

# Shame and Insult in Anatolia: Luvo-Hittite *zammurāi-*

ALEXANDER NIKOLAEV  
BOSTON UNIVERSITY

The origin of the verb (š)*zammurāi-* (MH+) is unknown. The goal of this paper is to 1) clarify the verb's meaning and 2) its derivational morphology, 3) discuss its purported etymological connection with Lyc. *zuīmē / zuīmā* and Luv. *zamman-*, and 4) propose an Indo-European etymology for the root, which, if correct, will make (š)*zammurāi-* relevant for the continued debate about reflexes of Indo-European dorsal stops in Luvic languages.

1. In Hittite texts *zammurāi-* and its verbal nouns, š*zammurai-* (n.) and *zammuratt(i)-* (c.), denote offence of the gravest kind: the objects are usually gods, kings, cities, and lands.<sup>1</sup>

1.1 In most of its occurrences the verb refers to verbal insult, slander, or defamation. This meaning is best seen in the following passage from the “Indictment of Madduwatta” (CTH 147), where *zammurāizzi* is used along with *idālu memian* and *kūruraš memian memai* “speaks evil/hostile word(s)”:

*idālunn=a=wa=tta memian [ku]iš peran mema[i] naššu=wa=tta kū[rur]aš memian kuiški peran memai našma=wa=kan LUGAL.MEŠ DUMU.MEŠ LUGAL (38) kuiški zammurāizzi z[ikk=a]=war=an lē [šan]natti. KUB 14.1+ obv. 37–38 (MH/MS)*

Also, whoever speaks an evil word before you, whether someone speaks of a matter of hostility before you, or someone *zammurā-es*<sup>2</sup> the kings and princes, you, too, shall not conceal him.

Similarly, *zammurāizzi* is preceded by *idālu uttar* in Tudḫaliya II's instructions to the army:

*mān=kan apāš=ma DUMU.LUGAL našma BĒLUM tuzziya peran arḫa idālu uttar peḫute[zzi] (27)n=ašta dUTU-ŠI zammurāizzi. KUB 13.20 i 26–27 (MH/NS; CTH 259)*

If that prince or lord spreads a bad word before the army and he *zammurā-es*<sup>3</sup> My Majesty . . .

In the following example the verb likewise appears to refer to verbal insult (note *idalun memian* in the preceding clause):

*našma=kan ŠA É.GAL-LIM=ma (3) idalun memian kuiški kuedanikki anda (4) ištamašzi INA É.GAL-LIM=kan (5) kuiški kuitki zammurāizzi. KBo 31.42 ii 2–5 (late NH; CTH 294)*

Or if someone hears an evil word about the palace in someone('s mouth) or someone *zammurā-es* in some way in the palace . . .

I am deeply grateful to Gary Beckman, Craig Melchert, and the anonymous reviewer for numerous suggestions; I am alone responsible for all conclusions reached in this paper.

1. Carruba 1967: 95 n. 21: “Das Verbum *zammurai-* scheint die höchste Beleidigung zu bezeichnen.” Compare also the discussion by Friedrich 1926: 71–72. *HEG Z* 650, which appeared while this article was in press, has “beleidigen, kränken, demütigen.”

2. Götzke 1968: 11: “beschimpft,” Beckman 1999: 154: “slanders.”

3. Miller 2013: 151: “disparages.”

In its only attestation the verbal noun *zammurai-* is modified by KA<sub>x</sub>U-*i* ‘mouth’, and so the translation ‘slander’ seems appropriate:

*mān=a=wa=kan ANA ŠEŠ-YA<<-za>>* <sup>(13)</sup> ŠA <sup>d</sup>UTU-ŠI ḪUL-*lu* *z*am<*m*>*urai* KA<sub>x</sub>U-*i* GEŠTU-*ašmi*. KUB 40.33 obv. 12–13 (late NH; CTH 212.74)

If I hear any evil *zammurai* (acc. sg.) against My Majesty in the mouth of my brother . . .

Finally, in a fragmentary NH letter 1st. sg. pret. *zammurānun* is used parallel to *ḫurtaḫḫun* ‘I cursed’, once again suggesting the idea of defamation<sup>4</sup>:

. . . ] LÚ *kuitki zammurānun našma k*[*u-* . . . <sup>(15)</sup> *kuit*] *ki ḫurtaḫḫun*. KUB 23.45: 14’–15’ (NH; CTH 209)

[If] I *zammurā*-ed a man<sup>5</sup> in any way, or if [ . . . , or if] I [in any way] cursed<sup>5</sup> . . .

**1.2** The verb *zammurāi-* can refer not only to a verbal insult, but also to actions constituting an offence. For instance, in a letter sent by the future emperor Tudḫaliya IV<sup>7</sup> to the queen Puduḫepa<sup>9</sup> the speaker uses the verb *zammurāi-*, speaking about the distress he caused to the emperor (presumably Ḫattušili III):

EN-YA=*kan* *kuin z*amuranun. KUB 19.23 obv. 3 (similar text in l. 10; NH; CTH 192)

Regarding my lord, whom I *zammurā*-ed . . .<sup>6</sup>

The (alleged) offense—to which Tudḫaliya is pleading not guilty—apparently consisted in his failing to supply reinforcements to the emperor.<sup>7</sup> As a result, Ḫattušili had to retreat and thereby lost face; Tudḫaliya’s actions can thus be described as causing disgrace or dishonor.

A similar use of our verb is found in the “Indictment of Mita of Paḫḫuwa”:

*mān* LÚ.MEŠ <sup>URU</sup>Paḫḫ[uwa *kē uddār*] <sup>(25)</sup>*ienzi n=at ANA* <sup>d</sup>UTU-ŠI ARAD.MEŠ  
*mān* LÚ.MEŠ Paḫḫuwa=*ma kē uddār ŪL ienzi n=a*[*t . . .*] <sup>(26)</sup>ANA BĒLŪTIM *zammurānzi*.  
KUB 23.72 rev. 24–26 (MH/MS; CTH 146)

If the people of Paḫḫuwa do [these things], they are servants of My Majesty.

If the people of Paḫḫuwa do not do these things, [. . .] they *zammurā*- [my] lordship.

In the preceding ll. 18–24 we learn what the actions expected of “servants of My Majesty” are: They should hand over the traitor Ušapa and his entire household, and in the future provide troops, participate in joint military endeavors, detain enemy envoys, and send them to Ḫattuša. Failure to do so constitutes a *zammurai* which, I submit, is in this context closer to “disgrace” than to “offense.”

**1.3** *zammurāi-* is also used to denote defilement and profanation. In the following passage from “Instructions for Temple Personnel,” shepherds are made to swear that they will deliver first-born animals to the temple, rather than keep some of the cattle for themselves, which would amount to desecration and offense:

4. [*za*]*mmurānun* is also used in l. 9’, but the context is lost.

