to have been modeled after Insular Celtic charms:

Ne me mer ne gemyrre (Storms 1948: 216) – ‘May no nightmare disturb me’.

The word *mer*, translated by the editor as *nightmare*, looks like the Middle English word for ‘mare, female horse’ (OED VI: 158), but the author of the text seems to have meant ‘demon’ or, even more likely, the same spooky figure of the ‘night horse’ haunting travelers on dark roads. Jones indeed wrote about the term *mare*, naturally in terms of psychophysiology rather than myth; cf. also Modern French *cauchemar* < Picard. *chauche-mar*, derived from Lat. *calcare* > Old French *chaucher* ‘to press’ and Germanic **marā*).

Celtic vs Germanic?

As Edgar Polomé once pointed out,

“There are quite a few reservations that can be made about the assumption that all these (*Celto-Germanic* – T.M.) terms were borrowed from Celtic into Germanic. First of all, in the case of correspondences restricted to Celtic and Germanic there are always four possibilities that need to be investigated:

- (a) the terms represented either a common regional innovation in marginal areas of the Indo-European territory or the localized survival of an archaic term lost elsewhere throughout the Indo-European linguistic area;
- (b) the terms have been both taken over from the same third source – be it a pre-Indo-European (‘substrate’) language or a less well-documented Indo-European language in their vicinity;
- (c) the Celtic term was borrowed by Germanic;
- (d) the Germanic term was borrowed by Celtic”

(Polomé 1983: 284).

There is a variety of hypotheses that were expressed on this subject in previous literature. Thus, Vladimir Orel characterized Germanic **marxaz* ‘horse’ as a Celtic loanword (Orel 2003: 261). De Vries also tended to accept the idea of borrowing from Celtic into Germanic, but left open the possibility that it was an old Wanderwort (de Vries 1962: 380). The idea of a “Wanderwort of Eastern origin” was proposed in Matasović 2009: 257. It is worth noticing that the borrowing of this lexeme into both Germanic and Celtic from an unknown source was first offered in Meillet 1926: 229. The idea of borrowing from the language of the Thracians, famous for their riding skills, was entertained on archeological grounds in Birkhan 1970: 393–402. As discussed at some length in Leonard’s paper, a borrowing from an Altaic language has likewise been proposed in Gamkrelidze, Ivanov 1995: 832.

The fourth possibility (borrowing from Germanic into Celtic) seems to have never been considered seriously, although at least in theory it is not totally unlikely. I believe that it was ignored due to the lack of linguistic evidence for the earliest Germanic dialects, since the

Celtic languages are attested through much earlier inscriptions, dating back to the first millennium BC.

Can the Celtic-Germanic isogloss be reconstructed at the PIE level, thus vindicating Polomé's first hypothesis? *Theoretically*, this is possible, especially under the glottochronological scenario that places the divergence of Celtic from Proto-Indo-European around 3350 BC (Starostin *apud* Blažek 2007: 85), while keeping in mind that mastering the skill of horseback riding took place somewhat earlier, about 3700–3500 BC in the steppe regions (see Anthony 2008: 23). *In practice*, however, the emergence of a word with the specialized meaning of 'saddle-horse / mare' seems unlikely to have occurred in the period before the divergence of Celtic, given its unclear provenance and its absence in Italic, Baltic and Slavic, although, of course, in some of these languages it might have been lost and superseded by other semantic innovations, given that the lexemes for 'horse' often yield an astonishing number of synonyms, even within the same language. Even the original meaning of the lexeme under discussion remains unclear: 'saddle-horse' or 'female horse'? In principle, the idea of a common innovation whose derivatives in the descendant languages developed similar yet not identical meanings ('saddle horse' in Celtic vs. 'horse' in Germanic) might still be acceptable, but only if we assume that initially the meaning of the word was different, for instance, 'any domesticated horse', perhaps only used as source of meat and milk. A similar suggestion was made in Mallory & Adams 1997: 276, where the possibility of borrowing an "Eastern" word for 'horse' into West PIE dialects is doubted and the proposal is made that Celtic and Germanic had their own lexeme for 'wild horse', but their conclusions seem somewhat far-fetched.

Altaic or Nostratic?

At the same time, a fact worth considering is that a word of similar meaning is well represented in Altaic languages: Mongolian *mörin* (wherefrom Russian *merin* 'gelding'), Kalmyk *mörŋ*, Evenki *morin* etc. (Ramstedt 1935: 266–67). The stem is reconstructed as Proto-Mongolic **mori*, Proto-Tungusic **murin*, attested in Korean (Middle Korean *mār* 'horse') and, in the most recent etymological corpus of Altaic, is traced back to Proto-Altaic **mórV* (Starostin, Dybo, Mudrak 2003: 945), already with the meaning of 'horse'. In Sergei Starostin's Nostratic database on the Tower of Babel website (<http://starling.rinet.ru>), an even deeper, Nostratic-level, connection has been suggested with a potential cognate in Proto-Dravidian (**mūr-* 'buffalo, cow'), suggesting Proto-Nostratic **morV* with the generic meaning 'livestock'. The word may have even deeper roots with additional evidence from Dené-Caucasian and Afroasiatic languages (same website, Long-range Etymologies database, filed under *MVRV* 'ungulate').

Theoretically, such a deep reconstruction is possible, and the semantic change 'ungulate' → 'horse' seems logical, but tracing the Celtic-Germanic etymon all the way down to a Nostratic origin and interpreting it as an inherited item of deep ancestry rather than a loanword, entails, as it seems to me, too many unprovable assumptions. In particular, such a deep reconstruction is only likely if one assumes parallel semantic shifts in different language families, which had already diverged by the time of horse domestication.

Yet another detail, however, is worth noticing. In Kalmyk and, more generally, in Mongolic the same lexeme (a homonym?) has the meaning 'broad river' (Ramstedt 1935: 265), which curiously parallels Jones' link between the Celtic-Germanic stem for '(female) horse' and the PIE word for 'water' or 'moisture' (Jones 1971: 329). While linguistic speculations by Jones, who was a psychoanalyst writing over 60 years ago, must be taken with a grain of salt, he seems to have made an insightful observation on the mechanism of "paronymic attraction".

He suggested that homophonic lexemes, despite being etymologically unrelated, can be drawn into the same semantic field whose borders are mostly blurred. This is presumably what happened to the Old English word for ‘female horse’, linked to a female demon by folk etymology, which ultimately yielded the word *nightmare*. Folk etymologies are in general frequently based on paronymic attraction: thus, Russian *merin* ‘gelding’ can be understood as *kto versty merjaet* “mile-measuring” > ‘fast-running’. Actually, the stem for ‘water moisture’ (along with ‘sea’) suggested by Jones may itself be of Nostratic origin (**märä*, Illich-Svitych 1976: 60; for PIE **mor-* and its reflexes, see IEW: 748). This stem is in turn parophonic with **mer-* ‘death, disease, pain’ as was also observed by Jones, even though his ideas are taken by many as bordering on junk science and lacking sound academic justification.

While this specific juxtaposition can hardly be taken seriously, it is worth considering a parallel in the languages of the Balkan area. According to H. Birkhan (1970: 393–402), the “Eastern” word for ‘horse’ was introduced into the “Western language area”. Are there any traces of this phenomenon in the Balkan languages? Gindin & Kalužskaja 1997 presents an intriguing and somewhat surprising attempt at unravelling the tangle of Balkan words with a generic (shifting) meaning of ‘livestock, horse, jade, carrion, garbage’. Starting off with Hungarian *marha* ‘cattle’, which they assume to have been borrowed from Middle German *market* ‘property, commodity’, they find an astonishing abundance of its reflexes all over the Balkan area, including Romanian dialects, Serbo-Croatian, Slovene etc. They see this lexeme as a case of ‘migration term radiating from the Hungarian language zone’ (Gindin, Kalužskaja 1997: 66). Without challenging these observations and conclusions, I would like to mention that the words cited in the work under discussion show amazing semantic consistency: ‘horse, old horse, jade, bad woman (fig.)’. Compare, for instance, Polish *marcha* ‘jade, old horse; carrion’, Slovene *mrha* ‘jade’ etc., a similar meaning is attested in West Ukrainian dialects for *merha*. Gindin and Kalužskaja also suggest a conflation of meanings, but then, would not it be reasonable to reconstruct a similar kind of contamination at a much earlier stage of language evolution and linguistic/ethnic migrations? In other words, can these words be relics of a Nostratic stem meaning something like ‘livestock, horse’?

A conclusion?

So, what sort of conclusions are we to draw from all this? Perhaps we cannot tell for sure whether the Nostratic isogloss is real or what were the actual ways of transmission in the case of this apparent Wanderwort. It is obvious that the word for ‘horse’ can change its meaning and acquire further specifications in accordance with how the horse was seen: as a wild ungulate hunted and eaten, cart-horse, saddle-horse, etc. We suspect, however, that the relevant Indo-European stems not only underwent semantic changes over the course of history, but were also influenced by paronymic stems encoded by the consonants *M-R*. This process was likely influenced, at least in part, by extra-linguistic factors, such as the archaic fear of night demons emerging from darkness, on the one hand, and the metaphor of copulation as riding, on the other hand. Yet, in our view, the sources of the trope are neither limited to the similarity of consonants nor derived from it. Thus, the Scythian progenitor goddess, akin to Ishtar, “was seen both as a water deity and a patroness of horses”, despite being genetically unrelated to the words under discussion (Schaub 2007: 94). A broad and archaic semantic link between the notions of ‘feminine’ and ‘moist’ must have played a role in this case. Thus, several factors conspired in the emergence of the trope of a female demon, “mare”, conceptualized in folklore as both a woman and a female horse.

References

- Anthony, David W. 2008. A New Approach to Language and Archeology: the Usatovo Culture and the Separation of Pre-Germanic. *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 36(1–2): 1–51.
- Birkhan, Helmut. 1970. *Germanen und Kelten bis zum Ausgang der Römerzeit*. Wien: Hermann Böhlau.
- Blažek, Václav. 2007. From August Schleicher to Sergei Starostin: On the development of the tree-diagram models of the Indo-European languages. *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 35(1–2): 82–110.
- Davies, Sioned, 1997. Horses in the Mabinogion. In: Sioned Davies, Nerys Ann Jones (eds.). *The Horse in Celtic Culture. Medieval Welsh Perspective*: 121–140. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
- Delamarre, Xavier. 2003. *Dictionnaire de la langue gauloise. Une approche linguistique du vieux-celtique continental*. Paris: Édition errance.
- Delamarre, Xavier. 2007. *Noms de personnes celtique dans l'épigraphie classique*. Paris: Édition errance.
- Derksen, Rick. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of the Slavic Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden / Boston: Brill.
- De Vries, Jan. 1962. *Altnordisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Leiden: Brill.
- Evans, D. Ellis. 1967. *Gaulish Personal Names. A Study of some Continental Celtic Formations*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Trubachev, O. N. (ed.). 1983. *Etimologičeskij slovar slavjanskikh jazykov. Vol. 10*. [An Etymological Dictionary of Slavic Languages. Vol. 10]. Moscow: Nauka.
- Falileyev, Alexander. 2010. *Dictionary of Continental Celtic Place-Names*. Aberystwyth: CMCS.
- Gamkrelidze, Thomas V., Vjaceslav V. Ivanov. 1995. *Indo-European and the Indo-Europeans. A Reconstruction and Historical Analysis of a Proto-Language and Proto-Culture*. Translated by Johanna Nichols. Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Gindin, Leonid A., Irina A. Kalužskaja. 1997. Ob odnom ungarizme v Karpatskom areale: *marha [On a term of Hungarian origin in the Carpathian area: *marha]. In: T. M. Sudnik, Ye. A. Khelimskiĭ (eds.). *Balto-Slavyanskije issledovanija 1988–1996 [Balto-Slavic Studies 1988–1996]*: 66–71. Moscow: Indrik.
- Glare, Peter G.W. 1968. *Oxford Latin Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Green, Miranda. 1986. *The Gods of the Celts*. Surrey: Brameley Books.
- Greene, David A. 1972. The War Chariot as Described in Irish Literature. In: Charles Thomas (ed.). *The Iron Age in the Irish Sea Province*: 59–73. London: Council for British Archeology.
- Hamp, Eric. 1990. The Indo-European Horse. In: Thomas L. Markey, John A. C. Greppin (eds.). *When Worlds Collide. Indo-European and Pre-Indo-European*: 211–226. Michigan: Karoma Publishers.
- Hull, Vernam (ed.). 1968. Noínden Ulad: The Debility of the Ulidians. *Celtica* VIII: 1–42.
- IEW = Pokorny, Julius. 1959. *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern: Franke Verlag.
- Illich-Svitych, Vladislav. 1976. *Opyt sravnenija nostraticheskikh jazykov. Sravnitel'nyj slovar'*. [A comparative dictionary of Nostratic languages]. Moscow: Nauka.
- Jones, Ernest. 1971. *On the Nightmare*. New York: Liveright.
- Jones, Nerys Ann. 1997. Horses in Medieval Welsh Court Poetry. In: Sioned Davies, Nerys Ann Jones (eds.). *The Horse in Celtic Culture. Medieval Welsh Perspective*: 82–101. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
- Kaliff, Anders, Terje Oestigaard. 2020. *The Great Indo-European Horse Sacrifice. 4000 Years of Cosmological Continuity from Sintashta and the Steppe to Scandinavian Skeid*. OPIA 72. Uppsala: Uppsala University.
- Kelly, Patricia. 1997. The Earliest Words for 'Horse' in the Celtic Languages. In: Sioned Davies, Nerys Ann Jones (eds.). *The Horse in Celtic Culture. Medieval Welsh Perspective*: 43–63. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
- Kluge, Friedrich. 1957. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*. Berlin: Walter De Gruyter.
- Kullanda, Sergej. 2008. Loshad' v praindoevropejskom [The name of the Horse in Proto-Indo-European]. In: Ilya Smirnov (ed.). *Aspects of Comparative Linguistics. Orientalia et Classica. Papers of the Institute of Oriental and Classical Studies. Issue XIX*: 669–678. Moscow: RSUH Publishers.
- Lambert, Pierre-Yves. 2002. *Recueil des Inscriptions Gauloises. Textes Gallo-Latins sur instrumentum. Vol. II*. Paris: CNRS Editions.
- LEIA = Vendryes, Joseph. 1959. *Lexique étymologique de l'irlandais ancien de Joseph Vendryes. Vols. I-VII*. Dublin Institute For Advanced Studies.
- Loth, Joseph. 1933. Les noms du cheval chez les Celtes en relation avec quelques problèmes archéologiques. *Mémoires de l'Institut national de France* 43(1): 113–148.
- Mallory, James P., Douglas Q. Adams. 1997. *The Encyclopedia of Indo-European Culture*. London: Fitzroy Dearborn.
- Mallory, James P., Douglas Q. Adams. 2006. *The Oxford Introduction to Proto-Indo-European and the Proto-Indo-European World*. Oxford University Press.

- Matasović, Ranko. 2009. *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Celtic*. Leiden: Brill.
- Meillet, Antoine. 1926. *Caractères généraux des langues germaniques*. Paris: Hachette.
- OED = Murray, J. H. et al. (eds.). 1933. *The Oxford English Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Olmsted, Garrett. 1992. *The Gaulish Calendar*. Bonn: Rudolf Habelt.
- O'Reilly, Barry. 1991. River Claiming Its Due & the Sod of Death Predestined: Two Legends of Fate in Irish Tradition. *Béaloideas* 59: 83–90.
- Orel, Vladimir. 2003. *A Handbook of Germanic Etymology*. Leiden / Boston: Brill.
- Pereltsvaig, Asya, Martin W. Lewis. 2015. *The Indo-European Controversy. Facts and Fallacies in Historical Linguistics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Polomé, Edgar. 1983. Celto-Germanic Isoglosses (Revisited). *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 11: 281–298.
- Ramstedt, Gustaf John. 1935. *Kalmückisches Wörterbuch*. Helsinki: Lexica Societatis Fenno-Ugricae.
- Ross, Ann. 1970. *Everyday Life of the Pagan Celts*. London / New York: B. T. Batsford LTD.
- Schaub, Igor J. 2007. *Mif, kult, ritual v Severnom Prichernomorje [Myth, Cult, Ritual in the North Pontic Area VII–VI BC]*. Saint-Petersburg: Sankt-Petersburg University Press.
- Schmidt, Karl Horst. 1957. *Die Komposition in gallischen Personennamen*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Schröder, Franz Rolf. 1927. Ein altirischer Krönungsritus und das indogermanische Rossopfer. *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 16: 310–312.
- Starostin, Sergej. 1988. Indoeuropejskie i Severno-Kavkazskie isoglossy [Indo-European and North-Caucasian isoglosses]. In: G. M. Bongard-Levin, V. G. Ardzinba (eds.). *Drevnij Vostok: Etnokul'turnyje sv'azi [Ancient East: ethnic and cultural relationships]*: 112–163. Moscow: Nauka.
- Starostin, Sergej, Anna Dybo, Oleg Mudrak. 2003. *Etymological Dictionary of the Altaic languages*. Leiden: Brill.
- Storms, Godfrid. 1948. *Anglo-Saxon Magic*. Nijmegen: Martunus Nijhoff.
- Thomson, Robert L. (ed.). 1957. *Pwyll Pendueic Dyuet*. Dublin: DIAS.
- Tatár, Maria Magdolna. 2007. The Myth of *Macha* in Eastern Europe. *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 35(3–4): 323–344.
- Watkins, Calvert. 2011. *The American Heritage Dictionary of Indo-Europeans Roots*. Boston / New-York: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

Т. А. Михайлова. *Night-mare*: о происхождении одного тропа в кельтских и германских языках (ответ С. П. Леонарду)

Статья представляет собой полемические рассуждения по поводу работы С. П. Леонарда «Гиппонимы в индо-европейском». Идея противопоставления обозначений лошади в «языке богов» и в «языке людей» представляется интересной. В то же время, более детальный анализ употребления лексем в Островном и Континентальном кельтском данной гипотезе противоречит. Анализ употребления когнатов и.-е. **márkos* в кельтском и германском заставил меня высказать предположение о возможной семантической конвергенции между **markos* и **mara* — обозначением демона женского пола, которая возникла в результате паронимической аттракции.

Ключевые слова: индоевропейская реконструкция; обозначения лошади; заимствования; бродячие слова; кельто-германские изоглоссы; алтайские языки; этимология; метафора; семантический сдвиг.

Where did one speak *luwili*?

Geographic and linguistic diversity of Luwian cuneiform texts

The purpose of this paper is to assess complications in Luwian dialectal geography in the second millennium BCE, which became apparent in the course of the ongoing work on the edition of Luwian cuneiform texts. On the one hand, a number of Luwian incantations embedded into the ritual traditions of Puriyanni and Kuwattalla (CTH 758–763) and traditionally assigned to the dialect of Kizzuwadna in the southwest of Asia Minor can now be linked to the Lower Land in the central and central-western part of Asia Minor. The increasing Kizzuwadna features of the Kuwattalla tradition, including the Hurrian loanwords in the respective texts, likely reflect its secondary evolution at the court of Hattusa. On the other hand, a large group of Luwian conjurations that is booked under CTH 764–766 can now be linked to the town of Taurisa situated to the northeast of Hattusa. Their language shows dialectal peculiarities, while their formulaic repertoire finds non-trivial parallels in Hattic and Palaic texts. The concluding part of the paper addresses the relevance of these new empirical findings for the dialectal classification of the Luwian language.

Keywords: Luwian language; Hurrian language; Hattic language; Palaic language; Hattusa; Kizzuwadna; Lower Land; Taurisa.

1. Introduction

The Luwian language was deployed in writing in Asia Minor in the second and early first millennium BCE and is attested in two distinct writing systems: the adaptation of Syro-Mesopotamian cuneiform and the indigenous Anatolian hieroglyphs.¹ The Luwian hieroglyphic inscriptions, most of which are edited in Hawkins 1995 and Hawkins 2000, usually represent independent compositions: some of them have parallel versions in other languages, but these are recorded in different writing systems. In contrast, the Luwian cuneiform texts, the bulk of which is published in transliteration in Starke 1985, are almost invariably embedded into the Hittite narrative frame. The Luwian insertions are commonly introduced by Hit-

¹ This paper is written under the auspices of the international project “Luwili: Luwian Religious Discourse between Anatolia and Syria”, co-directed by both authors of this paper and funded by the ANR (France, ANR-17-FRAL-0007-01) and DFG (Germany, YA 472/2–1). Susanne Görke (Marburg), H. Craig Melchert (Carrboro, NC), and David Sasseville (Marburg) read the draft of this article and made valuable remarks, while Vladimir Shelestin (Moscow) advised us on specific issues related to the topic of our investigation. Manfred Hutter (Bonn), Elisabeth Rieken (Marburg), and Zsolt Simon (München) made available to us their forthcoming papers. All the individuals and organisations mentioned above deserve our heartfelt gratitude. All the linguistic generalisations about the Luwian corpora, unless attributed otherwise, are made on the basis of the ACLT database (web-corpora.net/LuwianCorpus/search/) and can be independently replicated by other users. The following specialised bibliographic abbreviations are used in the text of this paper: CHD – *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*, H.G. Güterbock, H. Hoffner, and Th. van den Hout (ed.); CTH – *Catalog der Texte der Hethiter* (www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/CTH/); KBo – *Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi*, Leipzig, Berlin; KUB – *Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi*, Berlin.

tite sentences such as KUB 9.31 ii 20–21 *nu lu-ú-i-li ki-iš-ša-an hu-uk-ki-iš-ke-ez-zi* ‘(s)he conjures thus in Luwian’.

Such a state of affairs has a sociolinguistic explanation: the available cuneiform tablets with Luwian passages all emanate from the chanceries of Hattusa, where the main written language was Hittite, a close relative of Luwian. In contrast, the Luwian language was not regarded as suitable for the composition of official cuneiform texts in Hattusa chanceries. There are cases where direct speech utterances are introduced by the adverb *luwili* “in Luwian”, but then translated into Hittite. The embedded Luwian passages that avoided translation usually represent incantations, and one can assume that they were recorded in the original language because of their illocutionary force. A different sort of code-switching is the use of isolated Luwian words in Hittite texts. These occur in a wide variety of textual genres, predominantly in the texts written in the New Hittite ductus, and are frequently marked by special signs known as “gloss wedges” (*Glossenkeile*).

It was traditionally assumed that the two graphic systems deployed for writing Luwian were used for recording two different dialects. Consequently, the taxonomic terms Cuneiform Luwian and Hieroglyphic Luwian became standard among the Anatolianists (see e.g. Melchert 2003: 170–175). This basic dichotomy was challenged in Yakubovich 2010, primarily with reference to the status of the “*Glossenkeil* words”.

Developing some observations that are already found in Melchert 2003 and van den Hout 2006: 236, Yakubovich (2010) argued that these foreign words in Hittite cuneiform texts essentially reflect the same dialect as that of the hieroglyphic inscriptions. The lack of association between the “*Glossenkeil* words” with specific texts or even genres led him to the hypothesis that they reflect the Luwian dialect of the elites of Hattusa, the authors of the bulk of the compositions found in the cuneiform archives of this city. Since the longer Luwian hieroglyphic inscriptions of the Late Bronze Age all belong to the kings of Hattusa, it is easy to see how they can reflect the same dialect. The name “Empire Luwian”, proposed for this dialect in Yakubovich 2010, reflects the assumption that the prestigious variety of Luwian spoken in the capital was imitated by the provincial elites of the Empire of Hattusa (also known as the Hittite Empire). This explains why Iron Age Luwian / Late Luwian, the dialect of hieroglyphic inscriptions emanating from various Syro-Anatolian States (“Neo-Hittite States”) and continuing the cultural tradition of the Empire of Hattusa in 12th–8th centuries BCE, represents the descendant of Empire Luwian.

As for the Luwian incantations embedded in Hittite cuneiform texts, they must reflect dialects other than Empire Luwian on linguistic grounds. Some of them, e.g. the Luwian passages in a festival text KUB 35.133(+) (CTH 665), may have been dictated in the Luwian dialect of Hattusa before the formation of the imperial koine (cf. Yakubovich 2010: 21). Another special case are the Songs of Istanuwa (CTH 771–772), which were thought to reflect a particular Luwian dialect at least since Laroche 1959. These incantations, however, are relatively short and do not form the core of the Luwian cuneiform corpus. The label that Yakubovich (2010) assigned to the Luwian dialect determined to constitute the main counterpart of Empire Luwian was Kizzuwadna Luwian.

The new primary dichotomy in the classification of the Luwian dialects received a favourable response in the last decade. Among the papers who expressed support for the new solution are Melchert 2013: 159–160, Rieken 2017: 301–302, Giusfredi 2018: 80; it is also presented without objections in Hawkins 2013: 28.² It seems, however, that this near-consensus is pri-

² Simon 2016 represents an attempt to refute Hurrian influence on Kizzuwadna Luwian, which was presented in Yakubovich 2010 as the motivation for the key innovation of this dialect, namely the rise of a special

marily driven by the evaluation of linguistic isoglosses separating the two basic groups of texts, such as the distribution of the innovative acc.pl ending /-ntsi/ or the possessive constructions with plural possessors. Some scholars, notably Hawkins (2013), also address in passing the possible role of Hattusa scribes in the formation of Empire Luwian, but the geographic reality behind the term “Kizzuwadna Luwian” so far played little, if any role in the validation of the new hypothesis.

