

New approaches on Anatolian linguistics (Barcino Monographica Orientalia 22, Series Anatolica et Indogermanica 4), ed. by **José Virgilio García Trabazo**, **Ignasi-Xavier Adiego**, **Mariona Vernet**, **Bartomeu Obrador-Cursach**, **Susana Soler**. Barcelona: Edicions de la Universitat de Barcelona, 2023. 357 pages. Softcover, 28,00 EUR. ISBN: 978-84-9168-937-9.

The field of Anatolian linguistics is currently experiencing an upswing in both interest and progress. As evidence of this, one could adduce the volume under review, a collection of research papers by experts in various subfields pertaining to the Anatolian languages. For its publication we may thank the projects *Los dialectos lúvicos del grupo anatolio: escritura, gramática, léxico, onomástica* at the Universitat de Barcelona and *Los dialectos lúvicos del grupo anatolio: gramática, léxico* at the Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, both funded by the Spanish State Research Agency.

The book itself has a sleek design and the typesetting invites no criticism. A few unfortunate typos have survived the editing process, but none severely detract from the reading experience.<sup>1</sup> The inclusion of word and text indices is welcome, as this is often otherwise omitted in publications of this kind.

After a foreword by José Virgilio García Trabazo (pp. 9–11), the volume under review contains 18 contributions by various scholars. In the following, I will summarise these and provide comments whenever warranted.

In this volume's first contribution (pp. 13–29), Ignasi-Xavier Adiego discusses a new Lycian ruler by the name of Arssâma. The discussion starts with an analysis of a number of coins carrying this name (pp. 13–20). High resolution pictures of the most important coin make certain that Adiego's reading is correct. This is important, since the ability to mint coins is diagnostic of Lycian "rulership". The name Arssâma is also known from the inscriptions, i.e. from TL 29.11 (*arssuma*) and N 318.1 (*arssâma*). Adiego goes on to argue that Arssâma was a Lycian ruler in the early to middle 4th cent. BCE, probably based in Xanthos and of Persian descent.<sup>2</sup> Adiego's argument is

<sup>1</sup> Detected typos include: "citacion" for "citation" (p. 8), one too many "and" in the enumeration of citations (p. 50), "-enê" for "-êne" (p. 60), "rationalc" for "rationale" (p. 99), "packead" for "packed" (p. 101), "denominitive" for "denominative" (p. 106), "torub" for "to rub" (p. 107), "make" for "makes" (p. 126), and several cases of non-italic "u-" and "hi-" (p. 178). None of these significantly impact legibility, but the misspellings of "H. Craig Melchert" as "H. Craig Melche" and "Taner Korkut" as "Tamer Korkut" in the table of contents (pp. 7f.) are especially unfortunate.

<sup>2</sup> I assume that the sentence "[...] we cannot rule out the possibility that he was a local dynast bearing a Lycian name" in the summary on p. 27 is meant to say "[...] we cannot rule out the possibility that he was a local Lycian dynast bearing an Iranian name".

measured and easy to follow. Particularly interesting is the hypothetical chronological analysis of the narrative on TL 29 (pp. 20–24). This inscription remains one of the most enigmatic Lycian texts and any new developments on its interpretation are most welcome. The equation of the Arssâma on the coins with the Arssâma on N 318 is convincing, especially so with the datings provided in the postscript (p. 27). I agree with Adiego that the Arssâma (*arssuma*) on TL 29 (quite possibly a 333 BCE ruler of Cilicia known from Latin sources!) should be kept apart.

Manuela Anelli's contribution (pp. 31–48) is a study of Lycian coins from Kandyba (Lyc. *xâkbi-*). The majority of the text is devoted to a discussion of a coin auctioned in 2020 with a legend consisting of six letters. The first five letters spell *xâkbi*, but the correct reading of the last letter is not obvious. Anelli suggests either *ẽ* or *x*, providing argumentation for each but ultimately without committing to either. With a reading *ẽ*, we would have an interesting case of a sequence *-iẽ* instead of the expected *-ijẽ* for a form of an appurtenance adjective in *-ije/i-*. However, as Anelli readily admits, the situation is ambiguous; if we read *x*, the last letter is with Anelli probably rather an abbreviated dynast name.

