



Citation: Simon, Z. (2023). A Goddess and a City or How to Read the Hieroglyphic Luwian Sign MANUS+MANUS. *Asia Anteriore Antica. Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Cultures* 5: 131-138. doi: 10.36253/asiana-1961

Copyright: © 2023 Simon, Z. This is an open access, peer-reviewed article published by Firenze University Press (<http://www.fupress.com/asiana>) and distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Data Availability Statement: All relevant data are within the paper and its Supporting Information files.

Competing Interests: The Author(s) declare(s) no conflict of interest.

A Goddess and a City or How to Read the Hieroglyphic Luwian Sign MANUS+MANUS

ZSOLT SIMON

ELKH Hungarian Research Centre for Linguistics, Hungary
zsltsimon@gmail.com

Abstract. This paper argues that the unusual determinative MANUS+MANUS of the goddess Pahalati in Hama that resisted explanation until now can be understood due to its new attestation in the logographic spelling of a Cilician toponym. It will be shown that an earlier attempt that identified MANUS+MANUS as a variant of MAGNUS, the city as Urušša, and the name of the goddess as a Phoenician-Luwian mixed phrase meaning ‘Great Lady’, is palaeographically, linguistically, and geographically impossible. A clue to the decipherment of MANUS+MANUS is provided by the homo(io)phonous settlement in Cilicia, Pahra-, which explains how the same sign could have been used both as a determinative and as a logogram in accordance with the regular rules of the usage of the determinatives.

Keywords: Hieroglyphic Luwian, Neo-Hittite Geography, Neo-Hittite Religion, Hama, Cilicia.

1. INTRODUCTION

The name of the goddess Pahalati is well-attested in the Neo-Hittite state of Hama (see the list of attestations in ACLT *s.v.*). As a divine name, it is almost always written regularly, i.e., with the determinative DEUS. However, in HAMA 8 §2 we find MANUS+MANUS instead of DEUS. This version is completely unparalleled and has no explanation. Hawkins (2000: 410) cautiously claimed that it ‘may be easily understood to represent ideographically the protective character of the gods’ (Payne 2019: 75 calls this ‘convincingly argued’ and claims that ‘[it] is most clearly [*sic*] an instance of iconic reinforcement of an underlying idea’). Nevertheless, such a claim is *ad hoc* and incompatible with the structure of the Hieroglyphic Luwian writing system, since the determiners are basically working as

semantic classifiers for a set of words and not as *ad hoc* semantic explanations or representations (I will return to this issue later). Until recently, there was no other attestation of this sign.¹

2. THE CITY

The situation has considerably changed in the meantime thanks to the recently found ARSUZ stela. Both texts deliver the second attestation of the MANUS+MANUS sign, in the name of the Cilician city MANUS+MANUS-*sa_x-na*(URBS) (ARSUZ 1 & 2 §14). The usage of the sign both as a logogram for a toponym and as a determinative already argues that this sign has a regular role in the Hieroglyphic Luwian writing system, unlike the role suggested by Hawkins and Payne. The passage is as follows (Dinçol *et al.* 2015: 64; translation following Yakubovich 2019: 549):

a-wa/i |PRAE-i CAPERE+CAPERE.L.417-na(URBS) *a-mi-na |L.273-i-na |hi-nu-wa/i-ha
 []CAPERE+CAPERE.L.417-na(URBS) *a-mi-na |L.273-i-na |hi-nu-wa/i-ha
 'I moved my weapon up to the town X'

Two remarks are in order. First, due to the previous sentence, which refers to a campaign of a Neo-Hittite ruler called Suppiluliuma against Hiyawa, it is assured that this city is located in Hiyawa (Eastern Cilicia). This will later have an important role. Second, as we can see, the publishers transcribed the name of the city as CAPERE+CAPERE-L.417-na(URBS). But, as far as CAPERE+CAPERE is concerned, this is pure convention, as the editors too refer to the fact that this sign is otherwise known only from HAMA 8, where it is transcribed as MANUS+MANUS (Dinçol *et al.* 2015: 67). The publishers were also unable to suggest a reading.²

The case was further developed by Martien Dillo. First, he rightly observed that L.417 has an assured syllabic value <sa_x> in TOPADA, which could be employed here, too (Dillo 2016: col. 46). Second, he built up a chain of proposals leading to a reading of the city name (Dillo 2016: cols. 46-49):

1. The city attacked by Suppiluliuma is the Cilician harbour called Magarsus.
2. Magarsus is identical to the city of Urušša mentioned in the Šunaššura-treaty, since:
3. Both toponyms contain the word for 'great', *maga-*, as a 'possible variation' of Greek *mega-*, and *ur-* as 'a form of' Luwian *ura-*.
4. The Luwian sign for the word 'great' is MAGNUS, and MANUS+MANUS is its 'pictographic variant', while MAGNUS would be a 'cursive' form. This would be the reason why the toponym was written with MANUS+MANUS.
5. Accordingly, he does not see a determinative in the case of the goddess but identifies it as a part of a mixed Phoenician-Luwian phrase, MAGNUS *pahalati*, meaning 'Great Lady', which would be a title for Kubaba.³

Although in Yakubovich's view (2019: 550 n. 40) the identification of Urušša with the Cilician settlement is 'unconfirmed, but plausible', unfortunately all the steps of Dillo's argumentation are at least problematic or plainly wrong.