This is perhaps not a coincidence, because the positive arguments advanced thus far for the justification of the label Kizzuwadna Luwian are limited. There are only two cuneiform texts with Luwian insertions that contain internal references to Kizzuwadna. One of them is the well-preserved ritual of Zarpiya (CTH 757), which contains both Luwian and Hittite incantations, probably implying metaphorical code-switching (Yakubovich 2010: 282–283). The other is a tiny fragment KUB 35.8 (Starke 1985: 43).³ None of the other Luwian cuneiform texts available to date can be unambiguously assigned to Kizzuwadna, while some of them contain internal geographic references pointing in a different location. The main rationale behind assigning a variety of texts with Luwian insertions to Kizzuwadna was the presence of Hurrian loanwords in the respective compositions.

Today the availability of complete annotated corpora of Luwian cuneiform texts and the ongoing work on their translation undertaken within the framework of the Luwili project facilitate their analysis at a deeper level. In what follows we intend to offer a more nuanced version of the geographic and linguistic classification of Luwian incantations in cuneiform transmission. In Section Two, we intend to argue that a large group of cuneiform rituals with Luwian insertions yield conflicting cues as to their origin, showing significant parallels with the ritual tradition of the Lower Land of Hittite sources (parts of Classical Lycaonia and Cappadocia) as well as convergence with the Kizzuwadna rituals.⁴ In Section Three, we shall endeavour to demonstrate that another group of Luwian cuneiform texts, which received only cursory treatment in Yakubovich (2010), reflects the tradition of the town of Taurisa, probably situated to the northeast of Hattusa. Part of the texts belonging to both traditions is recorded in Middle Script, which pleads for their written fixation no later than in the Early New Kingdom period (early 14th century BCE). In the concluding Section Four, we shall explore the repercussions of the new data for the prehistory of the Luwian language and the development of its individual dialectal isoglosses.

possessive construction marking the plurality of the possessors. We shall return to this problem in the concluding section of this paper. For the time being, however, it is only important to observe that Simon 2016 accepts Kizzuwadna Luwian as a taxonomic unit.

³ The analysis of the formulaic content of the fragments undertaken with the framework of the Luwili project is conducive to grouping together KUB 35.8 with KBo 29.36, KBo 29.47, KUB 32.124, KUB 35.65, and KUB 35.68, all featuring Luwian incantations. The peculiarities of KUB 35.8 that speak in favour of such a cluster is the mention of a sheep in combination with a bovine, presumably as sacrificial animals, and the reconstructed reference to the tandem of an evil woman and an evil man. We assign the number CTH 763.1 to this group and believe that it eventually became integrated into the Kuwattalla tradition (for the general problem of Kizzuwadna influence on the evolution of the Kuwattalla tradition, cf. Section 2.2 below). At the same time, the form *ši-wa-an-na* attested in KUB 35.8 i 6 can hardly be separated from Hitt. *šiwannali-*, a noun of unknown meaning occurring in the texts of the Tunnawiya tradition (CHD Š: 488a). Note in particular its occurrence in the fragment KUB 35.146, which features code-switching between Hittite and Luwian, but also exhibits significant parallels with the Tunnawiya tradition, as convincingly argued in Pisaniello 2015.

⁴ See Yakubovich 2014 (submitted 2009) for a new etymology of Cappadocia, derived from what appears to have been the Hittite designation of the Lower Land. An independent account advocating the same connection but exhibiting formal differences is Casabonne 2012.

2. Ritual Tradition of the Lower Land

2.1. Tunnawiya and Kuwattalla

The goal of this subsection is to address similarities between the ritual traditions of Tunnawiya and Kuwattalla, which in turn represent an argument for the Lower Land origin of many fragments with Luwian insertions. Before proceeding to the discussion of individual texts, it is appropriate to address briefly our understanding of the word “tradition”. We accept the arguments presented in Miller 2004 and Christiansen 2006 in favour of the ongoing modification of ritual texts in Hattusa chanceries and believe that the list of secondary products of court scholarship is likely to be extended in the future. The elite group of scholar-scribes, discussed in van den Hout 2015, would supply the most likely milieu for the modification of the pre-existent ritual texts. At the same time, we accept the historicity of ritualists mentioned in the Hittite sources, and believe that at least some rituals were recorded in close cooperation with their practitioners.⁵ The last assumption is particularly necessary in the instance of rituals with Luwian incantations, which reflect dialects other than that of Hattusa and therefore could not represent a product of Hattusa scribes.⁶ This means in practice that the tradition associated with a particular ritualist (based on the combination of internal references and the commonality of structural features) may contain both original texts recorded from the respective performer and the result of their adaptation and amalgamation in scribal circles (or by other ritual practitioners).⁷

The Lower Land is the name assigned in Hittite sources to the southern part of the Central Anatolian Plateau from the 14th century BCE onward. Manfred Hutter (2003: 243–247) discussed at some length the festival of Huwassanna, worshiped as the divine queen of Hupisna, as a specimen of Lower Land religious literature. This is a straightforward assumption, given that the Bronze Age toponym Hupisna can be identified Hellenistic Κυβίστρα, the name of a town in southern Cappadocia (Laroche 1979: 67, fn. 25). The rituals of Ambazzi constitute another likely specimen: besides the Luwian names of supernatural entities mentioned in CTH 391 (Alauwaimi and Tarpatassi), the sacrificial practice described in CTH 391 is similar to that of the Hupisna festivals (Mouton 2012: 133–134). But the most straightforward candidates for exponents of the Lower Land tradition within the corpus of Hittite rituals is a group of compositions attributed to the Old Woman Tunnawiya (CTH 409).

The name Tunnawiya can be most straightforwardly explained as “sent by (the god of) Tunna” (Mouton 2015: 86, modifying the hypothesis of Yakubovich 2013a: 102–103). From the structural viewpoint, this name is parallel to some other female theophoric onomastic compound containing surface toponyms, such as Halpawiya “sent by (the Storm-god) of Aleppo” or Ziplantawiya “sent by (the Storm-god) of Zippalanda”.⁸ It is, however, to be noted that unlike the cults of Aleppo and Zippalanda, the cult of Tunna did not play a prominent role in the Kingdom of Hattusa at the state level. Therefore, an individual carrying the name Tunnawiya is likely to have a family connection with the town of Tunna, situated in the Lower Land (probably the archaeological site of Zeyve Höyük – Porsuk) and well-attested in Hittite

⁵ An illustration of such a phenomenon has been provided in Marcuson and van den Hout 2015.

⁶ For the discussion of dialectal interference in the course of copying Luwian incantations, see Yakubovich 2010: 28–29.

⁷ In contrast with Miller 2004: 522, cf. the more nuanced discussion in Pisaniello 2015: 31–32.

⁸ Note that if one accepts the earlier interpretations of these names as ‘woman of Tunna’, ‘woman of Aleppo’, ‘woman of Zippalanda’ etc., their connection with the respective toponyms becomes only more straightforward. For reasons to reject the interpretation of the Luwian element /wija-/ as ‘woman’, see Yakubovich 2013a.

sources (del Monte and Tischler 1978: 439). There is no contradiction between this hypothesis and the fact that Tunnawiya is called ^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI [^{URU}]HATTI ‘Old Woman of Hattusa’ in KBo 21.1 i 1, because she may have been practiced in Hattusa in adulthood, or, somewhat less likely, the scribe may have associated her with the whole Kingdom of Hattusa rather than its capital.

Another consideration fleshes out the connection between Tunnawiya and South-central Anatolia. A distinct feature of the Tunnawiya tradition is the presence of the ^DIM *ariyattalli-*, which can be literally interpreted as “Storm-god of the Crag”.⁹ Now the same deity occurs with a different possessive suffix in a curse formula of an 8th-century hieroglyphic text KULULU 1 (cf. Hutter 1988: 67–68), a new translation of which is provided under (1) below.¹⁰ The broader context of KULULU 1 makes it clear that after being restrained with the help of a mountain the evil-doer will be devoured by a supernatural dog. For our purposes, it is significant that both Kululu and Tunna ultimately belonged to the geographic area known as Tabal in the early first millennium BCE. It is, therefore, likely that the cult of the “Storm-god of the Crag” is identified with the area of Tabal, which in turn exhibits significant overlap with the late-second-millennium Lower Land (cf. Hutter 2003: 248).¹¹

(1) KULULU 1 § 10, cf. Hawkins 2000, II: 443

l̄á-pa-ti-pa-wa/i	l̄a+ra/i-ta-la-si-sá	l̄(DEUS)TONITRUS-hu-u-za-sá
abatti=ppa=wa	arittallassis	Tarxuntsas
he.DAT.SG=then=PTCL	crag.POSS-NOM.SG.C	Tarhunt.NOM.SG

l̄á-pa-si-na	l̄a+ra/i-ta-li-na	l̄INFRA-ni ² -na	l̄ha-pa-za-nu-wa/i-tu-u
abassin	arittallin	INFRA-nin	xabantsanuwattu
he.POSS-ACC.SG.C	of.crag.ACC.SG.C	bottom.ACC.SG	use.as.fastener.3SG.IMP

“Let Tarhunt of the Crag make attached to him the lower part (of) his crag!”

The anthropological side of the Tunnawiya rituals is addressed in Mouton 2015. Comparing them with three established clusters of ritual texts, Arzawa rituals, Kizzuwadna rituals, and texts with Hittian cultural background, Mouton comes to the conclusion that they display certain parallels with all of the three groups: the ritual use of combs is shared with Arzawa, that of wine for purification and ritual spitting into the mouth of an animal-substitute are common with Kizzuwadna, the conjuration of the nine/twelve body parts of the patient is inherited from the Hittian substrate. At the same time, the Tunnawiya rituals possess specific

⁹ The rationale for interpreting the adjective /arittali(ja/i)-/ as referring to an elevated landscape feature is its perceived connection with the Luwian verb /ari-(^{ti})/ ‘to raise, rise’. The traditional interpretation of Luw. **ariyatt(i)-* was ‘mountain’ but Gérard (2006) plausibly argued that the principal Luwian word for ‘mountain’ is /watt(i)-/. Given the geographic distribution of the divine epithet /arittali(ja/i)-/, it is likely that it refers to a specific landscape feature that was prominent in the area under discussion, such as the protruding rock formations, typical of Cappadocia and the areas immediately to the south and constituting the local tourist attraction.

¹⁰ The interpretation of *ha-pa-za-nu-wa/i-* as ‘to make attached’ is based on the comparison of this verb with Luw. /xab(a)i-(^{di})/ ‘to bind’, commonly used in ritual incantations, such as (6) below, and /xabantsu-/ ‘loyal, attached’, for which see Melchert 1988: 236–240.

¹¹ Note that KULULU lead strip 1 makes references to the towns of Upper and Lower Tun(n)a (Hawkins 2000, II: 506–507). The preferred tentative hypothesis of Hawkins 2000, II: 431–432 is to locate the twin towns in the immediate vicinity of Kululu, separating them from Tunna of the Hittite sources, although he admits various possibilities (cf. Hawkins 2000, II: 432, fn. 75). For fairness’ sake one must observe that the cite of Kululu is situated outside the borders of the historical Lower Land, not far from the Bronze Age town of Nesa and modern Kayseri. The Lower Land was, however, the most probable source of Luwian migrations or language shift into this area, which must previously have been populated by the speakers of Hittite/Nesite.

traits which they do not share with any other ritual tradition: the ritual use of a model of the *wawarkima*- door element and the mention of the “Storm-god of the Crag” are unique within the ritual corpus of Hittite Anatolia. This situation is perfectly consistent with the geographic location of the Lower Land at the crossroads of Anatolia, in the centroid of a triangle formed by Arzawa, Kizzuwadna, and the region of Hattusa.

The research history, summarised in Mouton 2015: 85–86, bears out the identification between the Tunnawiya tradition and the town Tunna in the Lower Land as the mainstream solution, advocated already in the first edition of the best-preserved ritual text belonging to this tradition (Goetze/Sturtevant 1938: 28, cf. Hutter 1988: 56, Hutter 2003: 248, Miller 2004: 453, Yakubovich 2010: 20). Miller (2004: 452–458) adduces a number of specific textual arguments against the Kizzuwadna origin of the compositions mentioning Tunnawiya. It is, therefore, our aim to pursue the implications of this discussion for the geographic origin of a closely related tradition, which is associated with the attendant woman Kuwattalla and the Old Woman Šilalluhi (CTH 759–763). The compositions of this group, some of which are recorded in Middle Script, are treated among the Kizzuwadna rituals in Hutter (2003: 253–254) and Hutter 2019, while their incantations are booked as specimens of the Luwian dialect of Kizzuwadna in Yakubovich 2010: 18–20 and Mouton 2014: 579.

We now submit that the attempts to assign the Tunnawiya and Kuwattalla traditions to separate quarters would be extremely unlikely in view of the close and non-trivial similarities between the ritual formulae used in the two groups of texts. A particularly well-studied case is that of the Hittite incantations embedded in the “Ritual of the Ox” (KUB 9.4+) and the quasi-parallel Luwian incantations in KUB 35.43(+). The “Ritual of the Ox”, although lacking internal attribution, was safely assigned to the Tunnawiya tradition based on the parallelism of many of its parts with those of the *taknaz dā*- ritual of Tunnawiya (Beckman 1990, cf. Mouton 2015: 81). Starke (1985: 136) linked KUB 35.43(+) to the Kuwattalla tradition in view of the transparent similarities of its Luwian incantations with those assigned to Kuwattalla’s “Great Ritual” on the basis of their colophons. Both attributions stood the test of time, and consequently the two texts are now booked under CTH 409 and CTH 761 respectively. But long before they were made, Laroche (1959: 147–151) effectively used the formulaic parallelism between the same texts in order to approach the interpretation of the Luwian incantations.¹² It is fair to say that KUB 9.4+ and KUB 35.43(+) functioned as quasi-bilinguals for decipherment purposes. This point can be illustrated with the following parallel passages, which refer to the manipulations involving a scapegoat and the ritual patron:

(2) KUB 9.4+ ii 18–21 (CTH 409.IV.Tf02.A), cf. Beckman 1990: 37

GÜB-laz=(z)a=an=ta		hūinunun	nu=(š)ši=kan
left.ABL=COORD=he.ACC.C=thee.DAT		drive.1SG.PRT	PTCL=he.DAT=PTCL
GÜB-latar	dāš	ZAG-na=ma=an=da	hūinunun
sinisterness.ACC.SG	take.3SG.PRT	right.ALL=COORD=he.ACC.C=thee.DAT	drive.1SG.PRT
nu=(t)ta=kan	idālu	hadugatar	dāš
PTCL=thee.DAT=PTCL	evil.ACC.SG.N	terror.ACC.SG	take.3SG.PRT

‘I drove him to your left, so that he took his(!) sinisterness. I drove him to your right, so that he took your evil terror.’

¹² This explains why these two texts had originally been assigned the number CTH 760 (Laroche 1971: 136). Laroche had originally reserved this number for the texts of the Kuwattalla tradition with demonstrable parallels in the Tunnawiya tradition. Note that the attribution of KUB 35.43(+) to Tunnawiya is still argued based on the structural features of this text in Marcuson 2016: 290.

(3) KUB 35.43(+) ii 16–18 (CTH 761), cf. Starke 1985: 144

i-pa-la-a-ti-du-wa-an	hu-i-[n]u-wa-ah-ha	a-du-ut-ta	i-pa-la-a-ti-en
ibaladi=du(w)=an	x ^w inuwa ^x xa	a=du=tta	ibaladin
left.INSTR=he.DAT=he.ACC.C	drive.1SG.PRT	PTCL=he.DAT=PTCL	sinisterness.ACC.SG
la-at-ta	i-šar-ú-i-la-t[i-p]a-du-wa-an	hu-u-i-nu-wa-ah-ha	
latta	isarwiladi=ba=du(w)=an	x ^w inuwa ^x xa	
take.3SG.PRT	right.INSTR=COORD=thee.DAT=he.ACC.C	drive.1SG.PRT	
a-du-ut-ta	at-tu-wa-li-in	h[a-a]t-ta-aš-ta-ri-in	la-at-ta
a=du=tta	attuwalin	xattastarin	latta
PTCL=he.DAT=PTCL	evil.ACC.SG.C	terror.ACC.SG	take.3SG.PRT

‘I drove him to his left, so that he took his sinisterness. I drove him to his right, so that he took his evil terror.’

In fact, the comparison of (2) and (3) is conducive to a stronger claim, namely the reconstruction of Luwian incantations in the redactional history of the “Ritual of the Ox”. As observed in Beckman 1990: 51, the vacillation between the second and the third person pronouns with reference to the ritual patron in (2) implies that the text “is obviously not in order here”. The comparison with (3) helps to qualify the origin of this error: the Luwian indirect object pronominal clitic /du/ can mean both “to you (sg.)” and “to him”, and the distinction between the second- and third-person interpretations can be established only by context. The corpus analysis of the Kuwattalla rituals suggests that the ritual patron is always addressed there in the third person, hence the translation proposed for (3) above. But the scholar-scribe responsible for translating some of the relevant incantations from Luwian into Hittite and embedding them into the Tunnawiya tradition did not attempt to generalise over the Kuwattalla corpus. Therefore, he was understandably confused, since the pragmatics of the incantation under discussion is compatible as such with both second-person and third-person interpretations.

If the parallel discussed above were isolated, one could argue that it represents an instance of secondary convergence between originally unrelated traditions. This is, however, not the case. The structural similarities between the texts attributed to Tunnawiya and Kuwattalla played a prominent role in the recent dissertation Marcuson 2016, written within the anthropological paradigm. Focusing on the role of the “Old Woman” in these ritual texts, Hannah Marcuson did not either tackle the question of the traditional CTH numbering of the latter or pursue the implications of her analysis for localising the Kuwattalla tradition, presumably because this topic lay outside the immediate scope of her dissertation research. But the degree of similarity between these texts, as discussed by Marcuson, militates against the assumption that they reflect practices of two different geographic areas. Therefore, if one accepts the evidence for connecting Tunnawiya with the Lower Land, we gain a serious argument for assigning the origin of the Kuwattalla tradition to the same region.¹³

Once this step has been made, this opens the possibility that the ritual for the purification of the house attributed to Puriyanni (CTH 758) likewise can be connected with the Lower Land rather than Kizzuwadna. The Luwian incantations embedded within this text do not show any resemblance to those of the Kizzuwadna ritual attributed to Zarpiya (CTH 757) but find close parallels within the Kuwattalla tradition. Thus, in both cases we find incantations

¹³ A comprehensive list of non-trivial similarities between the incantations of the Tunnawiya and Kuwattalla traditions was provided by Alice Mouton in her presentation at the conference “Contacts in Pre-Hellenistic Anatolia and Ancient Near East - From Languages to Texts” (Verona, 25–27 February 2021). The content of this talk will be incorporated into the philological edition of the Puriyanni and Kuwattalla traditions, currently in preparation by both authors of this paper.

prescribing the activities of the scapegoat. One feature they have in common is the literary figure consisting in the use of merisms for the classification of the negative phenomena to be carried away: “past or present/future, internal or external, of the living or the dead...” (Mouton and Yakubovich 2019). Another feature, which also finds parallels in Tunnawiya’s incantations, is the enumeration of the scapegoat’s body parts (cf. e.g. KUB 35.54 iii 9–11, Starke 1985: 68 vs. KUB 35.43(+) iii 24’–27’, Starke 1985: 143). An additional set of incantations common to the Puriyanni and Kuwattalla rituals introduces Luw. /talupp(i)-/ ‘a lump of dough’, which apparently also has the ability to carry away the miasma (cf. e.g. KUB 35.55:5’–7’, Starke 1985: 70–71 vs. KUB 32.9(+) obv. 2–6, Starke 1985: 87).¹⁴ Since the origin of Puriyanni is not mentioned anywhere in the text, the hypothesis of its connection with the Lower Land must also be given a fair hearing.

A linguistic argument in favour of localising both Kuwattalla and Puriyanni traditions in the Lower Land comes from the syntax of Luwian incantations in the respective corpus. As maintained in Mouton and Yakubovich 2020, their distinctive feature is the proleptic construction, which combines verbal fronting and clitic doubling.¹⁵ For example, the literal way of saying ‘The ritual patron is breaking the evil tongue’ found in these incantations is “(He) is breaking it, the ritual patron, the evil tongue” (KBo 29.3+ iii 17’). As argued in the same paper with reference to Adiego 2015, this Luwian construction is situated halfway between the verb-final syntax typical of most Luwian dialects and the Lycian construction with nasalised preterit, which ultimately reflects the grammaticisation of redundant clitic pronouns appended to clause-initial verbal forms (Mouton and Yakubovich 2020: 213–214). Since the Luwian proleptic construction is demonstrably innovative, linking its origin to the dialectal area that was adjacent to the territory of (pre-)Lycian language community represents the most economical solution. The Lower Land, situated as it was in the central-western part of Asia Minor, clearly qualifies better as such an area than Kizzuwadna, even though one cannot tell precisely how far this innovation eventually spread to the east.

A religious argument in favour of localising Puriyanni ritual tradition in the Lower Land is the mention of the divine epithet *parattašši-* ‘of impurity’ attributed to the Storm-god of the Open Country (KUB 7.14(+) i 2–3). This epithet can only be found in one other religious text, namely KBo 29.33+ iii 6’ (CTH 694.1) which is a fragment describing a festival for Huwasanna, the most important distinct goddess of the Lower Land. In this fragment, the epithet also qualifies a Storm-god.¹⁶

2.2. Kuwattalla, Šilalluhi, and Mastigga

Against such a background, one has to re-examine the arguments that were traditionally adduced for the Kizzuwadna connections of the Kuwattalla tradition. They were recently summarised in Kaynar 2017: 190–191 and Kaynar 2019: 108 with reference to the earlier work of other scholars (Hutter 2003, Yakubovich 2010, Beckman 2011, Melchert 2013). This list includes the appearance of several Hurrian theonyms, such as Hebat, Šawoška, and Ninatta, the use of the West Semitic loanword /xalal(i)-/ ‘pure’, a reference to purification by blood, and the Hittite technical terms *keldi-* and *nakkušši-*, both of Hurrian origin. We intend to argue that

¹⁴ The mentions of a “pure *taluppi-*” in the so-called Ritual of Kizzuwadna (CTH 479.1: see Ünal 2017, § 4’–5’) might reflect the permeability of certain ritual traits among neighbouring regions (in this case Lower Land and Kizzuwadna). For more instances of the same phenomenon, cf. the discussion in the following section.

¹⁵ The exhaustive English-language discussion of the proleptic construction will be presented in an appendix to our forthcoming edition of the Puriyanni and Kuwattalla traditions.

¹⁶ We are grateful to Laura Puértolas Rubio for bringing this point to our attention.

Kizzuwadna features of the relevant rituals mostly arose in the course of their adaptation in Hattusa.

The hypothesis of secondary interference is compatible with what we know on extralinguistic grounds. The incipits or colophons of several texts belonging to the group under discussion attribute them not to the attendant woman Kuwattalla but to the Old Woman Šilalluhi, or the tandem of both ritual practitioners. As already suggested by Starke (1985: 74), the texts of the “Great Ritual” with colophons mentioning Kuwattalla alone, namely KUB 35.24+ and KUB 32.9(+), belong to the oldest layer of the tradition. The work of the Luwili project was conducive to confirming that these two pieces belong to the same manuscript, to which one can also assign the smaller fragments KUB 32.10+, KUB 35.23, and KBo 29.15. We classify this earliest version of the Great Ritual as CTH 761.1. No Hurrian loanwords have been identified within this group thus far, which does not mean that they could not exist in the lost portions of the relevant manuscript, but suggests that they were infrequent. In contrast, Šilalluhi’s name certainly has a Hurrian origin, cf. the Hurrian professional title *šilalluhi* (Richter 2012: 375). Accordingly, it is tempting to hypothesise that certain Hurrian elements were introduced into the Kuwattalla tradition when Šilalluhi established collaboration with Kuwattalla or undertook a revision of her rituals. It seems, however, unlikely that the “Old Woman” Šilalluhi was acting alone, presumably the modification of the tradition reflected the expectations of the ritual patrons.

If the Hurrian elements represent a secondary phenomenon within the tradition of Kuwattalla, it is worth asking where and when they may have been added. One can approach the answer to this question from the prosopographic viewpoint. We know that king Arnuwanda I and Queen Ašmunikkal granted land to the attendant woman Kuwattalla, presumably in reward for her services (Hutter 2003: 253). If we exclude a hypothesis of two different women sharing the same name and title, this is as close as we can get to actually proving the connection between Hattusa and the first written record of the Kuwattalla tradition. But the implied chronology also accommodates well the Hurrian influence upon its subsequent development. We know that new Hurrian rituals were composed in Hattusa and/or Sapinuwa during the reign of Tudhaliya II/III, son of Arnuwanda I, who is also known under the Hurrian name Tašmi-Šarri. Furthermore, several Hurrian compositions, of which the Song of Release and the Kumarbi cycle are the best-known examples, probably reached Hattusa at about the same time.¹⁷ The prestige of the Hurrian religion in Hattusa in mid-fourteenth century BCE may have also inspired the efforts of Šilalluhi leading to the adaptation of the Hittite-Luwian rituals from the Lower Land.

A likely trace of such an adaptation is the appearance of Hurrian concepts in the incipits KUB 35.18(+) and KBo 29.3+¹⁸ introducing the combined performance of the ritual *katta walhuwaš* (literally “of striking down”) and the “Great Ritual”.¹⁹ This version of the Kuwattalla tradition,

¹⁷ The question of Hurrian impact on the state cult of Hattusa in the Early New Kingdom is likely to acquire a new dimension after the comprehensive publication of texts from Ortaköy, but in the meanwhile see Corti 2017b as a recent stance on this complicated issue.

¹⁸ The direct join KBo 29.3 + KUB 35.45, made first by Annelies Kammenhuber but largely ignored in subsequent scholarship, was recently reaffirmed in Sasseville 2020: 113–114. For the parallel description of scapegoat activities in this text and the Ambazzi ritual, see Marcuson 2016: 295–296.