Birgit Christiansen (pp. 49–63) discusses the Lycian enclitic morpheme *=ti* in building formulae. In this context, the enclitic appears as an optional element appended to the clause-initial particle chain, either as *meti* or as *mẽti*. The analysis of *=ti* is ambiguous, since it is formally compatible with either a form of the relative pronoun *ti-* or with the reflexive particle *=ti*. The latter interpretation was originally informed by Anatolian comparison; cf. e.g. Hitt. *=z(a)* and Luw. *=ti* (Laroche 1958: 171f.). Contrary to some previous views, Christiansen argues against the relative pronoun analysis. Rather, the *=ti* in *meti* / *mẽti* is a reflexive particle signalling the self-interest of the tomb-builder. This is hardly a new finding (see the references on p. 50), but Christiansen's treatment of the issue is welcome and adds to the discussion. In particular, the inclusion of Greek epigraphic evidence makes her argument convincing (pp. 54f.). In the final part of the contribution (pp. 56–59), Christiansen also argues against Kloekhorst's (2011) analysis of the particle chain *mene* / *mẽne* as consisting of *me* (CONJ) + *=ẽ* (ACC.SG.C enclitic pronoun) + *=e* (NOM.SG/PL.C enclitic pronoun). Rather than segmenting out a nominative pronoun *=e*, Christiansen defends the traditional analysis of *=ene* / *=ẽne* as a complete ACC.SG.C pronoun. I see no major fault in the argumentation as a whole. However, the old explanation of the unexpected final *-e* of an ACC.SG.C enclitic pronoun *=ene* / *=ẽne* from *\*=om* as a “prop vowel” remains unsatisfying.

Diego Corral Varela and Bartomeu Obrador-Cursach (pp. 65–75) offer a new analysis of the Lydian word *laqriša-*, attested numerous times in the Lydian corpus. While it is clear from contextual evidence that the referent of *laqriša-* is some part of the burial installation, multiple translations of the word have been suggested in previ-

ous scholarship, including e.g. ‘dromos’, ‘woodwork’, and ‘words’ (see pp. 67f. with references). However, Corral Varela and Obrador-Cursach take the commendable approach of recentring the discussion on the evidence from the Lydian-Aramaic bilingual LW 1. On LW 1, Lydian *laqriša-* corresponds to Aramaic *drḥt*. The reading of this Aramaic word is subject to debate (the signs *d* and *r* are virtually indistinguishable), but the most common interpretation is to read *drḥt* and to explain it as an Iranian loan from *\*draxta* (*vel sim.*) ‘tree’ (see the references on p. 68). Corral Varela and Obrador-Cursach consequently hypothesise a basic meaning ‘tree’ for *laqriša-*, with the sense ‘wood, grove’ for the plural and collective forms. The authors go on to demonstrate the importance of trees in burial installations of neighbouring and roughly contemporary cultures, adducing Phrygian and Greek evidence. Since the Lydian sources make clear that the destruction and/or removal of *laqriša-* is a punishable offense, their demonstration that this is also the case in Greek and Phrygian sources makes their argument especially cogent. To my mind, the analysis of *laqriša-* by Corral Varela and Obrador-Cursach is indeed the most promising one at present. However, some critical remarks are in order. First, the reading of Aramaic *drḥt* rather than, e.g., *rdḥt*, is seemingly assumed mainly on the basis of scholarly consensus: “[...] an overwhelming majority of authors [...] have opted, with different nuances, for the same interpretation” (p. 68). Since the reading *drḥt*, as well as its origin in Iranian *\*draxta* ‘tree’, is central to Corral Varela’s and Obrador-Cursach’s thesis, it would have been appropriate to give explicit reasons as to why this reading is the most likely one. Second, the authors offer a new analysis of the verb *ētosrs* on LW 2.3, occurring in the same clause as the NOM/ACC.PL/COLL form *laqriša* on the same line. With Sasseville (2021a: 284f.), this verb is most likely to be analysed as *ēt-* (preverb) + *os-* (root) + *-rs* (3PL.PRET.ACT ending). Melchert (*apud* Sasseville 2021a: 285) suggests connecting Lyd. *os-* to Hitt. *wāš<sup>i</sup>* ‘to buy’, assuming the same meaning for the Lydian word, taking *laqriša* in the meaning ‘woodwork’ as the direct object. Alternatively, Corral Varela and Obrador-Cursach (p. 71) translate *ētosrs* as ‘grew’, with *laqriša* as the subject. They underpin this translation with a connection of *os-* to the PIE root *\*ueṛs-* ‘to sprout, thrive’ (LIV<sup>2</sup>: 671f.). Thus, the development is *\*ueṛs-* > *\*wés-* > *os-*. Both analyses operate with a sound law whereby a sequence *\*wV* yields Lyd. *o*, originally formulated as Pre-Lyd. *\*ó/á* > Lyd. *ó / w<sub>-</sub>* (Melchert 1994a: 368). However, this sound law is hardly beyond reasonable doubt (cf. Billing & Sasseville 2024: 100 n. 7). Moreover, even if it were valid, there is to my knowledge no independent evidence that it would operate on an inherited sequence *\*-éj-*. For these reasons, the etymology of Lyd. *os-* from PIE *\*ueṛs-* becomes difficult to accept. Regardless, this does not detract from the validity of the translation of *laqriša-* as ‘tree’, the central thesis of Corral Varela’s and Obrador-Cursach’s contribution. Indeed, a meaning ‘to buy’ for