5. These words come from a quoted speech (*nu=wa=kan* in l. 13), and the speaker responds in l. 16’ with [*ammu*]*k parkununun* “I pardoned (you?).”

6. Friedrich 1926: 72: “Beleidigungen (Verleumdungen) ausstossen”; Hoffner 1999: 347: “offended.”

7. See Hagenbuchner 1989: 33.

*mān=wa=za kī hūelpi anzel ZI-ni hūdak* <sup>(50)</sup>*piyauēn . . .* <sup>(52)</sup>DINGIR.MEŠ-*aš=ma=wa=kan*  
*ZI-an zammurāuēn*. KUB 13.4 iv 49–52 (MH/NS; CTH 264)

If we claimed these young animals for ourselves on the spur of the moment, . . .  
 we have *zammurā-ed*<sup>8</sup> the spirit of the gods.

The sense ‘to offend gods’ aligns well with the use of 1.sg.imp. *zammurallu* with the Storm God in the following prayer, even though the text is too mutilated to allow a definitive interpretation:

*kuwat ŪL ŪL=ma=war=at w[a-. . .]* <sup>(6)</sup>*nu=wa=za ammuk kuiš antuḫ<š>aš x [ . . .]*  
<sup>(7)</sup>IM BĒLI=YA *zammurallu* x [ . . . KUB 36.85: 5’–7’ (MH?; CTH 389)

Why not? But it not [ . . .] I who am a man/person [ . . .]  
 I will surely *zammurā-* the Storm God, My Lord, . . .<sup>9</sup>

The expression DINGIR.MEŠ *zammuratti* “profanation of the gods” (verbal noun of *zammurāi-*) occurs in the treaty between Šuppiluliumas II and Talmi-Tešub of Karkamiš, where it is listed along with other kinds of schemes (*kup(i)yati-*), such as plotting against the emperor or seeking to harm the country:

*mān=ma=ta=kk[an] zikupyati=ma šer* <sup>(13)</sup>*naššu š[A . . . m]Šuppiluliuma HUL-ui zīmāli* <sup>(14)</sup>ŠA  
 DINGIR[.MEŠ . . .] *zammuratti Ū ŠA KUR* <sup>URU</sup>HATTI GUB<sub>3</sub>-l[awann]i *šer kuiški EGIR-p[a]*  
*a[nda uizzi . . .]*. KBo 12.30 ii 12–15 (NH; CTH 122.2)

But if someone [approaches] you for the sake of a plot,<sup>10</sup> either for an evil thought concerning Šuppiluliuma, or a *zammuratti(i)-* to the gods, or the detriment of Hatti-land (do not listen to him)!

**1.4** It has been argued that *zammurāi-* may occasionally need a stronger translation, such as ‘to injure, attack, harm’.<sup>11</sup> Evidence has been sought in the following three passages, which, however, all lend themselves to a satisfactory interpretation without assuming a “physical” sense for *zammurāi-*.<sup>12</sup>

**1.4.1** In the “Instructions for Temple Personnel,” already cited above, the temple guards are instructed to leave their post if an enemy enters Hattuša unbeknownst to the guards on the outer wall:

*mān INIM* <sup>LÚ</sup>KÚR *kuiški* <sup>(27)</sup> <sup>URU</sup>Hattušan=za=kan *zammurauwanzi* *kuiški tiškezzi* <sup>(28)</sup> *n=*  
*an araḫzenaš BĀD-aš UL uwanzi nu apūš LÚ.MEŠ É DINGIR-LIM* <sup>(29)</sup> *andurza uwanzi*  
<sup>LÚ</sup>*haliyattallaš=ši paiddu=pat*. KUB 13.4 iii 26–29 (MH/NS; CTH 264)

If there is some hostile matter and someone begins to *zammurā-* Hattuša, and the (guards) on the outer wall do not see him, but those temple servants inside see (him), let, by all means, a *haliyattalla-*guard go to him.

8. Miller 2013: 263: “wronged.”

9. Lebrun (1980: 391) translates “Que le dieu de l’orage, mon maître, soit offensé.”

10. See *CHD* s.v. *māli*.

11. Ünal (2007: 814) lists ‘injure, attack’ among the meanings of the verb. Boley (1993: 34) translates KUB 23.72 rev. 26 (above) as “they attack the lordship”; Boley (2000: 359) translates KUB 14.1 obv. 37–38 (above) as “if someone attacks the kings or princes.”

12. Cf. Friedrich 1926: 72: “Mit ‘beleidigen’ scheint man mir auch an den anderen Belegstellen durchzukommen.”

The problem at hand is certainly not a military raid: the infiltrator is alone (as the pronouns *an* and *ši* make clear<sup>13</sup>), and dispatching one guard would certainly not be a sufficient measure in case Ḫattuša were under attack.<sup>14</sup> Since this part of the text deals with admission to the temple, it is reasonable to assume that this passage is likewise concerned with undesirable entrance to the temple: once inside, a hostile person might be able to do something that would be detrimental for Ḫattuša—presumably a sacrilege of some kind—and the temple personnel are instructed to act as soon as they see a perpetrator who has made it past the wall guards. “To harm” would be a valid translation for *zammurauwanzi* here,<sup>15</sup> if a rather general one, but the choice of the verb becomes clear once one considers the enemy’s supposed motive: to profane the temple and thus make Ḫattuša disgraced in the eyes of the gods. This usage of *zammurāi-* is thus fully compatible with the sense of the verb surveyed above in 1.3.

**1.4.2** Translations of *zammurāi-* as ‘harm, injure, attack’ have also been inspired by the use of the verb in two treaties of Muršili II’s treaty with Targašnalli:

[*mān ITTI* <sup>d</sup>UTU-ŠI *kuiški*] *antuḫšaš idalāwešzi nu=kan* <sup>d</sup>UTU-ŠI *zamm[urāizzi . . .* KBo 5.4: 5’ (NH; CTH 67)

[If some] person quarrels [with My Majesty] and *zammurā-es* My Majesty . . .

Treaty with Kupanta-Kuruntiya:

*mān* <sup>d</sup>UTU-ŠI=*ma* *kuiški waggariyazzi n=an=kan zammurāizzi . . .* KBo 4.3 ii 8 (NH; CTH 68)

If someone revolts against My Majesty and *zammurā-es* him . . .

All things being equal, ‘offends’ or ‘belittles’ would seem to fit both passages.<sup>16</sup> But there is an additional difficulty: The second passage has been transmitted in several copies, two of which (KBo 5.13 iii 12 and KUB 6.41 iii 31) have *ḫatganu(z)zi* where KBo 4.3 ii 8 uses *zammurāizzi*. Assuming that these two versions are approximately synonymous, Puhvel (*HED* 3.267) renders *ḫatganuzi* as ‘besets’<sup>17</sup> and takes *zammurāizzi* to mean ‘assails’.

