Where did one speak luwili? Geographic and Linguistic Diversity of Luwian Cuneiform Texts

Alice Mouton, Yakubovich Ilya

Alice Mouton†, Ilya Yakubovich‡

† Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Paris; alice.mouton@cnrs.fr

‡ Institute of Oriental Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences; sogdiana783@gmail.com

Where did one speak *luwili*?
Geographic and linguistic diversity of Luwian cuneiform texts

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

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

1. Introduction

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

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

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

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

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

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

The new primary dichotomy in the classification of the Luwian dialects received a favourable response in the last decade. Among the papers who expressed support for the new solution are Melchert 2013: 159–160, Rieken 2017: 301–302, Giusfredi 2018: 80; it is also presented without objections in Hawkins 2013: 28.[2] It seems, however, that this near-consensus is pri-

---

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

2. Ritual Tradition of the Lower Land

2.1. Tunnawiya and Kuwattalla

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	á-pa-si-na		a+ra/i-ta-li-na		INFRA-ni²-na		ha-pa-za-nu-wa/i-tu-u
abassin	arittallin	INFRA-nin	xabantsanuwattu
he.POSS-ACC.SG.C	of.crag.ACC.SG.C	bottom.ACC.SG	use.as.fastener.3SG.IMP

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

i-pa-la-a-ti-du-wa-an	hu-i-[n]u-wa-ah-ha	a-du-ut-ta	i-pa-la-a-ti-en
ibaladi=du(w)=an	xʷinuwaxxa	a=du=tta	ibaladin
left.INSTR=he.DAT=he.ACC.C	drive.1SG.PRT	PTCL=he.DAT=PTCL	sinisterness.ACC.SG

la-at-ta	i-šar-ú-i-la-t[i-p]a-du-wa-an	hu-u-i-nu-wa-ah-ha
latta	isarwiladi=ba=du(w)=an	xʷinuwaxxa
take.3SG.PRT	right.INSTR=COORD=thee.DAT=he.ACC.C	drive.1SG.PRT

a-du-ut-ta	at-tu-wa-li-in	h[a-a]t-ta-aš-ta-ri-in	la-at-ta
a=du=tta	attuwalin	xattastarin	latta
PTCL=he.DAT=PTCL	evil.ACC.SG.C	terror.ACC.SG	take.3SG.PRT

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

2.2. Kuwattalla, Šilalluhi, and Mastigga

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

8. [8] UDU^{HÁ} Ù 1 ˹MÁŠ.GAL˺ *na-aš-ta A-NA* ˹8˺ UDU^{HÁ}

9. [*i*]*š-tar-na* 1 UDU GE$_6$ ŠÀ.BA ˹2˺ UDU^{HÁ} *a-ni-u-ra-aš*

10. [1] UDU BABBAR 1 UDU GE$_6$ 2 UDU^{HÁ}-*m[a]* ˹*i*˺˹-*ik-ku-na-at-ta-aš*

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

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

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

14. [… *I-NA*] U$_4$.4.KAM *ke-el-di-ya-aš*

15. [*A-NA* SÍSKUR *ku-in da-an*]-*zi*

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

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

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

5. [8 UDU^{HÁ} Ù 1 MÁŠ.GAL ŠÀ.B]A 2 UDU^{HÁ} *a-ni-u-ra-aš* BABBAR GE$_6$-*ya*

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

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

8. [... *I-NA* U$_4$.4.KAM *ke-el*]-*di-ya-aš A-NA* SÍSKUR *da-an-zi*

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

3'. *nu* 4 UDU^HÁ-*pát* Ù MÁŠ.GAL […]
4'. 1 UDU *ik-ku-na-at-ta-aš* 1 UDU […]
5'. *iš-har-nu-ma-an-zi* 1 MÁŠ.GAL-*ma A-N*[*A* …]
'Four sheep and one billy goat […], one sheep of the *ikkunatt*-rite, one sheep […], one sheep […] they smear [their feet], and one billy goat for […].

