

Essays in Anatolian Onomastics¹

A. LEHRMAN

I. Hieroglyphic Luwian Taiman

YARIRIS (YA+RA/I-RI-SA), THE EARLY first millennium B.C. ruler of Carchemish (modern Jerablus, a Turkish town on Euphrates near the Syrian border), the author of a number of Hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions glorifying his deeds and members of his family, in the inscription A 15 b, line IV, proudly informs posterity about his proficiency in various scripts and languages. This fact is extremely interesting *per se*, since such a conscious attitude towards linguistic matters was not at all common in Yariris' day and age. Unfortunately, the beginning of line IV, where Yariris enumerates the scripts in which he was literate, is damaged, providing us with only four of the toponyms, or rather toponymic adjectives, referring to scripts he claimed to have mastered. The readable part of the text runs as follows:

(A 15 b,IV) /.../ URBS-si-ya-ti SCRIBA-li-ya-ti sù+ra/i-wa/i-ni-ti URBS SCRIBA-li-ya-ti-i à-sù+ra/i-REGIO-wa/i-na-ti URBS SCRIBA-li-ya-ti-i ta-i-ma-ni-ti-ha URBS SCRIBA-li-ti

12-ha-wa/i-à "LINGUA"-la-ti-i-na u+LITUUS-ni-ha

wali-mu-u ta-ni-ma-si-na REGIO-ni-si-i-na-à INFANS-ni-na "VIA"-ha+ra/i-wa/i-ta-hi-ta5-ti-i CUM-na ARHA-sa-ta DOMINUS-na-ni-i-sa à-mi-i-sa LINGUA-la-ti SUPER+ra/i-à

ta-ni-mi-ha-wa/i-mu 273-wa/i+ra/i-pi-na u+LITUUS-na-nu-ta

"/.../ in the script of the City, the script of Sura, the script of Assyria and the script of Taiman (?). I knew 12 languages, and to me my lord gathered the son of every country by (means of) travelling for (the sake of) language, and caused me to know every wisdom."²

¹ The system of transliteration of Hieroglyphic Luwian signs adapted in this paper has been proposed and demonstrated in J.D. Hawkins, A. Morpurgo-Davies, G. Neumann, *Hittite Hieroglyphs and Luwian: New Evidence for Connection* (Göttingen, 1973).

I should like to use the opportunity to express my gratitude and appreciation to Prof. V. Shevoroshkin of Yale whose encouragement and help have always been most valuable to me; to Prof. A. Morpurgo-Davies of Oxford, England, Prof. W. Cowgill and Prof. S. Insler of Yale, whose criticism concerning sections II and III was most constructive and illuminating. Understandably, I assume all the responsibility for any mistakes and shortcomings of this paper.

² As rendered in J.D. Hawkins, "The Negatives in Hieroglyphic Luwian," *Anatolian Studies*, vol. XXV, 1975, p. 150.

Of the mentioned toponymic adjectives, URBS-*si(-ya)*- “of the City” undoubtedly refers to the Hieroglyphic (Luwian) script as used in Carchemish; *à-sú+ra/i*-REGIO-*wa/i-na*- can also be identified as “Assyrian” (=cuneiform); *sú+ra/i-wa/i-ni*- (cf. also *su+ra/i-za* in Carchemish A 6, line III) is not all that clear, but certain suggestions have been made³; *ta-i-ma-ni*- has remained obscure.

P. Meriggi, who transliterated this toponym as *Tâmana*-URU, compared it tentatively with *Teman* in Hanigalbat.⁴ The land of *Teman* is mentioned in the annals of the Assyrian king Adad-Nerari II (911-891 B.C.), always in the form of an ethnic adjective (KUR *te-man-aia*, etc.) referring to a proper name (PN) of a (military) leader who captured a territory in Hanigalbat, e.g., “Nur-Adad, the Temannite,” “Mamli, the Temannite,” “Muquru, the Temannite”;⁵ there is no reason whatsoever to locate *Teman* in Hanigalbat: an interpretation, according to which the bearers of the respective PNs *came* to Hanigalbat from *Teman*, seems more appropriate.

One could compare Hier. Luwian *Taiman*- (as well as Assyrian *Teman*-) with Hebrew *Têman*, non-vocalized *tim*, a toponym which occurs several times in the Hebrew Bible (<Sem. **ta-iman*-, the locative nominal type “*ta12a3*”⁶, of the root **imn* “right(hand); southern”⁷; Sem. **taiman*- would mean “situated on the right hand side; South”). It should be noted that in Assyrian, **ai* yielded *e* in an open syllable already in the Old Assyrian period (**ai* > Old Babylonian *i* under the same conditions;⁸ if Assy. *teman*- < Sem. **taiman*-, this is a strong argument against Meriggi’s connection, since the borrowing of the form in question from Assyrian into (Hier) Luwian should have

³ J.D. Hawkins, “Assyrians and Hittites,” *Iraq*, vol. XXXVI (London, 1974), p. 68, note 6: “Sura could refer to ‘Syrian,’ i.e., Aramaic or possibly to Urartian, since the kings called themselves ‘king of the land Sura.’ It is not clear, however, what language or script can be associated with *Taiman*, which is usually identified with *Teman* in Hanigalbat.”

