

Hieroglyphic Hittite: Some New Readings and Their Consequences

Author(s): J. D. Hawkins and A. Morpurgo-Davies

Source: *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, No. 2 (1975), pp. 121-133

Published by: [Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25203651>

Accessed: 07-08-2014 19:12 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

HIEROGLYPHIC HITTITE: SOME NEW READINGS AND THEIR CONSEQUENCES¹

By J. D. HAWKINS and A. MORPURGO-DAVIES

1. THIS PAPER IS CONCERNED with the phonetic values of four important Hieroglyphic signs: $\uparrow \uparrow$ (*HH*, Nos. 376, 377) and $\uparrow \downarrow$ (*HH*, Nos. 209, 210). To \uparrow and $\uparrow \downarrow$ the values *i* and *a* were ascribed long before the discovery of the Karatepe bilingual in 1948. On the other hand the differentiation of the second sign of each pair, viz. $\uparrow \downarrow$ and $\downarrow \downarrow$, by the double stroke has never been fully explained.² Conventionally the signs were transcribed as \bar{i} and \bar{a} , and this transcription has now become canonical, though there is no reason to believe that the distinction between, e.g., \uparrow and $\uparrow \downarrow$ is one of length.

In an article published posthumously Bossert³ suggested the readings *zi* and *za* for \uparrow and $\uparrow \downarrow$ on the ground of certain correspondences between Hieroglyphic and Cuneiform Luwian: cf. for instance the Hieroglyphic demonstrative \uparrow with the Cun. Luwian *za-*, the Hieroglyphic endings of Nom.-Acc. plural and Dat. plural \uparrow and $\uparrow \downarrow$ with the Cun. Luwian endings *-nzi* and *-nza*. Unfortunately some of Bossert's suggestions were unacceptable and the whole argument was supported by a number of doubtful readings and interpretations. He also attempted to retain the previous values and thus produced a system characterized by arbitrary polyphony. The whole hypothesis was rejected or ignored, though the attraction of some of the correspondences suggested remained.

A new piece of evidence can now revive the argument. Urartian *pithoi* frequently have two measures written on them in cuneiform. Jeffery Klein has pointed out (verbally) that the recently published Altintepe *pithoi* have the same measures written in Hieroglyphic.⁴ We gain the following correspondences:

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{Cun. } a\text{-qar-qi} = \text{Hier. } \acute{a}\text{-há+ra-ku} \\ \text{tê|tè-ru-si} = \quad \quad \text{tu-ru-}\uparrow \quad \quad / \quad \text{tu+ra-}\uparrow \end{array}$$

¹ This is a summary of the joint paper read by the authors at the 1973 Symposium; a fuller, but somewhat modified version of that paper with the title "Hittite Hieroglyphs and Luwian: New evidence for the connection" has been published by the authors, in collaboration with Professor G. Neumann, in the *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen*, I. Phil.-Hist. Klasse, 1973, 145–197, here abbreviated as *HHL*. See below, the beginning of our Appendix, p. 124.

As in *HHL*, we have used Latin transcriptions for the logograms and have indicated with an obelos (†) those transliterations of Hieroglyphic signs and forms which we quote from other authors but do not ourselves accept. For most signs we have followed the transliterations suggested in E. Laroche, *Les hiéroglyphes hittites. Première partie: L'écriture* (Paris, 1960) (henceforth *HH*). Normally we have given exact references for each Hieroglyphic word quoted, but in some cases we have preferred to refer to P. Meriggi, *Hieroglyphisch-hethitisches Glossar* (Wiesbaden, 1962³) (henceforth *Glossar*).

² This was our view at the time of the RAS Symposium. We now find a very satisfactory explanation based on the observation of Gelb, who pointed out (*HH*, III, 2) that the forms with the double strokes were written originally (and later by archaism) with the sign \acute{a} (*e* for him) in place of the double stroke. Thus the double stroke is merely a cursive development of \acute{a} written in ligature, and the *-a*-vocalization imparted by it to the original *zila* and *ilia*, can be clearly understood.

³ H. Th. Bossert, "Ist die B-L Schrift im wesentlichen entziffert?", *Orientalia*, XXIX, 1960, 423–42; *ibid.*, XXX, 1961, 110–8. Cf. also "Zur Vokalisation des Luwischen", *ibid.*, XXX, 1961, 314–22.

⁴ cf. T. Özgüç, *Altintepe II* (Ankara, 1969), Pl. LIII–LIV. [Cf. now E. Laroche, *Anatolia*, XV, 1971, 55 ff.; J. Klein, *An. St.*, XXIV, 1974, 77 ff.]

This gives us a cuneiform equivalent of *si* for \uparrow , but the lack of exact consonantal and vocalic correspondence between Cuneiform and Hieroglyphic prevents us from simply assigning this value to \uparrow . Nevertheless the equivalence creates a very strong presumption in favour of an *approximate* value *sibilant + vowel* for \uparrow .

In considering the distribution of \uparrow and \uparrow we note that the distinction between the two signs was only introduced in the later period; in inscriptions of the Hittite Empire only \uparrow was used, sometimes demonstrably in a context where later inscriptions use \uparrow . In other words Empire \uparrow was later differentiated into \uparrow and \uparrow . Since \uparrow appears to have the value *sibilant + vowel* and is a form of Empire \uparrow , we can attribute the same value to Empire \uparrow and to late \uparrow . The nature of the sibilant remains doubtful; we shall transcribe it with *z* partly because a *z*-series is largely missing from the Hieroglyphic syllabary and partly because of the correspondences with Luwian *z* pointed out by Bossert. We therefore assign the value *z + vowel* to both \uparrow and \uparrow .

The pair \uparrow \uparrow is graphically related to \uparrow \uparrow and shows a parallel development. \uparrow only is attested in the Empire inscriptions, but later on this sign is differentiated into \uparrow and \uparrow . Empire \uparrow can be shown to be used mostly in vocalic function, and for it both *i* and *a* equivalences have been quoted (cf. \uparrow *-ni-^atešub* with \uparrow = *i*, and *pi- \uparrow* = *pija-* i.e. later *pi- \uparrow*). The later sign \uparrow certainly has an *a*-vocalism (see below, p. 124 n. 10); this leaves for \uparrow the value *i* which otherwise would not be represented in the Hieroglyphic syllabary (since we now read \uparrow as *z + vowel*). In other words, one sign (\uparrow), with an originally undifferentiated *i/a*-vocalism, was in the post-Empire period differentiated into a sign with an *i*-vocalism (\uparrow) and a sign with an *a*-vocalism (\uparrow).