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

3. The Tradition of Taurisa

3.1. The Taurisa Triad

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

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

---

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

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

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

[ᴰL]AMMA	ᵁᴿᵁ*TA-Ú-RI-ŠA*	*A-NA*	ᴰ[UTU]	*A-BI-ŠU*
Tutelary.god	Taurisa	DAT	Sun-god	father.his

t[*ar-kum-mi-ya-u-an-z*]*i*	*ti-i-e-et*
interpret.INF	step.3SG.PRT

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

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

ᵁᴿᵁTa-ú-ri-ši-iz-za-aš	wa-aš-ha-az<-za-aš>	ᴰLAMMA-aš <<za-aš>>
Taurisitsas	wasxatsas	(K)runtiyas
of.Taurisa.NOM.SG.C	most.precious.NOM.SG.C	Tutelary.god.NOM.SG

ᴰUTU-ti-i	da-a-ti-i	tar-kum-mi-i-[ta]
Tiwadi	tadi	tarkummiTa
Sun-god.DAT.SG	father.DAT.SG	interpret.3SG.PRT

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

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

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

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

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

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

The content of the fragments listed under CTH 764–766 is sharply different from the ritualistic traditions addressed in Section Two. Here we are mainly dealing not with rituals as such, but rather with incantations presented separately from the description of non-verbal acts, e.g. offerings, whether or not they had to be accompanied by such. Accordingly, they are introduced as Hitt. *hukmaiš* 'conjuration' or as its Akkadographic equivalent *ŠIPAT*, but not as SISKUR 'ritual'. Furthermore, we do not have a single mention of a specific performer in connection with this group of texts: apparently the incantations mentioning members of the Taurisa trial were treated as folklore and did not require fixed authorship. As for their function, most of the texts grouped under CTH 764–766 concentrate on ensuring successful childbirth and fighting children's diseases. The common designation of patients in these incantations is DUMU.NAM.LÚ.U₁₉.LU 'human child' / 'human being'. With regard to their form, several of them contain historiolae, the best understood of which are the above-mentioned narratives of the divine banquet. The combination of these features clearly sets CTH 764–766 apart from the rest of the Luwian corpus, a conclusion that is anticipated in Starke 1985.[29]

---

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

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

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

3.2. Anchoring the Taurisa tradition

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

To begin with the geographic reality behind the cult of the Tutelary god of Taurisa, its welcome confirmation comes from a recent study of textual variation in the AN.TAH.ŠUM festival (Galmarini 2015). It is undertaken against the background of a general observation that "LAMMA of Taurisa rarely appears in the Hittite religious texts" (p. 49). The author's philological analysis is conducive to identifying two traditions of celebrating the great spring festival, only one of which includes the veneration of the Tutelary god of Taurisa. The places where the king administers his cult are variously called ^{GIŠ}TIR ^{URU}*TAURIŠA* 'forest of Taurisa', ^{GIŠ}KIRI$_6$ *harwašiyaš* 'garden of secrecy', and É ^{D}LAMMA ^{URU}*TAURIŠA* 'temple of the Tutelary god of Taurisa'. Tentatively but quite plausibly, he connects this variety with the changing itineraries of the AN.TAH.ŠUM festival: while originally the king made a detour to the Taurisa area, by the Late Empire period it became more practical to administer the same rites in a special sanctuary built in Hattusa for the Tutelary god of Taurisa (pp. 53–54).[30]

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

3.3. A Rhetorical Figure

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

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

a-uš-ta-ma-kán	ᴰ*Ka-am-ru-ši-pa-aš*	˹*ne-pí˺-ša-az*	*kat-ta*
see.3SG.PRT=COORD=PTCL	Kamrusepa.NOM.SG	sky.ABL	down

ku-it	*k[u-it*	*k]e-˹e-nì˺*	*ki-i-ni-iš-ša-an*
what.NOM.SG.N	what.NOM.SG.N	this.NOM.SG.N	thus

'Kamrusepa saw (it looking) down from the sky: "What (is) this here"?'

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

na-aš-ta	ᴰ*Kam-ru-še-pa-aš*	[*ne-pí-ša-az*	*kat-t]a*	*a-uš-ta*
PTCL=PTCL	Kamrusepa.NOM.SG	sky.ABL	down	see.3SG.PRT

i-ni-ma-wa	*ku-it*
yon.NOM.SG.N=COORD=QUOT	what.NOM.SG.N

'Kamrusepa saw (it looking) down from the sky: "But what (is) that"?'

