

Oscar Billing

A Song in Iṣtanuwa Luwian

<https://doi.org/10.1515/aof-2025-2002>

Abstract: On three tablets from the archives at Ḫattuša, the same formula is attested. There is incontrovertible contextual evidence that the formula is a song, or at least a song incipit. Using a combination of linguistic and orthographic evidence, it is possible to demonstrate that the song follows a metrical structure. The metre consists of trochaic and dactylic feet with four feet in each line. Similar types of poetry may be found in other Indo-European Anatolian traditions. Relying mainly on etymological and contextual evidence, an approximate translation of the song's contents is offered.

Keywords: Luwian, Iṣtanuwa, Anatolian linguistics, poetics

1. Introduction

The Hittite cuneiform archives of Ḫattuša (Boğazkale) mainly contain text in the Hittite language. However, embedded within certain ritual texts we find passages in Luwian, another Anatolian language genealogically related to Hittite. Dialectal distinctions within Luwian are determinable. One such dialect is Iṣtanuwa Luwian, associated with the town of Iṣtanuwa in northwestern Anatolia.¹ Iṣtanuwa Luwian is notable for exhibiting significant archaisms vis-à-vis the other Luwian dialects (cf. Melchert 2003: 174–175).

On two tablets categorised under CTH numbers 772 (Festival rituals of Iṣtanuwa) and 773 (Songs of Iṣtanuwa), the same formula is attested. See (1) and (2).²

(1) KBo. 4.11 rev. (CTH 772; NS)

54 *d[u-u]š-ša-ni-ia-al-la-aš-mi a-ia-<at>-¹tar¹ pa-a-i-u₂*

55 *a[n-t]e-me-et-ta du-wa-an-ta w[a-]¹a¹-šu pad₂-du*

(2) KBo. 30.167 iii (CTH 773; LNS)

8' *2 LU₂^{meš} GAL-šU-NU SIR₃^{RU} du-uš-¹ša-ni-ia¹-<al>-la-aš-m[i]*

9' *a-ia-at-tar pa-a-¹i¹-u₂ an-ti-mi[-i]t-t[a du-wa-an-ta]*

10' *wa-¹a-šu¹ pa-ad-du KI.MIN 3-š[u₂][?]*

A third tablet, also categorised under CTH 772, attests to the first half of the formula. See (3).

(3) KUB 35.135 iv (CTH 772; NS)

22' *du-uš-¹ša-ni¹-ia-al-la-aš-mi a-a-ia-at-ra pa-a-i-u₂ KI[.MIN]*

¹ On Iṣtanuwa Luwian (or Iṣtanuwa Luwic), see Laroche 1959: 11–12; Kammenhuber 1969: 122; Rosenkranz 1978: 6; Starke 1985: 31; Melchert 2003: 174–175; Sasseville 2021: 5; Yakubovich 2023: 290–295.

² The word *anti* is new. Starke (1985: 331, 341) rather reads *hal¹-ti* (KBo. 30.167) and **hal¹-[d]a* (KBo. 4.11). However, reviewing the photos available in the *Mainzer Fotoarchiv* via the *Konkordanz* (Kořak 2002ff.), it is evident that the first sign is AN on both tablets. The TE on KBo. 4.11 (restored by Starke as DA) is quite broken, but the rightmost vertical of a TE is clearly visible. See also Rieken (eDiAna-ID 3013) and Section 3.

On KBo. 4.11 rev. 53, the formula is recited to the god Iyašallašši: ¹EGIR¹-šU₂ ^di-ia-šal-la-aš-ši-in KI.MIN ‘Afterwards, he (drinks) (to the deity) Iyašallašši (and sings)’.³ The colophon on KBo. 4.11 reads [SIR₃^{(?)h}]^{i.a} *te-et-ḫe-eš-ša¹-na-aš iš-ḫa-mi-ia-an-‘zi* ‘they sing [songs] of thunder’ (Starke 1985: 342) and the tablet is generally understood to contain song incipits (Starke 1985: 299–300; Watkins 1986: 58). On tablets KUB 35.135 and KBo. 30.167, the phrase is introduced with *kiš-an* SIR₃^{uv} ‘they sing thus’ (KUB 35.135 iv 21; KBo. 30.167 ii 7). The formula is therefore in all likelihood a song. As a musical utterance, a song ought to consist of a melody and a rhythm. The latter makes possible that some metrical structure is at play.⁴ In this article, it is argued that such is indeed the case, demonstrable mostly on the basis of independent linguistic and orthographic evidence.

2. Initial Accentual Analysis

If the *duššaniyalla*-song is a metrical formula, a justifiable initial assumption is that the accent holds importance, especially since Luwian was most likely a stress-accent language (cf. Kloekhorst 2014: 548; Yates 2017: 102; Vertegaal 2020). We will therefore begin our investigation with an accentual analysis.

In current Hittitology, there is universal agreement that plene spelling, i.e. the addition of a V-sign, chiefly denotes long vowels.⁵ Moreover, long vowels are often a correlate of accentuation, both in Hittite and Luwian (cf. Melchert 1994: 261). Accordingly, we may immediately wager an accentual analysis of the following items:

- **ayattar/āyatra**: The “hyper-plene” spelling *a-a-ia-at-ra* on KUB 35.135 furnishes incontrovertible evidence of vowel length. No other vowel is spelled plene. It thus seems safe to assume an accentuation *áyattar/āyatra*, although note that *āyatra* is a NOM/ACC.PL.N form while *ayattar* is NOM/ACC.SG.N.
- **pāyu**: All tablets show plene spelling of the first syllable in *pāyu*. Moreover, the word is a verb in the 3SG.IMPV.ACT (Section 5), whose ending ought to be unaccented from an Indo-European perspective. An accentual analysis *pāyu* becomes rather certain.
- **wāšu**: This word has plene spelling in the first syllable on both tablets where it occurs, indicating an accentuation *wāšu*.

The word *paddu* ought to be a verb in light of the phrase-final position and the verb-final syntax of Luwian (Melchert 2003: 200; Bauer 2014: 35–36; Giusfredi 2020: 56). Its ending *-ddu* is easily recognizable as denoting the 3SG.IMPV.ACT (Melchert 2003: 192). In ancient Indo-European languages, including Hittite, the 3SG.IMPV.ACT ending is not accented. Accordingly, we may assume an accentuation *páddu*.

The word *duššaniyallaš* has been analysed by Sasseville (2014: 110) as NOM.SG.C of an agent noun in *-alla-*. There seems to be little reason to doubt this interpretation, especially considering that the form acts as subject to the verb *pāyu* ‘may (s)he give!’ (see Section 5), which would logically require a subject with volitional agency. Agent nouns in *-alla-* reflect a sequence **-é-leh₂-*, the geminate being a reflex of Čop’s law (Čop 1970). Assuming the same accentuation in Ištuwa Luwian, the result is *duššaniyállaš*. The element *=mi* which follows is a 1SG.DAT enclitic (see Section 3) — enclitics are assumed to be unaccented by default.

3. Metrical Scansion

Assuming the validity of the accentual analyses in Section 2, the result is the formula in (4). On the segmentation of *antimitta*, see below.

- (4) *duššaniyállaš=mi áyattar pāyu anti=mi-tta duwanta wāšu páddu*

3 Translation following Sasseville (2021: 355), but with ‘sings’ instead of ‘says’. KI.MIN refers back to Hitt. *e-ku-zi* ‘drinks’ (rev. 45).