It is then possible to suggest that a similar differentiation of Empire \uparrow = *z + i/a* took place so that in the later period \uparrow = *zi* and \uparrow = *za*.

A thorough examination of the correspondences on which the traditional equations were based reveals that none of them rested on sufficiently strong bases; in one case at least (the name of Hamath, spelled in Hieroglyphic with an initial \uparrow) it can be shown that *i* is a possible, indeed a better equivalence for the Semitic vowel. Archaic spellings of the type *VIR + \uparrow* for *ziti*—"man" (later written *VIR-ti-*) can be understood on the model of (MONS) *tu*, the traditional spelling of Tudhaliyas, if \uparrow = *zi*, but remain incomprehensible if \uparrow = *i*. Similarly *ma_x-li-zi* (URBS) offers a far better correspondence for the Cuneiform *ur^umi-li-di-a* and the Aramaic *mlz* (the name of modern Malatya) than the form \uparrow *ma_x-li-i*.⁵

One correspondence, that between Hier. \uparrow \uparrow \uparrow / \uparrow \uparrow \uparrow and Cun. Luwian *aia-*, has to be dropped because of the new values; here it is sufficient to observe that the verb is written with not one but two of the reinterpreted signs.⁶

From an orthographic point of view the reading of \uparrow , \uparrow , \uparrow as *i*, *zi*, *za* helps to make sense of numerous examples of *scriptio plena*. According to the current transliteration the syllabograms of the type *Ci* were frequently—but unpredictably—followed by an *a*-vowel. Thanks to our values we now acquire, in parallel with the well-known examples of *scriptio plena* of *u* (*-mu-u*, *-tu-u*, *tara-pi-tu-u*, etc.) numerous examples of *scriptio plena* of *i* (*-mi-i*, *-ti-i*, *tá-ti-i-sa*, *BONUS-mi-i-na*, etc.; cf. the earlier transliterations \uparrow *mi-a*, \uparrow *ti-a*, \uparrow *tá-ti-a-sa*, \uparrow *BONUS-mi-a-na*, etc.). In this context it is possible to embrace the readings, long proposed

⁵ For the reading of the first two signs cf. Meriggi, *Glossar*, 238 and *HH*, No. 125.

⁶ See below, Appendix, p. 128, n. on 359.

by some decipherers and now conveniently summarized and demonstrated by Mittelberger,⁷ of 𐎗𐎗 (HH, No. 214) as *ni*, 𐎗𐎗 (HH, No. 411) as *ni*, and 𐎗𐎗 (HH, No. 174) as *si*. The dual vocalization of the “thorn” (HH, No. 383) as *ra/i* and of 𐎗𐎗 (HH, No. 439) as *wa/i* is implicit in our proposal.⁸ Finally, we should point out that the numerous plene writings of the type - 𐎗𐎗 , i.e. *-zi-i*, give internal consistence to our view.

2. The values proposed have considerable bearing on our understanding of the grammar and the lexicon of the language. Here we shall summarize some basic points.

In the nominal declension some stems which seemed to alternate between *-ia-* or even *-a-* forms and *-i-* forms are now seen to be clear *-i-* stems written with or without *scriptio plena* (hence ovis *ha-wà/i-i-sa*, i.e. *hawis*, cf. Cun. Luwian *ha-ù-i-iš*; *tá-ti-i-sa* “father”, cf. Cun. Luwian *tatiš*, etc.).

The Nom.-Acc. plural ending is *-(n)zi* (e.g. in *tá-ti-i-zi* “fathers”), and the Dat. plural ending *-(n)za* (e.g. in *tá-ti-za*): Cun. Luwian has *-nzi* and *-nza* endings for the plural. More important, we can now explain the Nom.-Acc. singular neuter of the type *REX-hi-ša* “kingdom”, *á-ti-ma-za* “name”, *á-ma-za* “my”, etc. (*REX-hi-ša*, 𐎗𐎗-ti-ma-i , 𐎗𐎗-ma-i in the current transliteration): the final *-sa* or *-za* corresponds to the identical particle which in Cun. Luwian is added to the ending of the Nom.-Acc. neuter singular (cf. *huitwalahi-ša* “life”, *utar-ša* “word”, *adduwal-za* “bad”, etc.). Thus *REX-hi-ša* is the normal neuter abstract in *-hi* to which *-sa* is added, and *á-ti-ma-za* and *á-ma-za* must be read as *atiman-za* and *aman-za*, i.e. as the normal neuter singulars of an *-n-* stem (cf. the form *á-ti-ma-ni*) and an *-i-* stem (cf. the Nom. singular *á-mi-i-sa* and the neuter plural *á-ma*). As in Cun. Luwian the *s/z* alternation is determined by the phoneme which precedes the sibilant.

The *za-* demonstrative, which can be compared with Cun. Luwian *za-*, has already been mentioned. Here we may also quote the relative, which now appears as an *-i-* stem (i.e. *REL-i-sa* and not 𐎗REL-a-sa ; cf. Cun. Luwian *kuiš*), and the enclitic forms of the personal pronouns. For the first person plural we have *-(C)a-za* (i.e. *-anza*) with a possessive adjective *à-zi-* (i.e. *anzi-*): cf. Cun. Luwian *anza-* and Hitt. *anzaš*. Similar forms are attested for the second person plural: see Hieroglyphic *u-zi-* “your” and cf. Cun. Luwian *unza-/uzaš*.

In the verbal conjugation the *i-* reading of 𐎗 considerably clarifies our understanding of the personal endings. *Scriptio plena* now guarantees the endings *-wi(i)* and *-ti(i)* for the 1st and 3rd persons singular active (cf. Cun. Luw. *-wi* and *-ti*). More important, the so-called subjunctive forms in 𐎗-a (𐎗-tà-a , etc.) are now seen to be 3rd persons sing. present indicative with an *-i* ending (*tà-i*, etc.) in all respects parallel to the forms of Cun. Luwian (*muwai*, etc.) and Hittite (*dāi*, etc.).

Two points of word formation should also be stressed. First, *scriptio plena*, etc. now shows that the genitival adjectives end in *-Ca-si(-i)-* and not in 𐎗-Ca-sá(-a)- (cf. Cun. Luwian *-ašši-*), the ethnics end in *-wa/i-ni/ni(-i)-* and not in 𐎗-wa-ná/nà(-a)- (cf. Cun. Luwian *-wanni-*), and the participles end in *-mi(-i)-* and not in 𐎗-mi(-a)- (cf. Cun. Luwian *-mi-*). Secondly we acquire a series of nominal formations in *-za-*, which are partly paralleled

⁷ cf. especially H. Mittelberger, “Bemerkungen zu Meriggis hieroglyphisch-hethitischem Glossar”, *Die Sprache*, IX, 1963, 68–107; “Zur Schreibung und Lautung des Hieroglyphen-hethitisch”, *ibid.*, X, 1964, 50–98.