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

---

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

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

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

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

ᴰUTU-wa-az	ᴰKam-ru-še-pa-i	da-u-e-ya-an	ma-am-ma-[an-na-at-ta]
Tiwad	Kamrusibai	tawijan	mammanatta
Tiwad.NOM.SG	Kamrusepa.NOM.SG	towards	look.3SG.PRT

za-a-ni-wa	ku-wa-ti
tsani=wa	kʷadi
this.NOM.SG.N=PTCL	how

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

4. Back to the Broader Picture

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

The most serious revisions concern the distribution of the suffix /-ants-/ marking the plurality of the possessors in Luwian possessive adjectives. This grammatical feature was characterised as an innovation of Kizzuwadna Luwian in Yakubovich 2010: 50, with the stated implication that "forms in *-assanz(-)* never existed in central Anatolia". The new dialectal classification offered in the present paper plainly falsifies this claim: the absolute majority of possessive constructions marking plural possessors are found in the incantations of the Kuwattalla / Šilalluhi tradition, while the remaining few cases stem from the Taurisa corpus. At the same time, one can affirm the absence of this category in Late Luwian (Iron Age Luwian). The three known cases of unmarked plural possessors in Luwian texts, occurring in the constructions where one would expect them to be marked, are GELB § 1 DEUS-*ní-sa-ti-i* LEP[US …] 'by the authority of the gods', TOPADA § 21 FRONS-*ti-ia-sa₅+ra/i* FRONS-*ti-ia+ra/i* 'with the first among the first', and KIRŞEHİR lead strip § 16 OMNIS-*ma-sa-za-a* |MAGNUS+*ra/i-ia-a-la-za* 'to the grandees of all (the people)'.

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

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

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

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

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

References

Adiego, Ignasi-Xavier. 2010. On Lycian Genitives in *-h*, *-he*. In: Ronald Kim, Norbert Oettinger, Elisabeth Rieken, Michael Weiss (eds.). *Ex Anatolia Lux: Anatolian and Indo-European studies in honor of H. Craig Melchert on the occasion of his sixty-fifth birthday*: 1–8. Ann Arbor: Beech Stave.

Adiego, Ignasi-Xavier. 2015. Lycian Nasalized Preterites Revisited. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 120/1: 1–30.

Archi, Alfonso. 2015. Remarks on Hittite augur rituals and rituals from Arzawa. *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 72: 282–294.

Bauer, Anna H. 2014. *Morphosyntax of the Noun Phrase in Hieroglyphic Luwian. BSIEL 12*. Leiden: Brill.

Beckman, Gary M. 1990. The Hittite "Ritual of the Ox" (CTH 760.I.2-3). *Orientalia (NS)* 59/1: 34–55.

Beckman, Gary M. 2011. Blood in Hittite Ritual. *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 63: 95–102.

Carruba, Onofrio. 1970. *Das Palaische: Texte, Grammatik, Lexikon. StBoT 10*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Casabonne, Olivier. 2012. Notes anatoliennes. In collaboration with Anaïs Lamesa and Pascal Lebouteiller. *Anatolia Antiqua* 20: 19–24.

Corti, Carlo. 2017a. The North: Hanhana, Hattena, Ištahara, Hakpiš, Nerik, Zalpuwa, Tummana, Pala and the Hulana River Land. In: Mark Weeden, Lee Z. Ullmann (eds.). *Hittite Landscape and Geography*: 219–238. Leiden: Brill.

Corti, Carlo. 2017b. From Mount Hazzi to Šapinuwa: Cultural Traditions in Motion in the First Half of the 14th Century BC. *Mesopotamia* 52: 3–20.

Christiansen, Birgit. 2006. *Die Ritualtradition der Ambazzi. Eine philologische Bearbeitung und entstehungsgeschichtliche Analyse der Ritualtexte CTH 391, CTH 429, and CTH 463*. StBoT 48. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Fortson, Benjamin W. IV. 1998. A New Study of Hittite *-wa(r)*. *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 50: 21–34.

Fuscagni, Francesco. 2007. *Hethitische unveröffentliche Texte aus den Jahren 1906–1912 in der Sekundärliteratur*. HPMM 6. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Galmarini, Niccolò. 2015. The Veneration of LAMMA of Taurisa and the Discrepancies between Versions of the AN.TAḪ.ŠUM Festival. In: Anacleto d'Agostino, Valentina Orsi, Giulia Torri (eds.). *Sacred Landscapes of Hittites and Luwians. Proceedings of the International Conference Florence, February 6th-8th 2014 in Honour of Franca Pecchioli Daddi*: 49–55. Florence: Firenze University Press.