¹ The sign in YALBURT block 4 §1 transcribed as MANUS+MANUS in Hawkins (1995: 98) is in fact graphically completely different (here the hands are directed upwards, not downwards, and are combined with forearms), and it is usually identified with the sign L.66* (MANDARE or DARE+DARE), see Poetto (1993: 34) and Hawkins (1995: 73 with refs.).

² HAMA 8 was not yet published at the time of Laroche 1960 and Marazzi 1990; 1998; thus, this sign combination does not appear in their sign lists.

³ I will not investigate whether this goddess has anything to do with Kubaba, since this is beyond the scope of this paper. Also, the question will be left open whether a mixed Phoenician-Luwian phrase is realistic, since there is no need to assume such here (see below).




MAGNUS	MANUS+MANUS	
		
	ARSUZ 1 & 2	HAMA 8

Fig. 1. The Hieroglyphic Luwian signs MAGNUS and MANUS+MANUS (Dillo 2016: col. 50).

First, there is no evidence that the attacked city was on the seashore. This assumption is simply based on Dillo's arbitrary interpretation of the above quoted sentence, which would mean in his views 'I sailed my warship(s) in front of the city X' (Dillo 2016: cols. 45-46). However, there is not a single piece of evidence that *warpi-* means 'warship' and that *hinuwa-* means 'to sail' (see, most recently, Bauer 2021a; 2021b). Although he adds question marks and admits the speculative nature of his translation, this is still his starting point.

Second, there is no evidence that Urušša was located on the Cilician shore; based on its context in the Šunaššura Treaty (§54), it was rather located in the east, close to the Kizzuwatna – Mitanni border, since we are dealing with a Kizzuwatnean settlement that once stood under the rule of the Mittannian ruler (see the literature in RGTC 6/1, 6/2 *s.v.*).

Third, setting aside the toponym Magarsus, there is no by-form 'ur-' of *ura-*, and the toponym Urušša cannot be regularly derived from the word *ura-* (nor from †*ur-*).

Fourth, even if we assume for the sake of the argument that there was a toponym *Urassa in Cilicia (which would be the regular derivative both from *ura-* and †*ur-*), the spelling MANUS+MANUS-*sa_x-na* can simply not be MAGNUS-*sa_x-na*, since the shape and form of the signs MANUS+MANUS and MAGNUS are completely different (Fig. 1). They obviously have nothing to do with each other (note also that the standard MAGNUS is not cursive; *contra* Dillo's claim, it has its own cursive version).

Accordingly, this city name cannot be read as Urassa, and it definitely has nothing to do with Urušša, and there is no reason to assume any connection with Magarsus. Thus, (MANUS+MANUS)Pahalati- cannot be read as MAGNUS *pahalati-* and cannot be translated as 'Great Lady'.

All in all, one still has to look for a solution.

3. THE CITY AND THE GODDESS

As a starting point, it is worth returning to the role of the determinatives in Hieroglyphic Luwian. They have two basic types: the first, most widespread type is a classifier, i.e., it tells to which semantic category the following word belongs (a typical example is DEUS preceding divine names). One may want to argue that MANUS+MANUS was also a semantic classifier for the semantic sphere of protection, including the gods with a sort of metonymical connection (and thus in a given sense saving Hawkins's interpretation), but in this case, one would definitely expect many more attestations due to the huge number of divine names. The second, rare type is a phonological tool: It is a hint to the correct reading and pronunciation of the following word. Two examples from

the broad spectrum of possibilities shall suffice: The sign CAELUM showing a bowl is used as a determinative preceding the word for ‘sky’, which can be understood only if there was a homophonous bowl type (Simon 2016). A similar case is L.314, which has the syllabic value *ba*, and that’s why it is used as a determinative preceding various sorts of words starting with the syllable *ba-* (*batastr(i)-* ‘violence’, *haziwid-* ‘rite’, *hastan(a/i)-* ‘support’, Payne 2018: 103-104). That the MANUS+MANUS sign appears once as a determinative and once as a logogram in a Hiyawaeian city name implies that the Luwian reading of the determinative is a word that sounds identical or very close to the name of the Hiyawaeian city. It may also mean that the name of the Hiyawaeian city sounds identical or very close to the name of the goddess Pahalati, but this is not necessary if the determinative of the goddess was yet another type of classifier applied (at least) to divine names. The easiest way of making a decision is if we start with checking if there is any Hiyawaeian toponym similar to the divine name, since many Hiyawaeian toponyms are known, even if, obviously, not all of them.