⁸ It is also possible to show that internally and finally the ligature 𐎗𐎗 stands for *ri+i* and not for *i+ra/i*, or 𐎗𐎗 for *ra+ra* (the traditional transcription).

by Cun. Luwian formations (cf. *urazzaš*, *Taurišizzaš*). In some cases, e.g. for the name of the god Tarhunzas, it is possible to show that *-nza-* derives from **-ntyā-*, i.e. that Hieroglyphic shares with Cun. Luwian the assibilation of a dental before a cluster of consonantal *i* + vowel.

Finally we select for mention here a few lexical items which we quote first in the traditional transcription and then in our transliteration:

†*a-sà-tar-a* (Dat. sing.) "hand": *i-sà-tari-i* (i.e. *istari* or *istri*), cf. Cun. Luwian *iššari-*.

†*a-wa* "I go": *i-wa/i* (i.e. *ivi*), cf. Cun. Luwian *i-* "to go".

†*i-i-ā* (Dat. sing. in Cekke rev. 3; cf. Empire †*i-i-d*⁹), personal name: *Iza-za-*.

†*la* adverb: *zi-la*; cf. Cun. Luwian *zila*.

†*4-i* "four": *4-zi*, cf. Cun. Luwian *4-zi*.

†*9-i* "nine": *9-za*, cf. Cun. Luwian *9-(un-)za*.

3. To conclude: our proposals are based on phonetic correspondences and on orthographical rules rather than on the identification of grammatical elements. Yet it seems that grammar and lexicon confirm rather than oppose them. What we gain is a solution to some of the problems posed by the grammatical oddities of Hieroglyphic (†*á-ti-ma-i*, etc.) and at the same time a better understanding of the close relationship between Hieroglyphic and Cuneiform Luwian.

APPENDIX

THE END OF THE KARATEPE BILINGUAL

1. Above we have summarized the reasons which first induced us to question the values of some Hieroglyphic signs. After the 1973 Symposium at which our paper was read, further discussion with Professor Neumann and between ourselves led us to a partial modification of our views.¹⁰ The final conclusions are incorporated in a joint paper by Hawkins, Morpurgo-Davies, and Neumann published in the 1973 *Nachrichten* of the *Göttingen Akademie (HHL)*, see above, p. 121 n. 1). There we collected the epigraphic and grammatical evidence on which the sign values listed in Table I are based. Here we propose to test the same values in the concrete work of textual transliteration and interpretation. We have chosen this particular text, on the one hand because it is relatively new (at least in its definitive version), on the other hand because it can be interpreted with some confidence owing to the Phoenician version which has been known for some time and accurately studied on more than one occasion.

It is well known that his sudden death prevented Bossert from completing his edition of the Karatepe bilingual. However, some photographs of the final part of the text became available, mainly through archaeological publications. As early as 1967 Meriggi was able to exploit this evidence with his customary skill and to give a preliminary, though necessarily incomplete, edition of the whole text.¹¹ We are now fortunate in that in 1974 an excellent edition by the late F. Steinherr, based both on new photographs and on Bossert's old notes

⁹ For the reading †*i-i-ā* in Cekke see *HHL*, [47] n. 165; for the name †*i-i-a* which appears on a clay bulla from Korucutepe, cf. Güterbock, *JNES*, XXXII, 1973, 143, Figs. 3-4.

¹⁰ In particular we have abandoned our reading of 𐎗 as *a* in favour of Neumann's *ja*.

¹¹ cf. P. Meriggi, *Manuale di eteo geroglifico*, (Roma, 1966, 1967), II, 87 ff.; see *ibid.*, 95 f. for a list of the photographs on which Meriggi's edition is based.

and drawings, has come to give us a fuller account of both versions (*Hu* and *Ho*) of the Hieroglyphic text.¹² At the time of the London Symposium Steinherr's paper was not yet available, and it now seems suitable to use this part of the Karatepe inscription as a testing ground for our hypotheses.

In what follows we shall give a new transliteration of Karatepe 331 ff., a translation, and a series of notes on the text. The transliteration is largely based on Steinherr's edition and on the photographs which were available even before it. A number of doubtful points have been checked directly on the stone by Professor Halet Çambel, for whose assistance we are most grateful.¹³ The commentary does not aim at completeness and it will always be necessary to refer back to Meriggi and Steinherr. We have concentrated on the points where we differ from the earlier editors and where we think that our readings may help towards the comprehension of the text. Many points of grammar have already been discussed in *HHL* and rather than repeat statements already made in print we have often referred to that paper.

Because of the lapse of time which has preceded the publication of this article, we have decided in transliterating to follow the system suggested in *An. St.*, XXV, 1975, 153 ff., with the exception of *HH*, Nos. 172 and 319 (*ti*, *ti*), discussed below in Addendum I.

2. Transliteration

- LIX (331–332) REX-ta-ti-i-pa-wa/i REL-ra/i REL-sa-há
 LX (333–334) ní-pa-wa/i-sa ¹CAPUT-ti-sá
 LXI (335–337) ¹CAPUT-ti-ja-za-ha-wa/i-tu-ta á-tt-ma-za
 LXII (338–339) | za | á-sa₅-za-ja
 LXIII (340–344) ARHA-wa/i-ta “MANUS” i-ti-wa/i á+x-za-ti-wa/i-tà-sá á-tl-ma-za PORTA-la-na-ri+i zi-na
 LXIV (345–349) wa/i-mu-ta á-ma-za á-tl-ma-za à-ta tu-pi-wa/i
 LXV (350–353–) ní-pa-wa/i-sá (“VAS”) á-lá-na-za-ja CASTRUM-ni-si za-ti
 LXVI (–353–356) wa/i-ta à-ta AEDIFICARE+MI-i “PORTA”-la-na za-ja
 LXVII (357–359) á+x-za-ti-wa/i-tà-sa REL-ja i-zi-tl
 LXVIII (360–362) | à-wa/i za-ri+i | á-sa₅-za-ja
 LXIX (363–365) wa/i+ra/i-la-ja-wa/i “PORTA”-la-na i-zi-i-wa/i
 LXX (366–369) | á-ma-zi¹-há-wa/i-mu-ta á-tl-ma-za-à-ta tu-pi-wa/i
 LXXI (370–373) ní-wa/i-ta (“VAS”) á-lá-na-ma-ti à-ta AEDIFICARE+MI-ri+i-i
 LXXII (374–381) ní-pa-wa/i MALUS-ti-sa-tara/i-ri+i ní-i-pa-wa/i (MALUS) ha-ni-ja-ta-sa-tara/i-ti à-ta | AEDIFICARE+MI-ri+i | za-ja “PORTA”-la-na
 LXXIII (382–395) wa/i-ta ARHA MANUS i-ti-tu (CAELUM DEUS) TONITRUS-hu-za-sá (CAELUM DEUS) SOL-za-sá (DEUS) i-ja-sá OMNIS.MI-zi-ha DEUS-ni-zi á-pa | REX-hi-sá | á-pa-há “REX”-na | á-pa-há-wa/i | CAPUT-ti-na
 LXXIV (396–402) POST-na-wa/i ARHA (“CRUS”) ta-za-tu | ara/i-zi OMNIS.MI-zi á+x-za-ti-wa/i-tà-sa | á-tl-ma-za
 LXXV (403–407) (DEUS) LUNA+MI-sa-wa/i (DEUS) SOL-ha REL-ri+i á-tl-ma-za “CRUS”-i