¹⁹ Cf. e.g. KUB 35.18(+) i 2–7: *ma-a-an an-tu-uh-š[i] kat-ta wa-al-h[u-u-wa-aš SÍSKU]R ši-pa-an-du-wa-ni na-aš-ta ma-ah-ha-an I-NA U₄.3.KAM kat-ta wa-al-hu-u-wa-aš S[ÍSKU]R aš-nu-me-ni [n]a-an I-NA U₄.3.KAM pa-ra-a GAL-li-pát a-ni-u-u[r a]p-pu-ú-e-ni nu ki-i tum-me-ni* ‘When we perform the ritual *katta walhuwaš* for a person, and when we complete the ritual *katta walhuwaš* on the third day, on the (same) third day we take up the “Great Ritual”, and we take the following (implements)’. The *katta walhuwaš* ritual is the Hittite rendering of the name of the *dupaduparša*-ritual (Hutter 2019: 381 and Sasseville 2020: 111 with ref.).

which we book under CTH 760, demonstrably postdates CTH 761.1. The first one is attributed to both Kuwattalla and Šilalluhi, the performer of the second one is a practitioner from the town Ziluna, whose name has not been lost in a lacuna. We know, however, that Ziluna lies in a likely Hurrian milieu, on a road from Hattusa to northern Syria; therefore, according to the hypothesis of Sasseville 2020: 113, the performer from Ziluna is most probably to be equated with Šilaluhhi. In both instances the references to the *keldi* sacrificial rite and smearing feet with blood are found in a close juxtaposition in fragmentary contexts. The second fragment also mentions the *nakkušši* (scapegoat) rite.²⁰ So far as we can judge, both incipits describe essentially the same implements and the difference between the two is mainly stylistic. The restored translation presented below is based on the assumption that the number of sheep used for individual rites must total eight in each case.

- (4) KUB 35.18(+) i 8–15 (CTH 760), cf. Starke 1985: 91

8. [8] UDU^{HÁ} Û 1 MÁŠ.GAL' *na-aš-ta A-NA '8' UDU^{HÁ}*

9. [i]š-tar-na 1 UDU GE₆ ŠÀ.BA '2' UDU^{HÁ} *a-ni-u-ra-aš*

10. [1] UDU BABBAR 1 UDU GE₆ 2 UDU^{HÁ}-m[a] 'i' *'-ik-ku-na-at-ta-aš*

11. [1 UDU] *šar-la-a-at-ta-aš* [1 UDU].SÍG+MUNUS *na-an-za*

12. [ti-i-ta-a]n-da-an U[DU-un ha]l-zi-iš-ša-an-zi

13. [...] x [...](-)x-uš GÌR-ŠU-NU a-aš-har-nu-um-ma-'in-ti'²¹

14. [...] I-NA] U₄.4.KAM *ke-el-di-ya-aš*

15. [A-NA SÍSKUR *ku-in da-an*]-zi

‘[Eight] sheep and one billy goat. [A]mong the eight sheep, one black sheep (and other sheep) among which two sheep of the (main) ritual, [(namely) one] white sheep (and) one black sheep, two sheep of the *ikkunatt*-rite, [one sheep] of the *šarlatt*-rite, [one e]we – they call it ‘sh[ee]p’ (with) [su]cklings’.

[One sheep with whose] blood they smear their [...] feet, [one sheep ..., whom on] the fourth day they [tak]e [to] the *keldi*-[rite].’

- (5) KBo 29.3+ i 5–9 (CTH 760), cf. Starke 1985: 99

5. [8 UDU^{HÁ} Û 1 MÁŠ.GAL ŠÀ.BA] 2 UDU^{HÁ} *a-ni-u-ra-aš* BABBAR GE₆-ya

6. [2 UDU^{HÁ} *ik-ku-na-at-ta-aš* 1] UDU *šar-la-at-ta-aš* 1 UDU."SÍG+MUNUS" *ti-i-ta-an-ta-[aš]*

7. [...] GÌR]^{MEŠ}-ŠU-NU *ku-e-ez iš-har-nu-ma-an-zi*

8. [...] I-NA U₄.4.KAM *ke-el]-di-ya-aš* A-NA SÍSKUR *da-an-zi*

9. [...] k]at-ta-an *na-ak-ku-uš-ša-hi-ti da-an-zi*

‘[Eight sheep and one billy goat among wh]ich two sheep of the (main) ritual, (namely one) white and (one) black, [two sheep of the *ikkunatt*-rite, one] sheep of the *šarlatt*-rite, one ewe having suckling(s), [one sheep ...] with whose blood they smear their [feet ..., one sheep, which on the fourth day] they take to the [kel]di-rite, [one billy goat, which] they take along for the scapegoat rite.

Furthermore, it is appropriate to point out that the variation in animal offerings is directly attested through the fragmentary incipit (6), whose attribution to the Kuwattalla tradition was

²⁰ One must stress that the discussion here concerns the use of Luwian forms that are ultimately derived from Hurrian **nakkošše* ‘release’, and not the scapegoat rite as such. The latter represents an integral part of the Puriyanni and Kuwattalla traditions, but is also well known in Arzawa, where direct Hurrian influence can safely be ruled out.

²¹ The form restored here as *a-aš-har-nu-um-ma-'in-ti'* appears to represent a Luwian counterpart of Hitt. *iš-har-nu-ma-an-zi* ‘they smear with blood’, attested in (13). Its comparison with KBo 29.6(+) rev. 18' *a-aš-har-nu-um-m[i-ti]* suggests the interpretation of its stem as /asxarnumm(a)i-(di)/.

recently stressed in Hutter 2019: 384. It is easy to see that the total only four sheep are required for this version of the ritual, and only one sheep is necessary for the *ikkunatt*-rite, whereas twice as many sheep are mentioned in (4–5) in each of the two cases. Furthermore, although smearing feet with blood and the *nakkušši*-rite can be restored in (6), the *keldi*-rite was demonstrably absent in this version of the ritual, at least, it does not occur in its expected position. The passage under discussion confirms the hypothesis that individual rites could be added or removed as the tradition evolved, which in turn implies that the lost incipit of CTH 761.1 could easily lack references to any of the Hurrian concepts.

(6) Bo 4388: 3'–5' (CTH 763), cf. Fuscagni 2007: 70–71

3'. *nu* 4 UDU^{HÁ}-*pát* Û MÁŠ.GAL [...]

4'. 1 UDU *ik-ku-na-at-ta-aš* 1 UDU [...]

5'. *iš-har-nu-ma-an-zi* 1 MÁŠ.GAL-*ma* A-N[A ...]

'Four sheep and one billy goat [...], one sheep of the *ikkunatt*-rite, one sheep [...], one sheep [...] they smear [their feet], and one billy goat for [...].

In the light of this general observation, one can now consider the empirical evidence for distribution of Hurrian features within the Kuwattalla tradition. The most solid cluster is formed by the derivatives of Hurr. **nakkošše* 'release'. The Middle Script fragments KBo 9.141 and KUB 35.15 (CTH 761.2), both characterised by the archaic spelling *BE-EL SÍSKUR* for 'ritual patron', contain the description of a *nakkušši*-rite and Luwian incantations featuring the forms /nakkussaunta/ 'we released a scapegoat' and /nakkussaxidi/ 'with the release of the scapegoat'. Yet the style of both fragments, which feature long Hittite narrative passages, is different from that of CTH 761.1, where the extended Luwian incantations are punctuated by very laconic Hittite instructions. It is, therefore, perfectly possible that despite their archaic outlook, the manuscripts collected under CTH 761.2 reflect a version of the Great Ritual that had evolved with Šilalluhi's collaboration. Another interesting case is KBo 10.42 iv 4', where the Hittite instrumental form *nakkuššit* 'with the scapegoat', occurs at the very end of the tablet, almost immediately before the colophon. Although the Hittite instrumental forms are archaic by definition, the restoration of the colophon suggests that the manuscript is attributed to both Kuwattalla and Šilalluhi. The other manuscripts featuring Hittite *nakkušši*- or its Luwian cognates appear to be more innovative.

As for the other two Hurrian features reflected in the incipits, they are fairly likely to reflect the secondary modification of the Kuwattalla tradition in the course of its written transmission. The only reference to smearing feet with blood outside the incipit section is the Luwian foreign word KBo 29.6(+) rev. 18' *a-aš-har-nu-um-m[i-ti]* occurring in Hittite context, just as *a-aš-har-nu-um-ma-in-ti* does in (4). The relevant fragment can be attributed to the late-thirteenth-century scribe Pariziti based on its ductus and therefore can be assigned to CTH 762. The next paragraph of the same fragment, KBo 29.6(+) rev. 20'–23', signals the arrival of the next day (the number is unclear), while the following one, KBo 29.6(+) rev. 24'–26', and refers to a sheep offering. It is tempting to see here the reference to a *keldi*-rite, but this oblique piece of evidence is isolated within the available corpus. Furthermore, the reconstruction of the sequence of ritual acts within the Kuwattalla tradition suggests that the rite involving smearing feet with blood and the *keldi*-rite to follow occur after all the other identifiable rites. Such a peripheral position is obviously compatible with the hypothesis of a later addition.²² In fact,

²² An additional candidate for a Luwian technical term of Hurrian origin was the *ikkunatt*-rite. According to the tentative proposal of Hutter 2019: 383–384, this term represents a derivative of Hurrian *egunni* 'pure'. In the meanwhile, however, a convincing Indo-European etymology for this term was offered in Sasseville 2021: 562–563.

there are no grounds to believe that any of these two rites had already been present in the free-standing version of the Great Ritual (CTH 761).

The hypothesis of secondary Hurrian influence derives further circumstantial support in the analysis of other Hurrian theonyms in the incantations of the Kuwattalla tradition. For example, the Hurrian goddess Ninatta (KUB 35.71+ iii 3'), Ištar of Nineveh (KUB 35.71+ ii 7–8), and unspecified *IŠTAR*/Šawoška (KUB 35.71+ iii 2') all appear in the same New Script fragment belonging to the free-standing version of the *dupaduparša*-ritual (CTH 759). The formula in KUB 35.71+ ii 6'–9' exhibits close similarity to the one in KBo 29.6(+) obv. 20'–21', but no reference to the Hurrian gods is found in the latter passage, which supports the hypothesis of their secondary insertion. A less trivial issue is the attestation of *IŠTAR*/Šawoška in KUB 35.82:7' (CTH 761.2). The Middle Script fragment KUB 35.82 shares its ductus with several other specimens of the Kuwattalla tradition, including KUB 35.34. On the plausible assumption that these fragments belong to the same manuscript, it displays a number of archaic features, including the designation *BE-EL SÍSKUR* for 'ritual patron'. Yet the phraseology of the *taluppi*-rite in KUB 35.34 is not at all similar to its counterpart in CTH 761.1, so there are no arguments for assigning this manuscript to Kuwattalla alone.²³

Several more items of Hurrian origin are attested in the *dupaduparša*-ritual (CTH 759).²⁴ Thus, the best-preserved tablet of this composition contains a mention of the Syro-Hurrian goddess Hapat (KUB 9.6+ ii 6'). The fragment KUB 35.83(+) can be attributed to the same ritual based, among other things, on the characteristic purification rite involving the *gangati*-plant. This fragment contains the possessive adjective [*h*]a-am-ri-ta-aš-ši-en-zi (ii 6'), which is derived from Hurr. *hamri* '(type of sanctuary)', and possibly even the adverb [*hur-l*]i-li 'in Hurrian' (iii 18'). The palaeographic analysis suggests that KUB 35.83(+) belongs to the same manuscript as the small fragments KUB 35.40+ and KUB 35.41, which contain colophons attributing the *dupaduparša*-ritual to the tandem of Šilalluhi and Kuwattalla. There are no versions of CTH 759 attributed to Kuwattalla alone, while all the manuscripts of this group exhibit the features of either New Script or Late New Script.

Nevertheless, not all the instances of "southeastern" influence upon the Kuwattalla tradition can or need be explained in the same fashion. Once we turn to the formulaic repertoire, we find suggestive parallels even in CTH 761.1, the Middle Script version of the "Great Ritual" attributed to Kuwattalla alone. For example, the notion of a 'divine path', securely restored in KUB 32.10+ obv. 10', finds parallels in the Hurrian-inspired Šalašu ritual and an oracle question concerning Šawoška of Samuha (Hutter 2019: 393–394), which prompts Hutter to conclude that "here we find an element of Hurrian tradition taken up by Kuwattalla in her Kizzuwadnaean surroundings". The presentation of a pot with vegetable soup in the Kuwattalla ritual is accompanied by the statement that the seeds contained there "will not become seed" (KUB 32.9(+) obv. 25); the same statement is made in connection with the presentation of a pot with dough and black cumin in the Mastigga ritual against the domestic quarrel (Miller 2004: 80–81, § 27). The sufficient assumption for tackling such cases is the formulaic continuity between the rituals of the Lower Land and Kizzuwadna. While this explanation is notionally distinct from the one advanced for Hurrianisms, it agrees well with what we know about the interaction between ritualistic traditions in the neighbouring regions (cf. the preceding subsection).

The Luwian noun *ikkuwar* (KUB 35.72 ii' 8'), from which the name of the *ikkunatt*-rite is ultimately derived, represents a straightforward formal cognate of Latin *iecur*, Greek ἥπαρ, and Vedic *yákṛt* 'liver'. The understanding of the *ikkunatt*-rite as "the rite of liver-treat" is borne out by the fact that this is the only preserved rite within the Kuwattalla tradition where gods are actually treated with liver.

²³ Cf. immediately above for the discussion of the *nakkušši*-rite in CTH 761.2.

²⁴ Contra Melchert (2013: 169), who stresses the lack of Hurrian influence on the *dupaduparša*-ritual.

More intriguing is the non-trivial structural resemblance between the rituals attributed to Kuwattalla and Šilalluhi, on the one hand, and the Mastigga tradition, on the other hand. Mastigga was known as “woman from Kizzuwadna”, and the Kizzuwadna features of the Mastigga tradition received extensive coverage in Miller 2004. We argue in detail in our forthcoming edition of the Kuwattalla tradition that the absolute majority of rites characterising Mastigga’s ritual against domestic quarrels (CTH 404.1) find their counterparts in this corpus. Here we will perform the opposite test, namely a brief analysis of CTH 761.1 under the prism of its possible parallels with CTH 404.1 (its division into paragraphs adopted in this paper follows Miller 2004).

The identified rites of CTH 761.1 include the manipulations with a symbol of miasma made of paste (KUB 32.10+), substitution rites involving a sheep and two additional animals (KUB 32.9(+) rev. 1'–14', KUB 35.24+ obv. 1'–36", and KBo 29.15), and the presentation of a pot with vegetable soup (KUB 32.9(+) obv. 19–34). They are punctuated by recurrent purification rites involving manipulations with a lump of dough and ablution with water (for the sequence, see KUB 32.9(+) rev. 15'–34'). All these building blocks of the “Great Ritual” have likely counterparts in CTH 404.1, especially if one interprets them with the help of the later versions of the Kuwattalla tradition.

The initial part of this rite (§§ 8–10, 15–17) features manipulations with human figurines, symbolising sources of witchcraft, as well as hands and tongues made of paste, symbolising its impact. Although the type of the paste object in KUB 32.10+ remains unclear, both the anthropomorphic figurines and body parts made of paste are deployed in the same functions in the later versions of the Kuwattalla tradition. The mammals used as substitutes in CTH 404.1 include sheep (§§ 20–21), black sheep (§§ 22–23), piglet (§§ 24–25) and puppy (§ 30). While the identification of animals in CTH 761.1 present difficulties, we learn from (4–5) that the Kuwattalla tradition availed itself of the white and black sheep, while Bo 4388 adds the piglet and puppy to the ritual inventory. As mentioned earlier in this subsection, the formula “it will not become seed” bridges the presentation of pots in the two tradition. In both cases the seeds’ failure to realise their procreative function is presumably compared with the failure of witchcraft. But the most significant parallel arguably involves the purification rites: the combined purification with water and dough is likewise repeatedly used in CTH 404.1 (§§ 19, 31).

When assessing the similarities between the Kuwattalla and Mastigga traditions, it is important to keep in mind that they primarily concern the Hittite frame of the rituals. This is in stark contrast to the parallels between the Kuwattalla and Tunnawiya traditions, which primarily involve Luwian incantations. One way to interpret this discrepancy in line with our previous findings is to assume that Kuwattalla’s “Great Ritual” was tailor-made in Hattusa to satisfy the taste of her royal patrons and perhaps other members of the local elites. This implied minimal interference with the subject matter of the incantations, especially given the fact that the Luwian language may not have been commonly understood at the time. The main focus must have been on the adjustment of the ritual’s subject matter and its performative aspects. Therefore, if our hypothesis holds, the Luwian insertions reflecting the best practices of the Lower Land could coexist with Kizzuwadna templates within the Kuwattalla tradition from the beginning of its written attestation.²⁵

One item that remains unexplained by the proposed scenario is /xalal(i)-/ ‘pure’, a West Semitic loanword in Luwian (del Olmo Lete and Sanmartín 2015: 354–355). This adjective is

²⁵ Going back to the *nakkušši*-rite, its presence in CTH 404.1 enhances the probability that its counterpart was also present in CTH 761.1. This is not, however, the same thing as to claim that the earliest version of the Kuwattalla tradition featured the reflexes of Hurr. **nakkošše* ‘release’. As a parallel, one can consider the Arzawa rituals, which frequently feature scapegoats but refer to them without resorting to Hurrian loanwords.

common to the texts of the Kuwattalla and Puriyanni traditions, including their oldest versions. One has no doubt that this lexeme was well integrated in the Luwian dialect under discussion, in particular because of the attested derivative /*xalalanussa-*/ ‘to purify’. It is, however, possible to question the relevance of this lexeme for determining the geographic background of the respective rituals. In KBo 11.2 i 10, we also find *ha-la-li-en-zi* as a foreign word in a Hittite text, endowed with the characteristic Empire Luwian ending acc.sg /-ntsi/ (Yakubovich 2010: 30). Therefore, in the second millennium BCE this Luwian lexeme probably functioned as the standard (pan-dialectal) equivalent of Hittite *parkui-* ‘pure’. The way the West Semitic adjective *hl* found its way into the Luwian language remains to be investigated, but this problem should be kept apart from Hurrian borrowings into a specific Luwian dialect.

Summing up, the presence of Hurrian loanwords and other Kizzuwadna features in the Kuwattalla tradition is undeniable, but most of them can be accounted for within the context of its evolution at the court of Hattusa. These findings need not contradict the hypothesis of inherited similarity between the rituals attributed to Kuwattalla and those from the Lower Land, which primarily manifests itself at the level of Luwian incantations.

3. The Tradition of Taurisa

3.1. The Taurisa Triad

The idea that certain Luwian incantations are connected with the area of Taurisa is in itself not new. Thus, Taracha (2009: 100) observes: “Central Anatolia was inhabited ... by Luwian population groups which had gained dominance in some centers, thus prompting changes in local beliefs. Among the gods of Tauriša, a town which ... should be located in the Zuliya/Çekerek basin, there are the Luwian Sun-god Tiwad and Kamrušepa appearing as the parents of the local LAMMA god with the Luwian epithet /*wasxatsa-*/ ‘(most) precious’.” Nonetheless, the implications of this observation for the spread of the Luwian language appear not to have been systematically pursued. This is rather unfortunate, because the valley of Zuliya/Çekerek is located to the east/northeast of Hattusa and to the north of the upper valley of Kızılırmak known as the Upper Land in Hittite sources (Corti 2017a: 237). Whether or not one may wish to refer to this area as Central, Northern, or Eastern Anatolia, this is clearly not a region that is prototypically associated with the Luwians, and yet it emerges as the likely birthplace of a group of Luwian incantations.

It is appropriate to review the facts that offer the philological justification of this conclusion. The theonym ^{URU}*Ta-ú-ri-ši-iz-za-aš* ‘(god) of Taurisa’ (KUB 35.107 iii 10') appears immediately above the Luwian narrative about the diseases, who were not invited to a banquet organised by the Sun-god and took offense (CTH 764). A gloss written above the line defines *Ta-ú-ri-ši-iz-za-aš* as *wa-aš-ha-az<-za-aš>* ^DLAMMA-*aš* <<*za-aš*>> ‘Most Precious Tutelary God’ (vel sim.).²⁶ Due to the join made by Jared Miller we have learned that the fragment KUB 35.107 belongs to

²⁶ The interpretation of Luw. /*wasxatsa-*/ as ‘(most) precious’ follows from the functional identity of Luw. *in-ga-a-an wa-aš-ha* KUB 35.54 ii 32' and KÜ.BABBAR-*an* KÜ.GI-*a[n]* ‘silver (and) gold’ in KUB 35.52+9'. As became increasingly clear with the join KBo 29.2 + KUB 35.52 (Sasseville 2021: 553–554), one is dealing here with two parallel versions of the Puriyanni ritual for the purification of the house (CTH 758), which sometimes diverge in their grammar but not in their substance. We interpret Luw. /*wasxa-*/ as ‘treasure’ and /*wasxatsa-*/ as its derived adjective, possibly with relative connotations, for which see Yakubovich 2013b. The earlier interpretation of /*wasxatsa-*/ as ‘sanctified, holy’ is reflected in the citation from Taracha 2009 immediately above, cf. also the translation ‘patron’ (Melchert 2015: 410). The choice between these two alternatives does not impact the main claims of the present paper.

the same tablet as the matching Hittite narrative about the offended deity (KBo 43.223 + KBo 9.127 + KUB 36.41). The main difference of the Hittite account is that in this case the offended deity is the “Great Deity” (DINGIR-LUM RA-BU-Ú). But the Protective god of Taurisa is also mentioned in the introduction to the Hittite account, and in fact the respective Hittite and Luwian sentences display a close match.

- (7) KBo 43.223 + i 13', CTH 764.I.A, cf. Steitler 2017: 388

[PL]AMMA URUTA-Ú-RI-ŠA A-NA 𐎶[UTU] A-BI-ŠU
 Tutelary.god Taurisa DAT Sun-god father.his
 t[ar-kum-mi-ya-u-an-z]i ti-i-e-et
 interpret.INF step.3SG.PRT

‘The Tutelary God of Taurisa began to explain to the Sun-god his father’.

- (8) KUB 35.107 iii 10', CTH 764.I.A, cf. Steitler 2017: 392

URUTa-ú-ri-ši-iz-za-aš wa-aš-ha-az<-za-aš> 𐎶LAMMA-aš <<za-aš>>
 Taurisitsas wasxatsas (K)runtiyas
 of.Taurisa.NOM.SG.C most.precious.NOM.SG.C Tutelary.god.NOM.SG
 𐎶UTU-ti-i da-a-ti-i tar-kum-mi-i-[ta]
 Tiwadi tadi tarkummiTa
 Sun-god.DAT.SG father.DAT.SG interpret.3SG.PRT

‘The Most Precious Tutelary God of Taurisa explained to the Sun-god (his) father’.

Several more fragments mention the Tutelary God in the Luwian context. The most informative one among them for our purposes is KBo 8.130 + KBo 29.25, classified now as CTH 766 following the suggestion of David Sasseville, who is also responsible for the join. There we find the dative phrase KBo 8.130+ rev. 9' [URU]Ta-ú-ri-ši-iz-za 𐎶LAMMA-ya ‘to the Tutelary God of Taurisa’, as well as the collocation KUB 8.130+ obv. 17 [...] 𐎶LAMMA-ya-aš MUNUSAMA-ni 𐎶Kam-r[u-še-pa-i] ‘the Tutelary God to Kamrusepa, (his) mother’, which introduces the third member of the Taurisa triad. But the occurrences of KUB 35.103(+) iii 4' [...] 𐎶LAMMA-ya in the pregnancy incantation (CTH 766) and KBo 13.260 i 35 [...] 𐎶LAMMA-ya-a[š] in the incantation for a sick child (CTH 765) are no less important, because they provide arguments for linking the respective large fragments to the Taurisa tradition. Since no specific protective gods other than that of Taurisa appear in Luwian cuneiform incantations, one can make an educated guess that the fragmentary attestations of 𐎶LAMMA in CTH 764–766 all refer to the same deity, while several forms of the adjective *Ta-ú-ri-ši-iz-za-* are probably lost in the lacunae.

The occurrences of the goddess Kamrusepa in Luwian passages are likewise compatible with the assumption that she is invariably mentioned there as the patron goddess of Taurisa. In addition to the fragments discussed above it also occurs in KUB 35.108(+) (CTH 766) and KUB 35.88 (CTH 765). The fragment KUB 35.108(+) does not contain a single complete line, but the juxtaposition of 𐎶Ti-wa-d[a-...] and 𐎶Kam-ru-še-pa-aš-ši-iš in lines 5' and 6' suggests that the two deities are mentioned together as heads of the Taurisa pantheon. The juxtaposition of 𐎶Kam-ru-ši-pa-aš in KUB 35.88 iii 9' and 𐎶Zu-li-ya-ya-a[n] in KUB 35.88 iii 10' is no less telling. The deity Zuliya occurs several times in the description of the rites for the Tutelary God of Taurisa in a version of the AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival (Galmarini 2015: 53). In fact, it is almost certain that Zuliya is a river goddess (cf. Haas 1994: 452), which brings us back to the assumed location of Taurisa on the river Zuliya. If the Luwian form 𐎶Zu-li-ya-ya-a[n] does not contain a dittography, it may well represent a substantivised possessive adjective in /-ja/i-/ derived from the hydronym.