⁴ P. Meriggi, *Hieroglyphisch-hethitisches Glossar* (Wiesbaden, 1962), p. 239: “mit *Tâmana*-URU vgl. etwa das Land *Teman* in Hanigalbat (Luckenbill I §§363-70; Forrer, Provinzeinteilung 34f.)?”. The annals of the Assyrian king Adad-Nerari II (D. Luckenbill, *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia*, vol. I. (Chicago, 1926); cf. a more up-to-date translation in Albert Kirk Grayson, *Assyrian Royal Inscriptions*, vol. 2 (Wiesbaden, 1976), pp. 87-90) mention *Teman*, while E. Forrer, *Die Provinzeinteilung des assyrischen Reiches* (Leipzig, 1921), p. 34f. and index on p. 145, deals with *Temenu/i*; these two should not be confused.

⁵ Cf. Albert Kirk Grayson, *loc. cit.*

⁶ I.M. D’jakonov, *Jazyki drevnej perednej Azii* (Moscow, 1967), p. 207: “Type *ta12a3*: nouns of location: *tarbas*- ‘cattle yard’ [*rbš* “to lie (down)” (said of cattle)], *tabal*- < **ta’bal*- “dry land” [the root ‘*b*l].”

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 187.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 274.

occurred before 2000 B.C., which is very unlikely, especially since this toponym is first mentioned in Assyrian texts (cf. n. 4 and 5) at approximately the same time as in our Hier.Luwian text (ca. ninth century B.C.).⁹ Therefore, *Taiman-* would be a loan-word from a Semitic dialect where the contraction of diphthongs did not take place, or where it took place after the toponym had been borrowed into Hier.Luwian.¹⁰

Let us consider briefly the occurrences of our toponym in the Bible. In *Gen.*, XXXVI, 11 = *I Chron.*, I, 36, *Tēmān* is employed as a PN (of a son of 'āliḫāz, son of 'esāw). According to *Gen.*, XXXVI, 15, *Tēmān* is an 'allūḫ ("chief, prince" or "clan"¹¹) of 'āliḫāz; according to *Gen.*, XXXVI, 42 = *I Chron.*, I, 53, it is an 'allūḫ of 'esāw.¹² In *Gen.*, XXXVI, 34 = *I Chron.*, I, 45, *Huṣām*, the king of 'ādōm, is mentioned, who is said to have come from the "Temanite land." One of the three friends of Job ('ūiōb) is 'āliḫāz the Temanite (*hatēmānī*). So far we have dealt with the toponymic, or ethnic, adjective (concerning the usage of *Tēmān* as an eponym cf. n. 12). It should be noted on this occasion that in the Hier.Luwian text adduced above, *ta-i-ma-ni(-ti-ha)* (where *-ti-* is the desinence of the ablative-instrumental, *-ha* the conjunctive enclitic "and") must be interpreted as an adjective. In the text, we have the following parallelism:

URBS-*si(-ya-ti)* SCRIBA-*li(-ya-ti)*
sù+ra/i-wa/i-ni(-ti) (URBS) SCRIBA-*li(ya-ti)*
à-sù+ra/i-REGIO-wa/i-nà(-ti) (URBS) SCRIBA-*li(ya-ti)*

⁹ J.D. Hawkins, in his "Assyrians and Hittites" (see n. 3), p. 70, determines the time of Yariris' rule as ninth century. As to *-ai-* in Hier.Luw. *ta-i-ma-ni-*, there is no doubt that it represents the non-contracted Semitic diphthong. Very rarely is a syllabogram "C+a" followed by an *i*-sign in Hier.Luw.; such occurrences in the final position are restricted to those of the desinence of the 3.sg.prs. (cf. Hittite 3.sg.prs. in *-i* of the *hi-* conjugation). There are almost no cases of "C+a" + "i" in the medial position.

¹⁰ The contraction of Sem. **ai* to *ē* must have occurred relatively late in North Central Semitic dialects (i.e., Hebrew, Phoenician, largely unknown Moabite, and Aramaic; cf. I.M. D'jakonov, *op. cit.*, p. 186); such a view is supported by the hypothesis stating that the names of Ethiopian (and South Arabian) signs had been borrowed from Phoenician before the monophthongization took place, e.g., Phoen. **tait*->Hebrew *tēt*, Greek *thēta*, vs. Sabaeen (South Arabian) **tait*->Ethiop. *tait*, etc. (cf. I.M. D'jakonov, *op. cit.*, p. 367). On the other hand, the opinion that there existed a Semitic writing system (a "missing link") responsible for both North and South Semitic alphabets, seems to lead in the right direction, without oversimplifying the situation; cf. V. Shevoroshkin, "Zur Entstehung und Entwicklung der kleinasiatischen Buchstabenschriften," *Kadmos*, Band VII/Heft 2, 1968, p. 170f.