4 The same reasoning allowed Güterbock (1951: 141) to determine that the “Song of Ullikummi” is a metrical text. Moreover, the metrical “Song of Neša” is introduced with *nu-u=z-za iš-[ḫa]-ma-i-iš-ke-ez-zi* ‘they sing’ (KBo. 3.40a + KBo. 3.40b rev. 13). More on this in Section 4.

5 Hrozný 1917: xii–xiii; Kimball 1983; Georgiev 1983: 16–21; Melchert 1992: 185–186; Patri 2019: 143. See Kloekhorst 2014: 13–18 for a *Forschungsgeschichte* and Rieken 2017: 19–20 for a list of previous views.

Hypothesising that the formula is metrical, a reasonable first step is to assume that *pāyu* closes with a line break, since (a) Luwian syntax is verb final and *pāyu* is a verb (see Section 5), (b) that is where the line break occurs on KBo. 4.11, and, most importantly, (c) that is where the formula is cut off on KUB 35.135.

Secondly, we should ask whether the metre is accentual-syllabic, i.e. counting both syllables and stresses, or only stress-counting (cf. Lydian vs. Hittite verse respectively in Section 4). A raw count of syllables in the first line results in 10 to 11, reading *-iya-* in *duššaniyallaš* as either [-ja-] or [-i.ja-]. The second line contains either 10 or 11 syllables, depending on the analysis of *duwanta* as either [tu.wan.ta] (3 syllables) or [twan.ta] (2 syllables). A syllable count is schematised in (5), assuming the maximum possible amount of syllables and including the line break after *pāyu*. Since the number of syllables in each line is at the very least highly comparable, it becomes reasonable to pursue an accentual-syllabic analysis of the metre.

- (5) *duššaniyallaš=mi* (6) *áyattar* (3) *pāyu* (2) || 6 + 3 + 2 = 11
anti=mi=tta (4) *duwanta* (3) *wášu* (2) *páddu* (2) || 4 + 3 + 2 + 2 = 11

Assuming that the metre is accentual-syllabic, it becomes plausible that it is organised into metrical feet. If *pāyu* and *páddu* precede line breaks, the last foot of each line cannot be rising, since the final syllable is unaccented in both cases. A reasonable converse hypothesis is thus that feet start with an accented syllable. Accordingly, we may add a foot break before each accented syllable. Following this procedure, we end up with the partial scan-sion in (6).

- (6) *duššani|yallaš=mi | áyattar | pāyu ||*
anti=mi=tta duwanta | wášu | páddu ||

Note that the distance between accents never exceeds 2 syllables, fully compatible with a foot-based accentual-syllabic scansion. Counting the syllables and noting which are accented, the result is a structure as in (7).⁶

- (7) x x x | ' ~ ~ | ' ~ ~ | ' ~ ||
x x x x x x x | ' ~ | ' ~ ||

The structure in (7) implies a metre in which a foot may be either (a) dactylic | ' ~ ~ | (accented syllable followed by two unaccented), or (b) trochaic | ' ~ | (accented syllable followed by one unaccented). In pursuing a metrical hypothesis, it would seem worthwhile to see if the rest of the material is amenable to fitting such a mold.

The word *duššaniyallaš* stretches over two putative feet. Assuming that Luwian words only have one accentual peak, this would seem to complicate our metrical analysis. However, accent retraction to the first syllable is a well-documented phenomenon in Luwian.⁷ The same may very well be the case for *duššaniyallaš*. Following this accent retraction, I suggest the possibility of a retained *secondary accent* on the *originally* accented syllable, i.e. [tu(:³)s:anijal:as], formalizable for metrical purposes as *dúššaniyallaš*. To my knowledge, nothing speaks against this hypothesis.⁸

⁶ In rendering the metre of Iṣtanuwa Luwian verse, I use the same system as Eichner (1986) used for Lydian. The symbol | denotes feet boundaries and || denotes line breaks. The sign ' is used for an accented syllable and ~ for an unaccented one.

⁷ Cf. *pīya-* (pi-i-ia-) 'to give' < *piyá-, *túwa-* (tu-u-wa-) 'to put' < *tuwá- (Melchert 1994: 240–241; Vertegaal 2020: 219). Cf. the plene spelling of the originally unaccented reduplication syllable in *lāla-* 'to take', *tātariyamman-* 'curse'. Cf. *a-*stems continuing *é_{h2}-abstracts (Indo-European τριμή- and φρυγή-type) with plene spelling on first syllable and not the *a*-vowel, e.g. *zūwa-* (zu-u-wa-) 'food' < *giouh₃-é_{h2}- (Melchert 2003: 195; Rieken 2006: 291; Melchert forthc.: s.v.). This is not the totality of the evidence, but suffices here. Yates (2015) presents arguments for accent-retractions occurring already in Proto-Anatolian.

⁸ Note the numerous instances of several plene spellings within the same word in cuneiform Luwian (cf. Yakubovich 2023: 286), which could perhaps be related to secondary accents, although the issue requires further research. An anonymous reviewer suggests that the secondary accent could have been introduced in reference to other formations in *-alla-* where the accent was never retracted and whose derivational base was still present in the language. The opposite order of primary vs. secondary accent is also possible, i.e. [tu(:³)s:anijal:as].

The sequence *antimitta* is segmentable into *anti=mi=tta*. The element *=mi* is a 1SG.DAT enclitic pronoun and *=tta* is an enclitic locative particle. As enclitic elements, neither of these ought to have borne the accent. We are thus left with *anti*. One possible analysis is to see *anti* as a local adverb related to *ānda* ‘in(to)’, in which case we are likely dealing with a barytone **ānti*. This yields a foot **ānti=mi=tta* with the structure | ‘ ~ ~ ~ |, deviating from the predicted trochaic/dactylic foot structure in (7). In this case, we must either (a) allow for an aberrant foot at the beginning of the line, (b) abandon an accentual-syllabic scansion, or (c) consider alternative analyses.⁹ One such alternative may be available. Rieken & Sasseville (eDiAna-ID 3013) also interpret *anti* as a local adverb.¹⁰ In terms of reconstruction, they suggest either PIE **āndʰi* or **ndʰi* (cf. Ved. *ādhi* ‘above, upon, etc.’), both of which are reconstructable for PIE (Dunkel 2014: 45–46). A pre-form **ndʰi* (with inherited accent placement) would give *antí=mi=tta*. In favour of this, one may note the absence of initial plene spelling in *anti* — initial accented closed syllables with *a*-vocalism are normally spelled plene, i.e. *a-aC-* (cf. Melchert 1994: 263). This argument should not be attributed undue probativity, however, as vacillation in initial plene spelling can be observed for comparable lemmata, cf. e.g. *an-da* (iii 19) vs. *a-an-da* (ii 15') on KUB 35.54 (MS) for *ānda*. Regardless, the material does at least not provide any positive evidence of **ānti*. With *antí*, we are now left with the element *an-*, apparently resulting in another awkward foot | ~ ~ ~ ~ |. Either we allow for the existence of this first “up-beat” syllable, introducing a line which only properly starts with the accented syllable, or we could consider the vocalic closing of the preceding line breaking *pāyu*. The verb entering a form reflecting **ndʰi* would probably be rendered as [pa:ju n'ti], resulting in the desired three rather than four syllables of the first foot in the second line.¹¹ It is also worth noting that it is impossible to render a phonemic sequence /#nt-/ felicitously in cuneiform.¹²

For lack of plene spellings, the word *duwanta* is either to be analysed as disyllabic or trisyllabic, depending solely on semantic and etymological considerations (see Section 5). In either case, no conflict arises with the structure in (7) — we are either dealing with a trochee or a dactyl. There are no reasons to believe that the final syllable was accented, which would be the only condition under which *duwanta* would break from the suggested metrical mold.