There is indeed one city name that perfectly fits: Pahara, known from KARATEPE 1 Hu./Ho. §7 among the Hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions (cf. ACLT *s.v.*). Due to rhotacism, the name of the goddess Pahalati and Pahara sounded identical (setting aside, of course, the last syllable in the divine name). Thus, if the reading of MANUS+MANUS is **pahara-* or **pahala-*, it could have been used as a determinative for Pahalati in the sense of a phonological tool and it could have been used as a logogram to write the name of the city of Pahara, which appears in the text as a genitival adjective, i.e., the Paharaean city (the sentence thus means ‘I moved my weapon up to the city of Pahara’).

Having said that, there are some philological details to be elaborated. I assumed that the name of the city had three syllables (Pahara) and the divine name had four syllables (Pahalati). This is a completely regular interpretation of the attested spellings, and it is exactly the environment, i.e., the intervocalic position, in which rhotacism works. Nevertheless, there are problematic circumstances. First, Pahalati is originally a Phoenician goddess called Ba^clat.⁴ In other words, it is entirely possible that the Luwian form was only Pahlati. Second, the name of the city is also known from Neo-Assyrian transmission as Paḥri (RGTC 7/1 *s.v.*; the Phoenician version of KARATEPE 1 shows P^CR). In other words, it is entirely possible that the Luwian form of the city name was only Pahra. It is important to note that Pahlati and Pahra are also completely regular interpretations of the attested spellings and there is no way to choose between them on Luwian grounds. Since rhotacism is restricted to the intervocalic position, in this case, the underlying words would not be completely identical. There are two possibilities: Either one can explain away these forms or one takes them at face value and tries to explain the situation.

First, one can always argue that the Neo-Assyrian transcription is distorted. But this is neither theoretically (i.e., linguistically) nor empirically supported. Transcriptions are not *l’art pour l’art*, but follow the phonological system of the transcribing language, and there is nothing in Neo-Assyrian that would require the syncope of the vowel. One may of course refer to a folk-etymology that Assyrianises the syllable structure. This cannot be excluded, but it is worth recalling the Neo-Assyrian transcriptions of the Neo-Hittite royal names: The overwhelming majority were phonologically perfect, and real distortions are very rare (see the detailed analysis in Simon 2018: 123-124, 127-129). Thus, I would rather take the Neo-Assyrian form at face value.

As far as the divine name is concerned, the key question is if there was any epenthetic vowel between the *‘ayn* and the *l* at all, and if yes, when it appeared. Note that the *‘ayn* was substituted with another laryngeal in Luwian, resulting in the completely regular consonant cluster *-hl-*, and for this reason no epenthetic vowel is expected in Luwian. Thus, the question is a strictly Phoenician problem. Unfortunately, due to the Phoenician writing system, it is extremely hard to give an answer and the Phoenician grammars also tend to avoid this problem. It is clear that in the Punic period the *‘ayn* was not there anymore, but it is unclear if this is due to the simplification of the

⁴ This is the *communis opinio*, see esp. Niehr (2014: 166-167). Accordingly, in the following linguistic analysis, Phoenician data will be taken into account. Nevertheless, I. Yakubovich (pers. comm.) suggested that since Hama eventually becomes Aramaeanized, one may consider the possibility of an Aramaean goddess (and, accordingly, an Aramaic linguistic analysis). However, to the best of my knowledge, no such Aramaean goddess is attested (see the overview in Niehr 2014: 127-203), and Pahalati is only a part of a larger Phoenician religious influence upon Hama that survived even into the Aramaean period (see the discussion in Niehr 2014: 167).