There is, however, too little evidence to be certain that *ḫatganuzi* implies physical pressure: The verb is thus far attested only in this text. The derivation of *ḫatganu-zi* from *ḫatku-* ‘narrow’ is beyond doubt, but the adjective is often used in the figurative meaning ‘difficult’,<sup>18</sup> and nothing stands in the way of interpreting the hapax *ḫatganu(z)zi* as ‘stresses out’, ‘puts in a tight spot’, or ‘makes things difficult’.<sup>19</sup> Under this analysis there is no longer any reason for taking *zammurāizzi* in the Kupanta-Kuruntiya treaty to mean ‘attacks’ or ‘assails’, and we can return to the translation ‘belittles, causes to be disgraced’: when the emperor is challenged by a rebellious subject, he loses face.

**1.5** Finally, we find the form *zammurinut* in an appeal of a Hittite official for a renewed investigation of his case. The form is best analyzed as a causative derived from an intransi-

13. *apūš* may in theory be construed not as a Late Hittite nom.pl, but as a regular acc.pl. referring to the enemies; the anacoluthon would be tolerable (see Miller 2013: 395 n. 551). Note also that *HW<sup>2</sup> II/2*: 42 translates *šši paiddu* as “go for him” (not “go to him”), viz., go out *instead of* the guard on the outer wall.

14. As correctly noticed by Taggar-Cohen 2006: 103.

15. So Miller 2013: 257.

16. Beckman (1999: 69) uses “insults” for KBo 5.4: 5’.

17. Beckman 1999: 78: “beleaguers.”

18. E.g., KUB 4.72 rev. 4 *ḫatgauwaz pedaz* “(get out of) a tight spot” (viz. difficult circumstances) or KBo 4.14 iii 19 *ḫatkun* UD.KAM-*an* *kuinki* LUGAL-*i* “some hard day for the king.”

19. Another possibility is to take *ḫatganuz(z)i* to mean that a rebel subject would constrain the emperor in regard to the actions he is able to take (e.g., taxation or draft).

tive verbal stem \**zammuri-* (a Luvian syncopated equivalent of a Hittite stem in *-ya-*); compare Hittite *parkiyanu-* ‘to raise’ from intransitive *parkiya-* ‘to rise’ or *karti(m)miyanu-* ‘to make angry’ from *kartimmiya-* ‘to get angry’. The stem *zammurinu-* thus shares the verbal root with *zammurāi-*, but has a somewhat different meaning, as this passage illustrates:

EN-YA=wa=mu ḪUL-uwaḫta nu=wa=mu=kan Z[I-an<sup>20</sup> (20)] arḫa *zammurīnut* nu=wa=mu kedani [(21)] *pedi arnut* nu=wa=kan ANA ŠEŠ.MEŠ-YA NIN.M[EŠ-YA (22)] TI-anza akun nu=wa=za ŠEŠ.MEŠ-YA NIN.MEŠ-YA a[rḫa (23)] ŪL ūḫḫi kēdani=ma=wa=mu *pedi arn[ut (24)]* nu=wa=mu=kan EN-YA ANA 2 GÍR *pian paški[t]*. KUB 54.1 ii 19–23 (NH; CTH 389)

My lord mistreated me. He utterly caused my p[erson] to be *zammuri*-ed and moved me to this place. I (though) alive died for my brothers and sisters. I do not see my brothers and sisters.<sup>21</sup> But he moved me into this place. And so my lord pinned me before two daggers.

Following the disappearance of certain cultic objects, the speaker (Šauškaziti<sup>22</sup>) is charged with negligence (or theft?) and presumably placed in custody (or exiled?). As a result, he has had no further social contact with his family;<sup>22</sup> we may also speculate that his distress is in part due to the fact that he has been unable to perform any family functions required by law.<sup>23</sup> It seems that his previous appeals have not been considered,<sup>24</sup> and he now finds himself in an impossible situation.<sup>25</sup>

Given this context, the translation “my lord offended me”<sup>26</sup> seems too weak: Despite several uncertainties about the text, the feeling of \**zammuri*(*ya-*), caused by the emperor’s actions to Šauškaziti, seems better described as humiliation and loss of face.

**1.6** It is time to take stock of the usage of *zammurāi-*.<sup>27</sup> While the verb is indeed often used to refer to verbal offense and slander (**1.1**), traditional translations such as ‘to offend’ or ‘beleidigen’ do not seem to adequately convey the meaning of *zammurāi-* used of acts of religious irreverence and desecration (**1.3**), nor do they fully render the sense of the verb used of actions that dishonor the emperor (**1.2**). It appears that defamation and disgrace are

20. Reading with Melchert (p.c.); Archi and Klengel (1985: 55) have x[ .

21. The traces of the last sign in l. 22 can be interpreted as IGI or IGI.RI (= ar); Archi and Klengel (1985: 55) choose the former interpretation and read a[rḫa, while Melchert (p.c.) restores I[GI.ḪI.A-*it/az*] ‘(see) with [my] eyes’ (Gary Beckman points out to me that arḫa is not otherwise attested with au(š)-).

22. For the Hittites’ concern about family and the relationship between brothers and sisters, in particular, one may compare the Mastigga ritual (CTH 404) or recall the thirty brothers from the Zalpa myth (CTH 3.1), who stayed together until adulthood.

23. E.g., taking care of a widowed sister (*Hittite Laws* §193).

24. KUB 54.1 i 17–18: *ḫarganuir=ma=wa=mu=kan kuiḫš nu=wa=mu[=kan] apēdani<sup>sic</sup> (18) menaḫḫanda ḫanneššar ŪL [pu]nušteni* “you are not investigating my case against those who ruined me.”

25. The phrase EN-YA ANA 2 GÍR *pian* (scil. *peran*) *paški[t]* is notoriously unclear. It may mean that either course of action—to stay away from the family or to flee in order to join relatives and incur further wrath of the emperor—would be disastrous (cf. *HED* 8: 189: “subjected to double jeopardy”), but this reading is entirely speculative, since we cannot be sure of Šauškaziti’s present location or condition. Ünal (1994: 208), on the contrary, argued that the phrase refers to a “cultic act associated with swearing an oath” (the assumption being that Šauškaziti took an oath).