Provided that the analyses in the preceding paragraphs are valid, the result is a scansion as schematised in (8). The scansion in (8) assumes that *duwanta* forms a dactyl, but a trochaic interpretation would be equally valid. Two forms, i.e. *ayattar* and *duwanta*, in which a long accented vowel has been inferred, are given as such with an asterisk. The analysis in (8) assumes oxytone *antí* < PIE **ndʰi*. With the alternative reading **ānti=mi=tta*, the first foot in the second line would take the structure | ~ ~ ~ ~ |.

- (8) *dúššani|yállaš=mi | *áyattar | páyu ||* ~ ~ ~ | ~ ~ ~ | ~ ~ ~ | ~ ~ ||
*(a)ntí=mi=tta | *dúwanta | wášu | páddu ||* ~ ~ ~ | ~ ~ ~ | ~ ~ | ~ ~ ||

The metrical structure in (8) is notably regular and can be underpinned both linguistically and orthographically, as demonstrated above. It is true that some analyses are less secure (secondary accent in *dúššaniyállaš*, oxytone *antí* < PIE **ndʰi*), but I submit that they are plausible enough to merit justification. Additional aesthetic flair is provided by the rhyme in *-u* from *pāyu* to *páddu*. The conclusion of this section is thus that the *duššaniyalla*-song is a metrical composition. In the next section, the song will be situated in its Anatolian poetic context.

⁹ An anonymous reviewer prefers option (a), referring to early Indo-European metres only being strict in cadences and not in beginnings of lines. In case of option (b), the *duššaniyalla*-song could possibly still be analysed as adhering to a metre similar to that found in Hittite poetry (see Section 4). However, in this paper, I explicitly argue in favour of an accentual-syllabic analysis.

¹⁰ Rieken compares the construction *anti=mi* with Hittite *katti=mi* ‘with, beside, towards me’.

¹¹ An alternative path is disregarding the hypothesised line break, as a sequence *pāyu an-* would form a dactyl, fitting the hypothesised metre at the expense of lines cooccurring with the word boundary.

¹² If the Lycian adposition *ēti* ‘under’ should be adduced to the same set, it cannot reflect **ndʰi* (> Lyc. ***ñti*). Rather, Lycian demands a disyllabic barytone preform (cf. Dunkel 2014: 46). If the words are to be connected, differential accentuation between Luwian and Lycian is not without precedent, cf. Luw. *ānda* vs. Lyc. *ñte* (see eDiAna-ID 3444).

4. The Anatolian Poetic Context

In this section, the metrical structure of the *duššaniyalla*-song forwarded in the previous section will be compared to other Anatolian verse types. We will see that the analysis in the previous sections yields a metre which may be compared to those found elsewhere in Anatolian poetry. I will also offer a novel metrical analysis of another Iṣtanuwa Luwian passage, using the metre suggested for the *duššaniyalla*-song.

A compelling analysis of Lydian metre was offered by Eichner in a famous series of articles (Eichner 1986; 1987) building on previous work by West (1972; 1975).¹³ The basic structure of Lydian poetry also typically divides each foot into three syllables, although disyllabic feet are attested.¹⁴ Moreover, as argued for the *duššaniyalla*-song above, Lydian poetry is stress-based and syllable counting (i.e. accentual-syllabic). Another similarity is the rhyming between words preceding line breaks. However, a notable difference is that many Lydian feet, most prominently line closing ones, are not falling but rising, i.e. with an anapaestic structure | ~ ~ ~|. An example from perhaps the neatest Lydian poetic inscription, LW 11, follows in (9). The translation of the passage is insecure and subject to diverging opinions on both Lydian lexicon and morphology. It has therefore been left out in (9).¹⁵

(9) LW 11 (Sardis)

- | | | |
|---|---|-------------------------------|
| 1 | <i>éšt mruwáad</i> <i>šarištrós</i> <i>λ sfarwád</i> <i>astrkól</i> | ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ |
| 2 | <i>wántas wíc</i> <i>γ arél</i> <i>kaṭaréd=k</i> <i>ṃs iškós</i> | ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ |

The Hittite corpus has also been argued to contain metre-bound text, i.e. at least the “Song of Neša” embedded in the Puḫanu-Chronicle (CTH 16.a), a recitation in the Ritual of Iriya (CTH 400), and the Hittite version of the originally Hurrian “Song of Ullikummi” (CTH 345).¹⁶ Hittite verse is stress-counting, normally dividing each line into two hemistichs, each containing two stresses. The standard line is accordingly comprised of four ictus, a clear similarity to the Anatolian poetry we have discussed thus far. The difference lies in the Hittite focus on stress-counting — the number of syllables per line is not metrically relevant. Conversely, the metre of the *duššaniyalla*-song and Lydian verse is accentual-syllabic, where both the number of stresses and the number of syllables are important. Moreover, Hittite poetry employs phrasal stress, meaning that some phrases consisting of more than one word (e.g. a genitive form and its head noun) may count as a single stressed unit (Durnford 1971; Melchert 1998). As far as we currently know, this does not occur in Luwian poetry. An example of Hittite poetry, the “Song of Neša”, is given in transcription and translation in (10), following the scansion of Durnford (1971: 75).¹⁷ The metrically stressed words are underlined.

(10) “Song of Neša” (KBo. 3.40a + KBo. 3.40b rev.¹ 13’–15’; CTH 16; OH/NS)

- | |
|---|
| uruNeš[as ^{ski} <u>TUG₂</u> ^{hi.a} uruNešaš ^{ski} <u>TUG₂</u> ^{hi.a} <u>tiya</u> =mmu <u>tiya</u> |
| nu=mmu <u>ann</u> [aš]=maš katta <u>arnut</u> <u>tiya</u> =[mmu <u>tliya</u> |
| nu=mmu <u>uwaš</u> =maš katta <u>arnut</u> [<u>tliya</u> =mmu [<u>tliya</u> |
- ‘Clothes of Neša, clothes of Neša, bind me, bind!
 Bring me to my mother (for burial), bind me, bind!
 Bring me to my u. (for burial), bind me, bind!’

¹³ Alternative accounts of Lydian metre have also been offered and it is certainly possible that the Lydian corpus contains more than one verse type. See Schürr 2003: 115–125 and Bachvarova 2004 for accent-counting, non-syllabic analyses, which could be more appropriate for LW 10 and perhaps 12 but are by no means forced for LW 11 and 13, where an accentual-syllabic scansion remains convincing. Mercado (2007) offers a revised account of the metre on LW 11.

¹⁴ Cf. e.g. LW 13.6: *nik=τ=as* | *pitat* | *ul=τ=iñ kor* | *τis tarplas* | |, where the first two feet apparently must be disyllabic.

¹⁵ See Melchert *apud* Mercado (2007: 147) for a measured attempt.