Lyd. *os-* is not forced, and ‘to grow’ or ‘to plant’ may well be the correct translation on contextual (if not etymological) grounds.

A Sidetic coin legend (no. 232) from the Gazipaşa hoard is presented and discussed by Gem Ferrer Pérez (pp. 77–95). Coin no. 232 is remarkable in that it contains an additional inscription in the exergue. Ferrer Pérez’s contribution contains a comprehensive analysis of all linguistic material on the coin, including discussions on shapes and readings of individual signs. The inclusion of high quality photographs and tracings is commendable. Ferrer Pérez sees a personal name in the additional inscription of the exergue, possibly containing a Greek onomastic element  $-\delta\kappa\lambda\eta\varsigma$  /  $-\delta\kappa\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\alpha$  /  $-\delta\kappa\lambda\epsilon\iota\alpha$  /  $-\delta\kappa\lambda\iota\delta\alpha\varsigma$ .

José Luis García Ramón (pp. 97–114) forwards a compelling etymology of Hitt. *tarai-<sup>i</sup>* ‘to become weary, exhaust oneself’ and related words (e.g. *dariye/a-<sup>zi</sup>* ‘id.’, *dariyant-* ‘exhausted’, etc.). After a comprehensive synchronic semantic analysis, comparative evidence from Greek and Latin is adduced. García Ramón traces the Hittite word family back to the PIE root *\*terh<sub>1</sub>-* ‘to rub (by boring); to weary’; cf. e.g. Gr.  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omega$  ‘to weary’, Lat. *terō* ‘to rub away; wear away’. The argumentation is lucid and cogent. Acceptance of the specific etymology of Hitt. *tarai-<sup>i</sup>* suggested by García Ramón requires adherence to the *\*h<sub>2</sub>e*-conjugation theory (*\*tórh<sub>1</sub>-i-<sup>i</sup>*/\**térh<sub>1</sub>-i-*, ‘an *-i*-verb of the *\*h<sub>2</sub>e*-conjugation’; p. 112), but one could equally well reconstruct *\*trh<sub>1</sub>-ói-<sup>i</sup>* (cf. Kloekhorst 2008: 833–835).

Alwin Kloekhorst’s contribution (pp. 115–133) adds to the discussion of Lydian phonology. A number of novel and creative analyses are offered, of which perhaps the most important one is the reinterpretation of the vowel system. Kloekhorst postulates vowel length as a phonologically contrastive feature in Lydian, where the pairs *o* : *u* and *e* : *i* are distinguished by vowel length rather than by vowel quality. Long vowels are typically accented (preverbs furnish an exception), while short vowels can be either accented or unaccented. The result is a more symmetrical vowel system. Indeed, symmetry is Kloekhorst’s main hypothesis-forming device. The starting point is the nasal vowels, i.e.  $\tilde{a}$  and  $\tilde{e}$ . Kloekhorst accepts the interpretation of these vowels as denoting a long and short vowel respectively, where  $\tilde{e} = /ã/$  and  $\tilde{a} = /ã:/$  (Bossert 1944: 111; Melchert 1992: 36ff.; 1994a: 343). Here, one could potentially take issue. It is true that both nasal vowels alternate with a non-nasalised *a* (cf. e.g. *caqrlãv* vs. *caqrlaλ*; *tawsẽv* vs. *tawsas*) and that  $\tilde{e}$  often seems to originate in closed syllable sequences (e.g. *dẽti-* ‘mobile wealth’ < *\*h<sub>2</sub>i-ónt-*; Melchert 1994b: 186f.). However, both vowels occur in the closed syllable of the ACC.SG.C/DAT.PL ending, i.e.  $-\tilde{e}v$  and  $-\tilde{a}v$ . There is no doubt that  $-\tilde{a}v$  continues a long vowel; the input is ACC.SG *\*-éh<sub>2</sub>m* and DAT.PL *\*-éh<sub>2</sub>- + -om* (Melchert 1992: 37f.). The ending  $-\tilde{e}v$  should be understood to continue ACC.SG.C *\*-óm* and DAT.PL *\*-ó-om*; cf. e.g. *tawsẽv* ‘mighty’ < *\*teuH-s-óm* (Melchert 1994a: 330). Kloekhorst himself (to my mind correctly) assumes that *\*ó* is