¹² F. Steinherr, “Die phönizisch-hethitischen Bilinguen vom Karatepe”, *MSS*, XXXII, 1974, 103–48.

¹³ We have only given the text of the *Hu* version; *Ho*, when relevant, is quoted in the commentary. Since our division into sentences differs considerably from that of Steinherr we have been obliged to alter the numeration; however, we have kept the same Arabic numbers for the individual words, though sometimes this is inconsistent with the word division which we have adopted.

3. Translation

- LIX If anyone from (among) kings—
 LX or (if) he (is) a man,
 LXI and to him (there is) a manly name—
 LXII proclaims this:
 LXIII “I shall delete the name of Azatiwatas from the gates
 LXIV and I shall incise my name”;
 LXV or (if) he covets this fortress
 LXVI and blocks up(?) these gates,
 LXVII which Azatiwatas made,
 LXVIII and proclaims thus:
 LXIX “I shall make the gates my own(?)
 LXX and I shall incise my name for myself”;
 LXXI or (if) from covetousness he shall block (them) up(?),
 LXXII or from badness or from evil shall block up(?) these gates,
 LXXIII may Tarhunzas of Heaven, the Sun of Heaven, Ea and all the Gods delete that
 kingdom and that king and that man.
 LXXIV Hereafter may the name of Azatiwatas continue to stand for all ages
 LXXV as the name of the Moon and the Sun stands.

4. Notes

331 f. Steinherr has †LUGAL-*ta₄-ā-ti*. We read after collation ¶, and suggest a re-arrangement of the signs thus: †LUGAL-*ta₄-ti-a-*, i.e. REX-*ta-ti-i-*, the expected Ablative plural (or singular) of the word for king, REX-*ti-*. The ablative is sufficient to express what the Phoenician states with *b-mlkm*.

REL+*ra/i* REL-*sa-há*: an examination of the photograph (Akurgal, *Art of the Hittites*, Pl. 147) suggests that a reading in this order is possible. This would be much easier to interpret than that of Steinherr in the reverse order, REL REL+*ra/i-sa-há*, which would be completely unparalleled. Thus we take REL+*ra/i* as a rhotacized form of REL(-*ā*)-*ti* (**?kwati*), which in at least one clear context can be confidently translated “if” (Karaburun, 1.2, twice). Since it corresponds with the Phoenician ’*m*, this interpretation seems eminently satisfactory. What remains is the usual indefinite REL-*sa-ha* (**?kwisha*). We thus translate “if anyone . . .”. We may note as a parallel to this phrase Kargamis A 6, 1.8, | REL-*ā-ti* REL-*ti-i-ha* REX-*ti*, “if to any king . . .” (cf. *An.St.*, XXV, 1975, 144).

333 ff. The sentence division suggested by Steinherr creates a series of problems. The beginning is clear: *ni-pa-wa-(a)s* CAPUT-*tis*, “or (if) he (is) a man”, but, according to Steinherr, the clause continues with a dative plural CAPUT-*tijanza* (in our transcription) followed by the enclitic -*ha*. Both the dative plural, which would be in contrast with the ablative used in the previous sentence, and the enclitic are unexpected. At the same time the syntax of the following sentence, which would start with *wa-tu-ta*, remains incomprehensible. Steinherr’s translation shows this uneasiness: “Wenn aber von den Königen irgendeiner oder ein Mensch und unter den Menschen einer, und ihm ein Name so/dies seiend.” It is easier to suggest a different separation into clauses. After CAPUT-*tis* a new clause starts CAPUT-

tijan-za-ha-wa-tu-ta atamanza, which must be taken as a nominal sentence formed by an adjective Nom.-Acc. sing. neuter (CAPUT-*tijan-za*) which agrees in gender, number, and case with *atamanza* “name”.¹⁴ The whole clause can be translated (as literally as possible): “—or if he is a man and to him (-*tu*) is a manly name—”. This on the one hand allows a closer correspondence with the Phoenician version (*'m 'dm 'š 'dm šm*, “wenn ein Mensch, der ein angesehenener Mann ist”), on the other hand helps to clarify the syntax of what follows (see below).

CAPUT-*tijan-za* is a normal neuter adjective derived from an *-i*-stem (CAPUT-*ti-*). Parallels are not difficult to find: an obvious one is Boybeypari IV 3 B, *á-ma-za tá-ti-ja-za á-mi-za-sa á-ti-ma-za* “my paternal of-Amizas name”, i.e. “the name of my father A.”. From the noun *tati-* “father” the neuter adjective *tatijan-za* was derived just as CAPUT-*tijan-za* was derived from CAPUT-*ti-*. In other words a stem *tati-* can yield an adjective Nom.-Acc. neuter sing. *tatijan-* to which the normal *-sa/-za* particle of neuters is added (see above p. 123 and cf. *HHL*, p. [31] ff.).¹⁵

338 f. Steinherr treats these two words as part of the previous clause and offers two different translations: “und ihm ein Name so/dies seiend” (p. 107) and “und ihm ein(en) Namen so sprechend” (p. 123). In fact Steinherr’s own important finding, that *asa(n)za-* means “to speak, to say”, opens the way to a clearer interpretation. The previous clause, as we have seen, is complete in itself, but *za asa(n)zaja* is connected with the first clause, “If anyone from (among) kings—”, which in this way is completed by a verb added after two parenthetic clauses: “If anyone from (among) kings . . . proclaims this.”

asa(n)zaja is the third person sing. present of the verb *asa(n)za-* (for which see below Addendum II); the ending is in all respects parallel to that of, e.g., *taja*, 3rd person sing. of *ta-* (cf. *HHL*, p. [38]).

za is the Accusative neuter sing. of the demonstrative *zas* (cf. *HHL*, p. [35]) and here is the direct object of the verb. Semantically it corresponds to the dative or ablative *zati* which later on in this inscription (361) and in Sultanhan d occurs before the same verb, presumably with a semi-adverbial meaning “thus, in this way”.