¹⁶ See Güterbock 1951: 141–144; McNeill 1963; Durnford 1971; Melchert 1998; Eichner 1993: 99–106; Melchert 2007; Kloekhorst 2011; Kloekhorst 2014: 619–639; Daues/Rieken 2019. For a more negative view, see Korovina 2015; Sideltsev/Molina 2016: 270–273; Sideltsev 2018: 132.

¹⁷ Also followed by e.g. Melchert (2007: 125) and Kloekhorst (2014: 629).

We finally turn to another possible Luwian poem. One of the most famous suggestions of Anatolian poetry is the “Wilusiad”, a formula claimed by Watkins (1986) to reflect an early type of Anatolian poetry. The “Wilusiad” is found twice in the Cuneiform Luwian corpus, once on KUB 35.103 iii 11–14 in the context of a birth-ritual and once as an incipit on KBo. 4.11, the very same tablet hosting the *duššaniyalla*-song. The precise content varies between the two passages and the focus here will be on the variant on KBo. 4.11.¹⁸ A transliteration is given in (11).

(11) KBo. 4.11 rev. (CTH 772; NS)

46 *aḫ-ḫa-ta-<at>-ta a-la-ti a-u₂-i-en-ta u₂-i-lu-ša-ti*

Previous attempts at a metrical analysis of (11) have been offered by Watkins (1986: 59; 1995: 146–148), Schürr (2003: 109–110), and Eichner (1993: 107–109).¹⁹ Interestingly, the line is alternatively amenable to a scansion similar to that suggested above for the *duššaniyalla*-song.²⁰ Such an analysis is given in (12).

(12) *áḫḫa=(a)ta=tt | a álati a | wíenta wi | lúšati || ' ~ ~ | ' ~ ~ | ' ~ ~ | ' ~ ~ ||*
 ‘When they came from faraway w.’

The accents of *aḫḫatatta* and *alati* are recoverable on the basis of plene spellings in other attestations of the same words, e.g. in the other variant of the formula as *a-aḫ-ḫa* and *a-a-la-ti* (KUB 35.103 iii 11). For *awienta*, accent on the second syllable is expected from an Indo-European perspective, as the initial *aw-* continues a preverb (Sasseville 2021: 299–300 with further references). The accent of *wilušati* is unknown for lack of attested plene spellings, but nothing bars *wilúšati*.²¹ A number of assumptions are necessary for the scansion in (12) to be valid, however. Firstly, I assume sandhi at the end of *aḫḫa=(a)ta=tt* and the beginning of *alati*, resulting in a single syllable instead of two. Secondly, a three-syllable second foot is only possible if we assume a phonetic structure [aː.la.tj aˈ.wi(:).n.ta] for *alati awienta*.

The precise meaning of the “Wilusiad” formula has been much discussed in the literature and goes beyond the scope of this paper.²² Chiefly, the issue centres on the phrase *alati wilušati*, which Watkins suggested to interpret as ‘steep Wiluša’ in identification with Homeric Ἰλιος αἰπενή ‘steep Ilion’. The translation of the line in (12) takes no stand in this debate and essentially follows the lexical analyses of Melchert (forthc.).

We have seen that the standard line in Anatolian poetry consists of four feet and/or four ictus, and that these ictus correspond to the lexical and/or phrasal stress of the language used. When feet assume a central role in the metre, they consist of two or three syllables. Rhyme is occasionally employed. This section thus concludes with the assertion that the metrical structure of the *duššaniyalla*-song, while unique in detail, can be subsumed under a broader ancient Anatolian poetic tradition.

¹⁸ For attempts at scanning the longer passage on KUB 35.103 iii 11–14, see Watkins 1986: 61; 1995: 146–148; Schürr 2003: 110; Eichner 1993: 109–110.

¹⁹ Watkins and Schürr assume a strictly accent-based metre, dividing the line into two hemistichs after *alati*. Eichner attempts a syllable-counting scansion, but different from the one proposed here in (12).

²⁰ I do not exclude that other passages on the tablet follow a metrical structure, e.g. lines rev. 48–49. This has in fact already been hinted at by Starke (1985: 300), Watkins (1986: 61–62; 1995: 150–151), and Eichner (1993: 111). While such passages fall beyond the scope of the present paper, they may be interesting to investigate closer in future research. The same goes for the dialectal Luwian “Song of Growth” (Sasseville 2021: 368–371). See also Francia 2014.

²¹ The accentuation *wilúšáti* or *wilušáti* with two peaks proposed by Eichner (1993: 109) is unmotivated and implausible, as also pointed out by an anonymous reviewer.

²² See Oreshko 2023 for a recent discussion including references.

5. Semantic Analysis and Translation

Having inferred the metre of the *duššaniyalla*-song, we would also like to know its meaning. A few of its words have already been deciphered in the literature with virtually no serious disagreement and therefore do not require detailed discussion. These are:

- **pāyu**: 3SG.IMPV.ACT of a verb meaning ‘to give’, whose diphthongal stem is an archaism on behalf of Iṣṭanuwa Luwian vis-à-vis the other dialects (Melchert 2003: 174; Kloekhorst 2006: 117).
- **wāšu**: NOM/ACC.SG.N noun meaning ‘good’ or adverb meaning ‘well’ (PIE **uós-u*), cognate to e.g. Ved. *vásu*, Gr. *εὖς* ‘good’ (Bossert 1954; Melchert 1994: 234).

The local adverb *anti*, as well as the enclitics =*mi* ‘to me’ and locative =*tta*, are discussed in Section 3.

The word *ayattar* (*āyatra* on KUB 35.135) is transparently analysable as an action noun in *-ttar/-ttn-* formed to the verb *ā(ya)-^{di}* ‘to do, make’. Melchert (forthc.: s.v.) gives a translation ‘deed, action (?)’, which is certainly possible, although other extended meanings such as ‘activity’ or ‘agency’ are also possible.

The meaning of *duššaniyallaš* is not easily determined. As discussed in Section 2, the word is a NOM.SG.C noun. It has previously been conjectured that *duššaniyallaš* denotes some ritual functionary (Rieken eDiAna-ID 3020), presumably on the basis of other agent stems in *-alla-* with this function. However, *duššaniyallaš* need not be a functionary — note especially the lack of a determinative LU₂.²³ An attempt at a root etymology seems worthwhile, although the tentative nature of this top-down approach must be kept in mind. We begin with a PIE root **teuH-* ‘to swell; become strong’ (cf. Ved. *tavīti* ‘is strong’) with a metanalysed *-s-*, either from a root extension or an *s*-stem noun (cf. Ved. *tavás* ‘strength; strong’), i.e. **teuH-s-*. This base is already attested in Anatolian in the Lydian adjective *tawsa/e-* ‘mighty’ < **teuH-s-ó-* (Gusmani 1964: 211–212; Melchert 1994: 330). To **teuH-s-* we hypothesise an *n*-stem noun, i.e. transponate PIE **t(e)uH-s-en-* ‘the strong one, the one with strength’.²⁴ This noun may subsequently serve as derivational base for a verb in *-ani-^{ti}*, i.e. transponate PIE **t(e)uH-s-en-ie/o-* ‘to make into a strong one’. In fact, such a class of denominal verbs is already well-documented for Luwian (Sasseville 2021: 148–151). Finally, an agent noun in *-alla-* is formed to this verb, i.e. the attested *duššaniyalla-* ‘one who makes strong ones’.²⁵