Furthermore, the references to Kamrusepa in Hittite texts containing Luwian fragments also form a uniform cluster, which is equally compatible with the Taurisa connection. Before

the story of the angry Great Deity is told in Hittite in CTH 464.I.A, the Sun-god addresses Kamrusepa a question *i-ni-wa ku-it* ‘What is that?’ (KBo 43.223+ i 19’, Steitler 2017: 388). In KBo 12.89 iii 9’ (CTH 765), it is Kamrusepa who sees something from the sky and then poses the same question *i-ni-ma-wa ku-it* ‘But what is that?’, which is answered by another narrative about the divine banquet and an offended supernatural being. In KBo 12.100 iii 12–13 (CTH 765) Kamrusepa apparently sees again something from the sky, after which one can restore the sentence *wa-aš-ha-i[š] ᵀLAMMA URUᵀTA-Ú-RI-ŠA] A-NA ᵀUTU-wa tar-kum-mi-ya-[u-wa-an-zi ti-ya-at]* ‘The Most Precious Tutelary God of Taurisa began to explain to the Sun-god’ (cf. already Hutter 2003: 257). Needless to say, the sentence thus restored represents a paraphrase of (14).²⁷ Finally, KUB 35.90 is too fragmentary for any restorations, but even here the mention of Kamrusepa in line 5’ is followed by the possessive adjective *ᵀUTU-ša-an-za-a[n]* in line 7’.

It emerges from this discussion that the bulk of the fragments traditionally listed under CTH 764–766 form a closely-knit group, which exhibits connection with a particular divine triad. This fact was not always emphasised in the previous Hittitological discourse. Thus Hutter (2003: 231) addresses the function of Kamrusepa in the passages mentioned above together with the rituals collected on the *Sammeltable* KUB 7.1 + KBo 3.8, where she is mentioned in a company of the goddess Maliya and the god Pirwa. Making an additional step in the same direction, Yakubovich (2010: 23) views the possible Nesite affinities of Kamrusepa as a potential obstacle to localising the origin of CTH 764. Yet, once one steps back from attempts to generalise over isolated divine names and pays due attention to the systemic similarities, the segregation of texts connected with the triad of the Sun-god, Kamrusepa, and the Tutelary god of Taurisa ceases to cause difficulties (cf. already Starke 1985: 203).²⁸ As we shall see below, there are independent reasons to think that Kamrusepa has nothing to do with Nesa but represents an avatar of the Hattian goddess Katahzifuri in the texts under discussion.

The content of the fragments listed under CTH 764–766 is sharply different from the ritualistic traditions addressed in Section Two. Here we are mainly dealing not with rituals as such, but rather with incantations presented separately from the description of non-verbal acts, e.g. offerings, whether or not they had to be accompanied by such. Accordingly, they are introduced as Hitt. *hukmaiš* ‘conjuration’ or as its Akkadographic equivalent *ŠIPAT*, but not as *SISKUR* ‘ritual’. Furthermore, we do not have a single mention of a specific performer in connection with this group of texts: apparently the incantations mentioning members of the Taurisa triad were treated as folklore and did not require fixed authorship. As for their function, most of the texts grouped under CTH 764–766 concentrate on ensuring successful childbirth and fighting children’s diseases. The common designation of patients in these incantations is *DUMU.NAM.LÚ.U₁₉.LU* ‘human child’ / ‘human being’. With regard to their form, several of them contain historiolae, the best understood of which are the above-mentioned narratives of the divine banquet. The combination of these features clearly sets CTH 764–766 apart from the rest of the Luwian corpus, a conclusion that is anticipated in Starke 1985.²⁹

²⁷ External parallels to these formulaic passages are addressed below in 3.3.

²⁸ Another potential difficulty mentioned in Yakubovich 2010: 23 is the occurrence of *ᵀNu-ú-pa-ti-ga-aš* in KUB 35.108(+) iv 12’ (CTH 764). While there is no doubt that the god Nubadig has the Hurrian origin, the occurrence of this theonym in what apparently represents a formulaic divine list may well represent secondary influence. One can compare an equally isolated mention of *hurlaš ᵀInar* ‘Inar of the Hurrians’ in the Istanuwa tradition (KUB 35.135 iv 16’). For Hurrian influence on the religion of Hattusa in the Early New Kingdom period, cf. also 2.2 above.

²⁹ This generalisation is not meant to undermine the hypothesis that some of the incantations grouped under CTH 767 ultimately belong to the same tradition as CTH 764–766. The texts of this group, which certainly require further study, contain isolated Luwian code-switches, whereas our present paper focuses on longer Luwian utterances. It is also worth mentioning that some of the texts currently grouped under CTH 770 (unidentified Luwian fragments)

3.2. Anchoring the Taurisa tradition

But does this grouping guarantee that the texts mentioning the Taurisa triad are necessarily connected with Taurisa? The question is not as trivial as it may seem: one would, for example, hardly claim that all the texts mentioning the Storm-god of Zippalanda and his divine parents are necessarily connected with the town of Zippalanda, because the veneration of the Storm-god of Zippalanda was deeply integrated in the state cult of Hattusa. The cult expansion of the Goddess of the Night, documented in Miller 2004: 259–439, provides an illustration of how provincial pantheons could undergo changes in the Kingdom of Hattusa in the historical period. On the other hand, one could argue that the use of Luwian in CTH 764–766 reflects fairly recent demographic changes in Taurisa. The combination of these potential problems arguably contributed to underestimating the relevance of the “Taurisa connection” in the recent discussions of Luwian historical geography.

To begin with the geographic reality behind the cult of the Tutelary god of Taurisa, its welcome confirmation comes from a recent study of textual variation in the AN.TAH.ŠUM festival (Galmarini 2015). It is undertaken against the background of a general observation that “LAMMA of Taurisa rarely appears in the Hittite religious texts” (p. 49). The author’s philological analysis is conducive to identifying two traditions of celebrating the great spring festival, only one of which includes the veneration of the Tutelary god of Taurisa. The places where the king administers his cult are variously called ^{GIŠ}TIR ^{URU}TAURISÁ ‘forest of Taurisa’, ^{GIŠ}KIRI₆ *harwašiyaš* ‘garden of secrecy’, and É ^DLAMMA ^{URU}TAURISÁ ‘temple of the Tutelary god of Taurisa’. Tentatively but quite plausibly, he connects this variety with the changing itineraries of the AN.TAH.ŠUM festival: while originally the king made a detour to the Taurisa area, by the Late Empire period it became more practical to administer the same rites in a special sanctuary built in Hattusa for the Tutelary god of Taurisa (pp. 53–54).³⁰

The facts and interpretations offered by Galmarini flesh out the picture of the Tutelary God of Taurisa as a provincial deity, which may have undergone adlocation to Hattusa at some point in time but still remained on the periphery of the imperial pantheon. It is potentially compatible with two hypotheses: either the Luwian incantations collected under CTH 764–766 reflect the Taurisa tradition, or they were collected in Hattusa after the adlocation. It is, however, impossible to identify the dialect of the conjurations under discussion with Empire Luwian. The archaic accusative plural forms of the common gender, such as KBo 43.223+ iii 12' *a-li-in-za* HUR.SAG^{HÁ}-*ti-in-za*, KBo 43.223+ iii 23' *za-ar-pí-in-za*, KBo 8.130+ rev. 12' *a-pí-in-za* or KBo 13.260 ii 7 *pu-ú-ša-an-ni-in-za*, provide the most solid argument against such an assumption. The merger of nom.pl.c and acc.pl.c yielding the nom.-acc.pl.c ending /-ntsi/ represents the most obvious common innovation of the “Glossenkeil” words and Luwian hieroglyphic inscriptions of the Iron Age (Yakubovich 2010: 26–38). The fact that a number of texts belonging to the tradition (notably CTH 764) are recorded in Middle Script likewise strongly speaks against their written fixation after the adlocation of the cult to Hattusa.

Once we assume that the Luwian incantations referring to the cult of Taurisa also reflect the local variety of speech, identifying its dialectal features becomes a sensible task. If the Lu-

can in fact be assigned to CTH 764–766, as is, for example, the case of KUB 35.90. An example of a Hittite text that is likely related to the Taurisa tradition is KUB 12.26 (CTH 441.1), representing a ritual for the reconciliation between mother and child, where the Sun-God and Kamrusepa act as protagonists in a historiola (cf. Watkins 2010: 358–359).

³⁰ The precise date of cult adlocation naturally cannot be established with certainty, but the only occurrence of the reference to the temple of the Tutelary god of Taurisa belongs to the fragment KBo 45.16+, which is dated as Late New Script on palaeographic grounds. We are grateful to Dr. Susanne Görke and the Project “Hethitische Festräume” of the Mainz Academy of Sciences and Literature for confirming this information.

wian presence in Taurisa represented a result of recent migrations to the area, the local dialect would be likely to bear resemblance to the dialect of the area where the relevant migrations started. If, on the other hand, Luwian were spoken in the area of Taurisa for a long period of time, the local dialect would acquire distinct features of its own, perhaps displaying shared isoglosses with the geographically adjacent forms of Luwian.

A linguistic feature that appears to be closely aligned with the texts of this corpus concerns the second-position clitics. It is well known that some Luwian dialects, although not all of them, feature the particle /=wa/ as part of the Wackernagel clitic chain. This morpheme is absolutely pervasive in Late Luwian, where it can be best described as a clause-demarcational clitic. It is attested only once in the Zarpiya ritual (KUB 9.31 ii 33 with dupl.) and lacks assured attestations in the texts belonging to the Puriyanni and Kuwattalla traditions.³¹ In the Luwian texts belonging to CTH 764–766 it is reasonably common but does not appear in every sentence. In a Luwian version of the banquet narrative (KBo 43.223+, CTH 764.IA), it seems to behave as a particle introducing direct speech, which supports its etymological connection with the Hittite clitic particle =*wa(r)* having the same meaning. Nevertheless, if one factors in the rest of the Taurisa tradition, the semantics of /=wa/ cannot be reduced to that of an ordinary quotation particle. One can contrast, for example, the passage KBo 13.260 iii 24–29, where the particles /=wa/ and /=ba/ alternate in wish formulae with parallel syntactic structures.

A salient peculiarity of a relatively small group of Luwian texts is the presence of the particle =*ku-wa* /=*g^{wa}*/. Melchert (1993: 105) lists its occurrences under =*ku* on the assumption that we are dealing with a combination of the two clitics. This is not, however, the optimal solution, because the particle *=*ku* does not appear without the extension *-wa* in Luwian.³² What contributed to the confusion between the particles /=wa/ and /=*g^{wa}*/ was their shared slot in the idealised maximal clitic chain, situated between the discourse particles /=ba/, /=*γa*/ and the pronominal clitics. The examples such as KUB 35.103(+) ii 15' [*a*]n-ni-iš-ku-wa-ti, KUB 35.103(+) iii 4 za-am-pa-ku-wa, KBo 8.130+ rev. iii' 14' [...(-)]x-an-za-pa-ku-wa, and KUB 35.128 iii' 10' a-ku-wa-an will suffice to illustrate this distribution. The plausible semantic interpretation of /=*g^{wa}*/, reached in Simon 2020, is the successive-adversative particle 'in turn'. The following example (9) features variation between /=*g^{wa}*/ and /=wa/ in two subsequent clauses.

(9) KUB 35.103(+) iii 4–6, CTH 766, cf. Starke 1985: 222

za-am-pa-ku-wa	DUMU-ni-in	wa-al-li-in-du	ša-an-na-i-in-du
tsan=ba= <i>g^{wa}</i>	niwarannin	wallindu	sannaindu
thus.NOM.SG.C=COORD=in.turn	child.ACC.SG	lift.3PL.IMPV	remove ² .3PL.IMPV
pa-wa-an-tar	a-an-ni	ti-i-ta-ni	du-ú-wa-an-du
pa=wa=an=tar	anni	tidani	tuwandu
then=PTCL=he.ACC.SG.C=PTCL	mother.DAT.SG	breast.DAT.SG	place.3PL.IMPV

'Let them (in turn) lift and *separate* this child.³³ Then let them put him on (his) mother's breast'.

³¹ The sequence KUB 35.55:8' [...]x-aš-wa-du-wa-at-ta (CTH 758, Starke 1985: 71) is probably to be interpreted as [*ka*]r-aš<<-wa>>-du-wa-at-ta ~ /karstu(w)=ad(a)=tta/ 'let him cut it away', on the assumption of an anticipation error. We are grateful to H. Craig Melchert for the suggestion of such an analysis.

³² One doubtful instance of the unextended =*ku* is cited in Melchert 1993 is KUB 35.133(+) ii 3'. The inspection of the photograph shows, however, that the sequence traditionally read as *ku-i-pa-ku-ni-ya-aš* in this line has a more likely reading *ku-i-pa-ku-ī-ya-aš*. If so, it can be analysed as /k^{wi}-ba-k^{wi}(j)=as/, where /k^{wi}-ba-k^{wi}/ is a free choice indefinite pronoun (cf. Sideltsev and Yakubovich 2016: 91–92).

³³ As pointed to us by Elisabeth Rieken (pers. comm.), the Luwian verbal stem /sann(a)i-(^{di})/ probably belongs together with Gothic *sundro* 'apart', Latin *sine* 'without', Hittite *šanna-* 'to hide', *šannapi* 'in an isolated place', Vedic

The majority of the texts featuring /=*g*^{wa}/ can be assuredly or tentatively assigned to CTH 764–766 on independent grounds. The attribution of KUB 35.103(+), KBo 8.130+, KUB 35.90, and KBo 13.260 has already been discussed above. The fragment KUB 35.99 mentions the Luwian words for ‘snake’ and ‘wolf’, which otherwise only occur in the Taurisa incantations. The rare word *wa-lu-ti-in* of unknown meaning draws a bridge between KUB 35.99 and KUB 35.128, which are in addition written in the same hand. The fragments KUB 35.109 and KUB 35.79 probably belong to the same composition (see e.g. the rare shared word *ku-li-ma-aš-ši-*),³⁴ while the reference to DUMU.NAM.LÚ.U₁₉.LU ‘human child’ in KUB 35.79 iv⁷ 7’ suggests that we are dealing with yet another incantation meant for fighting children’s diseases. The enumeration of landscape features, including *ha-a-pi-in-ni-in-za* ‘little rivers, brooks’ places KBo 7.68(+) next to KUB 35.89 and KBo 43.223+, both assured representatives of the Taurisa tradition. Only in the instance of KUB 35.100 and KBo 29.38 no independent link with the texts grouped under CTH 764–766 imposes itself, but the latter of these two Luwian fragments mentions the Kaska-people, which independently vindicates its connection to the northern part of Asia Minor.

The findings regarding the particles of the Taurisa tradition can now be placed in a historical-geographic perspective. The absolute productivity of /=*wa*/ in Late Luwian is foreshadowed by a similar process in Empire Luwian, as should already be clear from the preliminary edition of YALBURT and EMİRGAZİ inscriptions in Hawkins 1995. The implementation of the same tendency on a more limited scale in the corpus under discussion is compatible with placing its source in the vicinity of Hattusa, the cradle of the Empire Luwian *koiné*.³⁵ As for /=*g*^{wa}/, it can be analysed as a result of the fusion between *=*gu* < PIE *=*k^we* (cf. Hittite =*kku* ‘now, even, and’, Palaic =*ku* ‘now, further’) and the particle /=*wa*/ discussed immediately above. In other words, the analysis of Melchert 1993: 105, while unfounded from the synchronic viewpoint, still holds as a plausible diachronic explanation. Naturally, for the proposed fusion to take place, the original quotative meaning of /=*wa*/ must have been sufficiently bleached, which again suggests a transition to the state of affairs attested in Hattusa Luwian. Summing up, it is fair to say that the linguistic features of the Taurisa tradition support rather than contradict the localisation of the relevant dialect in a region of North Anatolia, adjacent to but not identical with the area of Hattusa. In this sense, the default localisation of this tradition in the Çekerek valley perfectly fits the bill.³⁶

sánutar ‘aside, away’, and other cognate forms discussed in Yakubovich 2016: 472–477. If so, the likely basic meaning of Luw. /*sann(a)i-(di)*/ was ‘to separate’. In the context of a birth ritual, this may be a jargon word for cutting the umbilical cord.

³⁴ We interpret Luw. /*kulimass(i)-*/ as ‘type of enclosure’, a cognate of Palaic *kuwalima-* ‘id.’, for which see Sasseville and Yakubovich 2018, forthcoming. Note that this lexeme is attested next to the designations of domestic animals in KUB 35.109.

³⁵ It is worth mentioning in this connection that the use of the quotative particle =*wa(r)* in Hittite was likewise not uniform but depended on a text genre. While the texts of administrative or official nature, such as annals, treaties or official letters, normally deploy =*wa(r)* in every clause of the quoted speech, certain other texts, primarily rituals and myths, use the less consistent pattern, which gravitates towards the use of =*wa(r)* only in the first clause of the quoted passage (Fortson 1998: 22–24, 27). The refinement of Fortson’s syntactic observations is now provided in Sideltsev 2020.

³⁶ The two particles addressed above were singled out as dialectal isoglosses because Luw. /=*wa*/ is extremely common, while Luw. /=*g*^{wa}/ is restricted to the Taurisa tradition. Nevertheless, there are additional linguistic differences within the corpus of Luwian cuneiform texts, which deserve a separate brief mention. Thus, the texts of the Taurisa tradition commonly feature the forms /*k^wadi*/ ‘how’, /*abadi*/ ‘thus’, whereas those belonging to the traditions of Puriyanni and Kuwattalla use alongside them the extended variants /*kwadin*/ and /*abadin*/. The stem /*x^widumar-*/ ‘life’ occurs in KBo 13.260 iii 18’ (CTH 765), while the Kuwattalla tradition features the cognate

3.3. A Rhetorical Figure

There is an additional level of contact that can strengthen the proposed localisation of the dialect underlying CTH 764–766. Certain formulae occurring in the Taurisa incantations find direct counterparts in other texts emanating from the northern part of Asia Minor. Thus Klinger (1996: 158) stresses the fact that the clause “Kamrusepa saw it (looking) down from Heaven” occurs in both CTH 727 (the Hittite and Hattian bilingual myth about the Moon that fell down from the sky) and in the texts booked under CTH 765. Furthermore, as was already mentioned in Subsection 3.1, Kamrusepa typically issues a cry of amazement or indignation immediately upon checking the situation on earth. The bilingual CTH 727 clearly contains an original Hattian narrative featuring the goddess Katahzihuri, which only secondarily underwent syncretism with Kamrusepa.³⁷ But if the formula under discussion reflects the Hattian narrative of Katahzihuri and not Nesite folklore in (10), the same conclusion can also be extended to (11). The ability of the goddess Katahzihuri to cross ethnic boundaries is independently confirmed through the direct use of her name in Palaic texts, where she likewise occupies the second position in the local pantheon (cf. Taracha 2009: 58).

(10) KUB 28.4 ii 15–16, CTH 727.A, cf. Schuster 2002: 387

a-uš-ta-ma-kán ^D*Ka-am-ru-ši-pa-aš* *ˁne-pi-ša-az* *kat-ta*
 see.3SG.PRT=COORD=PTCL Kamrusepa.NOM.SG sky.ABL down
ku-it *k[u-it* *k]e-ˁe-ni* *ki-i-ni-iš-ša-an*
 what.NOM.SG.N what.NOM.SG.N this.NOM.SG.N thus

‘Kamrusepa saw (it looking) down from the sky: “What (is) this here?”’

(11) KBo 12.89 iii 9’–10’, CTH 765.2, cf. Starke 1985: 243

na-aš-ta ^D*Kam-ru-še-pa-aš* [*ne-pi-ša-az* *kat-ta*] *a* *a-uš-ta*
 PTCL=PTCL Kamrusepa.NOM.SG sky.ABL down see.3SG.PRT
i-ni-ma-wa *ku-it*
 yon.NOM.SG.N=COORD=QUOT what.NOM.SG.N

‘Kamrusepa saw (it looking) down from the sky: “But what (is) that?”’

But Kamrusepa (=Katahzihuri) is not the only deity to ask perplexed or angry rhetorical questions in texts belonging to the Taurisa tradition. In CTH 764.I, it comes from the Sun-god Tiwad (12), apparently after he sees that the gods vomited or trampled everything three times (Steitler 2017: 397, but cf. van den Hout 1994: 315–316 and Mouton 2007: 276 on /tarsija-/ ‘to trample’). His question prompts the narrative about a divine feast to which various diseases have not been invited (Steitler 2017: 393). The parallel Hittite story found on the same tablet contains the identical emotional query (13), whose motivation is unfortunately lost in a lacuna and whose answer consists of a similar narrative about the neglected Great Deity (Steitler

/x^widwalahid-/in the same meaning. The form *a-ad-du-wa-an-za* ‘evil’ occurring in KBo 13.260 iii 13’ reflects the sound change /-lts-/ > /-nts-/, which also characterises the dialect of Hattusa (cf. Yakubovich 2013/2014: 285–286 with a similar historical analysis but without separating the Taurisa tradition).

³⁷ In the Hattian version of CTH 727 the goddess is called Katahzihuri, but she apparently undertakes essentially the same action: “*Es wirkte ständig? erbarmungsvoll die (Göttin) Katahzihuri hier vom strahlenden (Himmel) aus. Dann <sah sie es> (und rief) folgendermassen: “Was (ist) in dieser Weise (geschehen)?”*” (Schuster 2002: 386). Another fragmentary Hittite-Luwian passage KBo 12.100 obv. 12–13 (CTH 765) also features Kamrusepa, who looks down from the sky but apparently suppresses her cry of indignation. The same is apparently true of KUB 17.8+ iv 1–2 (CTH 457.1.A).

2017: 389). But the Palaic Sun-god Tiyat (whose name is cognate with that of the Luwian Sun-god Tiwad) also asks the same question in a different text CTH 752, apparently upon learning that the divine guests eat and drink but cannot quench their hunger and thirst (14). The following Palaic narrative represents a version of the Anatolian myth of a disappearing deity, which can only loosely be compared with the narratives about neglected deities preserved in Hittite and Luwian transmissions in CTH 764. But the juxtaposition of all the three questions with mythological narratives can be regarded as a significant parallel in itself, beyond the sheer similarity among (12–14).

(12) KBo 43.223+ iii 8'–9', CTH 764.I.A, cf. Steitler 2017: 392

^D UTU-wa-az	^D Kam-ru-še-pa-i	da-u-e-ya-an	ma-am-ma-[an-na-at-ta]
Tiwad	Kamrusibai	tawijan	mammanatta
Tiwad.NOM.SG	Kamrusepa.NOM.SG	towards	look.3SG.PRT
za-a-ni-wa	ku-wa-ti		
tsani=wa	k ^w adi		
this.NOM.SG.N=PTCL	how		

'The Sun-god looked at Kamrusepa: "How (is) this?"'

(13) KBo 43.223+ i 19', CTH 764.I.A, cf. Steitler 2017: 388

<i>UM-MA</i>	^D UTU	<i>A-NA</i>	^D <i>Kam-ma-ru-še-pa</i>	<i>i-ni-wa</i>	<i>ku-it</i>
Thus	Sun-god	to	Kamrusepa	yon.NOM.SG.N=QUOT	what.NOM.SG.N

'Thus (spoke) Sun-god to Kamrusepa: "What (is) that?"'

(14) KUB 32.18+ i 8', CTH 752.B, cf. Carruba 1970: 8

[Ti]-ya-az-ku-wa-ar	ú-e-er-ti	ka-a-at-ku-wa-a-at	ku-it
Tiyaz=kuwar	wērti	kāt=kuwāt	kuit
Tiyat.NOM.SG=EMPH	say.3SG.PRS	this.NOM.SG.N=how	what.NOM.SG.N

'The Sun-god says: "What (is) this anyway?"'

The parallels adduced above need not be taken as a testimony of direct influence of Palaic mythological narratives upon the Taurisa tradition or vice versa. All the passages mentioned here are ultimately steeped in the oral folklore of North Central Anatolia, the fragments of which are transmitted in Hattian, Hittite, Palaic, and also Luwian. One of the recurrent themes there is the conflict between one deity or a group of related deities and the rest of the pantheon, which results in the disruption of the natural world order. It is important to observe that CTH 752 features not only Palaic but also Luwian incantations (Yakubovich 2010: 256–257). Furthermore, the most famous Hittite narrative of a disappearing deity, namely the Myth of Telepinu (CTH 324), contains non-trivial loanwords from Luwian, such as the combination of auspicious terms *šalhiyanti*- 'growth' and *mannitti*- 'proliferation (?)' (cf. Yakubovich 2010: 235–236 and Rieken, forthcoming).³⁸

³⁸ Goedegebuure 2008 offers an elaborate structural argument in favour of the hypothesis that an Anatolian Indo-European language had been spoken in north-central Anatolia already in the early second millennium BCE and functioned as a substrate for the non-Indo-European Hattian language. She justly describes Hittite as an unlikely candidate for such a substrate, because the indigenous name of the language (Nesite) is consistent with their localisation in the area of Nesa along the southern bend of the Kızılırmak River before the conquests of Anitta. She objects to the substrate role of Palaic on the grounds that this language is "too peripheral" (ibid.: 171) and opts for Luwian as the most likely candidate, referring to the demonstrable Luwian migrations in pre-historic period. Whatever is said in this chapter about the Luwian dialect of Taurisa broadly supports Goedegebuure's claim. We see, however, no logical necessity to assume that Hattian was impacted by just one Anatolian language

The goal of Section Three was to demonstrate that the Luwian texts from the area of Taurisa can be set aside from the rest of the Luwian texts based on their function, pantheon, linguistic features, and formulaic repertoire. There is every reason to treat the Taurisa corpus (CTH 764–766) as a cohesive group, on a par with the Luwian corpora associated with Hattusa, Istanuwa, or the Lower Land / Kizzuwadna.