340 ff. *itivi* must be 1st person sing. present; it is part of what the ill-intentioned man may say, just as the *tupivi* which follows (349).

The reading PORTA-*la-na-ri+i zi-na* is assured by collation. We have an ablative (“from the gates”) followed by the particle *zin* which occurs elsewhere in Karatepe (24 and 27), though admittedly in the sequence *zin . . . zin . . .* For an example of *zin* used by itself and not repeated cf. Sultanhan 4 (Meriggi’s transliteration †*i-n* rather than †*i-n* (*Manuale* II, 117) must be due to a misprint).¹⁶

350 ff. Direct speech ends with 349 and here the text goes back to the usual third person narrative style. *alanazaja* is again a third person sing. present in *-ja* (cf. above *asa(n)zaja*) and governs the Dat. sing. CASTRUM-*nisi*. It does not seem possible to take the latter word as

¹⁴ For the form of this word see *HHL*, pp. [31, 34]; for our reading of the signs normally transliterated *ti/ti* see below, Addendum I.

¹⁵ The personal determinative which precedes CAPUT is surprising but it is not easy to see how it should be explained.

¹⁶ For our reading of the name of Azatiwatas see *HHL*, p. [20 f.].

Acc. plural neuter with Steinherr, because (a) the Nom.-Acc. plural should end in *-sa* and not in *-si*; (b) it is followed by the Dat. (or Abl.) *zati* of the demonstrative. To take *zati* as the first word of the next clause (as Steinherr is obliged to do) unnecessarily complicates the syntax of the sentence. Since *zati* is the normal dative of *za-* and *CASTRUM-nisi* the normal dative of *CASTRUM-nisanza*, there are no obvious objections to our interpretation. The demonstrative can follow the noun, and this is the case, for instance, in 356 (*PORTA-lana zaja*). A priori there is nothing to prevent a verb meaning “to covet” from governing a dative. If, as suggested by Steinherr, *alanaza-* is related to Cun. Hittite *ilaliḫa-*, we can point out that *ilaliḫa-* normally governs the accusative (and is accompanied by the reflexive particle *-za*), but in one case at least is found with the Dat. *da-me-e-ta-ni* and without the *-za* particle (cf. Friedrich, *Staatsverträge* I, 122, §15, C. 16–7).

355. AEDIFICARE+*MI-i*. Here, as in other cases where the logogram is in ligature with the *mi* sign, we prefer to transliterate the latter as +*MI*, since it may well be part of the logogram rather than a phonetic complement (cf., e.g., the neuter plural *OMNIS+MI-ma*, i.e. *tanima*). *-i* is the ending of the third person sing. present; it could be compared with the endings of *tai*, *pijai*, etc. (see *HHL*, p. [37 f.]), but cf. below 373 and 379, AEDIFICARE+*MI-ri+i(-i)*, where we seem to have the normal *-ti/-ri* ending.

Steinherr has discussed the semantic problems which arise from the assumption that AEDIFICARE+*MI-* means “to build”, while *anta* AEDIFICARE+*MI-* here corresponds to the Phoenician *ns'* “to pull down, destroy”, but in Karatepe 123–4 to *bnh* “to build”. Not only is there a contradiction between these two passages, but also it is not clear why *anta* should alter the meaning of a verb in this way (a similar semantic shift after *ARHA* would be far easier to understand). Our translation hints at a possible, though doubtful solution. Could it be that *anta* AEDIFICARE+*MI-* really means “to build in”, i.e., in the case of gates, “to block up”?

356. *PORTA-lana zaja*. As in 353 f. we have here a noun followed by the demonstrative which agrees with it. Both words are Acc. neuter plural; for *zaja* cf. *HHL*, p. [35 f.].

359. *i-zi-ti*. For the verb “to make” and its reading in Hieroglyphic see *HHL*, p. [44]. We may add here that, though we assume that *i-zi-i-/i-zi-ja-* cannot be identified with Cun. Luwian *aia-*, it is possible that the latter has an exact correspondence in Hieroglyphic. Meriggi’s *Glossar* (p. 14) registers a 3rd person singular present †*a-ā-ti-a* (Sultanhan 6 C), which we now read *a-ja-ti-i* and could well mean “he makes”. More important, in the same inscription we find once *CUM-ni-' ā-tā-'* (4 B), which seems to have a sense strictly parallel to Karatepe 79–80 *CUM-ni i-zi-i-*, “to do (good) for someone”, and once *ā-tā* (base, 10).¹⁷ In both these examples we expect the preterite 3rd person sing. of a verb: once more an equivalent of Cun. Luwian *a-ta* (or *a-ja-ta*) would make sense.

For this particular form Steinherr observes, rightly, that the sense requires a preterite and consequently a *-ta* rather than a *-ti* ending; he then recalls that the sign *HH*, No. 172, was read as *ta* by Bossert and others. This point is worth pursuing and we have discussed it below, Addendum I.

¹⁷ Sultanhan must now be read together with the new fragment published by Dr. K. Emre in *Anatolia*, XV, 1971, 122 f. and Pl. XII.

361 f. *zari usa(n)zaja* “thus speaks”; see above apropos of 338 f. Here instead of an Acc. neuter sing. we have a dative or ablative sing. probably with semi-adverbial meaning; for our reading, *ri+i*, of the ligature of *i* and “thorn”, see *HHL*, p. [29] f.

363 ff. Steinherr is certainly right in recognizing in the final sign of *wa/i+ra/i-la-ja-wa/i* the direct speech particle *-wa*, but we take *waralaja* and *PORTA-lana* as Acc. neuter plural (rather than sing.), since the neuter sing. would end in *-za* (cf. *wa/i+ra/i-la-za* in Tell Tayinat VII A 1.). Perhaps *waralaja* may be compared with the Cun. Luwian *waralli-* and the negative compound 𐎗 *nivaralli-*, for which cf. N. van Brock, *RHA*, LXXI, 1962, 116 f. If so we suggest the following translations: *waralli-*, “own, proper”, 𐎗 *nivaralli-*, “alien, hostile”. Thus here in the Hieroglyphic text the ill-intentioned man says that he will make the gates subject to himself or his own (*waralaja izi-*), that is to say that he will appropriate them, although in the Phoenician text it is stated that he will make the gates alien (*yp^l l-s^r zr*), i.e. that he will alienate them from *'ztwd*. The neuter plural form in *-aja* is interesting, but not much can be made of it until we know whether in Hieroglyphic the adjective was an *-i-* stem as in Cun. Luwian (for these neuters cf. *HHL*, p. [30]).

iziwi: for the first person present ending see above 340 ff.; for the verb, 359. The same phrase *waralan(za) izi-* occurs in Tell Tayinat VII A 1.