26. Archi and Klengel 1985: 59: “mich [ . . . ] beleidigte er.”

27. There are several more attestations of the verb, but the contexts are too fragmentary to contribute anything of value to our understanding of the verb’s meaning. Particularly tantalizing is KBo 16.46 obv.<sup>2</sup> 13’, 16’ (MH/MS; CTH 212.6, instructions): *anda=ma=tta mān BĒLU kuiški za[mmuraizzi ( . . . ) (16’) mān=kan LUGAL=ma kuitki zammur[aizzi]* “furthermore, if some lord *zammurā*-es you ( . . . ) but if he *zammurā*-es the king in some way.” Further attestations include KBo 16.25 iv 27 (3.sg. *zammuraizzi*; MH/MS; CTH 251); KBo 8.35 i 25 = KUB 23.77: 47 (3.sg. *zammuraizzi*; MH/MS; CTH 139.1); KBo 47.239 ii 12’ (GAŠAN-YA *zammura*[ . . . ]; MH/NS; CTH 584; Soysal [2013: 701] reads *z̄a-am-mu-ra-u?-m[a<sup>2</sup>- . . . ]*).

two important connotations of the verb *zammurāi-* and its derivatives. At the same time, there does not seem to be sufficient textual evidence for the meaning ‘to attack, assail’.

2. We can now turn to morphological analysis. The frequent *Glossenkeile* make Luvian provenance of the verb likely.<sup>28</sup> We can thus posit a Luvian verbal stem *(\*)zammurā-*, which appears as *zammurāi-* in Hittite garb. The verb clearly looks like a denominative, but how exactly is it formed?

Kronasser (1966: 482) proposed starting with a Luvian thematic stem *zammura-* ‘insult’; he was followed by Kloekhorst (2008: 1030), according to whom “a nominal stem *zammura-* is attested in CLuvian, where we find the nouns *zammurai-* and *zammuratt-*, both meaning ‘insult, slander’.” This statement is, however, not entirely accurate: Verbal nouns *zam(m)urāi-* and *zammuratt(a)-* are just as likely to have been formed directly from the verbal stem *(\*)zammurā-*. A nominal stem “*zammura-*” therefore represents a product of reconstruction, and one is compelled to consider an alternative analysis of Luv. *(\*)zammurā-* as a denominative verb based on an athematic verbal noun *\*zammur* (< *\*zammuwar* with syncope<sup>29</sup>); in this case *(\*)zammurā-* would be comparable, e.g., to Hitt. *kururāi-* (KBo 9.96 i 9’) ‘to be hostile’, based on *kurur* ‘hostility’.<sup>30</sup>

This morphological aporia is familiar from such cases as Hitt. *zahhurāi-* ‘to break, crush’ or *kundurāi-* ‘?’,<sup>31</sup> where a derivation from thematic *\*-ura-*<sup>32</sup> and a derivation from athematic *\*-ur* / *\*-uwar* are equally plausible.<sup>33</sup> Similarly, in our case there are no means of deciding which of these analyses is right, unless one can provide evidence for either nominal stem, but neither *\*zammura-* nor *\*zammur* / *\*zammuwar* is attested.

In fact, we do not find *any* nouns derivationally independent of the verbal stem.<sup>34</sup> The dictionaries list an *i*-stem *ẓamuri-* of unknown, but allegedly negative meaning (e.g., Tischler 2001: 205: “etwas Negatives”).<sup>35</sup> However, this is a ghost-word: its originator appears to have been Kühne, who misconstrued the form *ẓamurai* at KUB 40.33 obv. 13 (see above) as dat.-loc. sg. of an *i*-stem.<sup>36</sup> There also exists a real *i*-stem *zammuri-* (c.), which has also been

28. 1.sg. pret. *ẓamuranun*, nom.-acc. sg. *ẓa<m>murai*, dat.-loc. sg. *ẓammuratti*, and unclear *ẓammura*[( see preceding note).

29. For this Luvian syncope compare alternations of the type 3.pl.imp. *dūwandu ~ dūndu* ‘they shall put’; see Melchert 2003: 183.

30. Descriptively, Anatolian heteroclitic nouns may employ either of the alternating stems for the purposes of further external derivation: contrast Hitt. *šehuriya-* ‘to urinate’ (*šehur* ‘urine’), CLuv. *pawari(ya)-* ‘to light (a camp) fire’ (*pāhūr* ‘fire’) with Hitt. *happišnāi-* ‘to dismember’ (*happešsar* ‘body part’) or *šahešnāi-* ‘to fortify’ (*šahešsar* ‘fortress’).

31. For *kundurāi-* (KUB 44.64 i 23) Puhvel (1996: 168) posited ‘imbue, impress’ as the meaning and proposed a derivation from *\*kundur*, a verbal noun formed from an unattested Hittite reflex of the root *\*k<sup>w</sup>end<sup>h</sup>-* (Gk. *πάσχω*).

32. Morphologically the sequence *\*-uro-* can be analyzed either as a thematic derivative made from a verbal noun in *\*-ur<sub>o</sub>* (*l uen-*) or as a *\*-ro-* derivative of a quasi-participial deverbal *u*-stem of the type found in Ved. *śayú-* ‘lying’, *jāyú-* ‘winning’. For an exemplary treatment of the intricate problems that the conglomerate *\*-uro-* may posit at the level of Indo-European reconstruction see Nussbaum 1986.

33. Rieken 1999: 356 n. 1759. Another case in point is the verb *(\*)šumrāi-* ‘to be pregnant’ (supine *šumreškewan*), which has been plausibly derived from *\*šūmar* ‘pregnancy’ (see the references in HEG S-2: 1164). Finally, Eichner (1973: 79; followed by Oettinger 1979: 367) analyzed *epurāi-* as a derivative of *\*ēpur*, a verbal noun of *epp-* ‘seize’, which would be another example of the derivation in question; however, it may be that the meaning of *epurāi-* was not ‘capture by siege’, but rather something like ‘to dam up, to build a siege ramp; Erdmassen bewegen’ (*HW<sup>2</sup>* 2: 89; see also the recent discussion by Singer [2008: 262 n. 62], who entertained the possibility of *ēpurāi-* being a loanword from Akkadian).

34. On the unclear *zamman-* see below, n. 49.

35. Similarly Neumann 2007: 433, 440.

36. “Das mir anderweitig nicht bekannte adjektivische Glossenkeilwort *zamuri-*, zum Verbum *zam(m)urāi-* zu stellen, ist im Bedeutungsfeld von ‘böse’ beheimatet” (Kühne 1972: 255 n. 101).

connected to *zammurāi-*.<sup>37</sup> But while its exact meaning is hard to determine, <sup>(NINDA)</sup>*zammuri-* clearly does not have a sinister or negative meaning: This word denotes an object used in Hurrian ritual contexts (e.g., the *(h)išūwa*-ritual and *keldi*-ritual).<sup>38</sup> It is often accompanied by the determinative NINDA, and there is a wide-ranging consensus that *zammuri-* was most likely a bread of some kind.<sup>39</sup> It is in all likelihood a Hurrian word which has nothing to do with the verb *zammurāi*.