4. Back to the Broader Picture

We have seen that the study of individual traditions associated with the use of the Luwian incantations is conducive to revealing additional fine differences among the regional varieties of Luwian. This empirical conclusion agrees well with what one expects on general sociolinguistic grounds: in the absence of an overarching written norm, enforced by scribal training, the ongoing differentiation among the spoken Luwian dialects was faithfully transmitted in writing. The new results, however, prompt the refinement of Luwian dialectal geography vis-à-vis the results reached in Yakubovich 2010.

The largest dialectal corpus of Luwian cuneiform texts available to us appears now to be associated with the Lower Land, while the tradition connected with the town of Taurisa situated to the northeast of Hattusa emerges as the close second. The Songs of Istanuwa and the incantations embedded in Kizzuwadna ritual texts all yield corpora of more modest dimensions. Although the term Kizzuwadna Luwian, was used very broadly in the last ten years, in the narrow sense, it can now be restricted to the incantations of the Zarpiya ritual (CTH 757) and perhaps to KUB 35.8 with related fragments (see Section One). In a broad sense, it can still be applied to a linguistic continuum stretching from Kizzuwadna proper to the Lower Land, with a caveat that fine linguistic differences between the Luwian dialects used in both regions deserve further study. In contrast, the dialect of Taurisa both emerges as linguistically distinct from the dialect of Kizzuwadna / Lower Land, even in the first approximation, and cannot be treated as part of a continuum in view of its remote geographic location. Finally, Hurrian influence can no longer be used as a decisive argument in distinguishing between Luwian dialects, because our study of CTH 759–763 suggests that it can increase over time within the same tradition.

The expanded dialectal landscape of Luwian cuneiform texts has repercussions for revisiting the sociolinguistic situation in the western Anatolian region of Arzawa. There is no doubt that Arzawa elites had Luwic personal names, and the Arzawa ritualistic traditions show similarities with those of Kizzuwadna and the Lower Land, but no Luwian incantations have been found thus far in the Arzawa rituals. Two different explanations of this seeming discrepancy were advanced in recent years. According to Melchert (2013: 170) “the lack of any Luwian incantations and rarity even of isolated Luwian technical terms in “Arzawan” rituals reflects that knowledge in Hattuša of the ritual practices of Arzawa was very indirect”. Archi (2015: 291) prefers a different explanation: the Arzawa rituals were collected “in the field” by Hattusa scribes, while the Kizzuwadna rituals “were obtained ... probably (at least in part) from the writing school of that kingdom”.

The disadvantage of Melchert’s hypothesis lies in failing to address the content of the Arzawa compositions. As cogently argued by Archi, most of them are rituals against epidemics

or that Palaic was as peripheral in the early second millennium BCE as it was half a millennium later. Since Palaic famously shows more traces of interference with Hattian than any other Indo-European Anatolian language, it remains perfectly possible that Hattian and Palaic speakers lived side by side on a large territory, and the areas of Palaic and Luwian substrate effectively bordered each other in the North of Asia Minor.

and based on their palaeographic history, many of them were likely recorded in response to the epidemic that decimated Hattusa at the time of Mursili II. If so, collecting these texts was not an idle intellectual enterprise, but rather an emergency measure, and therefore the scribes had every reason to accurately learn and record all the best practices attributed to the respected western ritualists. After the annexation of Arzawa by Hattusa this was not a logistically difficult task. Archi's proposal, on the other hand, crucially depends on the assumed dichotomy between the pre-existing literacy in Kizzuwadna, with its own scribal traditions and attitudes, and the lack of such in Arzawa. If our proposal of Luwian texts associated with the Lower Land and Taurisa holds water, they must have been recorded by the scribes trained in the Kingdom of Hattusa, who also happened to be responsible for collecting the Arzawa rituals according to Archi's views. Under such circumstances, it is not obvious why the Hattusa scribes would make efforts to record the original Luwian incantations from the Taurisa performers but not from the Arzawa practitioners.

Therefore, one has to look for alternative solutions. One hypothesis that still awaits its refutation attributes the lack of code-switching in Arzawa rituals to "the inability of Hattusa scribes, many of whom were Hittite and Luvian bilinguals, to understand the native language of Arzawa ritualists" (Yakubovich 2013a: 109). Given the distance between Hattusa and Arzawa, there is nothing counterintuitive about the assumption that the local dialects were situated at the opposite ends of the Luwic dialectal continuum. The objections of Archi (2015: 283a) to this hypothesis do not really go to the heart of the matter: Archi merely stresses how little we know about the language(s) of Arzawa. The burden of proof normally lies upon those who wish to demonstrate that the two languages or dialects are mutually understandable, rather than those who claim the opposite.

Returning to the attested dialects that belong to Luwian in the narrow sense, the findings of the present paper are conducive to revisiting some of their peculiarities. An isogloss whose description stood well the test of time is the merger of the nominative and accusative plural of the common gender in the dialect of Hattusa. We have seen in Section Three that the dialect of the Taurisa tradition, which presumably developed to the northeast of Hattusa, does not share this innovation, featuring the archaic accusative plural forms in /-nts(a)/ in lieu of /-ntsi/. The dialects of Kizzuwadna and the Lower Land, spoken to the south of Hattusa, preserve the same archaic ending. This conforms to the hypothesis that the case merger in Hattusa postdates the initial Luwian migrations and constitutes the defining feature of what is now called Empire Luwian. It also strengthens the case for the connection of this process with the merger of nom.pl.c and acc.pl.c in Late Hittite (cf. already Rieken 2006: 274–275). The direction of the influence probably was from Luwian to Hittite, because the result of the merger was always /-ntsi/ in Empire Luwian, whereas Late Hittite displays a complex distribution of nom.-acc.pl.c endings depending on a stem type (Yakubovich 2010: 337–345).

The situation becomes more intricate once one turns to the development of the Anatolian genitive case in Luwian. The survival of this category was traditionally described as an archaism of "Hieroglyphic Luwian", whereas their (near-)replacement with possessive adjectives in "Cuneiform Luwian" was viewed as an innovation (cf. Melchert 2003: 171).³⁹ The same analysis was essentially maintained in Yakubovich 2010, except that the terms "Cuneiform Luwian"

³⁹ For a recent discussion of the distribution between the genitives and possessive adjectives in Hieroglyphic texts, see Bauer 2014: 169–186. A number of Luwian forms attested in cuneiform transmission were analysed as relics of the genitives in /-assa/ or /-assi/ in Yakubovich 2010: 38–45. The alleged genitives in *-aš-ša* were, however, provided with an alternative interpretation as a particular class of possessive adjectives in Melchert 2012. The few possible genitives in *-aš-ši* were explained with reference to a possible interference of Hattusa scribes in Yakubovich 2010.

and “Hieroglyphic Luwian” were replaced there with Kizzuwadna Luwian and Empire Luwian. The refined analysis of Luwian traditions makes it now clear that the disappearance of genitives represents a common feature of at least two distinct Luwian dialectal corpora, namely the Lower Land traditions, explored in Section Two, and the Taurisa tradition, addressed in Section Three. The preservation of genitives as a category in the dialect of Hattusa alone, but not in the Luwian dialects flanking the capital from various sides, while not impossible, requires explanation.

A possible solution emerges once we take into consideration external evidence. As shown in Adiego 2010, there are two classes of possessive adjectives in Lycian (A), the best-studied member of the Luwic group besides Luwian. The possessive adjectives derived from the appellatives belong to the common *e/i*-declension type, which they share with the majority of other Lycian adjectives. Those derived from proper nouns show, on the contrary, an unusual declension pattern: nom.sg. *-h*, acc.sg. *-hñ*, loc.sg. *-he*, shared only with the otherwise problematic *s*-stems. Adiego plausibly concludes that the origin of the second pattern must be analogical but does not specify its ultimate source. Now the scrutiny of the Luwian hieroglyphic texts reveals a discrepancy in the proportion of proper nouns among the genitive case forms vs. possessive adjectives. About two thirds of the genitives are derived from proper nouns, while in the instance of the possessive adjectives this number is slightly more than one third. The difference is significant, and when contrasted with the Lycian data is conducive to formulating a hypothesis about the exclusive or statistical association of genitives with proper nouns in Proto-Luwic. Presumably the Lycian paradigm of analogical possessive adjectives derived from proper nouns reflects the second wave of case attraction in possessive constructions.⁴⁰

If one reconstructs the genitives as a residual category that was also restricted to or statistically aligned with proper nouns for Proto-Luwian, then its gradual disappearance in the majority of the Luwian dialects would appear logical. The declensional pattern of the proper nouns could easily have been levelled to that of the appellatives. This said, we have limited opportunities to judge how pervasive this levelling happened to be, because the possessive forms of proper nouns are genuinely rare in cuneiform texts.⁴¹ The situation in the Luwian dialect of Hattusa was different for a good reason. The widespread Hittite-Luwian bilingualism in the capital, which was postulated on independent grounds, could lead to the retention of the Luwian genitives and the relaxation of their association with proper nouns, since the Hittite language had no such association. At the same time, new possessive adjectives continued to be formed in Empire Luwian via the mechanism of case attraction, but unlike Lycian, the Luwian language did not perpetuate any formal distinction between their primary and secondary varieties. This eventually led to a complex pattern of coexistence between genitives and possessive adjectival forms, which can be observed in Late Luwian.

⁴⁰ For the mechanism of case attraction in the Anatolian languages, see Yakubovich 2008: 196–202. In order to make the proposed Lycian analogy work one has to assume that the declension of secondary possessive adjectives in Lycian was modelled after the paradigm of the consonantal stems after the genitives in **-s > -h* were reanalysed as nominatives. This implies that either some of the attested Lycian *s*-stems continue the inherited consonantal stems, or additional consonantal stems had existed in Proto-Lycian but were subsequently remodelled to a more productive type. The choice between these two alternatives naturally pertains to the domain of Lycian historical morphology and goes beyond the scope of the present paper.

⁴¹ Thus, the attestation of possessive adjectives within the Puriyanni and Kuwattalla-Šilalluhi traditions appears to be limited to the following six examples: KUB 35.54 ii 14', iii 7, KBo 29.4(+):8' [Ⓛ]IM-aš-ša-an-za; KUB 35.71(+):ii 7 ^{[U]R}Ni-nu-wa-wa-an-na-aš-ša-ti; KUB 35.71(+):ii 8 [Ⓛ]IŠTAR-aš-ša-a-an-za-[ti], KUB 35.82 i 7' [Ⓛ]Ša-uš-qa-a-aš-ši-in-z[i]. Therefore, one cannot absolutely exclude that the avoidance of genitives of in the Lower Land incantations was merely a matter of elevated register.

The most serious revisions concern the distribution of the suffix /-ants-/ marking the plurality of the possessors in Luwian possessive adjectives. This grammatical feature was characterised as an innovation of Kizzuwadna Luwian in Yakubovich 2010: 50, with the stated implication that “forms in *-assanz(-)* never existed in central Anatolia”. The new dialectal classification offered in the present paper plainly falsifies this claim: the absolute majority of possessive constructions marking plural possessors are found in the incantations of the Kuwattalla / Šilalluhi tradition, while the remaining few cases stem from the Taurisa corpus. At the same time, one can affirm the absence of this category in Late Luwian (Iron Age Luwian). The three known cases of unmarked plural possessors in Luwian texts, occurring in the constructions where one would expect them to be marked, are GELB § 1 DEUS-*ní-sa-ti-i* LEP[US ...] ‘by the authority of the gods’, TOPADA § 21 FRONS-*ti-ia-sa_s+rali* FRONS-*ti-ia+rali* ‘with the first among the first’, and KIRŞEHİR lead strip § 16 OMNIS-*ma-sa-za-a* | MAGNUS+*rali-ia-a-la-za* ‘to the grandees of all (the people)’.

There are two ways of interpreting this contrast. Either it reflects synchronic differences among Luwian dialects in the second millennium BCE (but with a different distribution than the one outlined in Yakubovich 2010) or the suffix /-ants-/ marking the plurality of the possessors was a common Luwian feature, which disappeared in the first millennium BCE. The use of the suffix under discussion in the idiomatic expression ‘patron of the ritual(s)’ tips the scales in favour of the second alternative. The relevant forms are KUB 9.6+ iii 25' *ma-al-ha-aš-ša-aš-ša-an-za-an* EN-*ya* (dat.sg), KUB 35.78(+) iv 7' [*ma-al*]-*ha-aš-ša-aš-ša-an-za-an-za* EN-*an-z[a]* (dat.pl), KUB 35.45+ ii 7 SÍSKUR-*aš-ša-an-za<-an>* EN-*ya* (dat.sg), and KUB 35.59+ ii 7' EN SÍSKUR-*an-za<-an>* (dat. sg). While all these forms are attested in the incantations of the Kuwattalla / Šilalluhi tradition, they were unlikely to appear in their oral performance, which was presumably personalised. The indication that the ritual patron was expected to be addressed by name comes from the common Hittite instruction *laman tezzi / halzai* in the prescriptive part of the rituals (see a selection of examples in Görke 2010: 287–288). There is even one example of a similar instruction embedded in a Luwian incantation (KBo 13.260 iii 17' ŠUM-ŠU *hal-za-a-i* ‘she calls him by name’).

Thus, it seems reasonable to assume that the generic reference to a ritual patron must have been introduced in the course of scribal adaptation of the Kuwattalla / Šilalluhi tradition. As long as one accepts that it ultimately stems from the Lower Land and shows close ties to the Tunnawiya tradition, the adaptation presumably happened not in Kizzuwadna but in Hattusa. If so, the Hattusa scholar-scribes appear to have had no difficulties with using the suffix /-ants-/ marking plural possessors, although they were less consistent about the notation of dative case endings in the relevant constructions (*-aš-ša-an-za<-an>*). The last fact finds a possible correlation with the existence of the genitive case in the dialect of Hattusa: perhaps forms in /-ass-ants(a)/ were perceived as innovative plural genitives. As for the use of /-ants-/, this presumably indicates that marking the plurality of the possessor in possessive adjectives was as grammatical in Hattusa as in the Lower Land. The absence of parallel attestations in the Luwian incantations linked to the state cult of Hattusa (or passages reflecting Kizzuwadna or Istanuwa Luwian) may merely be due to the tiny sizes of the relevant corpora.

Projecting the rise of the forms in /-ass-ants-/ to the prehistoric Luwian stage makes it difficult to outline the precise scenario of their development. Now as before, it remains quite likely that the typologically unusual placement of the number marker /-ants-/ after the possessive marker /-ass-/ is due to a contact-induced character of the relevant form. Nevertheless, attractive as it might seem from the formal perspective, one can no longer invoke a language shift from Hurrian to Luwian as the direct trigger of this change. There is no independent evidence to conclude that the Hurrian language as we know it was in use by compact communi-

ties to the northwest of Kizzuwadna at any point in time. Therefore, the critique raised in Simon 2016 against the scenario of Hurrian influence on the Luwian grammar appears to be justified, although for different reasons than those adduced in Simon's paper.⁴²

We have seen that the new approach to Luwian dialectal geography helped to clarify certain questions but also created new challenges. The purpose of the present section was not to corroborate the empirical conclusions of Sections Two and Three but rather to explore their consequences. The complicated picture that emerges from our investigation should remind the readers once again that the Luwian cuneiform texts of the second millennium BCE reflect not a sterile literary koine but a set of living dialects.

References

- Adiego, Ignasi-Xavier. 2010. On Lycian Genitives in *-h*, *-he*. In: Ronald Kim, Norbert Oettinger, Elisabeth Rieken, Michael Weiss (eds.). *Ex Anatolia Lux: Anatolian and Indo-European studies in honor of H. Craig Melchert on the occasion of his sixty-fifth birthday*: 1–8. Ann Arbor: Beech Stave.
- Adiego, Ignasi-Xavier. 2015. Lycian Nasalized Preterites Revisited. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 120/1: 1–30.
- Archi, Alfonso. 2015. Remarks on Hittite augur rituals and rituals from Arzawa. *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 72: 282–294.
- Bauer, Anna H. 2014. *Morphosyntax of the Noun Phrase in Hieroglyphic Luwian*. BSIEL 12. Leiden: Brill.
- Beckman, Gary M. 1990. The Hittite “Ritual of the Ox” (CTH 760.I.2-3). *Orientalia* (NS) 59/1: 34–55.
- Beckman, Gary M. 2011. Blood in Hittite Ritual. *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 63: 95–102.
- Carruba, Onofrio. 1970. *Das Palaische: Texte, Grammatik, Lexikon*. StBoT 10. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Casabonne, Olivier. 2012. Notes anatoliennes. In collaboration with Anaïs Lamesa and Pascal Lebouteiller. *Anatolia Antiqua* 20: 19–24.
- Corti, Carlo. 2017a. The North: Hanhana, Hattena, İstahara, Hakpiš, Nerik, Zalpuwa, Tummana, Pala and the Hulana River Land. In: Mark Weeden, Lee Z. Ullmann (eds.). *Hittite Landscape and Geography*: 219–238. Leiden: Brill.
- Corti, Carlo. 2017b. From Mount Hazzi to Šapinuwa: Cultural Traditions in Motion in the First Half of the 14th Century BC. *Mesopotamia* 52: 3–20.
- Christiansen, Birgit. 2006. *Die Ritualtradition der Ambazzi. Eine philologische Bearbeitung und entstehungsgeschichtliche Analyse der Ritualtexte CTH 391, CTH 429, and CTH 463*. StBoT 48. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Fortson, Benjamin W. IV. 1998. A New Study of Hittite *-wa(r)*. *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 50: 21–34.
- Fuscagni, Francesco. 2007. *Hethitische unveröffentlichte Texte aus den Jahren 1906–1912 in der Sekundärliteratur*. HPMM 6. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Galmarini, Niccolò. 2015. The Veneration of LAMMA of Taurisa and the Discrepancies between Versions of the AN.TAḪ.ŠUM Festival. In: Anacleto d'Agostino, Valentina Orsi, Giulia Torri (eds.). *Sacred Landscapes of Hittites and Luwians. Proceedings of the International Conference Florence, February 6th-8th 2014 in Honour of Franca Pecchioli Daddi*: 49–55. Florence: Firenze University Press.
- Gérard, Raphaël. 2006. Le(s) nom(s) de la montagne en louvite. *Res Antiquae* 3: 245–251.
- Giusfredi, Federico. 2018. Remarks on Luwian: Open Problems and State of the Art. *News from the Land of the Hittites* 1: 77–89.
- Goedegebuure, Petra. 2008. Central Anatolian languages and language communities in the Colony Period: a Luwian-Hattian symbiosis and independent Hittites. In: J. G. Dercksen (ed.). *Anatolia and the Jazira during the Old Assyrian period*. PIHANS 111: 137–180. Istanbul: Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut in het Nabije Oosten.

⁴² What remains possible is the hypothesis that when the Anatolian (pre-Luwian speakers) reached central Anatolia, they encountered indigenous languages that were typologically similar to Hurrian in this area. The discussion of possessive adjectives as an Anatolian areal feature is found in Luraghi 2008 (cf. also Giusfredi 2018: 82–83). This is not the only peculiarity of the Luwian language that calls for an areal explanation: arguably less trivial is the word-initial neutralisation of the opposition voiced/voiceless (or fortis/lenis) in both Luwian and Hurrian. These questions, however, go beyond the scope of Luwian dialect geography and as such need not be discussed in detail in the present paper.

- Görke, Susanne. 2010. *Das Ritual der Aštu (CTH 490)*. CHANE 40. Leiden: Brill.
- Goetze, Albrecht, Edgar Howard Sturtevant. 1938. *The Hittite Ritual of Tunlawi*. American Oriental Series 14. New Haven: American Oriental Society.
- Haas, Volkert. 1994. *Geschichte der hethitischen Religion*. HdO 1/15. Leiden: Brill.
- Hawkins, J. David. 1995. *The Hieroglyphic Inscription of the Sacred Pool Complex at Hattusa (SÜDBURG)*. StBoT, Beiheft 3. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Hawkins, J. David. 2000. *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions. Volume I. Part I, II: Texts; Part III: Plates*. Berlin / New York: W. de Gruyter.
- Hawkins, J. David. 2013. Luwians versus Hittites. In: Alice Mouton, Ian Rutherford, Ilya Yakubovich (eds.) *Luwian Identities: Culture, Language and Religion between Anatolia and the Aegean*. CHANE 64: 26–40. Leiden: Brill.
- Van den Hout, Theo. 1994. Träume einer hethitischen Königin: KUB LX 97 + XXXI 71. *Altorientalische Forschungen* 21: 305–327.
- Van den Hout, Theo. 2006. Institutions, Vernaculars, Publics: the Case of Second-Millennium Anatolia. In: Seth L. Sanders (ed.). *Margins of Writing, Origins of Cultures*: 217–256. Chicago: Oriental Institute.
- Van den Hout, Theo. 2015. In Royal Circles: The Nature of Hittite Scholarship. *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern History* 2(2): 203–227.
- Hutter, Manfred. 1988. *Behexung, Entsühnung und Heilung. Das Ritual der Tunlawiya für ein Königspaar aus mittelhethitischer Zeit (KBo XXI 1 - KUB IX 34 - KBo XXI 6)*. OBO 82. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Hutter, Manfred. 2003. Aspects of Luwian Religion. In: H. Craig Melchert (ed.). *The Luwians*. HdO 1/68: 210–280. Leiden: Brill.
- Hutter, Manfred. 2019. The Luwian Rituals of Kuwattalla: Thoughts on their Rearrangement. In: Aygul Süel (ed.). *Acts of the IXth International Congress of Hittitology (Çorum, September 08-14, 2014)*: 379–402. Çorum: İl Kültür ve Turizm Müdürlüğü.
- Kaynar, Fatma. 2017. *I rituali magici ittiti: struttura, classificazione e il ruolo di Kizzuwadna*. Tesi di dottorato, Università di Torino.
- Kaynar, Fatma. 2019. Kizzuwatnean Rituals under the Influence of the Luwian and Hurrian Cultures. *OLBA* 27: 97–114.
- Klinger, Jörg. 1996. *Untersuchungen zur Rekonstruktion der hattischen Kultschicht*. StBoT 37. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Laroche, Emmanuel. 1959. *Dictionnaire de la langue luwite*. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve.
- Laroche, Emmanuel. 1971. *Catalogue des textes hittites*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Laroche, Emmanuel. 1979. L'inscription lycienne. In: Henri Metzger, Pierre Demargne (eds.). *Fouilles de Xanthos VI*: 49–127. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Luraghi, Silvia. 2008. Possessive Constructions in Anatolian, Hurrian and Urartian as Evidence for Language Contact. In: Billie Jean Collins, Mary R. Bachvarova, Ian C. Rutherford (eds.). *Anatolian Interfaces: Hittites, Greeks, and Their Neighbors in Ancient Anatolia*: 143–151. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Marcuson, Hannah. 2016. *Word of the Old Woman: Studies in Female Ritual Practice in Hittite Anatolia*. University of Chicago Ph.D. Dissertation.
- Marcuson, Hannah, Theo van den Hout. 2015. Memorization and Hittite Ritual: New Perspectives on the Transmission of Hittite Ritual Texts, *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions* 15: 143–168.
- Melchert, H. Craig. 1988. Luwian Lexical Notes. *Historische Sprachforschung* 101: 211–243.
- Melchert, H. Craig. 1993. *Cuneiform Luwian Lexicon*. Chapel Hill, NC: Self-Published.
- Melchert, H. Craig. 2003. Language. In: H. Craig Melchert (ed.). *The Luwians*. HdO 1/68: 170–210. Leiden: Brill.
- Melchert, H. Craig. 2012. Genitive Case and Possessive Adjective in Anatolian. In: Vincenzo Orioles (ed.). *Per Roberto Gusmani. Linguistica storica e teorica: Studi in ricordo 2. Volume 1*: 273–286. Udine: Forum.
- Melchert, H. Craig. 2013. Luwian Language in “Luwian” Rituals in Hattuša. In: Billie Jean Collins, Piotr Michalowski (eds.). *Beyond Hatti: A Tribute to Gary Beckman*: 159–172. Atlanta: Lockwood Press.
- Melchert, H. Craig. 2015. Reciprocity and Commerce in Bronze and Iron Age Anatolia. In: Alfonso Archi (ed.). *Tradition and Innovation in the Ancient Near East. Proceedings of the 57th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale at Rome, 4-8 July 2011*: 409–416. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.
- Miller, Jared. 2004. *Studies in the Origins, Development and Interpretation of the Kizzuwadna Rituals*. StBoT 46. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Del Monte, Giuseppe F., Johann Tischler. 1978. *Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der hethitischen Texte*. RGTC VI. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