¹¹ R. de Vaux, "Téman, ville ou région d'Édom?," *Révue Biblique*, 76, 1969, p. 382.

¹² R. de Vaux in his article which has been quoted above, notes that ". . . Téman est l'éponyme d'un groupe tribal d'Édom" (*op. cit.*, p. 382). The etymology of this word as well as the fact that it occurs as a PN only once seem to suggest that its anthroponymic employment is secondary.

ta-i-ma-ni(-ti-ha) (URBS) SCRIBA-*li(ti)*

Here, *-si-* in URBS-*si(-ya-ti)* is undoubtedly the Luwian “genitival” suffix *-a(s)si-*, *-wan-* in *sù+ra/i-wa/i(-ni-ti)* and *à-sù+ra/i-REGIO-wa/i-na(-ti)* is the ethnical adjectival suffix; *ta-i-ma-ni(-ti-ha)* seems to fall out since it does not have any adjectival suffix, while its function is the same as that of the other ethnic adjectives in the passage. It seems reasonable to believe that *ta-i-ma-ni-* represents the Semitic form of the ethnic adjective, including the suffix (Sem. **taiṃan-iṯ-*, cf. Hebrew *tēmānî* “Temanite”; the Semitic suffix **-iṯ-* > Hebrew (and Phoenician) *-î* functionally corresponds to the aforementioned Luwian adjectival suffix; Assy. *tēmanai(a)* employs the suffix *-ai(-āi-)*, a variant of *-iṯ-*).¹³ Borrowing ethnic adjectives with the suffix of the source language is rather frequent, cf. English *Iraqi, Israeli*, where *-i* = Sem. suf. *-î* (<**-iṯ-*).

One context, in which the toponym Teman occurs in the Bible, deserves a special consideration. *Jeremiah*, XLIX, 7 reads as follows: *Lä'ädôm kō 'amar iḥwh ṣe'ba'ot ha-'ên Cōd ḥōkmā b'eṯēmān 'ōbdā Ceṣā mi-bānīm nisr'eḥā ḥōkmātām* - “To (or ‘concerning’) Edom thus says the Lord of hosts: Is wisdom no more in Teman? Has counsel perished from the prudent? Has their wisdom vanished?” This text specifically implies that Teman enjoyed the reputation of a place of wisdom.¹⁴ Such an implication should not be passed unnoticed, especially if one considers the “script of Taiman” in the Hier.Luwian text.

There is no consent among biblical scholars as to the exact location of *Tēmān*.¹⁵ The most cautious and traditional view, based on the (scarce!) textual evidence of the Bible and the etymology of the word itself, states that Teman was a region of Edom and, secondarily, a poetic designation of the whole of Edom situated south of the Dead Sea.¹⁶ Outside the Bible, it is mentioned by Pliny, who associates Temanites and Nabataeans.¹⁷ Eusebius, in his *Onomasticon*, mentions

¹³ I.M. D'jakonov, *op. cit.*, p. 209.

¹⁴ Such an implication is very much in favor of the proposed connection. Cf. a parallel passage in *Obadiah* I, 8: “There is no discernment in him, for shall I not in that day, says the Lord, even destroy the wise men out of Edom, and understanding out of the mount of Esaw? (9) And thy mighty men, O Teman, shall be dismayed, to end that everyone from the mount of Esaw may be cut off by slaughter.” Cf. below the view that Teman is a region of Edom and even a synonym of Edom in some biblical texts; cf. also the Temanite military expeditions possibly implied in the Assyrian texts (see n. 4 and 5).

¹⁵ R. de Vaux, *op. cit.*, p. 379ff.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 385: “Originellement le nom (Téman—A.L.) désigne une région d'Édom, le pays des Témánites. . . ; d'après l'étymologie du mot, il s'agit du sud d'Édom. . . Téman est devenu une désignation poétique de tout le pays d'Édom.”

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 382: “Nabataeis Thimaneos iunxerunt veteres.”

a fortress of *Thaiman* situated in the vicinity of Petra (southwestern Jordan),¹⁸ i.e., in approximately the same area.

The problem of the geographical identity of Assyrian *Temān*, biblical *Tēmān* and Carchemishian *Taiman*, as well as the problem of *Taiman* as an area of considerable political and cultural importance for the Near East in the period between twelfth and eighth century B.C., should be left to the attention of historians and biblical scholars. It appears reasonable, however, to identify *Taiman* as a North Central Semitic speaking area, and the supposition that Hier.Luwian *ta-i-ma-ni*-(URBS) SCRIBA-*li*- refers to an alphabetic writing system, should not strain credulity too much. Such an identification, although quite vague from the topographical point of view, would be sufficient for our purpose and relevant to the context of the Hier.Luwian inscription.