The form which might tip the scales in favor of an athematic *\*zammur / \*zammuwar* as the derivational basis of Luv. <sup>(\*)</sup>*zammurā-* is 3.sg.pret.act. *zammurīnut*, discussed above (1.5). The stem *zammurīnu-* cannot be a factitive derived from a putative noun *\*zammuri-* ‘offence’ or an adjective *\*zammuri-* ‘offending’: *nu*-factitives regularly delete stem-final *i* of the underlying nominal stem.<sup>40</sup> It follows that *zammurīnu-* has to be a causative stem in which the suffix *-nu-* was added to an (intransitive) verbal stem *\*zammuri(ya)-*.<sup>41</sup> This unambiguously denominative stem is much likelier to have an athematic noun *\*zammuwar* as its derivational basis, since there is no evidence for an *i*-stem that could serve as such (*\*-uri-* → *\*-uri-ia-*). If this analysis is correct, *\*zammuwar* by extension becomes the likelier derivational source for the other denominative verb, <sup>(\*)</sup>*zammurā-*, adopted in Hittite as *zammurāi-*. Ultimately, however, the indirect evidence of the verbal stem *zammurīnu-* is inconclusive, since the lack of an *i*-stem abstract *\*zammuri-* with the right meaning (‘disgrace, offence, defamation’) could be accidental.

3. Now we can turn to etymology,<sup>42</sup> starting with potential cognates of <sup>(λ)</sup>*zammurāi-* in Anatolian. One such cognate was identified by Neumann (1969: 396) in Lyc. *zuñmē, zuñmā* ‘harm’.<sup>43</sup> If correct, this comparison has important consequences for the further etymology of <sup>(λ)</sup>*zammurāi-*: As far as our limited knowledge of Lycian historical phonology allows us to tell, initial *z-* in Lycian goes back to Proto-Luvic *\*t<sup>s</sup><sub>1</sub>-* (< PIE *\*t<sub>2</sub>-*, *\*g/ǵ<sup>(h)</sup><sub>1</sub>-*) and *\*t<sup>s</sup><sub>2</sub>-* (< *\*ts-* / *\*ds-*).

The Lycian noun is only attested in stereotypical penalty clauses of sepulchral inscriptions (“whoever does any *z.* to this tomb . . .”), used with verbs *xba-* ‘inflict’ and *a(i)-* ‘do, make’.<sup>44</sup> The translation ‘harm, damage’ seems appropriate, but the evidence is too scarce to

37. E.g., by Berman 1972: 30. Ünal (2007: 814) combined Kühne’s <sup>(λ)</sup>*zammuri-* with <sup>(NINDA)</sup>*zammuri-* in an entry “adj. *zammuri-* / *zammuri-* ‘offending’.”

38. E.g., KUB 27.1 iii 68’–71’ (CTH 712A; ritual of Ištar-Šauška): *nu* [. . .] *INA É dIŠTAR.LÍL URUŠamūha pa[izzi]* <sup>(69)</sup> *nu zammurin ŠA 1/2 ŠĀTI dai* <sup>(70)</sup> *nu NINDA.X.ĪA NINDA.KU<sub>7</sub>.ĪA kue paršīannai x* [. . .] <sup>(71)</sup> *[an]aĥi peran arĥa daškiZZi* “and [. . .] go[es] into the temple of Šauška of the Field of Šamūha and he takes a *zammuri* of one half of a *SŪTU*. Then . . . -breads and sweetbreads which he crumbles he takes away for a [sn]ack”; KUB 40.102 v 4–7 (CTH 628; *(h)išūwa*-festival): *EGIR-anda 1 zammurin ŠA 1 ŠĀTI ti[anzī]* <sup>(5)</sup> *kāš zammuriš annalaš ANA TUP.PA.ĪA* <sup>(6)</sup> *ŪL ēšta n=an=kan* <sup>m</sup>*NIR.GÁL LUGAL GAL* <sup>(7)</sup> *EGIR-anda neia[ita]* “next they put one *zammuri-* of one *ŠĀTI* measure; this *zammuri* was not (mentioned) in older tablets; Muwattalli the Great King added it.” Other attestations are acc. sg. *zammurin* (KBo 20.122 obv. 8; KBo 19.133 4’, *zammuri[n]* 5’); gen. sg. *zammuriyaš* (KBo 20.123 i 14); dat. sg. *zammuri* (KUB 27.19 iii 5; *zammur[i’]* KBo 8.141 15’); [*z*]*ammuran* (KUB 40.102 i 13’).

39. E.g., Laroche 1980: 301: “pâtisserie culturelle”; Wegner 2004: 143: “ein Gebäck.” In two instances it is measured in *SŪTU*, but despite Haas 1971: 135 this does not necessarily make *zammuri-* a liquid; for breads measured in *SŪTU* see Hagenbuchner-Dresen 2002: 43.

40. Oettinger 1979: 249; Hoffner and Melchert 2008: 178–79 (e.g., *šallanu-* ‘to make great, magnify’ is derived from adj. *šalli-* ‘great’).

41. Coexistence of two denominative stems in Luvian, *\*zammuri-* and <sup>(\*)</sup>*zammurā-* is unproblematic; compare the Hittite pair *kururāi-* and *kururiya-* from *kurur* ‘hostility’.

42. According to the standard handbooks, the origin of the verb is unknown (Kloekhorst 2008: 1030: “Further etymology of this form is unknown”; HEG Z 652: “etymologisch unklar”).

43. See also Neumann 1979: 38; 2007: 440.

44. With *xbati*: TL 106.2; with *adi / aiti-*: TL 59.3; 91.3; 95.2; 135.2; N 314b.3; the context is broken at TL 44c17 (*zuñi*). The form *zuñmēne=ti* (TL 106.2) is usually interpreted as a denominative verb, but as the

guarantee any certainty in our evaluation of the semantic side of Neumann's comparison. On the one hand, as we have seen above, (ʔ)zammurāi- does not ever seem to mean 'to attack, to inflict physical damage';<sup>45</sup> on the other hand, it is entirely possible to speculate that *zuñmē* / *zuñmā* meant 'desecration, violation (of a religiously significant object/place)', which would make a comparison with the Luvian verb *viable* (see 1.3 above).

However, there also is a severe formal difficulty: The root vowel of *zuñmē* does not match the *a* of Luvian *zammurāi-*. While one might consider invoking the Lycian change of *a* to *u* caused by adjacent labial consonant (e.g., acc.sg. *χupu* 'tomb' for the usual *χupā* or nom.pl. *muhāi* 'gods' for *māhāi*), this explanation is unlikely in the case of *zuñmē* / *zuñmā*, which is consistently (8x) spelled with <u>.

It behooves us therefore to look for an alternative etymological solution for the Lycian word. Its morphological history has been plausibly outlined by Hajnal (1995: 112–13 n. 112): Starting with a neuter \*-men- stem, one would expect nom.-acc. pl. \*-mnā to lend itself to reanalysis as *a*-stem *zuñmā* (acc.sg.); the same *Scharnierform* \*-mnā would serve as the basis for a back-formed thematic neuter in \*-mno<sup>n</sup> > -mmē.