- Mouton, Alice. 2007. *Rêves hittites: Contribution à une histoire et une anthropologie du rêve en Anatolie ancienne*. CHANE 28. Leiden: Brill.
- Mouton, Alice. 2012. *Recherches sur la religiosité des Hittites*. Habilitation thesis defended on May 26, 2012 (unpublished manuscript).
- Mouton, Alice. 2014. Rituels de ‘boucs émissaires’ en Anatolie hittite. In: Piotr Taracha (ed.). *Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Hittitology*: 558–587. Warsaw: Agade.
- Mouton, Alice. 2015. Les rituels de la Vieille Femme Tunnauiya: Témoignages du Bas Pays hittite? In: Dominique Beyer, Olivier Henry, Aksel Tibet (eds.). *La Cappadoce Meridionale de la préhistoire à la période byzantine*: 79–89. Istanbul: Institut Français d’Études Anatoliennes.
- Mouton, Alice, Ilya Yakubovich. 2019. Internal or External Evil: A Merism in Luwian Incantations. *BSOAS* 82/2: 209–231.
- Mouton, Alice, Ilya Yakubovich. 2020. Proleptic Construction in the Luwian Language [in Russian with an English abstract]. *Indo-European Linguistics and Classical Philology* 24: 206–233.
- Del Olmo Lete, Gregorio, Joaquín Sanmartín. 2015. *A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition*. 3rd revised edition. Translated and edited by W. Watson. HdO 1/112. Leiden: Brill.
- Pisaniello, Valerio. 2015. Parallel Passages among Hittite-Luwian Rituals: For the Restoration of KUB 35.146. *Vicino Oriente* 19: 25–37.
- Richter, Thomas. 2012. *Bibliographisches Glossar des Hurritischen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Rieken, Elisabeth. 2006. Zum hethitisch-luwischen Sprachkontakt in historischer Zeit. *Altorientalische Forschungen* 33: 271–285.
- Rieken, Elisabeth. 2017. The Dialectology of Anatolian. In: Jared Klein, Brian Joseph, Matthias Fritz, Mark Wenthe (eds.). *Handbook of Comparative and Historical Indo-European Linguistics, Vol. 1*: 298–308. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Rieken, Elisabeth. Forthc. Luw. *mannitt(i)-*. ‘fertility’. Digital Philological-Etymological Dictionary of the Minor Ancient Anatolian Corpus Languages. Marburg — München. Online at: <http://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary.php>.
- Sasseville, David. 2020. Nouveaux joints relatifs au grand rituel louvite de Kuwattalla et Šilalluḫi. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 110/1: 111–118.
- Sasseville, David. 2021. *Anatolian Stem Formation: Luwian, Lycian, and Lydian*. BSIELL 21. Leiden: Brill.
- Sasseville, David, Ilya Yakubovich. 2018. Palaic Words for Animals and their Enclosures. *Historische Sprachforschung* 131: 46–58.
- Schuster, Hans Siegfried. 2002. *Die Ḫattisch-Hethitischen Bilinguen. II. Textbearbeitungen*. Documenta et Monumenta Orientis Antiqui XVII/2. Leiden: Brill.
- Sideltsev, Andrej. 2020. Syntax of direct speech particle *-wa(r)* in Hittite. *Acta Orientalia Hungarica* 73/2: 155–185.
- Sideltsev, Andrej, Ilya Yakubovich. 2016. The Origin of Lycian Indefinite Pronouns and its Phonological Implications. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 70/1: 75–124.
- Simon, Zsolt. 2016. Ist die Possessivkonstruktion im Kizzuwadna-Luwischen kontaktbedingt zustande gekommen? *Aula Orientalis* 34/2: 325–334.
- Simon, Zsolt. 2020. Cuneiform Luwian =*ku(wa)*: form and meaning. *Hungarian Assyriological Review* 1: 39–42.
- Starke, Frank. 1985. *Die keilschrift-luwischen Texte in Umschrift*. StBoT 30. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Steitler, Charles H. 2017. *The Solar Deities of Bronze Age Anatolia*. Studies in Texts of the Early Hittite Kingdom. StBoT 62. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Taracha, Piotr. 2009. *Religions of Second Millennium Anatolia*. DBH 27. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Ünal, Sultan. 2017. *Die erste (?) Tafel des Rituals von Kizzuwatna (CTH 479.1)*. Hethiter.net/CTH 479.1 (INTR 2017-03-03).
- Watkins, Calvert. 2010. Toward a Hittite stylistics: remarks on some phonetic and grammatical figures. In: Ronald Kim, Norbert Oettinger, Elisabeth Rieken, Michael Weiss (eds.). *Ex Anatolia Lux. Anatolian and Indo-European studies in honor of H. Craig Melchert on the Occasion of his sixty-fifth birthday*: 356–362. Ann Arbor: Beech Stave.
- Yakubovich, Ilya. 2008. The Origin of Luwian possessive adjectives. In: Karlene Jones-Bley, Martin E. Huld, Angela Della Volpe, Miriam Robbins Dexter (eds.). *Proceedings of the Nineteenth Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference*: 193–217. Washington: Institute for the Study of Man.
- Yakubovich, Ilya. 2010. *Sociolinguistics of the Luwian Language*. BSIEL 2. Leiden: Brill.
- Yakubovich, Ilya. 2013a. Anatolian Names in *-wiya* and the Structure of Empire Luwian Onomastics. In: Alice Mouton, Ian Rutherford, Ilya Yakubovich (eds.). *Luwian Identities: Culture, Language and Religion between Anatolia and the Aegean*. CHANE 64: 87–123. Leiden: Brill.

- Yakubovich, Ilya. 2013b. The Degree of Comparison in Luwian. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 118: 155–168.
- Yakubovich, Ilya. 2013/14. The Luwian Deity Kwanza. *Aramazd (Armenian Journal of Near Eastern Studies)*: 8/1–2: 282–297.
- Yakubovich, Ilya. 2014. From Lower Land to Cappadocia. In: Michael Kozuh, Wouter F. M. Henkelman, Charles E. Jones, Christopher Woods (eds.). *Extraction and Control: Studies in Honor of Matthew W. Stolper*: 347–352. Chicago: Oriental Institute.
- Yakubovich, Ilya. 2016. The Luwian Welcome. In: Šárka Velhartická (ed.). *Audias fabulas veteres. Anatolian Studies in Honor of Jana Součková-Siegelová*. CHANE 79: 463–484. Leiden: Brill.

Илья Якубович, Алис Мутон. Где говорили luwili? Географическое и лингвистическое многообразие лувийских клинописных текстов

Задачей данной статьи является разбор уточнений диалектной географии лувийского ареала во втором тысячелетии до н.э., ставших необходимыми в процессе работы по изданию лувийских клинописных текстов. С одной стороны, лувийские заклинания в ритуальных традициях Пуриянни и Куватталлы, традиционно относимые к диалекту Киццувадны, характерному для юго-востока Малой Азии, также обнаруживают связи с ареалом Нижней страны, расположенной в центральной и западно-центральной частях малоазиатского региона. Усиление влияния Киццувадны на традицию Куватталлы, включая увеличение числа хурритских заимствований в соответствующих текстах, отражает их вторичное бытование при дворе Хаттусы. С другой стороны, происхождение значительной группы лувийских заговоров, соотносимой с каталожными номерами СТН 764–766, можно связать с городом Тауриса, локализуемым к северо-востоку от Хаттусы. Язык этих заговоров имеет свои диалектные особенности, а их формульный репертуар обнаруживает нетривиальные параллели в хаттских и палайских текстах. В заключительной части статьи обсуждается значение новых эмпирических выводов для общей классификации лувийских диалектов.

Ключевые слова: лувийский язык; хурритский язык; хаттский язык; палайский язык; Хаттуса; Киццувадна; Нижняя страна; Тауриса.

Hypotheses of interference between Greek and the languages of Ancient Anatolia: the case of patronymics

Following an overview of how the different languages attested in Anatolia during the Iron Age express patronymics, this paper explores the alleged interferences among the strategies found in these languages. Particular focus is placed on the possible interactions between Greek and the Anatolian languages in the use of genitive patronymics with or without a noun for ‘son’ or ‘daughter’ (following prior studies by Merlin and Pisaniello 2019 and Rutherford 2002) and on the claim of a Lydian origin for Greek patronymics in *-ιδας/-ιδης* (Dardano 2011), for which an internal Greek development is accepted after the inclusion of relevant data from Phrygian. All in all, very few local interactions are sustained as being valid.

Keywords: patronymics; Anatolian languages; Phrygian language; Greek language; language contact.

Introduction

A patronymic is a complement to the personal name based on the given name of father’s name. They were used to identify a person in many ancient cultures before surnames replaced them, although many modern surnames are fossilized patronymics, for example, Scottish Gaelic *MacNéill* ‘the son of Niall’, English *Peterson* ‘the son of Peter’, Spanish *Martínez* ‘the son of Martín’ and Portuguese *Henriques* ‘the son of Henrique’. Ancient traditions are still in use in places like Iceland, where there are no surnames. For instance, the name of the current Icelandic president is *Guðni Thorlacius Jóhannesson*: *Guðni Thorlacius* is his first name and *Jóhannesson* derives from his father’s name, *Jóhannes Sæmundsson*, through the addition of the suffix *-son* ‘son’ (as in many current Germanic surnames). Because of their social relevance and their relationship with personal identity and ethnicity, patronymics can be used as a source of cultural information on a given community and can provide details about linguistic contact.

Earlier scholars have suggested some cases of contact between Anatolian languages and Greek on the basis of shared features with regard to the formation of patronymics. However, few of the proposals in the literature are based on updated knowledge of the Anatolian material and most avoid providing an overview of the subject. Moreover, in the last decades, the ancient languages of Anatolia (crucially for this paper, those of the Anatolian branch of the Indo-European family and Phrygian) have been subject to more systematic scientific study and the data, when available, are now more abundant and more reliable. Therefore, we have a good opportunity to provide an updated overview of patronymics in the languages attested during the Iron Age (§ 1)¹ and to review prior proposals of contacts in the light of our current knowledge (§ 2, 3 and 4). The Greek patronymic suffix *-ιδας/-ιδης* is one of the most important points here, since it has been identified as a possible borrowing from Lydian (Dardano

¹ There are no claims of contact between Greek and Anatolian languages based on patronymics during the Bronze Age. Therefore, I leave aside the intricate question of the contact between Greek (attested only in the Mycenaean dialect) and Hittite and Luwian.

2011). Finally, an account of Phrygian variation is given (§ 5), since this language has been largely overlooked in the linguistic map of Anatolia, despite the central position it occupies.

1. Overview of patronymics attested in Anatolia during the Iron Age

There were different ways of expressing the patronymics in Anatolia during the Iron Age, and in some cases several of these are attested in a single language. As we will see, Hieroglyphic Luwian, Lycian, Phrygian and Greek use different strategies to form patronymics, while Carian, Lydian, Sidetic, Phoenician, Aramaic and Urartian have only one patronymic form.²

The most widespread patronymic form in Anatolia is the creation of a “possessive” or “genitival” adjective, which derives from the father’s names through a suffix. There are two variants in the different languages: those which place the adjective in agreement with the nouns for ‘son’ and ‘daughter’ and those in which the adjective stands alone. In the first group of languages, which use the noun, we find Hieroglyphic Luwian, which uses adjectives derived through the suffix *-assali-* (1), and Lycian, which uses genitival-adjectives derived through *-h-* (when governed by nominative) / *-he* (by locative) / *-hñ* (accusative).³

1. Hieroglyphic Luwian: Bohça § 1

[! ?]ku+ra/i-ti-i-sá !á-<sa-hwali-si>-sa₄ !HEROS-li-i-sa ! (“INFANS”)ni-mu-wali-za-sa
Kurtis-n.sg.C Ashwis-adj.n.sg.C. of the hero-n.sg.C. son-n.sg.C.
‘Kurtis, the hero Ashwis’ son’

2. Lycian: TL 36, 2 (Xanthos)

ahqqadi: pizibideh: tideimi
Ahqqadi-nom.sg.C. Pizibide-adj.nom.sg.C. son-nom.sg.C.
‘Ahqqadi, son of Pizibide’

3. Lycian: TL 25a, 5–6 (Tlos)

tikeukēpre ... urtaquijahñ kbatru
Tikeukēpre-acc.sg.C. Urtaqija-adj.acc.sg.C. daughter-acc.sg.C.
‘Tikeukēpre, daughter of Urtaqija’

In the second group, those languages in which the adjective stands alone can be classed as Lydian, which builds an adjective through the suffix *-li-* (4), Lycian (5), Phrygian through *-evais-* (6) and, perhaps, *-(e)yo-* (7), Aeolic Greek through *-yo-* (8) and Urartian through *-hə* (9).⁴

4. Lydian: LW 001, 4 (Sardes)

manelid kumlilid šilukalid
Manes-adj.nom-acc.sg.N. Kumli(i)-adj.nom-acc.sg.N. Seleukia-adj.nom-acc.sg.N.
‘(belongs) to Manes (the son) of Kumli- (the grandson of) Seleukia’

² It may be significant that of the languages in this group, it is the Anatolian ones that remain more cryptic (Lydian and Carian) or present an extremely fragmentary corpus (Sidetic). Note that Carian has personal names that can be considered to have a patronymic meaning, if *mno-* is accepted as meaning ‘son’ (see fn. 9): cf. Ἐκατόμνωσ, Carian *ktmno-*, *ktmño-* (Adiego 2007: 375, 378), as adduced by Yakubovich in his discussion about the origin of Μεγ-μν-ἄδ-εσ (2017: 289).

³ I follow here the analysis by Adiego 2010. This work is not considered in Merlin and Pisaniello 2019, who assumed a derivation through the Lycian suffix *-ahi-/ehi-*. This last suffix commonly creates adjectives, but never patronymics. For an overview of the possessive adjective in the Luwic languages in place of the genitive case, see Melchert 2012.

⁴ Carian could be added to this list, if forms in *-ś* are not considered as genitives (see fn. 10).

5. Lycian: TL 105, 2 (Limyra)
esete muleseh
 Esete-n.sg.C Mulese-adj.nom.sg.C
 ‘Esete (son) of Mulese’
6. Phrygian: M-01a (Yazılıkaya)
ates arkievais akenanogavos
 Ates-n.sg.M. Archias-adj.n.sg.M. akenanogavos-n.sg.M.
 ‘Ates (son) of Archias the *holder* of the *akenan*’
7. Phrygian: G-183 (Gordion)
tiveia imeneia
 Tiveia-n.sg.F. Iman-adj.n.sg.F. ?
 ‘Tiveia (the daughter of) Iman’ ?
8. Greek: Buck 24 (Kebrene)
 ἄπι Σθενεΐαι [...] τῷ Νικιαΐοι
 prep Stheneias-dat.sg.M. Nikias-adj.dat.sg.M.
 ‘upon Stheneias (the son) of Nikias’
9. Urartian: CTU 1 A 08-01, 2-3 (Van)
mar-gi-iš-ti-[-še] mmi-nu-ú-a-ḫi-ni-še
 Argišti-erg.sg. Minua-adj.erg.sg.
 ‘Argišti (the son) of Minua’

It is worth recalling here that Greek has different patronymic adjectives but only the Aeolic patronymic in *-ιος*⁵ is found in Anatolia instead of the widespread genitive. Other Greek types are reported by the *Tékhnē Grammatiké* (GG I, 1: 25–26):

Πατρωνυμικὸν μὲν οὖν ἔστι τὸ κυρίως ἀπὸ πατρὸς ἐσχηματισμένον, καταχρηστικῶς δὲ καὶ τὸ ἀπὸ προγόνων, οἷον Πηλεΐδης, Αἰακίδης ὁ Ἀχιλλεύς. Τύποι δὲ τῶν πατρωνυμικῶν ἀρσενικῶν μὲν τρεῖς, ὁ εἰς δης, ὁ εἰς ων, ὁ εἰς αδιος, οἷον Ἀτρεΐδης, Ἀτρεΐων, τρεῖς, ὁ εἰς δης, ὁ εἰς ων, ὁ εἰς αδιος, οἷον Ἀτρεΐδης, Ἀτρεΐων, καὶ ὁ τῶν Αἰολέων ἴδιος τύπος Ὑρράδιος. Ὑρρα γὰρ παῖς ὁ Πιττακός. Θηλυκῶν δὲ οἱ ἴσοι τρεῖς, ὁ εἰς ις, οἷον Πριαμῖς, καὶ ὁ εἰς ας, οἷον Πελιάς, καὶ ὁ εἰς νη, οἷον Ἀδρηστίνη. Ἀπὸ δὲ μητέρων οὐ σχηματίζει πατρωνυμικὸν εἶδος ὁ Ὅμηρος, ἀλλ’ οἱ νεώτεροι.⁶

‘The patronymic is, properly, a form derived from [the name of] the father and by extension from [that of] the ancestors, such as *Pēlidēs* or *Aiacidēs* said of Achilles. There are three types of masculine patronymics: the type ending in *-δης*, that in *-ων*, and the type proper to the Aeolians, in *-αδιος*, as respectively *Atreidēs*, *Atreion*, and *Hyrradios*. Pittacus was, in fact, the son of Hyrra. Similarly, there are three types of feminine forms: the type in *-ις*, that in *-ας*, and that in *-νη*, as *Priamis*, *Pelias*, and *Adrestine*. Homer does not derive the patronymic from [the name of] the mother, but the new poets do’.⁷

The famous patronymics ending in *-ίδας/-ίδης* are restricted to literary sources (mainly after the influence of Homer), with the sole exception of some cases found in syllabic inscriptions from Cyprus (see below). It is true that the suffix *-ίδας/-ίδης* is found in some personal names from Anatolia but it is never used as a proper patronymic. No examples of patronymics ending in *-ίων* and *-αδιος* (both secondarily derived) are found in epigraphic sources, including, of course, the inscriptions from Anatolia.

⁵ There is also a variant in *-ειος* as seen in [Aq]ιστόξενος Βάκχαιος ‘Aristoxenos (the son) of Bakkhos’ (Nécropole de Myrina 116, 20).

⁶ It is a fact that in Homer there are no examples of patronymics derived from any mother’s name. However, this strategy is not unknown in archaic poetry. See, Περσεύς Δαναΐδης ‘Perseus the son of Danae’ in *Aspis* 229.

⁷ Translation by S. Merlin, who generously shared it with me.

A second way of expressing patronymics in the languages attested in Anatolia is the use of the genitive case. Again, the languages have two variants: the genitive can occur followed by the noun for ‘son’ or ‘daughter’ or it can stand alone. Languages that use the first variant include Hieroglyphic Luwian (10) and Greek (11). Carian may also be added to this list, if the identification of *mno-* as the word for ‘son’ is accepted (12).⁸ One could also include Lycian in this list (13), if the debated “adesinential genitives” reflect the inherited genitive ending **-s > -ø* (Adiego 2010: 5).⁹

10. Hieroglyphic Luwian: HAMA 4 Hama A1 § 1
u+rali-hi-li-na PRAE-*tá-sa* †INFANS.NI-*wali-za-sa*
 Urhilina-n.sg.C Paritta-gn.sg.C son-n.sg.C
 ‘Urhilina the son of Paritta’
11. Greek: TAM I 117 (with Lycian TL 117, Limyra)
 Σιδάριος Παρμένοντος υἱός
 Sidarios-n.sg.M Parmenon-gn.sg.M son-n.sg.M
 ‘Sidarios the son of Parmenon’
12. Carian: C.Ka 1 (Kaunos)
psuśólś *malś:* *mnoś*
 Psuśól-gn.sg.C Mal-gn.sg.C son-gn.sg.C
 ‘of Psuśól, son of Mal’ (Adiego 2010, 170, with caveats)
13. Lycian: TL 61 (Phellos)
sbikezijēi: *mrexisa:* *tideimi*
 Sbikezijēi-n.sg.C. Mrexisa-gen.sg.C son-nom.sg.C.
 ‘Sbikezijēi son of Mrexisa’

The second group of languages with this structure uses a sole genitive to express the patronymic, without using the noun for ‘son’ or ‘daughter’. Here we include Carian (14, with caution),¹⁰ Sidetic (15), Phrygian (16)¹¹ and Greek (17).¹² Again, Lycian could be added to this list (18), if the “adesinential genitive” is accepted. Note, however, that the only Lycian inscription containing this kind of filiation formula is TL 145, and unfortunately it shows some gaps. As can be seen, Carian, Greek and, perhaps, Lydian provide examples of both variants (with and without the noun for ‘son’ or ‘daughter’).

14. Carian: C.Hy 1, 4 (Hyllarima)
mane : *uśólś*
 Manes-n.sg.C Uśól-gn.sg.C or
 ‘Manes (the son) of Uśól’

⁸ I follow here the identification by Adiego (defended, e.g., in 2010b: 167–170). However, an alternative interpretation was given by Schürr (2013: 28–29) and Simon (2019: 299–302).

⁹ There are few examples of such an alleged category (TL 5 4, 61 1, 77 2, 117 3, 127 1, N 315 2, with \diamond in TL 69 2). Cf the critical remarks in Schürr 2010: 120–121.

¹⁰ Carian forms in *-ś* could be also interpreted as adjectives, since it is difficult to differentiate them from a possible genitive (Adiego, personal communication).

¹¹ The Phrygian patronymic or papponymic *manitos* in *manes iyungidas manitos* (B-07) can be added to this list, although the form *iyungidas* remains unclear (see below). It should be noted that, in a recent lecture, Rostislav Oreshko defended the identification of *masa urgitos* as the Luwian name *Masaurahisas* (cf. $\text{]}ma-sa-MAGNUS+rali-hi-sà-sá$ in Porsuk 1 § 4).

¹² In addition, despite being attested only in Imperial Roman times, Pisidian exhibits the same feature: e.g. 5 Μουσητα Τας ‘Museta (the son) of Ta’ (a man is depicted on the stele where the inscription occurs).

15. Sidetic: S1, 1 (Side)
artmon *θanpijs*
 Artemon-n.sg.C Athenobios-gn.sg.C
 ‘Artemon (the son) of Athenobios’
16. Phrygian: K-01 (Kerkenes Dağ)
masa *urgitos*
 Masa-n.sg.M Urgi(s)-gn.sg.M
 ‘Masa (the son) of *Urgi(s)’
17. Greek: TAM II 232, 1–2 (Sidyma)
 Χρύσιππος Ζωσίμου
 Chrysippos-n.sg.M Zosimos-gn.sg.M
 ‘Chrysippos (the son) of Zosimos’
18. Lycian: TL 145, 1 (Limyra)
hla *ñterubila*
 Hla-n.sg.C Ñterubila-gen.sg.C
 ‘Hla (the son) of Ñterubila’

Finally, the two Semitic languages attested in Anatolia, Phoenician and Aramaic, use their particular, inherited system: construct from of the word for ‘son’ followed by the father’s name (19 and 20).

19. Phoenician: KAI 24 (Samʿal)
klmw *br* *hyʿ*
 Kilamuwa son-cons.sg. Haya
 ‘Kilamuwa the son of Haya’
20. Aramaic KAI 318 (Daskyleion)
 ʔlnp *br* ʔšy
 Elnaf son-cons.sg. Ašay
 ‘Elnaf son of Ašay’

	Genitive alone	Genitive + ‘son/daughter’	Possessive adjective	‘son/daughter’ construct + name
Hieroglyphic Luwian	–	+	+	–
Lycian	±	±	+	–
Carian	±	±	±	–
Lydian	–	–	+	–
Sidetic	+	–	–	–
Phrygian	+	–	+	–
Greek	+	+	+	–
Phoenician	–	–	–	+
Aramaic	–	–	–	+
Urartian	–	–	+	–

2. The Aeolic patronymic adjective as influenced by the Anatolian languages

A well-known feature of Greek as recorded in Aeolis and, mainly, in Lesbos is the use of the adjectival patronymic ending in *-ιος* instead of the widespread genitive. This has sometimes been considered an influence of those Anatolian languages which use a patronymic adjective, such as Lydian or Luwian (Hawkins 2001: 58–59). A problem derives from the fact that the Aeolic forms can be considered an archaism because the suffix **-iyo-* forms possessive adjectives in a variety of Indo-European languages (Yakubovich 2010: 148–149).

The question is difficult to evaluate, since we do not have a morpheme borrowing in Greek (see below) and the patronymic use of **-iyo-* > *-ιος* is not so far removed from other occurrences in Greek: it forms an adjective to express belonging or relation (*ἀγρός* ‘field, country’ >> *ἄγριος* ‘living in the fields; wild’). Therefore, there are three possible scenarios: an archaism in Aeolic, an internal development, or a development triggered by the contact with the Anatolian language. Although far from certain, it is possible that a feature – the possibility of creating an adjective from a personal name – was promoted following the strategies of other neighboring languages, as a kind of influence.

However, Mycenaean shows the very same patronymic adjective for a Greek dialect during the Bronze Age. For example, in *a-re-ku-tu-ru-wo e-te-wo-ke-re-we-i-jo* *Alektruōn Etewoklewehiyos* ‘Alectryon (the son) of Eteocles’ (PY An 654.8–9), the suffix *-i-jo* /*ijos*/ (< **-iyo-*) is used to build a patronymic after the personal name found in alphabetic Greek as *Ἐτεροκλήρης* (classical *Ἐτεροκλήης*).¹³ Of course, it is feasible that both Mycenaean and Aeolic developed this strategy of building the patronymic adjective from an inherited adjective independently. But the simplest scenario is to assume that Mycenaean and Aeolic patronymics in **-iyo-* are a common, inherited feature. It is possible that, unlike the other Greek alphabetic dialects, Aeolic preserved this kind of patronymic because of its similarity to the analogous feature in neighboring languages, but this is difficult to prove; as an archaism, however, it does not need more substantiation than already provided by the current data. Note also that this feature could be treated as a typical archaism of a peripheral area. The same conclusion is reached by Hajnal (2018: 2046–2047), who adduced three points: 1. “*io*-adjectives that denominate belonging or possession of objects are not attested in Lesbian”. 2. In the Luwic languages, **-/io-/* was affected by the *i*-mutation, which does not occur in Greek *io*-patronymics. 3. As in Mycenaean, Lesbian shows that the possessive adjectives in */-io-/* interfered on “material adjectives” in */-e(i)o-/*.

It is possible that Phrygian, the closest language to Greek in genetic terms, also has the suffix **-eyo-*, used to form patronymics, if *tiveia imeneia* ‘Tiveya (the daughter) of Iman’ (G-183b) is, in fact, a feminine personal name followed by a possessive adjective derived from *iman* (Obrador-Cursach 2020: 254) and not a “material adjective”: ‘those things belonging to Ti(v)es Iman’ (*vel. sim.*). Leaving aside this example, Phrygian *-eyo-* expresses ethnics (*τεμρογεις* 1.1 = 48, derived from the name of the river Thymbris), *matar kubeleya* (B-01) ~ *kubileya* (W-04) ‘Cybele’ (literally, ‘the mother from Kybelon’) and seems to derive adjectives from nouns like *mireyun* (B-05) from *meros* (B-07)/*μικρος* (MPhr-01) ‘?’. In any case, it seems that, contrary to Aeolic Greek, in Phrygian the suffix *-eyo-* influenced the possessive adjectives in **-eyo-*.