366 ff. *amanzi' -ha-wa-mu-ta atamanza anta tupiwi: á-ma-zi* is the correct reading, but is surprising. The neuter adjectives Nom.-Acc. sing. always end in *-za*: mason's mistake? For the second sign of the word for “name” see below Addendum I.

373. AEDIFICARE + *MI-ri+i-i*. Here the two versions offer yet another example of the alternation between *-ri+i(i)* (*Hu*) and *-ti-i* (*Ho*) (cf. *HHL*, p. [29 f.]); for the verb see above 355.

380–381. *zaja PORTA-lana* “these gates” is the neuter plural Acc. with the expected forms of the demonstrative and noun; see above *PORTA-lana zaja* (356).

382 ff. We have already discussed this sentence in *HHL*, p. [31] f., where we concentrated in particular on the phrase *apa REX-hisa* “that kingdom”. *apa* is the demonstrative Acc. neuter sing. and *REX-hisa* is a neuter abstract noun derived from *REX-ti-* with the suffix *-ahi-* and followed in the Nom.-Acc. by the particle *-sa* (cf. above p. 123). *Ho* now provides a slightly different version with the fuller writing *REX-tahisa*; it is worth pointing out that this proves that an *-i-* stem like *REX-ti-* yields an *-ahi-* abstract, i.e. that the suffix is not *-hi(t)-* but *-ahi(t)-*.¹⁸ Exactly the same phenomenon occurs in Cun. Luwian: cf., e.g., *zi-da-a-lji-ša* “virility” built on *ziti-* “man” (for the origin of the suffix see Eichner, *MSS*, XXXI, 1973, 59 f.; Watkins, *Akten der V. Fachtagung der idg. Gesellschaft*, Wiesbaden, 1975, 358 ff.). *apas* of *Ho* vs. *apa* of *Hu* offers a more important divergence between the two versions; *apa* is the Nom.-Acc. sing. neuter of the demonstrative, while *apas* must be the Gen. sing. of the same pronoun, used with a possessive value: “the kingdom of him”, i.e. “his kingdom”.

For *Tarhunzas* and *Tiwazas* see *HHL*, p. [39 f.].

396 ff. For a complete analysis of this sentence cf. *HHL*, p. [43 f.]. The reading offered there

¹⁸ It seems likely that another form of the same abstract *REX-tahit-* is attested in Aleppo 2, 2 where we read *REX-^r tá[?] hi-tá*, which may well be one of those *-a* forms mentioned below, p. 131 (g) (see the forthcoming edition of this inscription by Hawkins).

and repeated here is based on collation and differs but slightly from that of Steinherr. The one divergence concerns the word 398 which we read as (CRUS) *tazatu* and interpret as a *-za*-iterative of the well-known verb *ta-* “to stand” (Steinherr has $\uparrow\text{GIR}/\text{ta}_6\text{-i-ta}_4\text{-tu}$ where he recognizes the same signs but reads the second and third signs in a different order). The pair (CRUS) *tazatu*/CRUS-*i* (i.e. *tai*) is formed by (a) an imperative from the deverbative *taza*-built on the root *ta-*, and (b) a regular third person sing. present *tai* from the same root *ta-*. The Phoenician has a single verb for both clauses, while the Hieroglyphic text stresses the semantic contrast by using both an iterative and a simplex. *tazatu arinzi taniminzi*, “may . . . continue to stand for all ages (?)” offers a close correspondence to the Phoenician *jkn l-lm*, “mögen bestehen in Ewigkeit”. For the *-za-* suffix cf. *IHHL*, loc. cit.

5. *Addendum I*: The signs HH, Nos. 172 (*ti*) and 319 (*ti*).

Karatepe 359, *i-zi-ti*, is correctly interpreted by Steinherr as a third person sing. preterite ending in *-ta*. This confirms a view which had been previously held by, e.g., Bossert, Friedrich, and Mittelberger:¹⁹ 172 has or may have the value *ta*. Since 172 constantly interchanges with 319 any conclusion we reach for one of these two signs must be valid for the other; very little help comes from the rare alternations with other dental signs. It may be useful to rehearse here the evidence for or against an *-a*-vocalism of the signs.

1. Evidence in favour of an *-a*-vocalism:

(a) As we have seen Karatepe 359, *i-zi-ti*, is likely to be a preterite with a *-ta* ending. Mittelberger, loc. cit., has also argued that PEDES *tara/i-pa-ti* (Kargamis A 6.4) is easier to understand as a preterite than as a present.

(b) Karatepe 120 appears as *TERRA-ti-ta-za-* in the *Hu* version, but as *TERRA-ta-ti-za* in the *Ho* version.

(c) The word *TERRA-ti-/ti-*, “place”, is regularly written with 172 or 319. At first sight the declension seems irregular, but we could put some order in the various forms if we assumed that alongside a neuter noun which ended in *-an-za* and was written *TERRA-ti/ti-za* or *TERRA-za*, there was an extended form in *-ant-*, which yielded a Dat. sing. in *-anti* (*TERRA-ti-ti*, i.e. *-tanti*) and a Dat. plur. in *-ant-anza* (*TERRA-ti-ta-za*, i.e. *-tantanza*).²⁰ It is of course possible—and indeed likely—that the form is related to Cun. Hittite *pedan* (Sumerogram KI): if so we should read the neuter Nom.-Acc. as *pedan-za* and the other forms as built on *pedant-*.²¹

¹⁹ For the earlier proposals cf. Laroche, *HH*, 165; for Mittelberger’s views see *Die Sprache*, IX, 1963, 82 n. 36.

²⁰ Sultanhan 9 has a form *TERRA-ti-za* followed by a small *i* sign which could belong to it or to the word that follows; a spelling *TERRA-ti-i-za* would be unique and it seems better not to give it too much importance, given the uncertainty of the reading. The Nom. plural *TERRA-ti-i-zi* (𐎲𐎲𐎲𐎲𐎲) found by Meriggi in Palanga, 2 is a reading far too dubious to serve as evidence.