long already in Proto-Anatolian (p. 123). In the DAT.PL, a long vowel is expected from *\*-ó-om* under any analysis. Thus, both *ã* and *ẽ* can apparently reflect long vowels. This weakens any appeal to vowel length as an explanation of the phonological distinction between *ẽ* and *ã*, which in turn weakens the basis for Kloekhorst's analysis of the Lydian vowel system. How compelling one finds Kloekhorst's arguments will therefore mainly rest on (a) one's preferred analysis of the Lydian nasal vowels and (b) how strong one finds arguments from symmetry in phonology. I have no major complaints on Kloekhorst's treatment of the consonants (pp. 124–131), which is careful and phonologically principled.

Elena Martínez Rodríguez discusses the Lycian A word *hãtahe* (pp. 135–150). This word is attested numerous times on the Xanthos stele (TL 44), but nowhere else. The context is a passage detailing various military victories and their spoils (TL 44a.41–55), interspersed with *hãtahe*. We also find *hãtahe* in a clause describing the erection of a monument (TL 44b.55–57). There is a Lycian A stem *hãta-* 'corpse', of which *hãtahe* would be the expected DAT/LOC.PL form of the genitival adjective. The issue is that a meaning 'for those of the corpse(s)' makes little sense in the passages containing *hãtahe*. An alternative interpretation therefore takes *hãtahe* as the Lycian name of the Anatolian martial deity Sanda (Melchert 2002) — the formal match is impeccable. Especially promising is the translation of Sasseville (2021b), where *hãtahe* is translated as '(for the glory) of the War-god'. To my mind, *hãtahe* should be analysed as a declined genitive (thus Melchert 2002); note the expected dative case of the elided head 'glory (*vel sim.*)' with a GEN.SG in *-he* (Adiego 2010). Martínez Rodríguez prefers a different analysis. She revives the connection to *hãta-* 'corpse' (cf. Meriggi 1928: 438f.), taking *hãtahe* as a genitival adjective with the lexicalised meaning 'in the burial grounds'. Support for this interpretation is provided in the form of semantic typology and Greek epigraphic parallels. Credit should be given to Martínez Rodríguez for attempting to renew the connection of *hãtahe* to *hãta-* 'corpse' — separating the lemmata is indeed the *lectio difficilior* (cf. p. 141). The problem is that the translation 'in the burial grounds, communal tomb' simply does not fit well in all the attested contexts. Martínez Rodríguez never gives a full analysis and/or translation of TL 44a.41–55 with her preferred interpretation of *hãtahe*, and it is therefore difficult to evaluate her proposal. Are we to believe that military engagements occurred in communal tombs? This is the result of supplanting *hãtahe* with 'in the burial grounds' in the provided translation of the passage (pp. 136f.). Such an interpretation may not be intended by Martínez Rodríguez, but this is never made clear in the text. If Martínez Rodríguez cannot make plausible that her analysis is correct on the basis of the Lycian passages themselves, the translation of *hãtahe* as '(for the glory) of the War-god (*vel sim.*)' remains preferable, despite the necessary separation from the homophonous stem *hãta-* 'corpse'.

H. Craig Melchert contributes a brief study on the syntax of Anatolian universal quantifiers (pp. 151–173). Building on Bauer (2020), he makes a fairly convincing argument that the Luwian adjectival universal quantifier *pūnata/i-* is postposed in the standard word order, while a preposed quantifier can be used in an “emphatic” or “intensifying” function. The basis for this is the correlation between preposed quantifier and an imperative verb. Thus, cf. e.g. CLuw. *zāwi zīyar* NUMUN<sup>H1.A</sup> [*p*]ūnāta ‘here lie all (kinds of) seeds’ (KUB 35.54 ii 31’) vs. *nānum=pa=mmaš wāšuwaššanza ḫalalanuššandu pūnati[nzi* DINGIR<sup>MEŠ</sup>-*inzi*] ‘now let all [the gods] purify their goods!’ (KUB 35.39 ii 24–25). A similar phenomenon can be seen in the use of Hitt. *ḫūmant-* ‘all, every’ (pp. 162–168). Melchert also discusses the “Luwo-Hittite” universal quantifier *dapi(d)-*, *dapiant-* at some length (pp. 156–162), for which one should now contrast the logographic reading DA.BI = Hitt. *ḫūmant-* by Kloekhorst (2022).