The meaning of *duwanta* is debated in the literature. Melchert (forthc.: s.v.) gives the grammatical analysis NOM/ACC.PL.N, connecting the form to a gloss wedge word NOM/ACC.SG.N *ṣ tu-u-wa-an-ta-an-za* (KUB 56.28 rev. 10’, 11’; NS) with the tentative meaning ‘mass, heap, swarm (?)’ (cf. de Roos 2007: 270–272). With *wāšu* in the same clause, the translation would be ‘heaps of good (things)’. An anonymous reviewer also suggests a NOM/ACC.PL.N direct object, but more compellingly connects *duwanta* to a number of Luwian words (e.g. *tūwaš-* ‘harvest (vel sim.)’) ultimately deriving from PIE **d^heug^h-* ‘gain, profit’ (Sasseville 2021: 370 with further references). A tentative placeholder meaning could in this case be ‘boon’. An alternative interpretation is offered by Rieken (eDiAna-ID 3268; 3269), who translates the word as an adverb meaning ‘in(to) the distance’. As comparanda, she adduces Hitt. *tūwa* ‘far’, suggesting that the derivational base *tūwa* is attested in Iṣṭanuwa Luwian *tu-u-wa(-a)* (KUB 35.139 iv 3, 6, 8; MS), likewise meaning ‘far’. One final possibility which should not be overlooked is found in the almost

²³ I owe this observation to David Sasseville.

²⁴ The root is normally reconstructed with **h₂* (cf. Rix et al. 2001: 639–640), informed only by Gr. *σῶς* ‘safe’ < *σάος* (Beekes 1969: 249). The equation of the root underlying *σῶς* and Ved. *tavīti* ‘is strong’ is not obvious, however. The more compelling connection is to Lat. *tueor* ‘to watch over’ (cf. de Vaan 2008: 632–633), which is filed under another root **teuH-* ‘to regard favourably, to protect’ in the *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben* (Rix et al. 2001: 639). Being *safe* is not the same as being *swollen* or *strong*, and a case can be made for separating the roots into **teuh₂-* ‘to protect, make/be safe’ (> Gr. *σῶς*, Lat. *tueor*) and **teuh_{1/3}-* ‘to swell; become strong’ (> Ved. *tavīti*, Luw. *duššaniyalla-*). In Hittite, the outcome of **Vh₂sV* is in all likelihood *VhšV*, cf. *paḫš-* ‘to protect’ < **peh₂s-*, although see the recent critique by Höfler (2023: 84 n. 7). It is in either case not by default true that the Luwian outcome is identical, and I know of no solid examples of **Vh₂sV* > Luw. *VhšV*. Note the absence of laryngeal reflex in Lyd. *tawsa/e-* (Sasseville eDiAna-ID 1445). In sum, the root etymology favoured here is arguably compatible with **teuh₂-* and entirely unproblematic with **teuh_{1/3}-*. Thus, nothing seems to prohibit assuming the same PIE root for Luw. *duššaniyalla-* and Ved. *tavīti*.

²⁵ An anonymous reviewer alternatively suggests that *duššaniyalla-* could mean ‘strong one’, derived from an adjective **duššaniya/i-* ‘strong, mighty’ formed with the adjectival suffix *-iya/i-* to the same *n*-stem noun hypothesised in the main text. Under this analysis, **t(e)uH-s-en-* would rather mean something like ‘strength, might’.

homophonous Hittite *tu-wa(-a)-an-ta* attested twice in the same context.²⁶ Here, the word means ‘to this side (vel sim.)’ (Kloekhorst 2008: 904–905). One could simply assume the same meaning for the Iṣṭanuwa Luwian word. Under this analysis, it is possible that this lexeme ultimately derives from the same etymon as Iṣṭ./Hitt. *tūwa* ‘far’ (thus e.g. Kloekhorst 2008: 904; Melchert 2008; Rieken eDiAna-ID 3269). In sum, two syntactic possibilities remain open: *duwanta* is either an adverb or a direct object.

It was noted in Section 3 that either a dactylic or trochaic interpretation of *duwanta* would be metrically viable. Melchert and Rieken’s interpretations suggest a dactyl [to:.wan.ta] in comparison to related terms with initial plene spelling, although under Rieken’s analysis the traditional etymology PIE **dueh₂* (cf. Schindler 1972: 37; Melchert 1984: 30) rather speaks in favour of a trochee [twan.ta].²⁷ The plene spelling in one of the Hittite attestations of *tuwānta* ‘to this side’ argues for a trochee [twa:n.ta]. However, it should be recalled under any analysis that accent retraction in a similar sequence is not without precedent, cf. *tūwa-* [to:.wa-] ‘to put’ < **tuwá-* (Melchert 1994: 241; Vertegaal 2020: 219). A dactyl is thus perhaps the most plausible option, hence why this is the analysis chosen in (8).

Ultimately, the choice of analysis for *duwanta* depends on the analysis of *paddu*, to which we now turn. The most obvious candidate cognate is the Hieroglyphic Luwian 3PL.IMPV.ACT form (“PES₂”) *pa-tu* (ASSUR letter e, § 24), which Hawkins (2000: 536) translates ‘let them go!’ (thus also Yakubovich 2016: 80; Bauer eDiAna-ID 3480). The clause reads *a-wa/i* | FLUMEN.DOMINUS-*ia* || (“PES₂”) *pa-tu* ‘let them *p.* to the river-lord!’ and the subject would in this context be a number of items which the sender of the letter has requested in the previous paragraph. Assuming a verb of movement is reasonable on account of the determinative PES₂. Sasseville (2021: 355–356) identifies this verb with Iṣṭanuwa Luwian *paddu*, assuming a *hi*-conjugating verb *pa-i* ‘to move oneself’, of which *paddu* would certainly be the expected 3SG.IMPV.ACT. With *paddu* as an intransitive verb of movement, *duwanta* can only be an adverb. The main issue facing this interpretation is the lack of an enclitic subject pronoun. As per Garrett (1990; 1996: 90–102) building on Watkins (1968: 93), intransitive verbs of movement in Hittite require a subject pronoun, and Melchert (2011) has demonstrated that the same holds in Luwian.²⁸

The analyses of (“PES₂”) *pa-tu* and *paddu* as verbs of movement are rejected by Melchert. For (“PES₂”) *pa-tu*, Melchert (2004: 375–376) suggests ‘to allocate, assign’, which works contextually but leaves the presence of PES₂ out of consideration. For *paddu*, a meaning ‘to carry’ is suggested (Melchert forthc.: s.v.), equivalent in morphology and semantics to Hitt. *pēdau* ‘may (s)he carry!’. Under this analysis, the ending is not *-ddu*, but *-u*. Etymologically, Melchert assumes **pē-dh₃-* with application of Čop’s law for the fortis dental.²⁹ This view renders any connection to HLuw. (“PES₂”) *pa-tu* impossible. Moreover, if *paddu* means ‘to carry (vel sim.)’, *duwanta* can hardly be anything but a direct object.