II. Luwian *piha*-

Luw. *piha*- occurs rather frequently in Anatolian PNs, attested in Hittite, Hieroglyphic Luwian, Lycian and Hellenistic Anatolian texts, e.g., Hier.Luwian *Pihami*-, Luw. (in Hittite) *Piha*-A.A (**Pihamuwa*), *Pihanu*-, *Pihananaya*-, *Pihassa*-A.A, *Pihassu*-, *Pihaddu*-, *Piha*-^dU, *Piha-walwi*-, *Piha*-UR.MAH, Hier.Luw.*Piha*-LEO, Cun.Luw. ^f*Pihawiya*-, *Pihawizi*-, *Piha-ziti*-,¹⁹ Lycian *Pigasa*, “greco-asianique” *piga*-²⁰; Pisidian *Pigerlōmēs*, *Pigerlōnis*; Lycian *pikr̄ma*, *Pigomas*, *Pige-sarmas*, *Pigasis*, etc.²¹

It is obvious that *piha*- is a verbal stem,²² cf. *pihaimi*- which is a

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 379.

¹⁹ E. Laroche, *Les noms des hittites* (Paris, 1966), pp. 139-141.

[All the ## of the Hittite names (referred to as “Laroche’s catalogue”) refer to the book mentioned above. The numbers of Hier.Luwian logograms are those listed in P. Meriggi, *op. cit.*, (see no. 4). For quotations of Hieroglyphic Luwian texts, see P. Meriggi, *Manuale di eteo geroglifico*, Parte II: Testi—1^a serie (Roma, 1967), and Parte II: Testi—2^a e 3^a serie (Roma, 1975).]

²⁰ E. Laroche, *Dictionnaire de la langue louvite* (Paris, 1959), p. 81.

²¹ Ph.H.J. Houwink ten Cate, *The Luwian Population Groups of Lycia and Cilicia Aspera during the Hellenistic Period* (Leiden, 1961), p. 156. Cf. also the entry *Pihra*, *ibid.*, pp. 156-157: “A comparison of *Pigramis* and *Pigramos* with *pikr̄ma*-/*Pigomas*, of *Pigrasis* with *Pigasis* and of *Erpigrēs* with *Erbigesis*, shows that *Pihra* must be closely related to the preceding element (*Piha*—A.L.), though one need not go as far as Kretschmer, who considers *Pihra* to be an extension of *Phia* with an *r* suffix.” Lycian *k* (x in Pedersen’s transcription) corresponds to Hitt.-Luw. *h*; in Hellenistic transliterations, it is always rendered as *g* (cf. Houwink ten Cate, *op. cit.*, p. 156).

²² E. Laroche (*Dictionnaire*..., p. 81) regards *piha*- as a noun; the form *pihaimi*- is, according to Laroche, built on the denominative verb *pihai*-; the pass. part. form *pihaimi*- is a simple phonetic variant of *pihaimi*-, cf. *Dictionnaire*..., p. 133f., p. 141; the form **pihassa*- is said to be a derivative

passive participle,²³ also Lyc. *pikr̄ma* = hellenized *Pigomas*. This Luwian passive participle form often serves as an epithet of the Thundergod²⁴ dX/dIM/dU/dISKUR (cuneiform ideograms), DEUS TONITRUS-*hu-za-sa* = **Tarhunzas* (Luwian hieroglyphs), etc., the supreme deity of the “Asianic” pantheon.²⁵ The meaning of *piha-*, as well as its etymology, has remained obscure.²⁶ It seems, however, that a positive identification of this element is possible, if one assumes its Indo-European origin as well as the existence of typological parallels in Anatolian, and IE in general, onomastics and ideology: the fact that *pihami-* is employed as an epithet of the Thundergod provides a helpful hint for comparison with other Indo-European traditions.

All these assumptions make it reasonable to consider Luw. *piha-* to be a continuation of IE **bhiH-* cf. Skt. *bhī̄-*, *bhī̄-ti-*, *bhiyás-* “terror, awe, fear,” *bhī̄-má-* “terrible, awesome,” etc.; Lith. *bijótis*, Latv. *bītiēs* “to be afraid of,” etc.²⁷ The meaning of *piha-* would then be posited as “to be afraid of, to awe, to revere,” or the like.

Unfortunately, the contexts outside PNs do not offer much for the philological analysis which would enable us to infer the meaning from the textual environment. In Cuneiform Luwian, we have four occurrences of **Tarhunt-s pihami-s* “the ?revered? *Tarhunt-* (Thunder-

adjective of the latter. Since such “doubling” of the same suffix *-assi-* is unique and rather dubious, a different interpretation of **pihassa-* is proposed here (cf. further in the text of the present paper), and *piha-* is regarded as a verb. Concerning *pihaimi-* see below.