Gérard, Raphaël. 2006. Le(s) nom(s) de la montagne en louvite. *Res Antiquae* 3: 245–251.

Giusfredi, Federico. 2018. Remarks on Luwian: Open Problems and State of the Art. *News from the Land of the Hittites* 1: 77–89.

Goedegebuure, Petra. 2008. Central Anatolian languages and language communities in the Colony Period: a Luwian-Hattian symbiosis and independent Hittites. In: J. G. Dercksen (ed.). *Anatolia and the Jazira during the Old Assyrian period. PIHANS 111: 137–180*. Istanbul: Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut in het Nabije Oosten.

---

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

Görke, Susanne. 2010. *Das Ritual der Aštu (CTH 490). CHANE 40*. Leiden: Brill.

Goetze, Albrecht, Edgar Howard Sturtevant. 1938. *The Hittite Ritual of Tunnawi. American Oriental Series 14*. New Haven: American Oriental Society.

Haas, Volkert. 1994. *Geschichte der hethitischen Religion. HdO 1/15*. Leiden: Brill.

Hawkins, J. David. 1995. *The Hieroglyphic Inscription of the Sacred Pool Complex at Hattusa (SÜDBURG). StBoT, Beiheft 3*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Hawkins, J. David. 2000. *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions. Volume I. Part I, II: Texts; Part III: Plates*. Berlin / New York: W. de Gruyter.

Hawkins, J. David. 2013. Luwians versus Hittites. In: Alice Mouton, Ian Rutherford, Ilya Yakubovich (eds.) *Luwian Identities: Culture, Language and Religion between Anatolia and the Aegean. CHANE 64*: 26–40. Leiden: Brill.

Van den Hout, Theo. 1994. Träume einer hethitischen Königin: KUB LX 97 + XXXI 71. *Altorientalische Forschungen* 21: 305–327.

Van den Hout, Theo. 2006. Institutions, Vernaculars, Publics: the Case of Second-Millennium Anatolia. In: Seth L. Sanders (ed.). *Margins of Writing, Origins of Cultures*: 217–256. Chicago: Oriental Institute.

Van den Hout, Theo. 2015. In Royal Circles: The Nature of Hittite Scholarship. *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern History* 2(2): 203–227.

Hutter, Manfred. 1988. *Behexung, Entsühnung und Heilung. Das Ritual der Tunnawiya für ein Königspaar aus mittelhethitischer Zeit (KBo XXI 1 - KUB IX 34 - KBo XXI 6). OBO 82*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Hutter, Manfred. 2003. Aspects of Luwian Religion. In: H. Craig Melchert (ed.). *The Luwians. HdO 1/68*: 210–280. Leiden: Brill.

Hutter, Manfred. 2019. The Luwian Rituals of Kuwattalla: Thoughts on their Rearrangement. In: Aygul Süel (ed.). *Acts of the IXth International Congress of Hittitology (Çorum, September 08-14, 2014)*: 379–402. Çorum: İl Kültür ve Turizm Müdürlüğü.

Kaynar, Fatma. 2017. *I rituali magici ittiti: struttura, classificazione e il ruolo di Kizzuwadna*. Tesi di dottorato, Università di Torino.

Kaynar, Fatma. 2019. Kizzuwatnean Rituals under the Influence of the Luwian and Hurrian Cultures. *OLBA* 27: 97–114.

Klinger, Jörg. 1996. *Untersuchungen zur Rekonstruktion der hattischen Kultschicht. StBoT 37*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Laroche, Emmanuel. 1959. *Dictionnaire de la langue louvite*. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve.

Laroche, Emmanuel. 1971. *Catalogue des textes hittites*. Paris: Klincksieck.

Laroche, Emmanuel. 1979. L'inscription lycienne. In: Henri Metzger, Pierre Demargne (eds.). *Fouilles de Xanthos VI*: 49–127. Paris: Klincksieck.