A third path, which enables a connection between (“PES₂”) *pa-tu* and *paddu* and avoids syntactic issues, may be available. Sasseville (2021: 355–356) derives both verbs from a PIE root **peH-* (Rix et al. 2001: 459), reflected in the Vedic middles *ut-pipīte* ‘rises’, *vi-pipīte* ‘separates’, and *má prá pāsta* ‘may (s)he not come!’.³⁰ Reviewing the Vedic evidence, we are dealing with a verb of movement. Burrow (1973) suggests that the Vedic root of these verbs, *pā-* ‘to go, pass’, can take either transitive or intransitive semantics. However, the examples of this root in

26 KBo. 25.42 l.col. 11’–12’ (NS): NIN.DINGIR-*aš* [pe₂-e-di-iš-šī]-pat₂ tu-wa-a-an-ta 1-šū u₂-e-eḫ-zi; KBo. 30.114 + KBo. 25.41 obv. 8 (MS): [NIN].DINGIR-*aš* pe₂-e-di-iš-šī-pat₂ tu-wa-an-ta [1-šū] u₂-e-eḫ-zi]. Translation: ‘In her place, the priestess turns to the side’.

27 Sasseville (2021: 346–347) has argued that Iṣṭanuwa Luwian does not participate in the sound law **Tw > kw* observable for other Luwian dialects. The basis of the argument is the verb *kwaya-i* ‘to fear’, which surfaces in Iṣṭanuwa Luwian as *dwaia-i*, ultimately to be connected to the PIE root **duei-* ‘to fear’ (Laroche 1967: 50).

28 Followed by Giusfredi (2020: 103–105). Unproblematic for (“PES₂”) *pa-tu* according to Yakubovich (2016: 80 n. 20), which he takes as “unergative”. Regardless, this would hardly work for *paddu*.

29 This etymology is fragile. It is highly questionable that Čop’s law would affect **-dh₃-*. See also the critiques of Kloekhorst (2008: 674; 2014: 575–577). Melchert (forthc.) adduces the non-Iṣṭanuwa cuneiform Luwian 3SG.IMPV.ACT verb *patzadu* ‘may (s)he carry (vel sim.)’ (KUB 35.54 iii 9, 11; MS) as a cognate. Per Yakubovich (2016: 73–77), HLuw. *paza-* ‘to carry (vel sim.)’ belongs to the same set. Conversely, Sasseville (2021: 270–271, 355–356) subsumes *paddu* and *patzadu* under separate lemmata.

30 The appurtenance of the Hittite verb *pipp(a)-i* ‘to destroy, overturn’ (thus Rix et al. 2001: 459; García Ramón 2009) remains semantically questionable. Cf. the doubts of Kloekhorst (2008: 676–677). García Ramón (2009; 2010) also adduces Gr. *σπάω* and Arm. *hanem* ‘to draw’, reconstructing a root **(s)peh₂-* ‘to move (violently), to draw’. This would fit well with the Hittite verb, but less so with the Vedic and Luwian data.

active verbs meaning ‘to go’ adduced by Burrow are highly questionable, and it is therefore plausible that the transitive reading is only available in the active (García Ramón 2009: 134–137). Notably, the middle participle *pīpāna* (without preverb) is used in a context concerning the transferral of a bull (Burrow 1973: 82).³¹ With a root meaning ‘to (make) go, pass (over)’, whose use in transferrals is supported by the Vedic evidence, the possibility of a meaning ‘to pass (over), confer’ for (“PES₂”) *pa-tu* and *paddu* opens up. The movement-oriented semantics would account for PES₂ in the hieroglyphic form.³² With *paddu* meaning ‘to pass (over), confer’, *duwanta* ought to be a direct object.

Using the semantic analyses put forward in this section, the result is the following translation: ‘May the creator of strong ones give me agency! May (s)he benevolently confer boons (?) upon me!’. A grammatical analysis is given in (13). I give the analysis in which *duwanta* acts as direct object and *paddu* as a verb of giving.³³ The variant with *ayattar* rather than NOM/ACC.PL.N *āyatra* has been chosen, as it occurs in two out of three versions (see Section 1).

(13) <i>duššaniyallaš=mi</i>	<i>ayattar</i>	<i>pāyu</i>
maker.of.strong.ones.NOM.SG.C=1SG.DAT	agency.ACC.SG.N	give.3SG.IMPV.ACT
<i>anti=mi=tta</i>	<i>duwanta</i>	<i>wāšu</i>
upon?.ADV=1SG.DAT=LOC	boon?.ACC.PL.N	well.ADV
		<i>paddu</i>
		confer.3SG.IMPV.ACT

I submit that the translation above (or some slight variation thereof) is coherent both in its content and its context. It makes intuitive sense that a “creator of strong ones (vel sim.)” would be capable of providing “activity, ability to act (vel sim.)”. On KBo. 4.11, songs are sung to various deities and *duššaniyalla-* is therefore likely to be a divine epithet.³⁴ Either way, being a “creator of strong ones” is presumably a property reserved for the divine.

On KUB 35.135 and KBo. 30.167, the *duššaniyalla*-song is sung to royals as part of certain religious proceedings. On KBo. 4.11, it is sung to a god in conjunction with ritual imbibement. The conjecture that the song is used as a form of request or prayer to a deity thus becomes attractive. On KBo. 4.11, the request is made by the singer, whereas men of Iṣṭanuwa or *ašuša(ta)la*-men make the request on KUB 35.135 and KBo. 30.167 respectively, presumably on behalf of the royal couple. Imperatives of verbs meaning ‘to give’ and ‘to confer (vel sim.)’ occurring in this context is not surprising. The direct object of *pāyu* ‘may (s)he give!’, *ayattar/āyatra* ‘ability to act (vel sim.)’, is understandable as a desired property of royals. A case can also be made that *ayattar/āyatra* refers to reproductive potency. On KUB 35.135, the song is sung not only to the king, but also to the queen. Note also the repeated mention of *tapāla*- ‘rain-clouds’ on KBo. 4.11 rev. 47–49 (Carruba 1998: 75–77; Sasseville 2021: 347 n. 17), a prerequisite of agricultural fertility. The precise meaning of *duwanta* remains elusive, but a term related to *tūwaš*- ‘harvest (vel sim.)’ would fit such a context. In sum, the request of various boons is hardly surprising in a song sung to a deity.

31 AVŚ 9.4.21: *ayám pīpāna indra id rayīm dadhātu cetanīm* ‘may (this bull) which is passing (being transferred), this lord indeed, bestow animate wealth’ (translation following Burrow).

32 This analysis is also congruent with the derivation of the HLuw. verb *panuwa*-ⁱ ‘to let enter’, attested only once as 3SG.PRES.ACT *pa-nu-wa/i-i* (SULTAHAN, § 36), from the verbal stem of (“PES₂”) *pa-tu* (Yakubovich 2016: 80; Sasseville 2021: 467–468; Bauer eDiAna-ID 3481). On the derivation of a stem in *-nuwa*-ⁱ from an already transitive verb, cf. Lyc. A *qanuwe*-^{ti} ‘to let be destroyed’ (Sasseville 2021: 478–479).

33 With *paddu* instead as a verb of movement, the meaning of the second clause would be something like ‘may (s)he move benevolently to my side’.

34 To which god *duššaniyallaš* refers is actually not immediately clear. One candidate is Iyašallašši, the deity to which the song is sung on KBo. 4.11, although one could in that case conceivably expect reference in the second (2SG) rather than the third (3SG) person. The Storm-god (of Iṣṭanuwa?) is another candidate, possibly supported by the colophon on KBo. 4.11: [STR₃ ^{(?)h} ⁱa] *te-et-ḫe-eš-ša¹-na-aš iš-ḫa-mi-ia-an-zi* ‘they sing [songs] of thunder’. On KBo. 4.11 rev. 47–49, rain-clouds (Luw. *tapāla*) are mentioned, which could point in the direction of the Storm-god. The Storm-god of Iṣṭanuwa is also mentioned on KUB 35.135 rev. 14’.