²¹ That at some stage an equivalent of Hitt. *pedan* existed in the “Luwian group” is shown by Lycian. The new Greek-Aramaic-Lycian trilingual has a phrase *pddēhadē . . . pddēnehūmis*, κατίστης ἀρχοντος in which Laroche, *CRATBL*, 1974, 120, has recognized a preterite verb *pddēhadē* derived from the same root as *pedan* and comparable with Hittite *pedaššah-*. Before the new evidence was available Laroche, *BSL*, LXII, 1967, 61 f. had identified in the Xanthos stele a dative *pddāt-i* and a genitival adjective *pddāt-ahi* with the meaning “temenos”, which he had compared with Hittite *pitta* or rather with a supposed “Luwian” extension of *pitta*, *pitant-*. However, we may now wonder whether *pddāt-i* and *pddāt-ahi* should also be compared with *pedan* or with an extension **pedant-* (cf. also O. Carruba, *Die satzeinleitende Partikeln in den idg. Sprachen Anatoliens*, (Roma, 1969), 81 n. 77.)

(d) Some ablatives end in *-tl/ti-ti*: MALUS-*tl-ti(-i-)* (see Meriggi, *Glossar*, 181 for the references, and cf. MALUS-*tà-ti-i* in Sultanhan 5), *sa-pi-sá-tl-ri+i* (Karatepe 276 *Hu*; cf. *sá-pi-sa-ara-ri-ri+i*, *ibid. Ho*), (VIA) *ha+ra/i-wa/i-ta-hi-tl-ti-i* (Kargamis A 15 b 4).²² Since in Hieroglyphic, just as in Cun. Luwian, an *-ati* ending for the ablative is far more normal than an *-iti* ending (and is probably compulsory in the case of consonantal stems), a reading *ta* of 172 and 319 would simplify the grammar.

(e) Mittelberger, *loc. cit.*, has already pointed out that in Kargamis A 6.2 it seems impossible to give an *-i*-value to the last sign of the sequence *wa/i-ma-tl*; the following clause, which ends with the same verb and which starts with *zi-pa-wa/i+ra/i*, supports this view. Mittelberger wants to recognize the preposition *anta* at the end of the particle chains, but in both clauses it seems preferable to identify the pronoun *-ata* “they” (hence *wa=mu=ata* and *zin=pa=wa=ata*); if so, this calls for a *ta* value of *ti*.

(f) The signs 172 and 319 regularly occur in the word for “name” and its compounds. There is little doubt that *á-tl/ti-ma-za* is etymologically related to Hiit. *laman*, Lat. *nomen*, etc. If so a reading *ataman-za*, while not solving all the phonetic problems, would at least clarify the vocalism.

(g) The new Sultanhan fragment (see above, n. 17) supplies us with a dative-locative (?) (“PES”) *pa-tà* “at the foot”. With this we can compare Kargamis A 15 b ** 2, (“PES”) *pa-ti-*. In both cases the phrase refers to something which happens “at the foot” of a god or goddess. The *-a* case requires further investigation, but there is no doubt that the Hieroglyphic texts have some examples of it.

2. Evidence in favour of an *-i*-vocalism.

(a) In Karatepe 102 the *Hu* version has (MALUS) *á-tu-wa/i-ri+i-zi*, i.e. *aduarinzi* (Nom. plural), while the *Ho* version has MALUS-*tí-zi*. We could read the latter form as MALUS-*tanzi* only at the cost of assuming either that *Ho* and *Hu* use different adjectives (which seems unlikely) or (somewhat more probable) that *Ho* has an (athematic?) ending of Nom. plural (*-anzi*), while *Hu* has the normal ending of the *-i*- stems.²³ Our reading *ri+i* of 𐎗𐎗 seems too well established to be called in doubt on the strength of this instance (cf. *HHL*, p. [29] f.)

(b) The well-known word *mi-tl/ti-sa* “servant” is written three times (according to Meriggi, *Glossar*, 84) with a fourth sign, *mi-ti-i-sa* (Kargamis A 17 b 1, A 29 c 2; Çiftlik B 2). A clear example of this spelling also occurs in Aleppo 2.1 (see the forthcoming edition by Hawkins). We are thus placed in some difficulty by assigning a value *ta* to 172 and 319. **mitais* is a possible nominative, but how do we explain the absence of the *i*-vowel in the normal spellings of the word?²⁴ On the other hand if the *i* sign is used only as a form of

²² For the word for “bad” see Hawkins, *An.St.*, XX, 1970, 88–9. It seems likely that the form quoted above is related to the forms of Karatepe 102, discussed below in 2. (a), (cf. also n. 23). (VIA) *ha+ra/i-wa/i-ta-hi-ti-ti-i* is a new reading in Kargamis A 15 b**4: the word is the ablative of an abstract noun derived from *harwa(n)(a)*- “road” (the exact form of this stem is still obscure: cf. Mittelberger, *Die Sprache*, VIII, 1962, 185).

²³ See above n. 2. Not much can be made of Karatepe 375, MALUS-*tl-sa-tara-ri-ri+i*, the ablative of an abstract noun built on the same adjective; even if the adjective had an *-i*- stem the vowel preceding the abstract suffix could be an *a*.

²⁴ In Sultanhan 4 C we expect the dative of *mi-ti-sa* and we find a form *mi-ti-i*. Does this speak against an *-a* value of *ti*? On the other hand the dative sing. of the obscure word *á-ti-sa* is written *á-ti*; could it be that the word has an *-a*- ending for the dative? For the dative sing. ending of the *-a*- stems, cf. *HHL*, p. [28].

scriptio plena, the previous sign should have an *-i-* vocalism. It is conceivable—but not likely—that here 387 (*mi*) and 319 (*ti*) form a whole with a purely logographic value; if so, *-sa* and *-i-sa* could be the phonetic complements of a word whose phonetic value would remain unclear—but, once more, this is too desperate a solution to carry conviction.²⁵

HH, Nos. 172 and 319 occur in other words but in all cases the interpretation is not certain. From the evidence listed above it appears that in most cases an *-a-* vocalism is more satisfactory than an *-i-* vocalism. However, it is not clear whether we should *always* attribute a *ta* value to the two signs or in a few instances a *ti* value could be retained (if so, one could think of signs like *wali*, *ra/i*, etc.). Yet neither conclusion is sufficient to solve another problem: why is it that some words (“name”, “place”, “bad”, “servant”) are regularly written with either 172 or 319 and are never written with the normal dental signs? The vocalic value of 172 and 319 cannot account for this phenomenon. Could it then be that the special character of these two signs is to be found in the value of their consonant? It seems likely that in most of the clear cases the consonant involved was (etymologically) voiced, but—at the moment, at least—this can hardly be sufficient to explain the use of these two signs, since (a) the syllabary is not geared to expressing a contrast of voiced and voiceless consonants, and (b) the normal *ta/ti* signs are certainly used to express originally voiced consonants. On the other hand two of the words which are regularly written with either 172 or 319 have a remarkable phonetic history; the first consonant of the word for “name” was etymologically an *n*, but was dissimilated (?) to *l* in Cun. Hittite. It is conceivable that the phenomenon was shared by Cun. Luwian, though we have no evidence about this. Similarly the final consonant of the word for “bad” appears as *l* in Cun. Hittite *idalu* and in Cun. Luwian *adduwal(iš)*. In these two cases Hieroglyphic has *tí* or *tí*; no doubt we must think in terms of a voiced consonant—but do we need to think of a normal dental stop? We could speculate about possible lateral or retroflex phonemes but do not have sufficient data to proceed.²⁶ Whatever the original value of these signs is, we must accept that at some stage they could be used in the place of normal dental signs as in the preterites listed above in 1(a).