Luraghi, Silvia. 2008. Possessive Constructions in Anatolian, Hurrian and Urartian as Evidence for Language Contact. In: Billie Jean Collins, Mary R. Bachvarova, Ian C. Rutherford (eds.). *Anatolian Interfaces: Hiitites, Greeks, and Their Neighbors in Ancient Anatolia*: 143–151. Oxford: Oxbow.

Marcuson, Hannah. 2016. *Word of the Old Woman: Studies in Female Ritual Practice in Hittite Anatolia*. University of Chicago Ph.D. Dissertation.

Marcuson, Hannah, Theo van den Hout. 2015. Memorization and Hittite Ritual: New Perspectives on the Transmission of Hittite Ritual Texts, *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions* 15: 143–168.

Melchert, H. Craig. 1988. Luvian Lexical Notes. *Historische Sprachforschung* 101: 211–243.

Melchert, H. Craig. 1993. *Cuneiform Luvian Lexicon*. Chapel Hill, NC: Self-Published.

Melchert, H. Craig. 2003. Language. In: H. Craig Melchert (ed.). *The Luwians. HdO 1/68*: 170–210. Leiden: Brill.

Melchert, H. Craig. 2012. Genitive Case and Possessive Adjective in Anatolian. In: Vincenzo Orioles (ed.). *Per Roberto Gusmani. Linguistica storica e teorica: Studi in ricordo 2. Volume 1*: 273–286. Udine: Forum.

Melchert, H. Craig. 2013. Luvian Language in "Luvian" Rituals in Hattuša. In: Billie Jean Collins, Piotr Michalowski (eds.). *Beyond Hatti: A Tribute to Gary Beckman*: 159–172. Atlanta: Lockwood Press.

Melchert, H. Craig. 2015. Reciprocity and Commerce in Bronze and Iron Age Anatolia. In: Alfonso Archi (ed.). *Tradition and Innovation in the Ancient Near East. Proceedings of the 57th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale at Rome, 4-8 July 2011*: 409–416. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

Miller, Jared. 2004. *Studies in the Origins, Development and Interpretation of the Kizzuwadna Rituals. StBoT 46*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Del Monte, Giuseppe F., Johann Tischler. 1978. *Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der hethitischen Texte. RGTC VI*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Mouton, Alice. 2007. *Rêves hittites: Contribution à une histoire et une anthropologie du rêve en Anatolie ancienne. CHANE 28*. Leiden: Brill.

Mouton, Alice. 2012. *Recherches sur la religiosité des Hittites*. Habilitation thesis defended on May 26, 2012 (unpublished manuscript).

Mouton, Alice. 2014. Rituels de 'boucs émissaires' en Anatolie hittite. In: Piotr Taracha (ed.). *Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Hittitology*: 558–587. Warsaw: Agade.

Mouton, Alice. 2015. Les rituels de la Vieille Femme Tunnawiya: Témoignages du Bas Pays hittite? In: Dominique Beyer, Olivier Henry, Aksel Tibet (eds.). *La Cappadoce Meridionale de la préhistoire à la periode byzantine*: 79–89. Istanbul: Institut Français d'Études Anatoliennes.

Mouton, Alice, Ilya Yakubovich. 2019. Internal or External Evil: A Merism in Luwian Incantations. *BSOAS* 82/2: 209–231.

Mouton, Alice, Ilya Yakubovich. 2020. Proleptic Construction in the Luwian Language [in Russian with an English abstract]. *Indo-European Linguistics and Classical Philology* 24: 206–233.

Del Olmo Lete, Gregorio, Joaquín Sanmartín. 2015. *A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition. 3rd revised edition. Translated and edited by W. Watson. HdO 1/112*. Leiden: Brill.

Pisaniello, Valerio. 2015. Parallel Passages among Hittite-Luwian Rituals: For the Restoration of KUB 35.146. *Vicino Oriente* 19: 25–37.

Richter, Thomas. 2012. *Bibliographisches Glossar des Hurritischen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Rieken, Elisabeth. 2006. Zum hethitisch-luwischen Sprachkontakt in historischer Zeit. *Altorientalische Forschungen* 33: 271–285.

Rieken, Elisabeth. 2017. The Dialectology of Anatolian. In: Jared Klein, Brian Joseph, Matthias Fritz, Mark Wenthe (eds.). *Handbook of Comparative and Historical Indo-European Linguistics, Vol. 1*: 298–308. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Rieken, Elisabeth. Forthc. Luw. *mannitt(i)-*. 'fertility'. Digital Philological-Etymological Dictionary of the Minor Ancient Anatolian Corpus Languages. Marburg — München. Online at: http://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary.php.