Norbert Oettinger’s contribution (pp. 175–182) is a discussion on the connection between the Anatolian *ḫi*-conjugation and imperfective aspect. Various topics are treated and several new proposals are offered, some quite speculative (e.g. tracing the imperfective class in *\*-anna-<sup>i</sup>/-anni-* to *\*-ādn-<sup>i</sup>ie/o-*; pp. 179f.). However, perhaps the most important suggestion concerns the Luwian iterative verbs in *-zza-<sup>i</sup>*, cognate to the Hittite type in *-ske/a-<sup>zi</sup>*. This type reflects the PIE suffix *\*-ské/ó-* and was originally *mi*-conjugating, whence the *ḫi*-conjugation observable in Luwian is rather puzzling. Oettinger suggests that the prevalence of the *ḫi*-conjugation in imperfective verb types enabled its secondary spread in Luwian to verbs reflecting *\*-ské/ó-* (pp. 176f.; 180f.).

Valerio Pisaniello and Federico Giusfredi are interested in the sociolinguistic situation of 13<sup>th</sup> cent. Ḫattuša (pp. 183–200). Was Hittite or Luwian the predominant spoken language? Pisaniello and Giusfredi make a convincing methodological argument why Akkadian medical texts, glossed with Luwian, Hittite, and Hurrian words, are a suitable corpus for investigations into this topic (pp. 186f.). Their main research object of choice is KUB 37.1 (CTH 808), an Akkadian medical text written in Late New Script. The Anatolian glosses in this text can be divided into two categories: (a) translations of Akkadian terms and (b) running interpolations and commentaries on the Akkadian text. Their conclusion is that the preferred code of the scribe of KUB 37.1 probably was a highly “Luwianised” Hittite; most glosses are written in such a variety. However, genuine Luwian was evidently known; a complete Luwian clause is found in a translation-gloss, marked with a gloss wedge (: *mamanašati battunāti puwāti* ‘(s)he crushes with pestle (?) and mortar’; KUB 37.1 obv. 16). Conversely, Hurrian was perceived as foreign, since the Hurrian gloss of KUB 37.1 is explicitly marked with the Hittite adverb *ḫurlili* ‘in Hurrian’.

Elisabeth Rieken’s contribution (pp. 201–215) is an investigation into a number of Hittite and Luwian words spelled with P-signs for etymological *\*w*. Rieken suggests

that these P-signs spell a fricative [v]/[β]/[φ]/[f]. The phoneme /w/ (< \*w) is hypothesised to have surfaced as an allophone [β]/[φ] in the position C<sup>[alveolar]</sup> \_V among native Hittite speakers. This allophonic variation would then have been phonologised by L2 speakers of Hittite with native languages containing phonemic labial fricatives (e.g. Hattian and Palaic). Subsequently, the pronunciation of the fricative rather than the approximant became standard for most speakers of Hittite in a small number of mostly lower register words. Rieken admits that this scenario is difficult to prove (p. 212). Indeed, the pertinent data is scanty and hardly unambiguous. For example, three out of eight data points consist of Hittite verbs in *-upa(e)-<sup>zi</sup>*, i.e. *kadupa(e)-<sup>zi</sup>* ‘to devour’, *šarā kašdupa(e)-<sup>zi</sup>* ‘to take up by the hand’, and *taškupa(e)-<sup>zi</sup>* ‘to cry, moan, wail’. Verbs in *-a(e)-<sup>zi</sup>* are typically denominal and the etymologies therefore rest on the reconstruction of nominal bases. All bases in *-upa-* are suggested to result from hypostasis of a GEN.SG of an original verbal noun in *-war/-n-* (this process has been hypothesised for other Hittite verbs). Accordingly, e.g., *kadupa(e)-<sup>zi</sup>* ‘to devour’ ← \**kadupa-* < \**kaduwa-* ← \**kaduwas* (GEN.SG of \**kaduwar/-n-*) ← \**kad-* < PIE \**kh<sub>2</sub>ed-* ‘to crush; chew’ (cf. e.g. Ved. *khādati* ‘chews’). It immediately becomes clear that a significant number of assumptions and hypothetical forms are needed to reconstruct an etymological input with \*-w- for the stems in *-upa(e)-<sup>zi</sup>*. Moreover, the root \**kh<sub>2</sub>ed-* is to my knowledge not represented elsewhere in Anatolian. For *taškupa(e)-<sup>zi</sup>* ‘to cry, moan, wail’, one must additionally imagine a secondary spread of *-upa-*, since the preceding consonant is velar, not alveolar (cf. p. 211). In sum, Rieken presents an interesting hypothesis, but due to the scanty evidence it remains speculative.