²³ E. Laroche, *Dictionnaire...*, p. 139; also p. 142.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 81; E. Laroche, *Recherches sur les noms des dieux hittites* (Paris, 1947), pp. 69, 71; J. Friedrich, *Hethitisches Wörterbuch*, 2. Ergänzungsheft (Heidelberg, 1961), p. 20.

²⁵ E. Laroche, *Recherches...*, pp. 108, 109, 116; Ph. Houwink ten Cate, *op. cit.*, p. 125; H. Otten, *Zur grammatikalischen und lexikalischen Bestimmung des Luwischen* (Berlin, 1953), p. 102; the reading **Tarhunzas* in Hieroglyphic Luwian, instead of the former (incorrect) *Tarhuis* is ascertained in: J.D. Hawkins et al, see n. 1.

²⁶ E. Laroche, *Dictionnaire...*, p. 82; H. Kronasser, *Etymologie der hethitischen Sprache* (Wiesbaden, 1966), p. 219; etc.

²⁷ IE **bh* corresponds to Luw. *p* in inlaut: Luw. *tappas-* “sky,” Hier.Luw. *tipas-*, cf. Lith. *debesis*; Gk. *nephos* “cloud,” Skt. *nabhas* “fog, steam, sky” (IE **nebhos-/ *debhos-*). We posit IE **bh* > Luw. *p-*; (probably also Lyc. *p-*; as Prof. Shevoroshkin of Yale has indicated [in a conversation], an initial *b-* occurs only once, in Milyan *busawān-*, an ethnic adjective of an unknown origin). The actual articulation of this *p* is difficult to determine because the Hittite-Luwian cuneiform uses *b-* and *p-* signs promiscuously. It is premature to make any conclusions as to the distinction between voiced and voiceless consonants in the Luwian Hieroglyphics. This problem will be dealt with in my paper on the rotacism in Hieroglyphic Luwian (in preparation).

Luw. *piha-* shows the zero-grade of the root diphthong (IE **bhoiH-/bheiH-/bhiH-*); cf. J. Pokorny, *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, I. Band (Bern, 1959), pp. 161-162 (J. Pokorny reconstructs *bhōi:·bhəi:· bhī̄-(bhījə-)* in the framework of the “pre-laryngealist” tradition); cf. also M. Mayrhofer, *Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen*, Band II (Heidelberg, 1963), p. 471f. The reconstructed laryngeal (probably H₂; cf. recent publications by H. Eichner) is present in the Luwian word and preserved in Lycian (as expected).

god)” (cf. KUB VI 46 II 31: ^dU *pi-ha-mi-iš*; KUB XVIII 6 I 24: ^dU *pi-ha-i-mi*; KUB XII 2 I 18 and III 1: ^dU *pi-ha-i-mi-iš*); in KUB XXI 1 IV 30, we have a toponym: URU *pi-ha-aš-ša-aš-ši* /.../ (where *-assi-* is the “genitival” or possessive suffix; *-as* preceding the suffix *-assi-* could be taken as the continuation of IE suffix **-e/os-*, cf. Skt. *bhiyas-* resp. Luw. **pihas-* < IE **bhiH-os-* “terror, awe”). J. Friedrich’s suggestion as to the possible identity of Luw. *pihassassis* and HI.HI-*assis*²⁸ may be justifiable if one considers, for instance, Russ. *groznyj* “terrible, awesome” and *groza* “thunderstorm”; cf. also French *foudre* “thunder, lightning” and *foudroyant* “terrifying”; ^dX HI.HI-*assis* “Dieu de la foudre” (if Friedrich was right and HI.HI-*assis* = *pihassassis*) should be alternatively translated as “Dieu foudroyant.”²⁹

In the Hieroglyphic Luwian texts, the evidence for the meaning of the verb in question is rather scarce as well. Several instances where *piha-mi-* stands isolated because the rest of the inscription is badly damaged (Carchemish A 28 j 1: 400] *pi[-ha]-mi-sa*; A 27 uu: “4]00[-*ha-mi-]-sa*; A 12 fragm. 11: ...*p]i-na-à 393a-wa/i*... “400” *-ha-[mi...*, where the sign 393a is unique) certainly cannot be helpful. Carchemish A 27 o 1 (...*pi-ha-mi-na i-zi-i-ha... wa/i... wa/i* “I made ?revered? ...”) does not contradict our interpretation, but does not help much either. One of the Assur letters, namely e I 3, contains this passive participle in the function of a PN (the standard introductory formula of Assur letters “tell N”; in this case *a-sas-za pi-ha-mi* “tell Pihami [dat.sg.m./f.]). The only example which not only does not contradict our interpretation, but also seems to confirm it, is Carchemish A 11 b 5: *à-wa/i pi-i-na-à REGIO-ni-ya-ti* “400”-*pi-ha-mi-sa SUPER+ra/i-à PES-wa/i-i-ha* “And I came *there*, ?revered/feared? by the country.”³⁰

Although the internal evidence of the attested Luwian texts is very scarce, there are reasons to believe that the posited connection with IE **bhiH-* is valid. Old Indian **bhi-ma-* (<IE **bhiH-mo-*) frequently occurs in Rig-Veda (RV) as an epithet of deities associated with various

²⁸ Mentioned in: E. Laroche, *Recherches...*, p. 69.

