This paper proposes a new etymology for Luw. (FLAMMAE) la₃-há-nú-wa/i-ta₃/luhanuwatal ‘he burned’ and Lyc. B ni ... lugātu ‘may they not burn’: these verbal stems are analyzed as factitives ultimately based on the Proto-Anatolian nominal stem *loyükH-á(H) < *h₂loyük₂₃-áh₂ ‘burning’ (with the loss of the initial laryngeal by the Saussure Effect), made from the PIE root *h₂leyh₂₃- ‘to burn’.
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The modest purpose of this note is to elaborate on a suggestion made in passing in my earlier publication in this journal¹ and to discuss the possible Anatolian descendants of PIE *h₂leyh₂₃- ‘to burn’.

In lines 3–4 of the Luwian hieroglyphic TOPADA inscription² we find the following passage (see fig. 1 below):

§ 13 wa/i-sa pa+ra/i-za₃-ta₃-wa/i-ni₃ (URBS) “TERRA”-kwa/i,+ra/i *273-ti (“PES₂”)i+ra/i

---

² The inscription is notorious for the problems of interpretation it poses, cf. e.g. Weeden 2010: 47: “due in part to its highly idiosyncratic use of archaising or unusual sign-forms, it is extremely difficult to interpret”.

Warm thanks are due to Craig Melchert, Massimo Poetto, and David Sasseville, and Andrei Sideltsev; all errors of fact and judgment are, however, mine alone.
§ 14 wa/i-ta, || URBS+MI.AEDIFICIUM-ta,na (FLAMMAE)(-)la, x-
ha-nú-wa/i-ta, x

§ 15 *274-ia-pa/wa/i FEMINA.MANUS-zi/a-ha SERVUS-sa
(“PES”)u-pa-ta, x

Payne 2012: 58 translates: “he (the Royal Horse? the cavalry?) went into the land of Parzata (?) with strength and burnt (?) building(s) (?), and he reduced the region, (including) women (and) children (in) (to) servitude”. The form of interest here is (FLAMMAE)la, x-ha-nú-wa/i-ta, x plausibly interpreted by Hawkins 2000: 456 as ‘he burnt’: by analogy with other cases where the sign FLAMMAE (*477) is used as a determinative with words referring to fire, Hawkins concludes that the “interpretation of the present verb as ‘(cause to) burn’ would fit the context as understood”. The

3 The transliteration follows the ACLT; for this inscription see Hawkins 2000: 451–61, plate 253; Woudhuizen 2007; Weeden 2010; Payne 2012: 54–9; d’Alfonso 2019. Per convention, determinatives are written in parentheses, while the presence of a logogram marker (*410) is indicated by placing a logogram in quotes. The numbering of hieroglyphic signs follows Laroche 1960; for an updated sign-list see Payne 2014: 161–96.

4 Viz. REX+RA/I-ti (ANIMAL)EQUUS-wa/i-ti (§ 5, 10). Note zil/a-lälti-ta, x ‘galloped’ (Weeden 2010: 51) in § 11.

5 The reversed form of the sign FLAMMAE in the inscription “seems no good reason to doubt its identity” (Hawkins 2000: 456), but see Weeden 2010: 52 for a position of skepticism; however, the vertical cross-bar mentioned by Weeden is likely to represent the division between two “tongues” of the flame.

6 See Laroche 1960: 241: kinu(wa)- ‘to burn’, marusana- ‘fire-brand’, and la/i/u-sált-la/i/u-sált ‘to burn’ (?), on which see the following footnote.

7 Hawkins’ reading and interpretation of the form have been widely accepted. A sole dissenter is d’Alfonso (2019: 137) who reads *477 in TOPADA as a logogram: he transcribes FLAMMAE-la, x-ha-nú-wa/i-ta, x as *laslahhanuwata without discussing either his reasons for this reading or the resulting form. The number of phonetic complements following the logogram (five!) makes his reading a priori less convincing. The form *laslahhanuwata posited by D’Alfonso is probably made from the same root as reduplicated la/i/u-sát-la/i/u-sát in HAMA 4, § 11: (“BOS”)u-su-pa]t-ta-ta-ha-wa/i (“FLAMMAE”)la/i/u-za-li-na NEG2- (“FLAMMAE”) la/i/u-sát-la/i/u-sát]ta DEUS-ni-i SUPER+ra/i- ‘INFRA-ta “they did not burn the burnt offering, a sacrificial ox, up and down to the god” (trans. Payne 2012: 65). In view of the triple vocalization of the sign *445, the writing system does not allow distinguishing between laslassa-, luslussa-, or lislissa- ‘to burn (habitually)’; the reduplicated formation is clearly an iterative of some kind, construed with the likewise phonologically
verb recurs in § 24 of TOPADA in the same spelling and with the same meaning: URBS [(FLAMMAE)] laₐ-ha-nú-wa/i-tₐₐ, ‘burnt the city’.