The multidisciplinary approach of Martin Seyer and Mariona Vernet (pp. 217–239) is exemplary. In their contribution, the authors discuss the meaning of the Lycian A word *ñtipa*, attested twice (TL 88.3; 124.3–4). They cogently argue against previous proposals, including the translation ‘inscription’, thought to be a loan from Old Persian *dipi-* ‘inscription, script’. Instead, on the basis of a combination of linguistic and archaeological evidence, Seyer and Vernet claim that the most likely meaning of *ñtipa* is something like ‘addition, additional; inserted’. The provided arguments are convincing. However, some comments on the linguistic component of the contribution are warranted. The grammatical analysis of individual forms is only discussed very sparingly, resulting in some confusion concerning the translation of individual passages. TL 124.1–6 reads *ebēnē xupu se=i hri=ti ñtipa m=e=ti adē uhetēi*, translated as ‘this tomb and that which as an addition there is above, Uhetēi has made [...]’ (pp. 223; 229). The form *ñtipa* is apparently taken as direct object of *adē* ‘made’. However, this is not formally possible, since the form cannot be accusative (a NOM/ACC.COLL reading is excluded if assuming agreement with the relative pronoun =*ti*). Rather, one should to my mind read *ñtipa* as a DAT/LOC.SG form of an *a*-stem *ñtipa-* (C) ‘addition’, functioning as an adverb. My preferred translation of the passage on TL 124 would

accordingly be: ‘this tomb and that which there is above it in addition, Uhetēi has made it [...]’. Moreover, *ñtatā* (TL 124.7–8) is apparently translated as ‘burial chambers’ (p. 223), but the form is clearly the ACC.SG of *ñtata-*. An analysis of *ñtipa* as ‘in addition’ would also work for TL 88.3 (*m=ene ñtepi tāti ñtipa tezi* ‘they shall place him in the ñ. t.’), but one should also be open to a compound expression *ñtipatezi* ‘in the addition-t.’ (cf. pp. 228f.). Seyer and Vernet do not expound on the origin of *ñtipa*, beyond plausibly segmenting out an adverbial prefix *ñt-/ñte-/ñti-*. To this point, I would like to tentatively suggest that there are pertinent Anatolian comparanda. Billing (2025) analyses a song in the Iṣtanuwa dialect of Luwian. In the second line (*anti=mi=tta tuwanta wāšu paddu*), *anti* [...] *paddu* is analysed as a verb of giving in the 3SG.IMPV.ACT. The stem of *paddu* could be a verb *pa-* (cf. Ved.  $\sqrt{pā}$ - ‘to (make) go, pass’) and the metre suggests an accentual analysis of the preverb as *antí*. Lyc. A *ñti-pa-* ‘addition’ becomes a promising formal match. The first member *ñti-* is the expected cognate of Luw. *antí*. As for the second member *-pa-*, one could envision an *a*-stem abstract noun to the verbal stem underlying Luw. *paddu*. Semantically, an abstract noun of a verb of giving with the secondary meaning ‘addition’ seems plausible to me.

Zsolt Simon’s contribution (pp. 241–252) is a welcome addition to the discussion of Carian phonology. Simon investigates the Carian spelling of Egyptian names. The goal is a clearer understanding of the synchronic phonology of Carian and Simon introduces his text with a brief methodological note (pp. 241f.). After a lucid presentation of the data in table format, Simon concludes that all vowels except the stressed one are deleted in the Carian adaptation of Egyptian names. However, there are two types of exceptions. One consists of *i*-vowels in final syllables, which optionally spell an Egyptian post-tonic schwa (e.g. Car. *tt(u)bazi* ← Eg. *T<sup>3</sup>-dj(.t)b<sup>3</sup>st.t* vs. *pdubez* ← Eg. *P<sup>3</sup>-dj-B<sup>3</sup>st.t*, both from Egyptian names with final *-b<sup>3</sup>st.t*). The other is one case in which the resulting consonant cluster would be illicit in Carian (i.e. Car. *apmen* ← Eg. *Hp-mn* \*[ḥapi mēn], not Car. *\*\*pmen*). Another important finding is that the accent of both Egyptian and Greek words is kept in the process of Carian adaptation (pp. 248; 249). Simon does not expound on the topic, but it should be noted that his observation could be used to argue that the Carian accent was non-demarcative, or “free”; the location of the accent in synchronic Carian could apparently not be predicted by any set of rules. Finally, Simon reasserts the notion that Carian writing is not “defective” (pp. 248–251), as persuasively argued by Adiego (2019). There are no unspelled phonemes; the sequence of graphemes maps neatly onto the sequence of phonemes.