At this stage we must simply suspend judgement; one point is worth stressing: while the *-a-* vocalism of the sign is certain, the *-i-* vocalism is possible in some cases, but not equally well attested. In our transliteration we have preserved the traditional values, but a transcription *ta_x* and *ta_y* would seem more appropriate.

6. *Addendum II*: The verb *á-sa₅-za-* (†*á-sa₅-i-*), “to speak”.

Steinherr has at long last found the solution for a complicated problem, the meaning of Hieroglyphic *á-sa₅-za-*, and has at the same time provided an analysis of the passages in which the verb occurs. The forms attested are:

(a) 3rd person sing. present; *á-sa₅-za-ja* is found twice in Karatepe (339 and 362; see above). *á-sa₅-za-i* occurs once in Sultanhan d where we read *á-wa/i za-ti-i tu-wa/i+ra/i-si-i MALUS-za REL-sa á-pa+ra/i-ta á-sa₅-za-i*, “whoever in future will speak evil for this vineyard”. The distinction between *á-sa₅-za-ja* and *á-sa₅-za-i* is parallel to that, e.g., between *tá-ja* and *tá-i*, etc. (cf. *HHL*, [38]).

²⁵ Meriggi’s *Glossar* lists three forms which would seem to speak in favour of an *-i-* value of *ti* (*á-mi-ti*, p. 26; †*Á+s⁴-i-tl-wá-tá-á*, p. 36; and †*a-s³-tar-ti-a*, p. 38); in all cases the correct reading is †*ti⁴* instead of *ti*.

²⁶ It is interesting to observe that the liquid signs seem to show some oscillations in their vocalism: cf. *HH*, No. 383: *ra/i* and *HH*, No. 445: *lá/i/u*.

(b) 3rd person sing. preterite; *á-sa₅-za-ta-* occurs in Kargamis A 19 j 1. 2; the text is too broken to be easily understandable, but the phrase *za'-ti á-sa₅-za-ta-* seems to be the exact equivalent (in the past) of *za-ri+i á-sa₅-za-ja* found in Karatepe 361–362.

(c) 2nd person imperative; *á-sa₅-za* “speak” regularly occurs at the beginning of the Assur letters and is regularly followed by a dative (see Meriggi, *Glossar*, 36 for the references).

(d) Participle Nom. singular; *á-sa₅-za-mi-i-sá* is attested in Kargamis A 7 j 2. Steinherr is certainly right in translating “gesprochene”; it must mean something like “famous”, “well-known”.

The entry *ási-* in Meriggi, *Glossar*, 36 can now be drastically altered. On the one hand we have a verb *á-sa₅-za-* which means “to speak, to say”, on the other hand a verb *á+x-za-* which means “to love” and which occurs either by itself or in compounds (e.g. *á+x-za-ti-wa/i-tá-sa*). *á+x-za-* must correspond to Hittite *aššija-* (cf. *HHL*, [20]); do we have an Hittite or Luwian equivalent for *á-sa₅-za-* “to speak”?

We owe to Mr. Alan Nussbaum the suggestion that the verb could be connected with the root of Hittite *aiš* “mouth”. This is semantically plausible, but at first sight appears to create insurmountable difficulties of a phonetic and morphological nature. However, (a) we now know a Luwian equivalent of *aiš* in the form *ašša*, and this appears to have a by-form redetermined with the omnipresent *-nt-* suffix;²⁷ (b) the new reading *á-sa₅-za-* (rather than *†á-sa₅-i-*) allows us to clarify the stem formation. *á-sa₅-za-* is built on *assant-* with the well-known suffix *-ya-* used to form verbal stems from nouns: the change *-ntya-* > *-nza-* has been discussed elsewhere (cf. *HHL*, [40] ff. and [43]) and creates no difficulties. It seems right to conclude that *á-sa₅-za-* can be transcribed as *asanza-* (< **asantya-*) and means “to speak, to say” or (etymologically) “to mouth”.

ADDITIONAL NOTE BY GÜNTER NEUMANN

Im folgenden gebe ich nur ein kurzes Resümee meines Londoner Vortrages, da seine Ergebnisse in wesentlichen Teilen mit denen von Frau Morpurgo-Davies und Herrn Hawkins übereinstimmen. Siehe oben, S. 121 n. 1, 124.

Für drei (ziemlich häufige) Zeichen der sogenannten “hethitischen Hieroglyphenschrift” habe ich neue Silbenwerte vorgeschlagen: für 𐎗 den Wert *ya* (vgl. schon meinen Beitrag in der *Festschrift Heinrich Otten*, Wiesbaden, 1973, S. 243 ff.), für 𐎗 den Wert *zi*,²⁷ und für 𐎗 *za* (wie das schon H.Th. Bossert in *Orientalia*, XXIX, 1960, 423 ff. erwogen hatte). Ausgegangen wird dabei jeweils von Hinweisen, die die phönikischen Entsprechungen von hieroglyphischen Namen (in der Bilingue von Karatepe) geben; erst sekundär sind dann sprachvergleichende Argumente hinzugezogen worden. Es zeigt sich, daß durch diese neuen Lesungen die Sprache der Hieroglyphentexte dem älteren Keilschrift-Luwischen in Wortschatz und Morphologie sehr ähnlich wird. Es bleiben nur noch wenige (dialektale und diachronische) Unterschiede und Neuerungen, welche die jüngere Sprachform von der des 13. Jahrhunderts vor Chr. trennen.

²⁷ For references to *ašša-*, *aššant-* in Cun. Luwian see Laroche, *Dictionnaire de la langue louvite* (Paris, 1959), 33 with the corrections printed in Laroche, *RHA*, LXXVI, 1965, 45; and the references mentioned there to Bossert, Meriggi, and Carruba.