¹³ One can add that these patronymics also occur in some names with the ending *-i-jo* in agreement with the nouns *ko-wo* /*korwos*/ ‘boy’ and *u-jo*, *i-**65 and *i-jo* ‘son’, so they could be very productive in Mycenaean. Nevertheless, these endings can be also interpreted as a variant of the thematic genitive in *-i-jo-jo* (cf. Duhoux 2008: 357–359).

3. Greco-Anatolian influences in the use of ‘son/daughter’ after genitive for the patronymic formula?

In a recent paper, Merlin and Pisaniello (2019: 97–98) raised the question of whether the Greek pattern genitive + υἰός ‘son’ is triggered by Lycian genitive + *tideimi* ‘id.’ in the bilingual inscriptions from Lycia. Note that they operate with the traditional assumption that Lycian patronymics in *-h* are mere genitive forms (as in eDiAna, but against Adiego 2010). Rutherford (2002: 210–212) stated earlier that the occurrence of υἰός ‘son’ following the genitive of the father’s name in the Greek part of the bilingual inscriptions is a calque of the Lycian formula father’s alleged genitive + *tideimi*. After consulting the bilinguals and the uses in the monolingual Greek inscriptions from Lycia, Merlin and Pisaniello observed that in the eight useful bilinguals, three texts show the Greek formula genitive + υἰός for the patronymic where the Lycian part has genitive + *tideimi* (TL 72,¹⁴ TL 117, N 320 [2x]), three other texts lack the word for ‘son’ in both versions (TL 6 [2x], TL 45 A, N 312), and in only two instances (TL 25a, TL 56) divergences occur (in the Lycian text *tideimi* is used after the genitive while the Greek counterpart lacks the word υἰός).¹⁵ They also observed that the “the occurrence of υἰός with the father’s name is quite sporadic” in the monolingual inscriptions from Lycia and, in fact, the only occurrence is found in “an inscription from Limyra (H ii 34, iv/iii c. BC), whose structure fully reproduces that of the Lycian sepulchral inscriptions, with a topicalized object, followed by the verb, the subject and the filiation formula with the father’s name in genitive case + the noun ‘son’ (both personal names are Anatolian), and the indirect object (the builder himself, his wife, and their sons)” (Merlin and Pisaniello 2019: 98).¹⁶ All in all, one can easily conclude that the use of υἰός in the Greek inscriptions from Lycia (almost all confined to the bilingual documents) can be attributed to the influence of the Lycian formula. However, Merlin and Pisaniello (2019: 98) acknowledge that the possible interference “does not operate against the Greek rules or create something new; it rather expands an uncommon epigraphic use already existing in the Greek”. Note also that a similar process occurred in Roman times with the Latin influence of the formula genitive + *filius* (usually abbreviated as F.) on Greek (Adams 2003: 670–677). See, for example, the inscription Klazomenai 11, l. 3–4 (Ionia, 41/54 AD): Τι(βέριος) Κλαύδιος Μενάνδρου υἰός ‘Tiberius Claudius the son of Menandros’.

A second point studied by the same authors (Merlin and Pisaniello 2019: 98–99) addresses the reverse scenario: the lack of *tideimi* in the Lycian inscriptions as a calque of the Greek formula, as suggested by Rutherford (2002: 212). They quote the interesting bilingual inscription N 312 (Xanthos),¹⁷ where the Greek text precedes the Lycian and seems to be primary because of the layout and the content, as a Lycian text lacking *tideimi* likely influenced by the Greek formula. Three more cases of the twenty examples available are found in bilingual inscriptions, where the feature can be considered a Greek influence. However, this is difficult to state

¹⁴ On this text, see the new edition and commentaries by Christiansen (2019: 83–84).

¹⁵ Note that Lycian also has a patronymic with a zero ending (Melchert 2012: 275). In most examples, the genitive depends on the word *tideime/i-* ‘son’ (TL 5 4, TL 61 1, TL 77 2, TL 117 3, TL 127 1 and N 315 2) or *kbatra-* (TL 87 5), although there is an example without these words (*Hla: Ñterubila* ‘Hlas (the son) of Ñterubila-’ TL 145 1).

¹⁶ The inscription reads as follows: τοῦτο τὸ μνημεῖον κατεσκευάσατο Κενδας Ασσᾶ υἱ[ὸς] ἑαυτῶ <τ>ε καὶ τῆς γυναικὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῖ[ς] τέκνοις. ‘This monument, Kendas son of Assas built (it) for himself, his wife, and (their) children’.

¹⁷ The patronymic sequences read in the bilingual inscriptions are Greek Δεμοκλ[εῖ]δης Θε[ρ]βησιος Λιμυρεὺς ‘Demoklides (the son) of Therbesis, from Limyra’ (l. 1–2) and Lycian *ñtemuxlida krbbe[s]eh zemuris* ‘Ñtemuxlida (the son) of Krbbase, from Limyra’ (l. 4–5).

with any certainty because of the small number of instances with explicit Greek data and the same use in other surrounding Anatolian languages.

A similar situation with regard to possible interference with Greek can be found in other Anatolian languages, although these other languages are more fragmentary than Lycian and data are scarce or, in the worst cases, not consistently interpreted. One such case is Carian. According to Adiego (e.g. 2007: 291, 383), the word *mno-* means ‘son’ and occurs 11 times¹⁸ in contexts similar to the abovementioned C.Ka 1: *sñis : sdisas : psuśólś malś: mnoś* (C.Ka 1) ‘this (is) the tomb of Psuśól, son of Mal’. Note, however, that this point has been analysed in other terms by Schrürr and Simon (see fn. 9). In any case, “the most typical Carian onomastic formula” consists of individual name + father’s name with the genitive ending *ś*, sometimes followed by a postclitic *ki* (Adiego 2007: 265–266).

As far as we know from the few identified inscriptions, the Sidetic formula is always two-fold: name followed by the father’s name in genitive without any word for ‘son’ or ‘daughter’: *artmon θanpijś* ‘Artemon (the son) of Athenobios’ S1, 1 (Side). The case of Phrygian is also interesting: it has some suffixes to create patronymic adjectives but also the genitive without any noun for ‘son’ or ‘daughter’: *masa urgitos* ‘Masa (the son) of Urgis’ (K-01, Kerkenes Dağ). Therefore, western Anatolia provides examples of languages using the genitive without any noun to express patronymics. It is true that Caria was one of the earliest Hellenized territories in Anatolia, leaving apart the Greek colonies proper. Likewise, Sidetic was surrounded by Pamphylian Greek, and Phrygian is so close to Greek that this feature could be inherited. It is likely, then, that the lack of the noun for ‘son’ or ‘daughter’ after the patronymic genitive was triggered by Greek and/or Phrygian in the Anatolian languages. An areal feature could be a more feasible explanation. As in the case of Lycian, however, a simple elision of the noun as an independent innovation (as occurred in Greek and Phrygian) is very likely, and such an influence cannot be considered a fact.

4. Greek -ιδᾶς/-ίδης and variants and the alleged Lydian borrowing

As noted by Masson (1965: 222–227, also in Dardano 2011: 42), Greek alphabetic inscriptions lack any Greek patronymic in -ιδᾶς/-ίδης. Only syllabic Cypriot inscriptions attest four instances of this kind of patronymic: *o-na-sa-to a-ra-wa-ti-ta-u* Ὀνάσα(ν)το(ς) Ἀρφατίδου ‘of Onasas, son of Arwatos’, *e-ke-ti-mo te-o-to-ki-ta-u* Ἐχετίμω Θεοδοκίδου ‘of Echetimos, son of Theodokos’, *sa-ta-si-wo-se to-pa-po-pa-si-le-wo-se sa-ta-si-pi-li-ta-u* Στάσιφος τῷ Πάφῳ βασιλῆφος Στασιφιλίδου ‘of Stasis, king of Paphos, son of Stasiphilos’ and *o-na-si-ti-mo-se ti-wi-so-ni-ta-se* Ὀνασίτιμος Διψισωνίδας ‘Onasitimos, son of Diwison’ (see Keurentjes 1997: 385–386). In fact, the suffix -ιδᾶς is found for the first time in some personal names read in the Mycenaean tablets. However, they are used as plain personal names, not as patronymics: see the suitable example of *ko-ni-da-jo* /konnidajos/ (KN AS 1516.7, quoted by Dardano 2011: 42). The Mycenaean patronymic suffix is -ijos <(i)-jo> (Bartoněk 2003: 422), the relational suffix, also found forming the patronymic as -ιος in the Aeolic dialect and in some Homeric instances (e.g. Νηληϊῶ υἱ Ἰλ. 2.20). From this last suffix, the variant -ίων derives through the agglutination of the individualizing suffix -ων. The patronymic use of -ιδᾶς/-ίδης seems to be an innovation of the literary tradition applied to significant characters which spread with Homer’s influence. As Dardano summarizes (2011: 43, improving on prior statements by Keurentjes 1997), the function of the suffix was not to form patronymics in the strict sense; rather, it denotes a vague relation with

¹⁸ C.Eu 1, C.Ka 5, C.Ka 1, C.Kr 1. E.Me 10, E.Me 12, E.Me 16, E.Me 27, E.Me 39, E.Me 43b, and E.Me 47.

an ancestor, as seems to be apparent through its use in the names of the demi (Αἰθαλίαδαι, Ἰωνίδαί, etc.), the names of the Attic φυλάι (cf. Αἰαντίδης), the names of relevant families (e.g., Βαγχιάδαι, Κυψελίδαί, Πεισιστρατίδαι, even Ἀχαιμενίδαί for the same dynasty found in Old Persian as *Haxāmanišiya-* ‘Achaemenid’). It may also denote a relation with a place, for example in Εὐριπίδης (derived from Εὐριπος) and Βρασίδης (from *Βράσιος). In the light of these different functions, Dardano (2011: 43) concludes: “le forme in esame non sono patronimici, sono piuttosto aggettivi relazionali derivati da un antropónimo o da un toponimo”.

A problem arises from the origin of *-ídās*. After considering the difficulties to substantiate prior explanations for the etymology of this suffix, Dardano (2011: 48–58) suggests that Lydian *-da-* < **-ida-* < **-iyo-* (Gérard 2005: 89, with a common syncope) is the origin for Greek *-ídās*. In fact, this suffix is used to create the ethnics in the light of *sfar-* ‘Sardis’ >> **sfar-ida-* > *sfarda-* ‘Sardian’ (in LW 22 alternatively *sfardēti-* ‘Sardian’) and, if accepted, **luda-* ‘Lydian’ (Greek Λυδός) < *luwīya-* ‘Luwian’ (see Yakubovich 2017: 287–288, with references).¹⁹ However, the hypothesis cannot be upheld for several reasons.

First, the existence of Mycenaean personal names in */-idās/* invalidates the theory of a Lydian borrowing because they predate the Lydian documentation by several centuries. It is true that at least *mo-ri-wo-do-* /*moliwdo-*/ ‘lead’ (DMic. I 457–458, alphabetic Greek μόλυβδος, ου, ό, ή) is suggested to be a borrowing from Lydian in the light of the theonym *mariwda-* (LW 004a).²⁰ In fact, Myc. /*moliwdo-*/ shows Lydian consonant treatments, if we assume the likely etymology **mork^w-iyo-*, a derivative from PIE **merk^w-* ‘dark’. But the possibility exists that it is simply a cultural loanword, which does not imply the close contact required to support the theory of suffix borrowing.²¹ This is also the case of Greek κύανος ‘enamel, lapis lazuli, blue copper carbonate’, found in Mycenaean as *ku-wa-no-* ‘smalt’ (DMic. I 415–416), and somehow related to Hittite *ku(wa)nna(n)-* ‘copper, ornamental stone’ (Simon 2018: 396 § 85). The same can be said of κύμινον ‘cumin’, Myc. *ku-mi-no* /*kuminon*/ (DMic. I 401), very likely a borrowing from a Semitic language (Rosół 2013: 55–56). It is, however, to be noted that, leaving aside the possibility of the patronymic suffix *-ídās*, there are no other traces of Anatolian structural influences on Greek (see a summary in Simon 2018: 277–378).

Second, Bronze-Age Greek speakers would need a large number of borrowed forms in *-(i)da-* to be able to recognize and use this suffix in a productive way in their own language (borrowing indirectly through complex loanwords containing this suffix)²² but we lack any evidence for this (the documentation does not provide any more alleged Lydian words). Direct borrowing of the suffix is a possibility, but it implies a direct knowledge of the donor language, in this case Lydian. Such knowledge is not confirmed in the use of the suffix: Lydian *-(i)das* is used to form at least one ethnic (if not two, as said above) but never occurs in patronymics, which are built through the suffix *-li-* (as seen in example 4).

¹⁹ Dardano (2011: 55) alleged other formations that now are considered to contain a clitic = *dav*: the alleged *taac-* ‘votive offering’ >> *taacda-* ‘relative to the votive offering’ became *taac=dav* ‘the podium’ + ‘from’; *sfēn(i)-* ‘relative?’ (*sfēn(i)-* for her, I use the current transliteration) >> *sfēnda-* ‘?’ became *sfēn=dav*. The same clitic is also found in *amu=dav* ‘T’ (LW 023 and 024, see Yakubovich 2017: 278), *cidaλm=dav* ‘?’ (LW 022) and *τελm=dav* ‘?’. Only, **mλwen-* ‘of grave’ (in **mλwēnš(i)-*) >> *mλwēndav* ‘(burial) installation?’ remains as so.

²⁰ First suggested by Melchert 2008 and followed by Simon 2018: 400 § 107 and Bianconi 2020: 139 fn. 5.

²¹ Note, however, that we do not know if any other language of the area was affected by the same shifts. It also remains unclear where Proto-Lydian was spoken during the Bronze Age.

²² In fact, neither of the other two criteria established by Seifart (2015: 513) can be applied here: Greek does not have “a set of pairs of loanwords, one with and one without the affix” (e.g., profit–profitable) and, consequently, one cannot observe if “[w]ithin pairs of complex loanwords and corresponding simple loanwords, complex loanwords have a lower token frequency than the corresponding simple loanwords”.

Moreover, it remains unclear why Mycenaean adopted the Lydian suffix *-ida-* as *-do-* in *mo-ri-wo-do-* /moliwdo-/ but as *-idā-* in personal names such as *ko-ki-da* (MY Au 102.8). Finally, onomastics represents a special sphere of the language and the introduction of a suffix that is only operative in onomastic formulae would only be plausible in a context of strong contact and even with a linguistic subordination of Mycenaean to Lydian.

As discussed so far, it seems unlikely that Proto-Lydian exerted such an influence that Mycenaean could have borrowed any suffix. Therefore, it is time to move to another scenario. All the given approaches to Greek *-ιδᾶς* ignore the recent Phrygian evidence, yet this evidence is relevant given the genetic relationship of the two languages. In fact, Phrygian is the closest language to Greek (Obrador-Cursach 2019) and the languages share very specific exclusive features such as the suffix **-eu-/*-ēu-* (Greek *-εύς, -έως, Epic -ῆος*, Phrygian *-avos* thematized) and a dental enlargement of the masculine *i*-stems in cases other than nominative and accusative. This last Phrygian feature was identified by Brixhe (2006: 40; see also Obrador-Cursach 2019: 236) through genitives: *artimitos* (B-05, the Greek goddess Ἀρτεμις, genitive Ἀρτέμιδος, but Mycenaean *a-te-mi-to*, Ἀρτέμιτος AlcM.54, Ἀρτάμιτος CID 1.10.8, 12), *manitos* (B-07, genitive of *manes*) and, perhaps, *urgitos* (K-01). Importantly, *manitos* and *urgitos* are genitives used as patronymics: *manes iyungidas manitos* (if *iyungida-* is a patronymic, *manitos* is a papponymic) and *masa urgitos*.²³

After considering the existence of a shared dental enlargement, one might ask if the Phrygian feature can be used in discussing the origin of Greek patronymics in *-ιδᾶς*. In fact, the Phrygian enlargement *-it-* may go back to a proto-form **-it-* or **-id-* (through the Phrygian devoicing of the stops identified by Lubotsky 2004). Therefore, the presence of this feature in both close languages confirms the plausibility of an inherited treatment from a proto-Greco-Phrygian suffix nom. **-is*, gen. *-idos*. This point is the key to ruling out a borrowing from Lydian: the older the form, the more unlikely the Lydian borrowing. Of course, this approach implies that Greek *-ιδᾶς* is to be analysed as *-ιδ-ᾶς*, where the second element is the individualizing suffix which goes back to **-eh₂+s*, as found in some nouns such as *νεανίας* ‘young man’ or in Greek and Latin verbal governing compounds of the type *βαθυδίνης* ‘deep-eddying’ and *agricola* ‘farmer’, respectively (Fellner and Gretenberger 2016). This analysis for Greek *-ιδ-ᾶς* is not new and has been considered by prior scholars (Chantraine 1933: 339, 362; Schwyzler 1953: 510). What we can rule out definitively is that *-ιδ-ᾶς* is the mere masculinization of feminine words in *-ιδ-*, since **-eh₂- > -ᾶ+ς* only individualizes the form, which is a suitable explanation for the creation of mere personal names, as seen in the Mycenaean stage. Secondly, when used to qualify masculine personal names, it receives the analogical *-s* form nominatives of other stems, as is also the case of *νεανία-ς*.

Despite this segmentation, the origin of **-id-* remains unexplained and has no parallels outside the Greco-Phrygian branch.²⁴ As such, a form inherited from Proto-Indo-European and only attested in these two languages is highly unlikely. As stated above, a borrowing from Lydian is difficult to substantiate because of the Lydian chronology and use. Therefore, only an internal innovation seems plausible. At this point it can be proposed that the Greek derivatives in *-ις, -ιδος* are in fact etymological derivatives in **-i-* (see an earlier proposal in Chantraine 1933: 339, 362). If this is correct, it would explain the relatively limited presence of this suffix in Greek and the abundance of **-ιδ-*.

²³ Note, however, that I suggested a possible continuity from Hurrian *Urḫi-*, as in *Urḫi-Tešub*, heteronym of Muršili III (Obrador-Cursach 2020: 142), see fn. 9.

²⁴ I leave aside the problem of the origin of some dental suffixes found in Luwian such as CLuwian *-aḫit-/āḫid/ < -eh₂+id-* (according to Hajnal 1994: 137 fn. 4) or *-it-/id-* (Starke 1990: 151–224), which goes beyond the scope of my knowledge.

Proto-Indo-European *i*-stems are used to form nouns and adjective of all genders, as one can infer from some ancient Indo-European languages: see, e.g., Hittite *palh-i-* ‘broad’, Vedic *śúc-i-* ‘bright’, Greek τροφ-ι-ς ‘stout, large’, Latin *turpis* ‘ugly’ (< **mor-i-*), Old Irish *maith* ‘good’. However, details on this possible category in PIE remain cryptic if not controversial, since exact formations in different branches are not found (see Balles 2009; Rau 2009: 72, 132; Grestenberger 2014: 94–95). Leaving aside the exact origin of *i*-stem adjectives in Indo-European languages, we can assume that those found in the prehistory of Greek are relational adjectives in **-i-* ‘belonging, related to’, with no gender distinction (as assumed for PIE and as still seen in Latin and in some Greek words),²⁵ secondly individualized (**-eh₂-*) and masculinized (through an analogical **-s* in the nominative) ‘he who is related to’, as seen in the diversity of types of words that *-ιδας* derives: they can be derived from a personal name, such as the gentilics derived from a mythical ancestor (Αἰθαλίδαι, Ἰωνίδαι, Σκαμβωνίδαι) and the names of families (Βαγχιάδαι, Κυψελίδαι, Πεισιστρατίδαι, etc.), from a place name (Εὐριπίδης, Βρασιδάς) or even from nouns (like εὐπατριδης or κοιρανίδης). In fact, the history of the patronymic in *-ίων* is very similar, where after an adjective in **-yo-* a patronymic was built by the addition of the individualizing *-ων*. At some point in Greek pre-history after the creation of personal names in *-ιδας*, the suffix *-ιδ-* was identified as a feminine formation, since many words derived through **-i-* (but not all) are found as feminine in historical times. Consequently, *-ιδας* was not the masculine of *-ιδ-*, as previously suggested.

The suffix *-ιδ-* may have arisen as an analogical inflection after the Greco-Phrygian shift **-VT-s#* > *-Vs#*. In the case of Greek, this shift can be seen in Attic νεότης ‘youth’ (Doric, Aeolic νεότης, Latin *nouitās* ‘newness, novelty’) < PIE **néwo-teh₂t-s* (Rix 1992: 143, §157), χάρις, χάριτος ‘beauty, elegance; gratitude’ < PIE **ǵʰr̥-i-t-* and Doric πῶς, ποδός ‘foot’ < PIE **póds* (Attic πούς is problematic). For Phrygian, the shift occurs in Old Phrygian *nevos* ‘male descendant’ < **nepot-s* (acc. sg. *nevotan*, identified by Hämmig 2013) and the theonym Βας < **bʰóh₂-t-* / **bʰéh₂-t-* (acc. sg. *batan*, Βαταν see Obrador-Cursach 2017). Importantly, there are problems and divergences in the inflection of *i*-stems in Greek (Chantraine 1933: 114; Beekes 1973: 241–245). Alongside the words which retained the inherited inflection (ὄις, οἴος ὄ and ἦ ‘sheep, ram’) and variants (π(τ)όλις, πόλιος or -ηρος/-εως ‘city’), there are words that follow two inflections, with and without the dental enlargement: μῆνις ‘wrath’ gen. μῆνιος or μῆνιδος, μῆτις, ἦ ‘wisdom, skill, craft’ gen. μῆτιος and μῆτιδος, εὖνις, ὄ, ἦ ‘reft of, bereaved of’ gen. εὖνιδος and εὖνιος and nom.pl. εὖνιδες and εὖνιες, πτερίς, ἴδος has the variant πτέρις, εως ἦ ‘male fern, Aspidium Filix-mas’, etc. There are also words with an accusative singular which shows an earlier stage: for instance, ἔρις, ἴδος ‘strife, quarrel, contention’ (an original *-i* stem, EDG 459) has ἔριν together with ἔριδα. As far as we know, Phrygian *i*-stems only retain the original ending in the accusative: the personal name *manes* has a genitive *manitos* but an accusative *manin*.²⁶ Therefore, it can be inferred that the inflection of some *i*-stem words merged the dental stems (which have a *-Vs* nominative), resulting in the creation of a new derivative suffix not found outside Greco-Phrygian or an analogy of the genitive from dental stems (*-VTos*) that prompted a reanalysis of such stems. The advantage of this hypothesis is that it would explain the presence of the dental in unexpected environments such as παῖς, παιδός, ὄ, ἦ ‘child; daughter or son’ < **péh₂u-i-s* << **péh₂u-* ‘few, little’ (seen in Attic παῦς, cf. EDG 1142–1143) and even why this word can be used as both masculine and feminine. Just like *-is*, *-is* in the third Latin declension, in the early stages of Greek pre-history, the suffix **-is* could have been indifferent

²⁵ The same claim was made by Leukart 1994: 255–256, who stated “Das Suffix /-id-/ war ursprünglich genus-indifferent, vgl. παῖιδ-”. Note that παῖς (Epic πάϊς), παιδός ‘child’ (masculine and feminine) goes back to **peh₂u-*.

²⁶ We can infer from **dh₃-ti-m* > *totin* ‘gift, offering’ (Ligorio 2016) that the same accusative is preserved in the derivatives in *-ti-*, as in Greek (cf. the acc. δόσιν of δόσις, εως or ιος).

to the masculine and feminine gender. Consequently, the formation $-\dot{\iota}\delta\text{-}\bar{\alpha}\zeta$ can be considered the “Maskulinisierung des genusindifferenten Suffixes $-\dot{\iota}\delta-$ ” (Meier 1975, § 66), during the specialization process of the suffix $*-id-$ as forming feminine and diminutive words. A similar process can be found in Luwian. In this language the i -stems of foreign origin were adapted as neuter id -stems (Starke 1990: 210–226). This is, for example, the case of Hurrian loanwords: e.g., Hurrian *abi-* ‘sacrificial pit’ is adapted in Luwian as *abid-* and *erippi-, irimpi-* ‘cedar’ as *irimpid-, irippid-*.²⁷

If the above scenario is accepted for Greek, it is likely that $*-id-$ can in fact be analysed as $*^{\circ}i-d-$, since in many instances it is an innovation of inherited i -stems (e.g. $*\mu\epsilon\lambda\pi-$ ‘expect’ > $\epsilon\lambda\pi\text{-}\dot{\iota}\zeta$, $\dot{\iota}\delta\text{o}\varsigma$ ‘hope, expectation’, EDG 415). This new suffix $-d-$ was also analogically added to other stems such as derivatives in $*-iH-$ > $*-i-$ ($\kappa\lambda\epsilon\dot{\iota}\varsigma$, $\kappa\lambda\epsilon\dot{\iota}\delta\text{o}\varsigma$ ‘bar, bolt’ < $*\kappa\lambda\epsilon\eta_{2u}\text{-}iH-$, EDG 711) and some non-inherited u -stems: $\epsilon\mu\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$, $-\acute{\upsilon}\delta\text{o}\varsigma$, η ‘fresh-water tortoise, esp. *Emys lutaria*’ (also $\acute{\alpha}\mu\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$, $-\acute{\upsilon}\delta\text{o}\varsigma$, η), $\pi\eta\lambda\alpha\mu\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$, $\acute{\upsilon}\delta\text{o}\varsigma$, η ‘young tunny’, $\chi\lambda\alpha\mu\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$ ‘short mantle, cloak’. One can add to this list $\pi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\mu\upsilon\varsigma$, $\upsilon\delta\text{o}\varsigma$ ‘king’, a clear borrowing from Lydian *qaλmu-* ‘king’. The same process occurs in the inflection of foreign personal names, such as the eight Lydian names in genitive used as patronymic which were adapted in Greek as dental stems²⁸ in the inscriptions of Ephesos *IEphesos* I.2 (= *Ephesos* 572):

Αταδος (l. 24, 26, 54, 55), genitive of Ατας (LGPN V5a-45664–5, KPN § 119–2), Lydian *ata-* (LW 030, Sardis).