Recai Tekoğlu and Taner Korkut present a new Lycian-Greek epigraphic find (pp. 253–263), found on an architrave block unearthed in 2021. The text consists of a well-understood Lycian funerary formula (*māxazusttā=ti : prñnawate : hrixñmah : tideimi : hrppi ladi se tideime* ‘M., son of H., built (it) for his wife and children.’),

followed by a brief description of the buried individual in Greek (Μεγάσυστας σταδίαδρομος ‘M., stadium-runner’). While Hrixm̃ma is a Lycian name known from other inscriptions (TL 89.1; 90.1; 2), Lyc. A Māxazustā = Gr. Μεγάσυστας is new. This name is therefore appropriately given special consideration in the comments (pp. 260f.).

Miguel Valério offers a novel etymological account of the Luwic word-family in *mūwa-* (pp. 265–291). A considerable number of Luwian and Lycian lemmata can be subsumed under this set, whose meanings and etymologies have been heavily debated in the literature (see pp. 266–268). Valério makes a case for tracing them all to the PIE root *\*m(i)eyh<sub>1</sub>-* ‘to move’ (c.f. e.g. Lat. *moveō*, Skt. *√mīv-* ‘to move’; see LIV<sup>2</sup>: 445f.). As far as I can tell, there are no glaring phonological issues; a root *\*m(i)eyh<sub>1</sub>-* can account for all pertinent data with independently substantiated sound laws. However, the reconstruction of the strong stem of Luw. *mūwa<sup>i</sup>* ‘to overpower’ as *\*méyh<sub>1</sub>-* (p. 273) should be adjusted to *\*móyh<sub>1</sub>-*, since a radical *o*-grade is expected for a *hi*-conjugating root verb. Against Valério, note that Hitt. *mau<sup>i</sup>* ‘to fall’ (also *mauš<sup>zi</sup>* with a secondary *-š-*) is an intransitive verb of movement, while Luw. *mūwa<sup>i</sup>* ‘to overpower’ is a transitive verb of destruction/dominance. Valério includes the Hittite ‘fall’-verb as a reflex of PIE *\*m(i)eyh<sub>1</sub>-* (p. 271). His analysis implies that both verbs would originate in a stem *\*móyh<sub>1</sub>-/muh<sub>1</sub>-* (cf. Kloekhorst 2008: 564–566). However, it is not immediately clear what meaning is then to be reconstructed for the etymon. Regardless, Valério’s proposal should be taken as a serious possibility. Indeed, the author is to be commended for the extensive coverage of earlier literature and primary data. The reader should contrast Valério’s account with the main competing proposal of Weiss (1996), who rather reconstructs a root *\*meyh<sub>1</sub>-* ‘to be abundant, reproductively powerful’. To my mind, it cannot be excluded that the Luwic *mūwa*-family contains reflexes of both roots.

The topic of Marion Vernet’s contribution (pp. 293–316) is the Anatolian deity “King of Kaunos”. The epigraphic evidence pertinent to this deity is surveyed, including Lycian, Carian, Greek, and Aramaic material. Vernet argues that the Carian proper name of the deity was *Kandawats* (possibly Car. *kδou-*; see p. 306 n. 29), the word for ‘king’. Thus, ‘king’ would not only be an epithet. The main basis for this is the Aramaic rendering of the deity as *kndwš* on the Letoon Trilingual (pp. 299–302). Vernet also argues that King of Kaunos was the principal deity of the Carian pantheon, leading to syncretism between King of Kaunos and Zeus on Cos (pp. 307–312).

Concluding the volume, Ilya Yakubovich (pp. 317–333) presents an analysis of the Cuneiform Luwian word *halliṣ-* (N), as well as the related verb *hallīna<sup>i</sup>* and abstract noun *halliyatta-* (N). These terms are attested in incantations belonging to the ritual traditions of Puriyanni and Kuwattalla/Šilalluḫi, dealing with the removal of impure matter and undesirable states. Using a broad array of both philological and

linguistic evidence, Yakubovich makes a detailed and compelling case for translating *ḫalliš-* as ‘contamination, defilement’, *ḫallīna-<sup>i</sup>* as ‘to absorb contamination’, and *ḫalliyatta-* as ‘(ritual of contamination)’.