In search of a plausible *Transponat* for the Lycian word, one would need an Indo-European root beginning with \*tj-, \*g<sup>(h)</sup>j-, \*ǵ<sup>(h)</sup>j-, \*ds-, or \*ts- and ending in \*-E<sub>u</sub>-. Identifying a root of requisite shape is not an easy task.<sup>46</sup> As an entirely gratuitous proposal one might think of Lith. *žūti* 'to die', *pražūtis* 'ruin', Latv. *zūst* 'to disappear',<sup>47</sup> if these forms continue Proto-Baltic \*ǵ<sub>ieu</sub>H- / \*ǵ<sub>iu</sub>H- < \*ǵ<sup>(h)</sup><sub>ieu</sub>H-.<sup>48</sup> But there is too little evidence for certainty. Whatever the etymology of *zuñmē* / *zuñmā*, this word should be kept apart from (ʔ)zammurāi- on formal grounds.<sup>49</sup>

anonymous reviewer points out, this sequence can alternatively be analyzed as *zuñmē=ñne=ti* ('harm=them=that'), which eliminates the otherwise unattested verbal stem and yields a sequence of three familiar lexemes.

45. Neumann appears to have been aware of this difficulty, judging by the question mark in his gloss for *zammurāi-*: 'kränken, beleidigen, verletzen?' (1969: 396).

46. Hajnal's own etymology seems to contain a mistake: He derives the *men*-stem from a root ">\*t<sub>ieu</sub>- 'schüteln,'" for which no cognates are provided. It is possible that the PIE root of Gk. *σειώ* was intended, in which case *σειώ* would need to be divorced from Ved. *tviṣ-* (<\*t<sub>uei</sub>(s)-) traditionally (and plausibly) viewed as its cognate.

47. Fraenkel 1962: 1323.

48. Holthausen (1906–7: 327) compared Lith. *žūti* to Old English (*ā*)*gētan* 'to kill, to destroy', which he traced back to Gmc. \**gautjan*; the resulting root \*ǵ<sup>h</sup><sub>eu</sub>H- would not be compatible with the Lycian form. However, the length in (-)*gētan* is unreliable, and the OE verb is better taken as a prefixed form of *gitan* / *getan* / *gietan* 'to take' (*scil.* one's life away).

49. Eichner (1984) and Hutter (1988: 95) compared Lyc. *zuñmē* with CLuv. *zamman-* of uncertain, but clearly negative meaning; however, the same formal problem, namely, the mismatch between Lycian *u* and Luvian *a*, seems to be fatal for this idea.

In theory, CLuv. *zamman-* might be formally aligned with (ʔ)zammurāi- as a neuter *n*-stem, but its meaning is too unclear to warrant any conclusions. It might be useful to cite a few discussions of CLuv. *zamman-* and its derivatives that have appeared since the detailed overview in Starke (1990: 277–79). ʔzammanti- DUMU in the birth ritual was taken by Ivanov (1999: 30–31) to mean '(new)born' (< PIE \**g<sup>w</sup>em-* 'to come'), but his analysis is predicated on a doubtful phonological development of \**g<sup>w</sup>* to *z-*. Yakubovich (2013: 101) offered a plausible solution for the element *Zamna-* in personal names such as *Zamazitiš* or Σεμενδηςις, which used to baffle scholars in view of the otherwise unfavorable connotation of the word (e.g., Starke 1990: 279; Melchert 1993: 276). Yakubovich proposed seeing here an elliptical substitute of DINGIR.MEŠ *zammaššaš*. Finally, in an important study Taylor (2003: 81–113) proposed for *zamman-* the meaning 'curse'; this suggestion certainly seems apposite in view of the close textual association of *zamman-* with other terms for 'curse, evil eye' (*tātariyamman-*, *tivātani(ya)-*). Under Taylor's interpretation *zammašši-*<sup>MUSEN</sup> are birds of bad omen, DINGIR.MEŠ *zammaššaš* are the gods who oversee curses, HLuv. SCALPRUM-*su zama(n)tin* is a defiled / cursed stele, *zammanza udarša* is word(s) of a curse formula, and ʔzammantiš DUMU-iš (construed with inf. *lalauna* 'to bewitch' at KBo 13.241 rev. 24) is a cursed child.

Under this semantic analysis (which, however, is by no means certain), Taylor's comparison of *zamman-* with Ved. *śap-* 'to curse' seems particularly attractive: Taylor identified the reflex of the verbal root in CLuv. *zapp-* (view-

4. It remains to identify the Indo-European root. Based on the known sound laws one may propose a *Transponat*  $*(s)k̑em-$ : both the *a*-vowel and the geminate *-mm-* of Luvian  $(*)zammurā-$  would be regular by Čop's Law ( $*t^sem- > *t^samm-$ ), while the initial affricate can be viewed as a product of palatalization of  $*k̑$  by the following  $*e$ .<sup>50</sup> For these phonological developments one may compare CLuv. *zalla-* 'to trot', HLuv. *zallal-* 'vehicle' going back to IE  $*(s)k̑el-$  (cf. Lith. *šúolis* 'a leap').<sup>51</sup>

A Germanic cognate of such a putative root immediately suggests itself: It is English *shame* going back to  $*skamō$  f. (OE *sc(e)amu* 'shame; disgrace', OHG *scama*, German *Scham*). These words have no standard Indo-European etymology<sup>52</sup> and their derivation from a verbal root  $*(s)k̑em-$  'to be disgraced, to feel shame',<sup>53</sup> posited on the strength of Anatolian data, appears semantically and formally compelling.<sup>54</sup>

Much as one would like to have a *tertium comparationis*, there is no certainty about other possible descendants of this PIE root. The comparison of Germanic  $*skamō$  with Umbrian *eskamitu* made by Pisani (1964: 211)<sup>55</sup> remains very doubtful, as long as there is no particular reason to believe that *eskamitu* denoted sacrificial cakes shaped after male genitals.<sup>56</sup> Cheung (2007: 371) proposed an interesting connection between Germanic  $*skamō$  and Christian Sogdian *šym-* / *šm-* 'to blush, be ashamed' (<  $*šamaya-$ ).<sup>57</sup> However, the traditional derivation of the Sogdian verb from the Iranian root  $*šam$  'to glow, to shine ruddily' (Av. *hū frāšmō.dāti-* 'sunset', Parthian *nyš'm* 'darkness')<sup>58</sup> should not be given up too easily,