²⁹ In Russian, the meaning “thunderstorm” (*groza*) is probably secondary, as one can deduce from the data of other IE languages (cf. Lith. *grązoju, grąžoti* “to threaten”=Russ. *grozit*,” Latv. *grēžuôt* “to threaten, to be angry”; Greek *gorgos* “terrible, awesome,” *Gorgō* “terrible ghost”; Irish *gargg/garg* “austere, wild”; cf. also Serbo-Croatian *groza* “terror, tremor,” where the archaic meaning appears to be preserved; an identical development may be assumed for *pih-ass-assi-* (if *pihassassis*=HI.HI-*assi-*): “terrible”→“relating to thunderstorm,” especially since the word in question was closely associated with the Thundergod.

³⁰ Cf. Bossert’s translation: “und . . . als ein vom Lande ge...ter stand ich darüber,” in: P. Meriggi, *Manuale...*, Parte II, p. 64. A more plausible interpretation of the verb PES-*wa/i-i-ha/awiha/* has been proposed and demonstrated in: J.D. Hawkins, “‘To come’ and ‘to build’ in Hieroglyphic Hittite,” *Révue hittite et asianique*, vol. 29 (Paris, 1971), pp. 113-116.

weather phenomena, especially the thunderstorm. This can hardly be a coincidence. Cf., e.g., RV 537, 4 (Indra, who has the characteristics of the thundergod as well as those of a war-god, cf. the name of the Hittite-Luwian thundergod **Tarhunt*- “der Überwindende,” “The Victorious one,” cf. Skt. $\sqrt{\text{tṛ}}$ - “cross, overcome” <IE * tṛH-): *bhīmo viveṣāyudhebhīr eṣām aparṁsi viçvā naryāni vidvan / indrah puro jarhṛṣāno vi dūdhod vi vajrahasto mahinā jaghāna* // “Der Furchtbare hat mit den Waffen ihre (Waffen) abgetan, der aller mannhaften Werke kundig ist. Indra rüttelte kampferregt an den Burgen. Mit der Keule in der Hand hat er sie machtvoll zerstört.” RV 574, 2 (Maruts, the “lightning-speared” sons of Rudra, whose sound is thunder and roaring of the winds): *janūṣ cid vo marutas tveṣyeṇa bhīmāsas tuvimanyavo ’yāsaḥ /* “Schon eure Geburt (geschieht) unter Schrecknis, ihr furchtbaren, erzgrimmigen, unverzagten Marut.” Skt. *bhīma-* is also used as an epithet of Rudra and Parjanya, both of whom are associated with the thunderstorm. Most frequently, however, it is used as an epithet of Indra.³¹ The relation between Luw. *pihami-*, Lyc. *pikrīma* on the one hand, and Skt. *bhīma-* on the other, is more complicated than it may seem. Although the root and the suffix appear to be identical (<IE **bhiH-* + **-mo-*), the Sanskrit formation is athematic, while the Luwian formation appears to be thematic. It is beyond the scope of the present paper to discuss this question in detail; it should be noted here that athematic types in Luwian are replaced by thematic ones; one should also add, with E. Laroche, that the formal distinction between athematic and thematic verbs “est brouillée par une masse de graphies capricieuses qui peuvent refléter un réel désordre.”³² The situation becomes even more obscure in Hieroglyphic Luwian where “non-vocalic” signs are all of the form “consonant + vowel.” The cuneiform spelling *pihaimi-* can be interpreted either as a purely phonetic variant of *pihami-*,³³ or as formed from a denominative verb *pihai-*, derived, in its turn, from a thematized noun **pih-*,³⁴ cf. Skt. *bhī-* “fear, awe” (f.), gen. sg. *bhiyas*.

Summary: It is proposed here that Luwian *piha-* is the continuation of IE **bhiH-*, cf. Skt. *bhī-*, etc. Its meaning can be rendered as “to fear,

³¹ In this function: RV 55, 1; 81, 4; 100, 12; 316, 6; 537, 4 quoted here; cf. also other forms of *bhī-* used in relation to Indra: impf. 3. pl. med. *abhayanta* (*indrāt*), RV 384, 5; impf. 3. sg. *abibhet* (*indrasya vajrāt* = “vor Indras Keule”), etc.; see H. Grassmann, *Wörterbuch zum Rig-Veda* (Wiesbaden, 1955), p. 937.

³² E. Laroche, *Dictionnaire...*, p. 143.