In summary, the volume under review contains interesting treatments of a wide array of topics pertaining to virtually every Anatolian language, ranging from Carian phonology to Luwian syntax. I can therefore recommend it to anyone interested in Anatolian linguistics, especially considering the modest price.

### 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*. Ann Arbor/New York: Beech Stave Press, 1–8.
- Adiego, Ignasi-Xavier. 2019. Consonant Clusters, Defective Notation of Vowels and Syllable Structure in Caromemphite. In Ronald I. Kim, Jana Mynářová & Peter Pavúk (eds.), *Hrozný and Hittite. The First Hundred Years. Proceedings of the International Conference Held at Charles University, Prague, 11–14 November 2015* (Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 107). Leiden/Boston: Brill, 95–119.
- Bauer, Anna. 2020. All, many, some and more: Nun-Numerical quantification in Anatolian. In Luka Repanšek, Harald Bichlmeier & Velizar Sadovski (eds.), *vácāṃsi miśrá ḱṛṇavāmahai. Proceedings of the international conference of the Society for Indo-European Studies and IWoBA XII, Ljubljana 4–7 June 2019, celebrating one hundred years of Indo-European comparative linguistics at the University of Ljubljana*. Hamburg: Baar-Verlag, 49–65.
- Billing, Oscar & Sasseville, David. 2024. Lydian *o*-vocalism and the word for ‘rite, cult supply’. *Kadmos* 63, 99–113.
- Billing, Oscar. 2025. A Song in Iṣtanuwa Luwian. *Altorientalische Forschungen* 52, 21–32.
- Bossert, Helmuth Th. 1944. *Ein hethitisches Königssiegel. Neue Beiträge zur Geschichte und Entzifferung der hethitischen Hieroglyphenschrift* (Istanbuler Forschungen 18). Berlin: Wasmuth.
- Kloekhorst, Alwin. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon* (Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series 5). Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Kloekhorst, Alwin. 2011. The Opening Formula of Lycian Funerary Inscriptions: *mēti* vs. *mēne*. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 70, 13–23.
- Kloekhorst, Alwin. 2022. Hittite *dapi(a)-*, *dapit/d-*, *dapiant-* ‘all, every, each; entire’: a logographic interpretation. *Hungarian Assyriological Review* 3, 203–220.

- Laroche, Emmanuel. 1958. Comparaison du louvite et du lycien. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 53, 159–197.
- LIV<sup>2</sup> = Rix, Helmut, Kümmel, Martin, Zehnder, Thomas, Lipp, Reiner & Schirmer, Brigitte. 2001. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben. Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstambildungen. Zweite, erweiterte und verbesserte Auflage*. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- Melchert, H. Craig. 1992. The third Person present in Lydian. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 97, 31–54.
- Melchert, H. Craig. 1994a. *Anatolian Historical Phonology* (Leiden Studies in Indo-European 3). Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi.
- Melchert, H. Craig. 1994b. PIE \*y > Lydian d. In Petr Vavroušek (ed.), *Iranian and Indo-European Studies. Memorial Volume of Otakar Klíma*. Praha: enigma corporation, 181–187.
- Melchert, H. Craig. 2002. The God Sanda in Lycia? In Piotr Taracha (ed.), *Silva Anatolica. Anatolian Studies Presented to Maciej Popko on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. Warsaw: Agade, 241–251.
- Meriggi, Piero. 1928. La declinazione del licio. *Rendiconti della Reale Accademia nazionale dei Lincei. Classe di Scienze morali, storiche e filologiche* 6/4, 410–450.
- Sasseville, David. 2021a. *Anatolian Verbal Stem Formation. Luwian, Lycian and Lydian* (Brill's Studies in Indo-European Languages & Linguistics 21). Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Sasseville, David. 2021b. Die Deutung von lykisch *terñ* und ihre Konsequenz für die Kriegspolitik Lykiens. *Hungarian Assyriological Review* 2, 161–172.
- Weiss, Michael. 1996. Greek  $\mu\upsilon\pi\acute{o}\varsigma$  'countless', Hittite *mūri-* 'bunch (of fruit)'. *Historische Sprachforschung* 109, 199–214.

Oscar Billing  
Uppsala Universitet  
Engelska parken  
Thunbergsvägen 3H, Box 635  
751 26 Uppsala, Sverige  
oscar.billing@lingfil.uu.se