---

ing *zappatta zammanza utarša* [KBo 22.137 rev. iii 9'] as a *figura etymologica*) and argued that the stem  $*k̑ep-m̑$  developed first into  $*kemman$  with assimilation and then to *zamman-* by Čop's Law; a connection between CLuv. *zapp-* and Ved. *śap-* was also recently proposed by Poetto 2012 (without knowledge of Taylor's unpublished work); Poetto added to the dossier HLuv. *zapa-* 'to offer in sacrifice'. Ved. *śap-* had previously been connected with Hitt. *kappilāi-* 'to be angry' by Eichner (1979: 61); Taylor discards this idea, but it is worth noting that under the revised theory of the outcome of PIE dorsals in Luvo-Lycian (Melchert 2012), both comparisons could in theory be kept, since *kappilāi-* is obviously based on *o*-grade  $*k̑opi-lo-$  (note that its derivative *kappilalli-* is used of a (cursed?) city demolished in KUB 7.60 iii 12). If, however, an early Anatolian assimilation of  $*-pm-$  to  $-mm-$  (and thus Taylor's comparison of *zamman-* with Ved. *śap-*) is shown to be untenable, alternative comparanda might be sought in late Ved. *sámala-* 'pollution, defilement' and its Germanic cognates (OHG *hamal* 'maimed', ON *hamla* 'to mutilate'), which could be considered together with  $\lambda$ *zammantiš* DUMU-*iš* and Hluv. SCALPRUM-*su zama(n)tin*. To conclude, Luv. *zamman-* will basically remain unclear until its dossier is augmented by new finds, and while formally it may be related to  $(\lambda)zammurāi-$ , any etymological proposal at this point should be viewed as very tentative.

50. See Melchert 2012 (under the earlier theory proposed by Melchert 1987 initial  $*t^s > z-$  would still be a regular unconditioned reflex of PIE  $*k̑$ ).

51. See Rieken 1997.

52. "Verdere aanknopingen zijn onzeker" (de Vries 1992: 60); "no established etymology" (Kroonen 2013 s.v. *skamō*). Etymological dictionaries of Germanic languages usually register (with a modicum—or more—of skepticism) the etymology canvassed by Kluge (1883: 285), which takes  $*skamō$  back to the PIE root  $*k̑em-$  'to cover, to conceal (oneself)'; for a detailed (but still somewhat short of compelling) defense of this view see Meringer 1913: 143–44. Kluge's etymology has also enjoyed some popularity in non-linguistic works, e.g., Wurmser 1981.

53. I posit an intransitive basic meaning for the PIE root, since the transitive diathesis of Luvian  $(*)zammurā-$  is expected in an Anatolian derived stem in  $*-ā-$  (Hittite *-āi-*). Note that causative *zammurinu-* points to an intransitive stem  $*zammuri(ya)-$  'to be disgraced'.

54. ON *skōmm* and its denominative verb *skamma* 'to disgrace' show an unexplained geminate, no trace of which is found in other Germanic cognates; see de Vries 1962: 512 for a proposal that these words were influenced by *skammr* 'short'.

55. Pisani's idea was accepted by Poultney (1959: 210) and further developed in Pisani 1974: 285.

56. See the critical remarks by Campanile (1967: 150–51); Weiss (2010: 218 n. 265) calls *eskamitu* "very obscure." For a different explanation of the Umbrian word see Ancillotti and Cerri 1996: 359 (participle of  $*ē-skalmi-$  'cut').

57. See Sims-Williams 1985: 180; Gharib 1995: 373, 379.

58. See Benveniste 1936: 230–31.

given the trivial nature of the semantic development ‘to become red’ > ‘to blush’ > ‘to be ashamed’.<sup>59</sup>

The evidence for a root *\*(s)kēm-* ‘to be disgraced, to feel shame’ is thus limited to two branches, Anatolian and Germanic. Further research will show whether *shame* can be assigned a more secure place in Indo-European prehistory.

59. Parallels are ample, e.g., OIr. *rucae* ‘shame, disgrace’ (< *\*rud-k-jo-*), ON *kinnroði* ‘blush of shame’, or Skt. *lajj-* ‘be ashamed’ (< *\*raj-ya-* ‘become red’).

#### REFERENCES

- Ancillotti, Augusto, and Romolo Cerri. 1996. *Le Tavole di Gubbio e la civiltà degli Umbri*. Perugia: Jama.
- Archi, Alfonso, and Horst Klengel. 1985. Die Selbstrechtvertretung eines hethitischen Beamten (KUB 41). *AoF* 12: 52–64.
- Beckman, Gary. 1999. *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*<sup>2</sup>. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Benveniste, Émile. 1936. Notes parthes et sogdiennes. *Journal Asiatique* 228: 193–239.
- Berman, Howard. 1972. The Stem Formation of Hittite Nouns and Adjectives. PhD diss., Univ. of Chicago.
- Boley, Jacqueline. 1993. *The Hittite Particle -z / -za*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- . 2000. *Dynamics of Transformation in Hittite: The Hittite Particles -kan, -asta and -san*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- Campanile, Enrico. 1967. Minima italica. *Studi e saggi linguistici* 7: 142–51.
- Carruba, Onofrio. 1967. Rhyta in den hethitischen Texten. *Kadmos* 6: 88–97.
- Cheung, Johnny. 2007. *Etymological Dictionary of the Iranian Verb*. Leiden: Brill.
- Eichner, Heiner. 1973. Die Etymologie von heth. *mehur*. *MSS* 31: 53–107.
- . 1979. Hethitisch *gēnuššuš, ginušši, ginuššin*. In *Hethitisch und Indogermanisch: Vergleichende Studien zur historischen Grammatik und zur dialektgeographischen Stellung der indogermanischen Sprachgruppe Altkleinasiens*, ed. Erich Neu and Wolfgang Meid. Pp. 41–61. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- . 1984. Review of G. M. Beckman, *Hittite Birth Rituals*. *Die Sprache* 30: 197.
- Fraenkel, Ernst. 1962. *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Friedrich, Johannes. 1926. *Staatsverträge des Ḫatti-Reiches in hethitischer Sprache*, Teil 1: *Die Verträge Muršiliš’ II. mit Duppi-Tešup von Amurru, Targašnalliš von Ḫapalla und Kupanta-dKAL von Mira und Kuwališa*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs.
- Gharib, Badr al-Zamān. 1995. *Sogdian Dictionary: Sogdian-Persian-English*. Tehran: Farhang Publications.
- Götze, Albrecht. 1968 [1927]. *Madduwattaš*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Haas, Volkert. 1971. Zu den neuen hurritischen Texten in KBo XIX. *SMEA* 14: 135–42.
- Hagenbuchner, Albertine. 1989. *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Hagenbuchner-Dresel, Albertine. 2002. *Massangaben bei hethitischen Backwaren*. Dresden: TU Dresden.
- Hajnal, Ivo. 1995. *Der lykische Vokalismus: Methode und Erkenntnisse der vergleichenden anatolischen Sprachwissenschaft auf das Vokalsystem einer Kleincorpusssprache*. Graz: Leykam.
- HED—Jaan Puhvel. *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1984–.
- HEG—Johann Tischler. *Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck, 1977–2016.
- Hoffner, Harry A. 1999. *Letters from the Hittite Kingdom*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Hoffner, Harry A., and H. Craig Melchert. 2008. *A Grammar of the Hittite Language*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Holthausen, Ferdinand. 1906–7. Etymologien. *IF* 20: 316–31.