Fig. 1. TOPADA § 14 (Hawkins 2000, plate 253)

The first sign in the form under discussion, transliterated by Hawkins as laₐ, is *455 (the third sign on the bottom line in fig. 1). This rare syllabogram is also found in § 4 of the same inscription where it is used to write the personal name wa/iₐ-ra/i-pa-*455-wa/i-saₐ. This ruler was identified by Hawkins 1979a: 166 and Poetto 1982: 282 n. 22 with Warpalawa of Tuwana known to the Assyrians as Urbala’a and attested in Assyrian sources from 738 BCE through at least 709 BCE. The value <la> was thus tentatively established for the sign *455. However, Hawkins’ identification of the ruler ambiguous laₐ(z)ali- liz(z)ali- luₐ(z)ali- ‘holocaust’ as its direct object in a quasi figura etymologica (so ACLT). Importantly, the usage of IVslVsta IVz(z)alin in this passage is not immediately comparable with that of lVhanuwata in the TOPALA inscription where the object is ‘buildings’. Contra Hawkins 2000: 406, it does not appear possible to directly compare Luwian IVslVs- with Hittite lukki/a- ‘set fire to’: PIE *leuₐk- ended in a plain velar, and as Luwian kiₐ(n)i- ‘to comb’ shows, one would expect Luwian ṭluk- as the outcome; note that there is no evidence for PIE (or Proto-Anatolian) *lukₐ-ske/o- (which would not have meant ‘to light up, to put on fire’ anyway). Poetto 1979: 677 n. 19 (whose study of this difficult passage remains influential) chooses laslaₐ- as the transcription and compares Hittite lazz(i)- ‘good, right’, while Sasseville 2020: 135 compares unreduplicated Luwian (OCCIDENS) láli/çu/i- (which he transcribes as lusi- and translates as ‘to disappear’) and Lycian lusali/ja‘destructive’ and proposes a derivation from PIE *leyH- ‘to cut off’ (on which see Nikolaev 2010: 232–6).

8 To judge from the drawing in Hawkins 2000 (plate 253), the edge of the inscription is mutilated and it is impossible to ascertain whether the determinative (FLAMMAE) was present.

9 The only other word written in Iron Age Luwian texts with the sign *455
also allowed dating the inscription to the last third of the 8th cent. BCE, and it is known that another sign in the l-series showed alternating vowel values in the Late Period, namely, *445: the sole reading attested for this sign in the Empire Period is <lu>, but in the Iron Age inscriptions it could also be used to write <la> and <li>. The vocalization of la, (*455) is therefore uncertain; note that in his commentary on la/i/u-sà-la/i/u-sà-ta in HAMA § 11 (see n. 7), Hawkins (2000: 406) actually suggests luhanuwata as the bound transcription of the form in TOPADA.

Other potentially relevant Luwian forms are too unclear to be useful. One that has the highest chance of being from the same verb is found in MARAŞ 8 § 2: wa/i-ta ku-ma-na mi-lia-i3-ti-i [FLUMEN, REGIO-ia-ti-i] DOMUS-na-x[...] ARHA (FLAMMAE) la/i/u-x(-x) “when from my river-land the house[s?]... burned down”. This morsel of an (allegedly) verbal form is written with *445, which, again, does not allow deciding between <la>, <li> or <lu>.

To sum up, under the assumption (which is not independently supported) that both l-signs, *445 and *455, had triple vocalization <la/i/u> in Luwian hieroglyphic script, the sequence *455-ha-nu-wa/i-ta, in the TOPADA inscription may be analyzed as 3 sg. pret. luhanuwata ‘he burned’.

This verbal form is clearly made with the suffix -nuwa-i (Hitt. -nuwa-mi, Lyc. -nuwe-) used in Anatolian to make a) causatives from verbal stems (e.g. Luw. ta- ‘to stand’ → tanuwa- ‘cause to stand’, hwiya- ‘to walk’ → hwinuwa- ‘cause to walk’) and b) factitives from nominal stems (e.g. ura/i- ‘great’ → uranuwa- ‘to magnify’, arla- ‘place’ → arlanuwa- ‘to relocate’). It will be argued here that Luw. luhanuwata is best analyzed as a denominate factitive formation.

A cognate of the Luwian form was identified by Ševoroškin 2002: 183 in Lycian B (Milyan) 3 pl. ipv. ni ... lugātu (TL 44d.60) referring to some kind of a forbidden action (Neumann 2007: 187) which Ševoroškin translated as ‘let them not burn X’: this attractive

is *455-li-ia-na, the meaning of which is unknown. The word is attested in KARKAMIŠ A1a: § 24 ARHA-pa-wa/i kwa/i-i PES-wa/i-i-ha § 25 wa/i-mi-i-`za/i-na DEUS-mi-si-i-na | *455-li-ia-na i-zi-i-ha “when I came forth, I made myself this X of gods” (Hawkins 2000: 88 translates ‘assemblage’ with reservations).

interpretation nicely matches the preceding mention of “destructive (viz. hot) autumns” (lusalija zēna) which the xruwasa-deities should make quick (nuniti).