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 133f.; p. 141.

³⁴ E. Laroche, *op. cit.*, p. 81, derives both *pihami-* and *pihaimi-* from the denominative vb. *pihai-*.

awe, revere." The onomastic type represented by Luw. PNs containing *piha-* possibly goes back to Indo-European *"revered/awesome N," where N stands for a name of a deity or the word meaning "god," "man," "nation/breed/race," or a numinous animal, such as "lion," "wolf," and the like.³⁵

III. Luwian *walwa/i-*

F. Steinherr³⁶ has successfully identified the Luwian reading of the cuneiform ideogram UR.MAḪ "lion" and the hieroglyphic ideogram LEO (=Meriggi #88) as *walwa/i-*. An Indo-European etymology for this word will be proposed here.

Walwa/i- is frequently met with in Luwian PNs, such as *Walwa-LÚ-is = Walwa-ziti-, Piha-walwi- = Piha-UR.MAḪ(cun.) – Piha-LEO* (hier.), *Mula-walwi-, Takiti-walwi-, Muwa-UR.MAḪ(-sa), Ali-UR.MAḪ-i-, MAGNUS+LEO*, etc.³⁷ In Hier.Luwian, it is always spelt with an ideogram; in two cases it has the complement *-wa/i(-i)* following the ideogram; in one case (Assur letter a III) the complement is unusual and its full interpretation is difficult: *LEO-REL-sa-na-ma-za*.³⁸

It seems to us that it is possible to connect *walwa/i-* with IE **włk^w-o-*, cf. Skt. *vrka-*, Lith. *vilkas*, OSl. *vlükü*, Germ. **wulfaz* etc., "wolf." Luw. *-w-* < IE **-k^w-* does not present any real problem, cf. Luw. *tarwai-* (Hitt. *tarkuwai-*) "dance" (iter. *tarwis-*, Hitt. *tarkuisk-*) IE **tor-k^w-* (Lat. *torqueo*, Gk. *terpō*).³⁹ A Luwian trend to deocclude the guttural is spotted in Luw. *mannahunna-* (vs. Hitt. *maninkuant-* "short"); cf. also *mannahuwanni* and *mannawanni*, *erhuwanzi* and *erwanzi*, *lahuni* and *launi*, where the deoccluded element disappears completely.⁴⁰ There are also good reasons to believe that the Hieroglyphic Luwian sign transliterated as *REL* stands for *hwi*, cf. Hier.Luw. *REL-i-sa* vs. Luw. and Hitt. *kuis* "who" on the one hand, and Hier.Luw. "PES"-*REL-*

³⁵ See the list of PNs employing *piha-* in the *Appendix*; cf. also section III of the present paper (Luw. *walwa/i-*).

³⁶ F. Steinherr, "Das Wort für Löwe im Hieroglyphen-Hethitischen," *Die Welt des Orients*, IV, Heft 2, 1968, pp. 320-325.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 322f.; also E. Laroche, *Les noms...*, #/ 1486, 972, 976, 817, 1210, 839, 34, 1372a, 1440.

³⁸ The phrase where this form occurs see in: P. Meriggi, *Manuale...*, Parte II, p. 136. *REL* is a conventional symbol for the Hier.Luw. sign which occurs mostly as the first sign of the relative pronoun (cf. Luwian *kui-*).

³⁹ G. Jucquois, *Orbis* 16 (1967), pp. 175-176.

⁴⁰ E. Laroche, *Dictionnaire...*, p. 133.

REL-ta (3.sg.prt.) corresponding to Luw. *huihuia-* “run/move” (intrans.),⁴¹ on the other hand. Therefore, one could posit the following scheme of the phonetic development:

IE**wlkw-o-* > Anat.**walkwa-* > Luw.**walwaji-* > *walwaji-*.⁴²

In Hittite, the deocclusion never took place; therefore, a form **walkwa-* should be expected there. One finds this form in Hittite PNs, as well as in the regular usage. The PNs are: *Walkuwa-* (Laroche’s catalogue #1482), *Walkui-* (#1483), *Ura-walkui-* (#1437).⁴³ The word *walkuwa-* (=/*walkwa-*/ mutatis mutandis with regard to the Hittite cuneiform syllabary) occurs twice: (1) in KBo XXII, 2, and (2) in KBo III 40 Vs. 15. (1): (Vs. 1) [SAL.LUGA]L URUK_{ka}-ni-iš XXX DUMUMEŠ IEN MU-*an-ti ha-a-aš-ta UM-MA ŠI-MA* (Vs. 2) [*ki*]-i-*u_u* ku-it *u_u*-al-ku-an *ha-a-as-hu-un* “Die Königin (von) Kanis gebar im Laufe eines einzigen Jahres 30 Kinder (Söhne). Folgendermassen (sprach) sie: ‘Was für ein u. habe ich geboren!?’ ” (2): *ú-ku-uš_u pu-nu-uš-ki-m* [*i ki-i k*]*u-it u_u*-al-ku-*u_u*-an “ich befrage sie: ‘Was (ist) das, ein ualku_uan. . .’ (bzw. ‘was (für) ein ualku_uan’).”⁴⁴ The noun in question (interpreted by H. Otten as a neuter, while in our interpretation it is considered a common gender noun in the accusative) has been translated as “schlechtes Omen, Unheilverkündendes.”