6. Conclusions

The main theses of this paper are summarised below.

1. An Iṣtanuwa Luwian formula beginning with the word *duššaniyallaš* is attested on three separate tablets.
2. There are clear contextual indications that this formula is a song, rendering it a plausible object of metrical analysis.
3. Plene spelling and morphologically informed reasoning allows for the identification of an accentual-syllabic verse type organised around dactylic and trochaic feet.
4. The whole song is amenable to an analysis under which such feet form the basis of the metre, each line consisting of four feet.
5. More or less similar types of metre are attested in other Anatolian poetic traditions.
6. Using philological, contextual, morphological, and etymological evidence, it is possible to offer an approximate translation of the song: ‘May the creator of strong ones give me agency! May (s)he benevolently confer boons (?) upon me!’.

Acknowledgements: I thank David Sasseville, Christiane Schaefer, Alwin Kloekhorst, and Harriet Dunn for reading and commenting on previous drafts of this paper. I am grateful to H. Craig Melchert for allowing me to cite his forthcoming *Dictionary of Cuneiform Luvian*, the contents of which may be subject to change before publication. I also thank an anonymous reviewer for fruitful discussions on virtually every topic covered. All remaining errors are my own.

Abbreviations

ALAC: Ancient Languages and Civilizations.

BSIEL: Brill’s Studies in Indo-European Languages & Linguistics.

eDiAna: Digital Philological-Etymological Dictionary of the Minor Ancient Anatolian Corpus Languages (URL: <https://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/> [accessed 28.05.2024]).

IEED: Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series.

IEL: Indo-European Linguistics (Brill).

JLR: Journal of Language Relationship.

LSIE: Leiden Studies in Indo-European.

All other bibliographical abbreviations follow the *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie*.

Bibliography

- Bachvarova, M.R. (2004): Topics in Lydian Verse: Accentuation and Syllabification, *JIES* 32, 227–247.
- Bauer, A.H. (2014): Morphosyntax of the Noun Phrase in Hieroglyphic Luwian (BSIEL 12), Leiden-Boston.
- Beekes, R.S.P. (1969): The Development of the Proto-Indo-European Vowels in Greek (*Janua linguarum, series practica* 42), The Hague-Paris.
- Bossert, H.Th. (1954): Untersuchungen hieroglyphenhethitischer Wörter. Das Wort „gut“ in den kleinasiatischen Sprachen, *MIO* 2, 78–103.
- Burrow, T. (1973): Sanskrit *pā-* ‘go, move, pass, traverse’, *IJ* 15, 81–108.
- Carruba, O. (1998): Etymologica anatolica minora. In: J. Jasanoff et al. (ed.), *Mír Curad. Studies in Honor of Calvert Watkins* (IBS 92), Innsbruck, 75–81.
- Čop, B. (1970): Eine luwische orthographisch-phonetische Regel, *IF* 75, 85–96.
- Daues, A./E. Rieken (2019): Rhythmische Sprache in den hethitischen Gebeten, *WO* 49, 29–47.
- de Roos, J. (2007): Hittite Votive Texts (PIHANS 109), Leiden.
- de Vaan, M. (2008): Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the Other Italic Languages (IEED 7), Leiden-Boston.
- Dunkel, G.E. (2014): Lexikon der indogermanischen Partikeln und Pronominalstämme. Band 2. Lexikon, Heidelberg.
- Durnford, S.P.B. (1971): Some Evidence for Syntactic Stress in Hittite, *AnSt.* 21, 69–75.
- Eichner, H. (1986): Die Akzentuation des Lydischen, *Die Sprache* 32, 7–21.
- Eichner, H. (1987): Die Entdeckung des lydischen Akzents, *BiOr.* 44, 80–88.
- Eichner, H. (1993): Probleme von Vers und Metrum in epichorischer Dichtung Altkleinasiens. In: G. Dobesch/G. Rehrenböck (ed.), *Die epigraphische und altertumskundliche Erforschung Kleinasiens: Hundert Jahre Kleinasiatische Kommission der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Akten des Symposiums vom 23. bis 25. Oktober 1990* (DÖAW 236), Vienna, 97–169.