Sasseville, David. 2020. Nouveaux joints relatifs au grand rituel louvite de Kuwattalla et Šilalluḫi. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 110/1: 111–118.

Sasseville, David. 2021. *Anatolian Stem Formation: Luwian, Lycian, and Lydian. BSIELL 21*. Leiden: Brill.

Sasseville, David, Ilya Yakubovich. 2018. Palaic Words for Animals and their Enclosures. *Historische Sprachforschung* 131: 46-58

Schuster, Hans Siegfried. 2002. *Die Ḫattisch-Hethitischen Bilinguen. II. Textbearbeitungen. Documenta et Monumenta Orientis Antiqui XVII/2*. Leiden: Brill.

Sideltsev, Andrej. 2020. Syntax of direct speech particle *-wa(r)* in Hittite. *Acta Orientalia Hungarica* 73/2: 155–185.

Sideltsev, Andrej, Ilya Yakubovich. 2016. The Origin of Lycian Indefinite Pronouns and its Phonological Implications. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 70/1: 75–124.

Simon, Zsolt. 2016. Ist die Possessivkonstruktion im Kizzuwadna-Luwischen kontaktbedingt zustande gekommen? *Aula Orientalis* 34/2: 325–334.

Simon, Zsolt. 2020. Cuneiform Luwian =*ku(wa)*: form and meaning. *Hungarian Assyriological Review* 1: 39–42.

Starke, Frank. 1985. *Die keilschrift-luwischen Texte in Umschrift. StBoT 30*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Steitler, Charles H. 2017. *The Solar Deities of Bronze Age Anatolia. Studies in Texts of the Early Hittite Kingdom. StBoT 62*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Taracha, Piotr. 2009. *Religions of Second Millennium Anatolia. DBH 27*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Ünal, Sultan. 2017. *Die erste (?) Tafel des Rituals von Kizzuwatna (CTH 479.1)*. Hethiter.net/:CTH 479.1 (INTR 2017-03-03).

Watkins, Calvert. 2010. Toward a Hittite stylistics: remarks on some phonetic and grammatical figures. In: Ronald Kim, Norbert Oettinger, Elisabeth Rieken, Michael Weiss (eds.). *Ex Anatolia Lux. Anatolian and Indo-European studies in honor of H. Craig Melchert on the Occasion of his sixty-fifth birthday*: 356–362. Ann Arbor: Beech Stave.

Yakubovich, Ilya. 2008. The Origin of Luwian possessive adjectives. In: Karlene Jones-Bley, Martin E. Huld, Angela Della Volpe, Miriam Robbins Dexter (eds.). *Proceedings of the Nineteenth Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference*: 193–217. Washington: Institute for the Study of Man.

Yakubovich, Ilya. 2010. *Sociolinguistics of the Luvian Language. BSIEL 2*. Leiden: Brill.

Yakubovich, Ilya. 2013a. Anatolian Names in *-wiya* and the Structure of Empire Luwian Onomastics. In: Alice Mouton, Ian Rutherford, Ilya Yakubovich (eds.). *Luwian Identities: Culture, Language and Religion between Anatolia and the Aegean. CHANE 64*: 87–123. Leiden: Brill.

Yakubovich, Ilya. 2013b. The Degree of Comparison in Luwian. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 118: 155–168.

Yakubovich, Ilya. 2013/14. The Luwian Deity Kwanza. *Aramazd (Armenian Journal of Near Eastern Studies)*: 8/1–2: 282–297.

Yakubovich, Ilya. 2014. From Lower Land to Cappadocia. In: Michael Kozuh, Wouter F. M. Henkelman, Charles E. Jones, Christopher Woods (eds.). *Extraction and Control: Studies in Honor of Matthew W. Stolper*: 347–352. Chicago: Oriental Institute.

Yakubovich, Ilya. 2016. The Luwian Welcome. In: Šárka Velhartická (ed.). *Audias fabulas veteres. Anatolian Studies in Honor of Jana Součková-Siegelová*. CHANE 79: 463–484. Leiden: Brill.

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

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

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