It is time to discuss the semantic side of the problem. We posit that *walwaji-* “lion” < IE**wlkw-o-*, continuations of which in other IE languages mean “wolf.” It appears, however, that there is nothing extraordinary in such a variation of meaning. The word for “lion” in all known IE languages is considered either a loanword from Semitic⁴⁵ or a secondary descriptive term.⁴⁶ It should be also noted (and this is an important argument) that Sumerian, the source of the Hittite-Luwian cuneiform script as well as an important source of influence in the

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 46; P. Meriggi, ... *Glossar*, p. 197.

⁴² Luw. **walwaji-* could be regarded as attested in LEO-*REL-sa-na-ma-za: /walhwis.../*, etc., but one should not rely on this example until an interpretation of the whole complement is provided.

⁴³ E. Laroche, *Les noms...*, p. 203 and p. 197.; *ibidem*, p. 339, Laroche connects *Walkui-*, *Walkuwa-* and *Ura-walkui-* with Hitt. *welku-* “herbe,” without a due explanation of what enabled him to posit this entirely *ad hoc* alternation; there is no evidence for an alternation -e-: -a- in this case.

⁴⁴ H. Otten, *Eine althethitische Erzählung um die Stadt Zalpa*, Studien zu den Bogazköy Texten, 17 (Wiesbaden, 1973), p. 16.

⁴⁵ e.g., A. Walde—J.B. Hofmann, *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 4. Auflage, I. Band (Heidelberg, 1965), p. 785.

⁴⁶ See A.J. Van Windekens, “L’explication du nom d’animal grec *leōn* a partir d’un ancien **newōn* ‘celui qui rugit’,” *Orbis*, XXIV N° 1, 1975, pp. 211-213, containing a brief survey of various opinions on the origin of the word in question.

domain of ideology in the Near East and Asia Minor, classifies both “lion” and “wolf” as belonging to the same class of canines (cf. Sum. cuneiform ideogram UR “dog” and UR.MAH “lion,” UR.BAR.RA “wolf”).⁴⁷ Ideologically ambiguous numinous functions of the root **wlk^w-o-* in the IE tradition are well known (“wolf” as a symbol of strength, aggressiveness and military success on the one hand; as a symbol of guile, craftiness and violent death on the other); they are preserved also in the later forms of folklore. As to the ideologically negative meaning of **wlk^w-o-*, cf. Skt. *vrkati-* “craftiness, danger,” *avrkā-* “friendly, safe, harmless” (literally “unwolfish”); Irish *olc* lost its relation to any particular animal and conveys only the meaning “bad, evil, wicked”; in Old Norse, descriptive synonyms of *úlfr* speak for themselves: *valdýr* “slain-eating animal,” “Walstatt-Tier,” *geri* “der Gierige,” *freki* “id.,” *vargr* “der Würger.” Another curious ideological item is “lycanthropy,” an archaic “institution” of *werewolves*, cf. Gk. *lukanthrōpos*, Lith. *vilkatas*, *vilkolakis*, *vilkotrasa*, etc. (Lithuanian abounds in synonymous words for “werewolf”), Russ. *volkolak*; and the most archaic of them all, LÚMEŠ UR.BAR.RA and LÚMEŠ UR.MAH, the mysterious “wolf people” (cf. Engl. *werewolf* Germanic **weraz* **wulfaz* “man-wolf”) and “lion people” respectively, met with in Hittite texts.

In the light of the above parallels, the meaning “schlechtes Omen, Unheilverkündendes,” proposed for the noun *walkuwa-* in KBo XXII, 2, Vs. 2 and III, 40, Vs. 15, could be a connotation of this noun in the respective contexts, and as such should be considered valid.

As an element of PNs, “wolf” as well as “lion,” is used extensively in most IE anthroponymic traditions, cf. Gk. *Luk-ormos*, *Timolukos*; *Leonto-mēnes*, *Euru-leōn* (cf. *Ura-walkui-*, etc.), *Timo-leōn* (cf. *Piha-walwi-*); Germ. *Wolf*, *Ad-olf*, etc.; Serb. *Vuk*; Russ. pre-Christian *Vŭlkŭ*; etc., to name but a few.

Summary: It is proposed here that Luw. *walwaji-* “lion” (~Hitt. *walkuwa-*) is a continuation of IE **wlk^w-o-* “wolf.”

Yale University

⁴⁷ J. Friedrich, *op. cit.*, p. 299.