- Francia, R. (2014): Gli scongiuri e pronunciamenti magici in luvio: tentativi di analisi stilistica, *Sc. Ant.* 20, 3–14.
- García Ramón, J.L. (2009): Idg. **(s)peh₂-* ‘in (heftige) Bewegung setzen, ziehen’: Ved. *pā* 3, heth. *pipp(a)*^{bbi} und gr. *σπάω*, arm. *hanem*. In: R. Lühr/S. Ziegler (ed.), *Protolanguage and Prehistory. Akten der XXI. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, vom 11. bis 15. Oktober 2004 in Krakau, Wiesbaden*, 134–148.
- García Ramón, J.L. (2010): On Hittite Verbs of the Type *mimma-ḫḫi* ‘refuse’: *Aktionsart and Aspect in Indo-European Reconstruction*. In: R. Kim et al. (ed.), *Ex Anatolia Lux. Anatolian and Indo-European Studies in Honor of H. Craig Melchert on the Occasion of his Sixty-fifth Birthday*, Ann Arbor-New York, 40–54.
- Garrett, A. (1990): Hittite Enclitic Subjects and Transitive Verbs, *JCS* 42, 227–242.
- Garrett, A. (1996): Wackernagel’s Law and Unaccusativity in Hittite. In: A.L. Halpern/A.M. Zwicky (ed.), *Approaching Second: Second Position Clitics and Related Phenomena (CSLI Lecture Notes 61)*, Stanford, 85–133.
- Georgiev, V.I. (1983): *Hethitica II*, *Linguistique Balkanique* 26, 5–28.
- Giusfredi, F. (2020): *A Study in the Syntax of the Luwian Language (THeth. 30)*, Heidelberg.
- Gusmani, R. (1964): *Lydisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg.
- Güterbock, H.G. (1951): The Song of Ullikummi: Revised Text of the Hittite Version of a Hurrian Myth, *JCS* 5, 135–161.
- Hawkins, J.D. (2000): *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions: Inscriptions of the Iron Age. Part 1 (UIJK 8.1)*, Berlin.
- Höfler, S. (2023): How to Pull a Wagon in Indo-European, *IF* 128, 83–124.
- Hrozný, B. (1917): Die Sprache der Hethiter: ihr Bau und ihre Zugehörigkeit zum indogermanischen Sprachstamm (BoSt. 1), Leipzig.
- Kammenhuber, A. (1969): Hethitisch, Palaisch, Luwisch und Hieroglyphenluwisch. In: B. Spuler (ed.), *Keilschriftforschung und alte Geschichte Vorderasiens. Erster und zweiter Abschnitt. Geschichte der Forschung, Sprache und Literatur. Lieferung 2. Altkeinsasiatische Sprachen (HdO 1/2.2)*, Leiden-Köln, 119–357.
- Kimball, S.E. (1983): *Hittite Plene Writing*. PhD Thesis, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.
- Kloekhorst, A. (2006): Hittite *pai-/pi-* ‘to give’, *IF* 111, 110–119.
- Kloekhorst, A. (2008): *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon (IEED 5)*, Leiden-Boston.
- Kloekhorst, A. (2011): Accentuation and Poetic Meter in Hittite. In: M. Hutter/S. Hutter-Braunsar (ed.), *Hethitische Literatur: Überlieferungsprozesse, Textstrukturen, Ausdrucksformen und Nachwirken. Akten des Symposiums vom 18. bis 20. Februar 2010 in Bonn (AOAT 391)*, Münster, 157–176.
- Kloekhorst, A. (2014): *Accent in Hittite: A Study in Plene Spelling, Consonant Gradation, Clitics, and Metrics (StBoT 56)*, Wiesbaden.
- Korovina, E.V. (2015): К вопросу о метрической структуре “песни об Улликумми”, *Индоевропейское языкознание и классическая филология* 19, 425–430.
- Košak, S. (2002ff.): *Konkordanz der hethitischen Keilschriftafeln*. Online-Datenbank, Mainz (URL: <http://hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/hetkonk/> [accessed 28.05.2024]).
- Laroche, E. (1959): *Dictionnaire de la langue louvite (Bibliothèque archéologique et historique de l’institut français d’archéologie d’Istanbul 6)*, Paris.
- Laroche, E. (1967): *Comparaison du louvite et du lycien (suite)*, *BSL* 62, 46–64.
- McNeill, I. (1963): The Metre of the Hittite Epic, *AnSt.* 13, 237–242.
- Melchert, H.C. (1984): *Studies in Hittite Historical Phonology (Ergänzungshefte zur ZVS 32)*, Göttingen.
- Melchert, H.C. (1992): Hittite Vocalism. In: O. Carruba (ed.), *Per una grammatica ittita. Towards a Hittite grammar (StMed. 7)*, Pavia, 183–196.
- Melchert, H.C. (1994): *Anatolian Historical Phonology (LSIE 3)*, Amsterdam-New York.
- Melchert, H.C. (1998): Poetic Meter and Phrasal Stress in Hittite. In: J. Jasanoff et al. (ed.), *Mír Curad. Studies in Honor of Calvert Watkins (IBS 92)*, Innsbruck, 483–495.
- Melchert, H.C. (2003): Language. In: H.C. Melchert (ed.), *The Luwians (HdOr. 1/68)*, Boston, 170–210.
- Melchert, H.C. (2004): A Luwian Dedication. In: J.H.W. Penney (ed.), *Indo-European Perspectives. Studies in Honour of Anna Morpurgo Davies*, Oxford, 370–379.
- Melchert, H.C. (2007): New Light on Hittite Verse and Meter? In: K. Jones-Bley et al. (ed.), *Proceedings of the 18th Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference, Los Angeles, November 3–4, 2006 (JIES Monograph Series 53)*, Washington, DC, 117–128.
- Melchert, H.C. (2008): Hittite *duwān (parā)*. In: C. Bowern et al. (ed.), *Morphology and Language History in Honour of Harold Koch (Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science 4/298)*, Amsterdam-Philadelphia, 201–209.
- Melchert, H.C. (2011): Enclitic Subject Pronouns in Hieroglyphic Luwian, *Aramazd* 6, 73–86.
- Melchert, H.C. (forthc.): *A Dictionary of Cuneiform Luwian*.
- Mercado, A.O. (2007): A Lydian Poem (Gusmani 11) Re-Examined. In: K. Jones-Bley et al. (ed.), *Proceedings of the 18th Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference, Los Angeles, November 3–4, 2006 (JIES Monograph Series 53)*, Washington, DC, 143–159.
- Oreshko, R. (2023): Where All the Killed Dragons Graze: Luw. *āla/i- wiluš(a)-*, Ἠλύσιος λευμών and the PIE Concept of the Netherworld. In: L. Massetti (ed.), *Castalia: Studies in Indo-European Linguistics, Mythology, and Poetics (LSIE 23)*, Leiden-Boston, 229–255.
- Patri, S. (2019): *Phonologie hittite (HdOr. 1/130)*, Leiden-Boston.
- Rieken, E. (2006): Zur Etymologie von luwisch *nū(t)*. In: G. Carling (ed.), *GIŠ.HURgul-za-at-ta-ra. Festschrift for Folke Josephson (Meijerbergs arkiv för svensk ordforskning 32)*, Göteborg, 284–297.
- Rieken, E. (2017): Word-internal Plene Spelling with <i> and <e> in Cuneiform Luwian Texts, *JLR* 15, 19–30.
- Rix, H. et al. (2001): *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben (2nd ed.)*, Wiesbaden.
- Rosenkranz, B. (1978): *Vergleichende Untersuchungen der altanatolischen Sprachen (Trends in Linguistics State-of-the-Art Reports 8)*, The Hague–Paris–New York.

- Sasseville, D. (2014): Luwian and Lycian Agent Nouns in **-é-leh₂*, *Die Sprache* 51, 105–124.
- Sasseville, D. (2021): *Anatolian Verbal Stem Formation: Luwian, Lycian and Lydian* (BSIEL 21), Leiden-Boston.
- Schindler, J. (1972): L'apophonie des noms-racines indo-européens, *BSL* 67, 31–38.
- Schürr, D. (2003): Zur Rekonstruktion altanatolischer Verse, *IF* 108, 104–126.
- Sideltsev, A.V. (2018): Hittite Prosody. Unstressed Proclitic *nu* vs. Stressed Sequence *nu* + Enclitics?, *IF* 123, 113–136.
- Sideltsev, A.V./M.A. Molina (2016): Rev of Kloekhorst, A. *Accent in Hittite: A Study in Plene Spelling, Consonant Gradation, Clitics, and Metrics* (StBoT 56). Wiesbaden 2014. In: L. Kogan et al. (ed.), *Proceedings of the 6th Biennial Meeting of the International Association for Comparative Semitics and Other Studies* (Babel und Bibel 9), Winona Lake, 259–278.
- Starke, F. (1985): *Die keilschrift-luwischen Texte in Umschrift* (StBoT 30), Wiesbaden.
- Vertegaal, A. (2020): Syllable Weight Gradation in the Luwic Languages, *TPhS* 118, 211–236.
- Watkins, C. (1968): The Celtic Masculine and Neuter Enclitic Pronouns, *Études Celtiques* 12, 92–95.
- Watkins, C. (1986): The Language of the Trojans. In: M.J. Mellink (ed.), *Troy and the Trojan War. A Symposium held at Bryn Mawr College October 1984*, Bryn Mawr, 45–62.
- Watkins, C. (1995): *How to Kill a Dragon: Aspects of Indo-European Poetics*, Oxford.
- West, M.L. (1972): Lydian Metre, *Kadmos* 11, 165–175.
- West, M.L. (1975): The Lydian Accent, *Kadmos* 13, 133–136.
- Yakubovich, I. (2016): Some Transitive Motion Verbs and Related Lexemes in Late Luwian, *IF* 121, 69–92.
- Yakubovich, I. (2023): Cuneiform Luwian in the Hattuša Archives. In: F. Giusfredi et al. (ed.), *Contacts of Languages and Peoples in the Hittite and Post-Hittite World. Volume 1: The Bronze Age and Hatti* (ALAC 4), Leiden-Boston, 284–312.
- Yates, A.D. (2015): *Anatolian Default Accentuation and Its Diachronic Consequences*, *IEL* 3, 145–187.
- Yates, A.D. (2017): *Lexical Accent in Cupeño, Hittite, and Indo-European*. PhD thesis, University of California, Los Angeles.