- Hutter, Manfred. 1988. *Behexung, Entsühnung und Heilung: Das Ritual der Tunnawiya für ein Königs-paar aus mittelhethitischer Zeit (KBo XXI 1–KUB IX 34–KBo XXI 6)*. Freiburg: Universitätsverlag. HW<sup>2</sup>—Johannes Friedrich, Annelies Kammenhuber, and Inge Hoffmann. *Hethitisches Wörterbuch*. 2., völlig neubearbeitete Auflage. Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1974–.
- Ivanov, Vyacheslav Vsevolodovich. 1999. Palatalization and Labiovelars in Luwian. In *Proceedings of the Tenth Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference (Los Angeles, May 21–23, 1998)*, ed. K. Jones-Bley. Pp. 27–47. Washington D.C.: Institute for the Study of Man.
- Kloekhorst, Alwin. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden: Brill.
- Kluge, Friedrich. 1883. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*. Strassburg: K. J. Trübner.
- Kronasser, Heinz. 1966. *Etymologie der hethitischen Sprache*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Kroonen, Guus. 2013. *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Germanic*. Leiden: Brill.
- Kühne, Cord. 1972. Bemerkungen zu den kürzlich edierten hethitischen Texten. ZA 62: 236–61.
- Laroche, Emmanuel. 1980. *Glossaire de la langue hourrite*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Lebrun, René. 1980. *Hymnes et prières hittites*. Louvain-la-Neuve: Centre d’histoire des religions.
- Melchert, H. Craig. 1987. PIE Velars in Luvian. In *Studies in Memory of Warren Cowgill*, ed. C. Watkins. Pp. 182–204. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1993. *Cuneiform Luvian Lexicon*. Chapel Hill, NC: self-published.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2003. Language. In *The Luwians*, ed. H. C. Melchert. Pp. 170–210. Leiden: Brill.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2012. Luvo-Lycian Dorsal Stops Revisited. In *The Sound of Indo-European 2: Papers on Indo-European Phonetics, Phonemics and Morphophonemics*, ed. R. Sukač and O. Šefčík. Pp. 206–18. Munich: Lincom.
- Meringer, Rudolf. 1913. Einige primäre Gefühle des Menschen, ihr mimischer und sprachlicher Ausdruck. *Wörter und Sachen* 5: 129–71.
- Miller, Jared L. 2013. *Royal Hittite Instructions and Related Administrative Texts*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Neumann, Günter. 1969. Lykisch. In *Handbuch der Orientalistik I/2*, Absch. 1/2, lief. 2: *Altkleinasiatische Sprachen*. Pp. 358–96. Leiden: Brill.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1979. *Neufunde lykischer Inschriften seit 1901*. Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2007. *Lykisches Glossar*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Nussbaum, Alan J. 1986. *Head and Horn in Indo-European*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Oettinger, Norbert. 1979. *Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbums*. Nürnberg: H. Carl.
- Pisani, Vittore. 1964. *Manuale storico della lingua italiana*, vol. 4: *Le lingue dell’Italia antica oltre il latino*. 3rd ed. Turin: Rosenberg & Sellier.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1974. Kamm und Scham. In *Antiquitates Indogermanicae: Studien zur indogermanischen Altertumskunde und zur Sprach- und Kulturgeschichte der indogermanischen Völker. Gedenkschrift für Hermann Güntert*, ed. M. Mayrhofer et al. Pp. 285–88. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- Poetto, Massimo. 2012. Un nuevo verbo luvio-geroglífico: *zapa-*, e la sua correlazione al luvio cuneiforme *zapp(a)-*. In *Ex Anatolia Lux: Anatolian and Indo-European Studies in Honor of H. Craig Melchert on the Occasion of His Sixty-fifth Birthday*, ed. R. Kim, N. Oettinger, E. Rieken, and M. Weiss. Pp. 296–302. Ann Arbor: Beech Stave Press.
- Poultney, James W. 1959. *The Bronze Tables of Iguvium*. Baltimore: American Philological Association.
- Puhvel, Jaan. 1996. Three Hittite-Greek Etymological Pairings. HS 109: 166–68.
- Rieken, Elisabeth. 1997. Zu den Reflexen von uridg. \*(s)k’el- “springen, eilen.” HS 110: 167–75.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1999. *Untersuchungen zur nominalen Stammbildung des Hethitischen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Sims-Williams, Nicholas. 1985. *The Christian Sogdian manuscript C2*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Singer, Itamar. 2008. On Siege Warfare in Hittite Texts. In *Treasures on Camels’ Humps: Historical and Literary Studies from the Ancient Near East Presented to Israel Eph’al*, ed. M. Cogan and D. Kahn. Pp. 250–65. Jerusalem: Hebrew University, Magnes Press.
- Soysal, Oğuz. 2013. On Recent Cuneiform Editions of Hittite Fragments (II). JAOS 133: 691–703.

- Starke, Frank. 1990. *Untersuchung zur Stammbildung des keilschrift-luwischen Nomens*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Taggar-Cohen, Ada. 2006. *Hittite Priesthood*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Taylor, John Patrick. 2003. *Studies in Ancient Anatolian Language and Culture*. PhD diss., Harvard Univ.
- Tischler, Johann. 2001. *Hethitisches Handwörterbuch mit dem Wortschatz der Nachbarsprachen*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck.
- Ünal, Ahmet. 1994. The Textual Illustration of the “Jester Scene” on the Sculptures of Alaca Höyük. *AnSt* 44: 207–18.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2007. *Multilinguales Handwörterbuch des Hethitischen*. Hamburg: Dr. Kovač.
- Vries, Jan de. 1962. *Altnordisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*<sup>2</sup>. Leiden: Brill.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1992. *Nederlands etymologisch woordenboek*<sup>3</sup>. Leiden: Brill.
- Wegner, Ilse. 2004. *Hurritische Opferlisten aus hethitischen Festbeschreibungen, Teil III: Das Glossar*. Rome: Bonsignori editore.
- Weiss, Michael. 2010. *Language and Ritual in Sabellic Italy: The Ritual Complex of the Third and the Fourth Tabulae Iguvinae*. Leiden: Brill.
- Wurmser, Leon. 1981. *The Mask of Shame*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press.
- Yakubovich, Ilya Sergeevich. 2013. Anatolian Names in *-wiya* and the Structure of Empire Luwian Onomastics. In *Anatolian Interfaces: Culture, Language and Religion between Anatolia and the Aegean*, ed. Alice Mouton et al. Pp. 87–123. Leiden: Brill.