Lycian B luga— which appears to be a transitive verb — can be analyzed as a factitive stem based on a nominal stem *luga- ‘burning’, compare Lycian A kumazati ‘performs a sacrifice’ ← kumaza- (c.) ‘sacrificer’ or Lycian B mrssxati ‘desecrates’ ← mrssxa- (c.) ‘offense, deceit’. The putative nominal stem *luga- can be analyzed as a factitive stem based on a nominal stem *luga-'burning'

12 For Lycian verbs in -a-t( (Luw. -a-, Hitt. -aḫḫ-) in general see Sasseville 2015; Sasseville 2020: 16–77).

13 mrssxa- (c.) ← *mrssax- ‘to desecrate’ ( = Hitt. maršaxh-), see Melchert 2015: 161; Sasseville 2020: 48.

14 It is tempting to believe that a direct reflex of Proto-Luwic nominal stem *lūHā- is, in fact, attested in cuneiform sources as lūḥa- (c.), in two of its three occurrences written with a Glossenkeil and thus likely a Luwianism. The translation ‘light’, going back to Laroche 1959: 63 (“lumière?”), rejected by Melchert 1993: 128 and Tischler 2001: 95), finds no support in the actual texts: as CHD (s.v.) admits: “the suggested meaning “light” is based on the similarity of this word to the root of Hittite lalukkima-, luk-, and lukatta”. This view can no longer be upheld: there is no evidence for a systematic relationship of Hitt. -k(k)- to Luw. -h- / -h-. But even if PIE *leuk- is left out of the picture, it is uncertain whether 2nd-millennium Luwian lūha- has anything to do with the 1st-millennium Luwian luhanuwa- and Lycian B luga-. The form lūha- is listed in a “Sitzordnung” of deified abstracts in a ritual text (KUB 17.20 ii 9–12; CTH 492.1): EGIR-ŠU=ma ḫantantatar=ya ēšzi, EGIR-ŠU=ma dušgarašza ēšzi, EGIR-ŠU=ma :nūš :dummanteiaš ēšzi, EGIR-ŠU=ma karinyaša :lu-ū-ḫa-aš MU.KAM SIG, [...] hattulatar :ušašš=a ašanzi “behind it sits providence, behind it sits joy, behind it sits contentment, behind it sits mercy, lūḫa-, a good year, [...] health, (length?) of years” (ed. S. Melzer, hethiter.net/: CTH 492.1, trans. Puhvel 2001: 102), and a similar phrase karinyaši lu-ū-ḫa.
It remains to discuss the Indo-European etymology of Proto-Anatolian *louHá(H)- ‘burning’. As a “τομή-” type” formation with an o-grade of the root, *louHá(H)- can be mechanically back-reconstructed as either *louh₂/₃₂ah₂- or *h₂louh₂/₃₂ah₂-, since the root-initial laryngeal would be expected to be lost in an o-grade environment (“Saussure Effect”). The latter option allows aligning Proto-Anatolian *louHá(H)- ‘burning’ with PIE *h₂leu₂h₂- ‘to burn’ which can be reconstructed on the basis of the following forms:

Vedic rūra- ‘burning hot’ (< *h₂luh₂-ro-), Iranian *H₂rau- ‘to burn’ (Chorasm. pcr ’wê- ‘to heat up’, Ossetic (Iron.) arawyn ‘to burn in fire, to parch’), Gk. ἀλέα ‘heat’ (< *h₂leu₂h₂-eh₂ ← *h₂leu₂h₂-o-), (-)ἀλεής ‘hot’, ἀλεενός ‘id.’ (< *h₂leu₂h₂-es-), OIr. loscaid ‘burns’ (< *h₂lu₂h₂-sk₂/є/o-) and possibly Latin lāstrum (if ‘fire ritual’). If Luw. luhanuwata ‘he burned’ and Lyc. B ni ... lugâtu ‘may they not burn’ belong to this root, its root-final laryngeal should be specified as *h₂/₃, to give Luw. -h- and Lyc. B -g-.
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MU.KAM S[IG₅] (dat.-loc. sg.) is found in IBoT 3.83 5. KBo 3.65 rev. 4’ (CTH 655) has acc. sg. :lu-u-ha-an in a broken context (see Beckman 2001: 55): the text may be saying that lūha-, along with other favorable things, has been taken away from the murderers of Muršili I (nu=šmaš ... uiyan ḥarkir), but this interpretation is very uncertain. All in all, lūha- is unlikely to have a negative meaning related to burning (‘heat’, ‘warmth’ vel sim.) and is therefore best analyzed as etymologically unrelated to Luw. luhanuwata and Lyc. B lugâtu and homophonous with the reflex of Proto-Anatolian *louHá(H)- posited in this paper. (N. Oettinger apud Melchert (forthcoming) derives lūha- ‘letting go, acquiescence’ from the root *leu₂h₂-, *lu₂h₂- ‘cut off’ (Gk. λύο “let go”, Skt. lūnāti ‘cuts’, Old Norse lēr ‘scythe’ < *leu₂h₂), see n. 7 above).

15 See Nikolaev 2021b for details.