Ατιδος (l. 23, 43, 47, 56), genitive of Ατις (LGPN V5a-45671–6, KPN § 119–4).

Βαβαδος (l. 50), genitive of Βαβας (LGPN V5a-45956 and 45962, KPN § 133–1).

Ιβιδος (l. 55), genitive of Ιβις (not included in KPN nor in LGPN, only in literary sources).

Καδωδος (l. 37, 50), genitive of Καδως (LGPN V5a-49067–8, KPN § 500–10), Lydian *katowa-* (LW 010, Sardis).

Καρουδος (l. 16, 17, 18, 33, 45, 46, 48, 49, 54), genitive of Καρους (LGPN V3b-28762–72, KPN § 542–2), Lydian *karo-* (e.g. LW 010, Sardis).

Κονδαδος (l. 33), genitive of Κονδας (LGPN V5a 49365, not included in KPN).

Ποταδος (l. 57), genitive of Ποτας (LGPN V5a 52275–6, not included in KPN).

This short list shows how three different patterns were adapted²⁹ in a similar way: we have names with a nominative in $-\text{o}\upsilon\varsigma$ (Καρους), in $-\text{i}\varsigma$ (Ατις and Ιβις) and in $-\text{a}\varsigma$ (Ατας, Βαβας, Κονδας and Ποτας). Καδως, Καδωδος is a special case, since it shows the evolution of a name in $-\text{a}\varsigma$ with the vowel contraction occurring after the loss of $/w/$: Lydian *katowa-* > Καδοας (KPN § 500–7) > Καδως. The dental adaptation for names in $-\text{i}\varsigma$ is not surprising in light of observations made above. The adaptation of Καρους can be explained by the inflection of $\pi\acute{\omicron}\upsilon\varsigma$, $\pi\acute{\omicron}\delta\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$. The names in $-\text{a}\varsigma$ follow the inflection of some Greek nouns in $-\bar{\alpha}\zeta$ $-\bar{\alpha}\delta\text{o}\varsigma$ (e.g. $\phi\epsilon\upsilon\gamma\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$, $\phi\epsilon\upsilon\gamma\acute{\alpha}\delta\text{o}\varsigma$ ‘exile’), which remain problematic. It is common to read that the suffixes $-\dot{\iota}\delta-$, $-\upsilon\delta-$ and $-\alpha\delta-$ are variants of a Pre-Greek suffix (see Keurentjes 1997: 397). However, no traces of Pre-Greek have been identified in Phrygian, the language which shares at least the dental ex-

²⁷ I provide these examples according to Yakubovich 2015. For a possible instance of a similar development in an inherited Luwian lexeme, cf. Yakubovich 2016: 481. In fact, it seems that at some stage of this language almost all the neuter i -stems were eliminated, some by way of transfer to the id -class through a proportional analogy of a similar kind (Yakubovich in p.c.).

²⁸ See Kearns 1994, who defended the presence of the dental adaptation as a “transformation of the Lydian possessive adjectives in $-\text{i}\varsigma$ ”. This statement is unnecessary, since they are names in genitive, not adjectives. The inscription contains a death sentence passed against Sardian men for sacrilege against Artemis Ephesos.

²⁹ Note that the adaptations of these names do not always follow the same pattern. In Pisidia we find the dative Ατα (MAMA 4.245) of Ατας without any trace of a dental inflection. The same is seen with Βαβα, the genitive of Βαβας found in Bithynia and Phrygia.

tension for the *i*-stems. If we add to this the possible internal development of the suffix as argued here, an alternative origin for *-αδ-* must be found.

To develop the hypothesis of analogy suggested for *-ιδ-*, it would be necessary to find a kind of nominative which could be the source of such a stem. Here, one could suggest some *as*-stem neuters. In fact, they have multiple origins: they can be “primary *s*-stems derived from a root in final **-h₂*” like γῆρας ‘old age’ or γέρας ‘prize of honor’ < **g_{er}h₂-s-*, from “secondary *s*-stem derivatives from **h₂-stems*” (Nikolaev 2010a: 191) like δέμας ‘bodily frame’ (see Nikolaev 2010b) and from a heteroclitic **r/n*-stem. The latter is the case of only two Greek words, “τέρας ‘marvel’ and πείρας/πέρας ‘limit’, which may continue **k^wer-*r** and **per-*u**” (Nikolaev 2010a: 190). Note that the first has two inflections, Epic τέρας, τέραος vs. the dental extension in the most common τέρας, τέρατος, and the second also has variants, Epic and Lyric πείραο and πείρας, but it is commonly inflected as a *t*-stem: πέρας, πέρατος. However, a complex process of stem reconversion and a gender shift is unlikely as an explanation for the origin of the words containing the suffix *-αδ-* because it requires the assumption of two processes that cannot be proved.

The process can be explained in other terms, including a prior neuter stage. In fact, the words with *-αδ-* may derive from ancient collective neuters in **-h₂* with the ending for animate nouns in **-s*, a kind of “singulative” found, e.g., in δρῦς, δρῦός ‘tree, oak’ (feminine) < **druh₂-s* ‘a single tree’ << **dru-h₂* ‘wood’ << **doleru* ‘tree’ (Janda 1997: 141–145). A similar process has been considered for the masculine Greek noun λᾶας, λᾶος by Nikolaev (2010a: 192–193): **leh₂-e/os-* ‘stone’ >> **leh₂-es-h₂* ‘mass of stones’ >> Proto-Greek *lāha-s* ‘stone’. Thus, we can hypothesize that a singulative like νιφάς ἄδος, ἡ ‘snowflake; snowstorm’ has the following prehistory: PIE **sneǵ^{wh}-* ‘to snow’ >> **niǵ^{wh}-h₂* ‘the snow’ >> **niǵ^{wh}-h₂-s* ‘snowflake’. The same applies to φυγάς, ἄδος, ὁ, ἡ ‘one who flees, fugitive, exile’: PIE **b^heuǵ-* ‘to flee’ >> **b^huǵ-h₂* ‘exile’ >> **b^huǵ-h₂-s* ‘a single exile’. The parallel process can be hypothesized for λιθάς, ἄδος, ἡ ‘stone’, λαμπάς, ἄδος, ἡ ‘torch’ and words with the same suffix. After the creation of **s*-stem non-neuter nouns and the shift **-VT-s#* > *-Vs#* with the rise of the new suffix *-δ-*, the nominative resulting from **-h₂-s*, with a strange short-vowel nominative and **s*-stem inflection was re-analysed as **-a-d-s* > **-α-ς* and a new stem **-a-d-* considered to be a suffix. Following this process, the new suffix *-α-δ-* was also used as an allomorph of *-ιδ-* after *-ι-*, as in Ἰλιον/Ἰλιος >> Ἰλιάς, ἄδος, ἡ ‘the Troad; a Trojan woman; The Iliad (the poem)’. It also occurs in the patronymics built after this suffix such as Δέξιος >> Δεξιάδης (*Il.* 7.15).

To sum up, the main idea is that the nominatives of some ancient stems (mainly the relational adjective **-is* and the singulative of an ancient collective **-h₂-s* > *-as*) were re-analysed after the shift **-VT-s#* > *-Vs#* and, as a result, a new suffix **-V(δ)-* was created in Greek (and Phrygian). On the basis of the resulting suffix **-id-*, singulatives in **-id-eh₂-s* were created and became used as patronymics in Homer (and in Cyprus, according to the syllabic inscriptions).

5. Variation in Phrygian patronymics

Similarly to Lycian and Greek, Old Phrygian shows different ways of expressing patronymics. To the best of our knowledge, Phrygian has patronymics built with a plain genitive without any noun for ‘son’ or ‘daughter’. There are two different structures of this formula. The first is the personal name followed by the father’s name in genitive:³⁰

³⁰ The identification of *-oy*, written both <oi> and <oy>, as the thematic genitive is a recent proposal by Oreshko (fthc.), who also adds the Middle Phrygian inscription W-11 νικοστρατος κλευμαχοι ‘Nikostratos (the

W-08: *ates agomoi* ‘Ates (the son) of Agomos’ (according to Oreshko fthc.).

B-05: *atriyas davoi* ‘Atriya (the son) of Davos’ (according to Oreshko fthc.).

K-01: *ḡasa urgitos* ‘Masa (the son) of Urgis’

HP-102: *midas aiasay* ‘Midas (the son) of Aiasa’ ?

Conversely, there are several examples of a possible genitive preceding the name, which is usually the case of normal genitives in Indo-European languages but does not occur with patronymics:

M-06: *davoi iman* ‘Iman (the son) of Davos’ (according to Oreshko fthc.).

G-136: *tadoy : iman* ‘Iman (the son) of Tados’ ?? dative?

G-144: *estatoy avun* ‘Avun (the son) of Estados’ ???

Dd-101: *pser²keyoy atas* ‘Atas (the son) of Pser/ukeyos’ ?

Dd-102: *surgastoy inas* ‘Inas (the son) of Surgastos’ ?

Alternatively, Phrygian has “possessive” or “genitival” adjectives used as patronymics.

The clearest are those with the suffix *-(e)vais*, *-(e)vanos* < **-wnt-s*,

T-02b: *[-?]-ḡumida : memeuis* ‘[-?]-ḡumida (the son) of Meme(s)’³¹

P-02: *bugnos vasos kanutii²evanos²* ‘Bugnos (the son) of Vasos (the son) of Kanutı’

P-03: *vasous iman mekas ḡanutieivai²s* ‘Vasos Iman the great (the son) of Kanutı’

M-01a: *ates : arkiavais* ‘Attes (the son) of Archias’

M-01b: *baba : memevais* ‘Baba (the son) of Meme(s)’

M-02: *bba : memevais* ‘Baba (the son) of Meme(s)’

Other kinds of patronymic adjective are more problematic. As stated above, there is one possible example of a patronymic in *-eyo-*: G-183 *tiveia imeneia* ‘Tiveia (the daughter) of Iman’. Also problematic is the alleged example of a Phrygian patronymic in *-idas*: B-07 *manes iyungidas manitos*.³² Is Manes the son of a man called *Iyungi-* and grandson of a man called Manes? In fact, *iyungidas* is a hapax and even its spelling is strange in Phrygian (there are no other attested examples of <iy> at the beginning of a word). We do not know the origin of this form, although theoretically it could be an ethnic in **-eh₂-s* like *tias* (G-249, said of a *sekel* ‘weight’), New Phrygian Πουντας (said of the god *Bas* in 1.1 = 48), which can be equated to Greek Ποντανηνός (KON 504 § 1085), and, before being a personal name, **Gordiyas* > Γορδίας, equated to Greek Γορδιανός (literally ‘the one from Gordion’).³³ The most striking feature, however, is that *-idas* is incompatible with the homophonic Greek patronymic suffix if both are inherited. If *iyungidas* is a patronymic in *-idas*, it must be a feature borrowed from Greek. But can we be sure that it is not another kind of formation? We cannot, and unfortunately it is a hapax.

When considering the Phrygian variant of patronymic expression, one wonders if this – or indeed any of the attested variants – can be considered a contact-induced feature. In fact, the formulas attested in Phrygian have parallels in other languages from Anatolia, with the sole exclusion of the possible sequence father’s name in genitive + personal name. As explained above (§2), however, the use of *-(e)yo-* (Obrador-Cursach 2020: 84–85) seems to be an inherited feature shared with Mycenaean Greek and Aeolic. The suffix *-(e)van-* is also inherited and used to create some patronymics (Obrador-Cursach 2020: 84–85). So, Phrygian, like Greek, shows no suffix transference in its patronymic formations. It is also plausible that the genitive use of

son) of Kleumakhos’. According to him, the suffix *oi*, *-oy/-oi* goes back to **-osyo* as Mycenaean Greek *-o-jo /-oyo/*, Epic *-oio* and Thessalian *-oi* (after apocope). One can wonder whether it is a case of syncretism rather than apocope. Before his proposal, these forms were considered dative singular.

³¹ The form *memeuis* instead of *memevais* (M-01b) is explained as influenced by the Anatolian shift *wa > u*. Note that the inscription was found in *Tuvana* (Greek Τύανα), a relevant Luwian capital.

³² This is a proposal by Brixhe (2004: 77–78), followed by Avram 2019: 312.

³³ On Phrygian ethnics in **-eh₂-s* > *-as*, see Obrador-Cursach 2019b.

the patronymic could be an influence of the Anatolian languages with this strategy and/or Greek on Phrygian. At least the genitive followed by the personal name has no parallels in Anatolian, so an influence is not expected. A Greek influence can also be ruled out: early contacts are only detected in the case of Aeolic, a dialect whose patronymics are built with a derivative in **-iyo-* (as seen above). Therefore, one must conclude that the genitive patronymics in Phrygian are an internal innovation, although an Anatolian influence (Luwian would be the most likely candidate) cannot be ruled out or traced back.

Conclusions

Having compared the available data with the suggested proposals, it seems prudent to assume that patronymics do not provide evidence of a strong influence between Greek and the languages spoken in Anatolia. Suffix transference, as suggested for *-ιδᾶς/-ίδης* and for Aeolic *-ιος*, are accounted for as purely Greek features. Only local calques can be accepted at most, as in the case of ‘son’ or ‘daughter’ used after the father’s name in Greek-Lycian bilingual inscriptions. More controversial is the case of the father’s name in genitive alone: this Greek feature is also found in Phrygian, Lycian, Carian and Sidetic, while Luwian always shows the presence of the noun for ‘son’. Coastal areas are known to have been quickly Hellenized, so it is possible that Greek exerted an influence on these languages, if it is not an areal feature (despite the absence of Lydian from this list). However, the elision of the noun ‘son’ in genealogies is so general that an internal feature cannot be ruled out.

Acknowledgements

This paper was produced in the framework of the project PALaC, which has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (Grant Agreement n° 757299). An earlier version was presented at the workshop “Contacts in Pre-Hellenistic Anatolia and Ancient Near East: From Languages to Texts” (Verona, 25–27 February 2021), organized by PALaC and the project Luwili.

References

- Adams, James Noel. 2003. *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Adiego, Ignacio Javier. 2007. *The Carian Language*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Adiego, Ignacio Javier. 2010a. On Lycian Genitives in *-h*, *-he*. In: R. Kim, N. Oettinger, E. Rieken, M. Weiss (eds.). *Ex Anatolia Lux: Anatolian and Indo-European studies in honor of H. Craig Melchert on the occasion of his sixty-fifth birthday*: 1–8. Ann Arbor, New York: Beech Stave Press.
- Adiego, Ignacio Javier. 2010b. Recent developments in the decipherment of Carian. In: R. van Bremen and J.-M. Carbon (eds.). *Hellenistic Karia. Proceedings of the First International Conference on Hellenistic Karia – Oxford, 29 June – 2 July 2006*: 147–576. Bordeaux: Ausonius Éditions.
- Avram, Alexandru. 2019. Phrygian personal names in Phrygian inscriptions. In: G. R. Tsetschladze (ed.). *Phrygia in Antiquity: from the Bronze Age to the Byzantine Period. Proceedings of an International Conference ‘The Phrygian Lands over Time: From Prehistory to the Middle of the 1st Millennium AD’, held at Anadolu University, Eskişehir, Turkey, 2nd–8th November, 2015*: 305–349. Leuven/Paris/Bristol: Peeters.
- Balles, Irene. 2009. Zu den *i*-stämmigen Adjektiven des Lateinischen. In: R. Lühr and S. Ziegler (eds.). *Protolanguage and Prehistory. Akten der XII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 11. bis 15. Oktober 2004 in Krakau*: 1–26. Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag.

- Bartoněk, Antonín. 2003. *Handbuch des mykenischen Griechisch*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Beekes, Robert S. P. 1973. The Greek *i-* and *u-*Stems and *πόλις, -ης*. *Glotta* 51(3–4): 228–245.
- Bianconi, Michele. 2020. The linguistic relationships between Greek and the Anatolian languages. (Dissertation Summary). *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 20: 133–145.
- Brixhe, Claude. 2006. Préhistoire et début de l'histoire des dialectes grecs. *Incontri Linguistici* 29: 39–59.
- Chantraine, Pierre. 1933. *La formation des noms en grec ancien*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Christiansen, Birgit. 2019. Editions of Lycian Inscriptions not Included in Melchert's Corpus from 2001. In: I.-X. Adiego, J.V. García Trabazo, M. Vernet, B. Obrador-Cursach, E. Martínez Rodríguez (eds.). *Luwic dialects and Anatolian. Inheritance and diffusion*: 65–134. Barcelona: Publicacions Universitat de Barcelona.
- Dardano, Paola. 2011. I patronimici in *-iḏāç* del greco antico tra conservazione e innovazione. *Res Antiquae* 8: 41–62.
- Duhoux, Yves. 2008. "Mycenaean anthology". In: Y. Duhoux, A. Morpurgo Davies (eds.). *A Companion to Linear B. Mycenaean Greek Texts and their World*. Volumen I: 243–394. Louvain-La-Neuve/Dudley: Peeters.
- EDG = Beekes, Robert S.P. 2010. *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Fellner, Hannes A., Laura Gretzenberger. 2016. Greek and Latin verbal governing compounds in **-ā* and their pre-history. In: B. S. S. Hansen, B. N. Whitehead, Th. Olander, B. A. Olsen (eds.). *Etymology and the European Lexicon. Proceedings of the 14th Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, 17–22 September 2012, Copenhagen*: 135–149. Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag.
- Gérard, Raphaël. 2005. *Phonétique et morphologie de la langue lydienne*. Louvain-la-neuve: Peeters.
- Gretzenberger, Laura. 2014. Zur Funktion des Nominalsuffixes **-i-* im Vedischen und Urindogermanischen. In: N. Oettinger, Th. Steer (eds.). *Das Nomen im Indogermanischen. Morphologie, Substantiv versus Adjektiv, Kollektivum. Akten der Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 14. bis 16. September 2011 in Erlangen*: 88–102. Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag.
- Hajnal, Ivo. 1994. Die lykischen *a*-Stämme: Zum Werdegang einer Nominalklasse. In: J. E. Rasmussen, B. Nielsen (eds.). *In honorem Holger Pedersen, Kolloquium der Indogermanische Gesellschaft vom 25. bis 28. März 1993 in Kopenhagen*: 135–171. Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag.
- Hajnal, Ivo. 2018. Greco-Anatolian contacts in the Mycenaean Period. In: Jared Klein, Brian Joseph, Matthias Fritz (eds.). *Handbook of Comparative and Historical Indo-European Linguistics. Volume 3*: 2037–2055. Berlin: DeGruyter.
- Hämmig, Anna Elisabeth. 2013. *Ne votan niptiyan*. Die Fluchformel der Stele von Vezirhan. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 118: 134–38.
- Hawkins, Calvert. 2001. An Indo-European Linguistic Area and its Characteristics: Ancient Anatolia. Areal Diffusion as a challenge to the Comparative Method?. In: A. Y. Aikhenvald, R. M. W. Dixon (eds.). *Areal Diffusion and Genetic Inheritance*: 44–63. Oxford University Press.
- Kearns, John M. 1994. A Greek Genitive from Lydia. *Glotta* 72(1): 5–14.
- Keurentjes, M. B. G. 1997. The Greek patronymics in *-(i)ḏαç / -(i)ḏηç*. *Mnemosyne* 50(4): 385–400.
- LGPN = Fraser, Peter M., Elaine Matthews (eds.). 1987–. *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Ligorio, Orsat. 2016. Old Phrygian *totin*. *Lucida intervalla* 45: 33–39.
- Lubotsky, Alexander. 2004. The Phrygian Zeus and the Problem of the 'Lautverschiebung'. *Historische Sprachforschung* 117(2): 229–37.
- Masson, Olivier. 1965. Trois questions de dialectologie grecque. *Glotta* 43: 217–234.
- Meier, Michael. 1975. *-iḏ-*. *Zur Geschichte eines vorgriechischen Nominalsuffixes*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Melchert, H. C. 2008. Greek *mólybdos* as a Loanword from Lydian. In: B. J. Collins, M. R. Bachvarova, I. C. Rutherford (eds.). *Anatolian Interfaces: Hittites, Greeks and their Neighbours. Proceedings of an International Conference on Cross-Cultural Interaction, September 17–19, 2004, Emory University, Atlanta*: 153–157. Oxford University Press.
- Melchert, H. Craig. 2012. Genitive case and possessive adjective in Anatolian. In: Vincenzo Orioles (ed.). *Per Roberto Gusmani. Linguistica storica e teorica: Studi in ricordo. 2nd edition. Vol. 1*: 273–286. Udine: Forum.
- Merlin, Stella, Valerio Pisaniello. 2019. Linguistic strategies in filiation formulas: data from Lycian-Greek bilingual texts. *Incontri linguistici* 42: 89–108.
- Nikolaev, Alexander. 2010a. Time to Gather Stones Together: Greek and Its Indo-European Background. In: S. W. Jamison, H. C. Melchert, B. Vine (eds.). *Proceedings of the 21st Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference*: 189–206. Bremen: Hempen.
- Nikolaev, Alexander. 2010b. Indo-European **dem(h₂-)* 'to build' and its derivatives. *Historische Sprachforschung* 123: 56–96.
- Obrador-Cursach, Bartomeu. 2017. The Phrygian god Bas. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 76(2): 307–317.

- Obrador-Cursach, Bartomeu. 2019a. On the place of Phrygian among the Indo-European languages. *Journal of Language Relationship* 17(3): 233–245.
- Obrador-Cursach, Bartomeu. 2019b. Γορδίας and Γόρδιον: a remark on Phrygian onomastics and ethnics. *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 47(3–4): 545–552.
- Obrador-Cursach, Bartomeu. 2020. *The Phrygian language*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Oreshko, Rostislav. Forthc. *Phrygian and the Early History of Greek Dialects*.
- Rau, Jeremy. 2009. *Indo-European Nominal Morphology. The Decads and the Caland System*. Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft.
- Rix, Helmut. 1992. *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen. Laut- und Formenlehre*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Rosół, Rafał. 2013. *Frühe semitische Lehnwörter im Griechischen*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Rutherford, Ian. 2002. Interference or Translationese? Some Patterns in Lycian-Greek Bilingualism. In: J. N. Adams, M. Janse, S. Swain (eds.). *Bilingualism in Ancient Society: 197–219*. Oxford University Press.
- Schürr, Diether. 2010. Lykische Genitive. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 115: 118–126.
- Schürr, Diether. 2013. Kaunisch-Karisches in Krya: Revision der Grabinschrift und Vergleiche. In: O. Henry (ed.). *4th Century Karia. Defining a Karian Identity under the Hekatomnids: 21–31*. Istanbul/Paris: Institut Français d'Études Anatoliennes.
- Schwyzler, Eduard. 1953. *Griechische Grammatik. Erster Band: Allgemeiner Teil. Lautlehre. Wortbildung. Flexion*. Munich: Verlag C. H. Beck.
- Seifart, Frank. 2015. Direct and indirect affix borrowing. *Language* 91(3): 511–532.
- Simon, Zsolt. 2018. Anatolian Influences on Greek. In: Ł. Niesiołowski-Spanò, M. Węcowski (eds.). *Change, Continuity, and Connectivity. North-eastern Mediterranean at the turn of the Bronze Age and in the early Iron Age: 376–418*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Simon, Zsolt. 2019. Zu den karisch-griechischen Lehnbeziehungen. *Glotta* 95: 295–308.
- Starke, Frank. 1990. *Untersuchung zur Stammbildung des keilschrift-luwischen Nomens*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Yakubovich, Ilya. 2010. *Sociolinguistics of the Luwian Language*. Leiden: Brill.
- Yakubovich, Ilya. 2015. *The Luwian Language*. Oxford Handbooks Online. doi: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199935345.013.18.
- Yakubovich, Ilya. 2016. A Luwian Welcome. In: Šárka Velhartická (ed.). *Audias fabulas veteres: Anatolian Studies in Honor of Jana Součková-Siegelová: 463–484*. Leiden: Brill.
- Yakubovich, Ilya. 2017. An agreement between the Sardians and the Mermnads in the Lydian language? *Indogermanische Forschungen* 122: 265–294.

БартOMEУ ОбрадОр-Курсак. Патронимы и проблема интерференции между древнегреческим языком и древними языками Малой Азии

В статье описываются стратегии выражения патронимов (отчеств) в различных языках, засвидетельствованных в Малой Азии железного века (I тыс. до н. э.), а также обсуждается возможность обоснования языковых контактов на данном материале. Особое внимание уделяется вопросу о возможной интерференции генитивных патронимов в сочетании со словом «сын/дочь» или без такового, обсуждавшемуся ранее в работах Merlin, Pisaniello 2019 и Rutherford 2002, а также гипотезе о лидийском влиянии на греческие патронимы и родовые имена с формантом *-ídaς/-íδης* (Dardano 2011). В последнем случае, сравнение с фригийским материалом говорит в пользу унаследованного характера данной модели в древнегреческом языке. В целом лишь в очень немногих случаях удастся проследить ареальное происхождение патронимов и сходных образований.

Ключевые слова: патронимы; анатолийские языки; фригийский язык; древнегреческий язык; языковые контакты.