consonant cluster or whether first an epenthetic vowel appeared and later the intervocalic *ʿayn* disappeared followed by the contraction of the vowels. Exactly this latter scenario was assumed by Krahmalkov (2001: 31-32) in his Phoenician grammar, although without further elaboration. Friedrich, Röllig, and Amadasi Guzzo (1999: 53 §96) argue, however, in their Phoenician grammar that the Greek spelling *Baal*, the Neo-Assyrian *Baʿa-al*, etc. show only “scheinbar” (with emphasis in original) epenthetic vowels, since “hier handelt es sich einfach um die behelfsmäßige Wiedergabe von Lauten (Laryngalen) bzw. Lautfolgen (Doppelkonsonanz), die in der betreffenden Umschrift nicht adäquat dargestellt werden konnten” (emphasis in original). Nevertheless, it is worth having a look at the Neo-Assyrian spellings of Ba^l- and Ba^lat-names more closely. The Ba^lat-names are not very helpful, since their spellings are ambiguous (*Baʿa-la-* / *Ba-la-* / *Ba-al-te/ti/ta-* / *Bal-ti-*, PNA 1: 241-242) as far as the possibility of an epenthetic vowel is concerned in case of *Baʿa-la-* and *Ba-al-te/ti/ta-*, and, more problematically, they are much later than our inscription from the middle of the 9th c. (they are attested during the reign of Sennacherib and during and after the reign of Assurbanipal). More instructive is the spelling of the Ba^l-names (PNA 1: 241-242). Although the later spellings, i.e., those from during and after the reigns of Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal, are ambiguous in terms of the presence of an epenthetic vowel,⁵ earlier spellings, and exactly those that are practically contemporaneous with our inscription, show a different picture: *Baʿa-il* is a Phoenician king, possibly that of Šimirra during the reign of Shalmaneser III, and the name of the king of Tyre, *Ba^lmanzēr*, again during the reign of Shalmaneser III, is spelled not only as *Baʿa-li-NUMUN*, but also as *Baʿa-il-ma-an-zi*. The *i*-vocalism appears also in the fragmentary personal name *Ba-il*[...] and in the oronym *Baʿi-il-ša-pu-na* from the period of Sargon II (RGTC 7/1 s.v.). These spellings argue that there was an epenthetic vowel, which was at this time, however, not (or not yet) an [a]. In the Luwian transmission, however, this is either [a] or zero. Since this epenthetic vowel was heard by a non-native speaker as [i], we would rather expect the same in Luwian (especially because Iron Age Luwian had only short and long *a i u*), but this is obviously not the case. It is worth noting that assured (but admittedly later) cases of Phoenician epenthetic vowels in this position tend to be [i] or something similar, but definitely not [a], see the examples in Friedrich, Röllig, Amadasi Guzzo (1999: 53): σοιρις / συρις ‘root’ < *śurš*, Συδεκ (Συδουκ, Σεδεκ) < *šidq*. This argues that the <a> of the Luwian form is an empty vowel, and we are dealing with a consonant cluster *-hl-*. This is logical: An epenthetic vowel is not necessarily heard and substituted by a non-native speaker, and the cluster *-hl-*, as mentioned above, was completely regular in Luwian and did not require any epenthetic vowel. All in all, these considerations argue that the name of the Luwian goddess was [Pahlati-].

Accordingly, it is probable that both the ‘input’ and the ‘output’, i.e., the original Phoenician form and the Luwian toponym contained consonant clusters, i.e. Pahla° and Pahra-. But is it possible to use **pahra-* for Pahlati- or **pabla-* for Pahra-? This is definitely possible, because, first, as the attested cases show, the phonological link was not always homophonous, identical-sounding, but also homoiophonous, similar-sounding (see the case above where the identity of just the initial syllable was the reason for using the same determinative). Second, although it is not well understood or well investigated, we do have evidence for *l ~ r* interchange in postconsonantal position: The best-known example is COR-*la-ti-i-* ‘person, self’ for /atradi/ (abl.-instr.) in KULULU 4 §5 (Sasseville, Yakubovich 2017).⁶ In other words, although it was not necessary from the point of view of the writing system that **pahra-* and **pabla-* sounded identical, this may well have been the case. Identical or not, both cases are completely regular. All in all, if we want to be very strict, we have the following possibilities:

⁵ *Baʿa-li/lu ~ Ba-a-lu* (Baʿalu, King of Tyre); *Baʿa-al- ~ Ba-al-* (the brothers of the king of Arwad: *Baʿal-ḥanūnu*, *Baʿal-iašūpu*, *Baʿal-maluku*); as well as *Ba-al-* and *Ba-li-*; see also *Baʿa-li-* in toponyms (from Shalmaneser III via the Eponym Canon 803 until Tiglath-pileser III, RGTC 7/1: 39-41).

⁶ An anonymous reader pointed out that this case can alternatively be explained with an **Cn > Cl* change in the oblique stem. However, such a change has not been identified yet in Luwian and as the reader also admits, this must be excluded if *tara/i-sā* in İVRİZ 1 §3 is indeed the gen. sg. of this word (which is currently the most probable explanation, see Sasseville, Yakubovich 2017), since then there is no evidence for a different oblique stem, which, furthermore, appears lexicalised as COR-*ni-* ‘soul, self’ without any *-l-* (Yakubovich 2017a).

	Phoenician form	Luwian DN	Luwian GN	Neo-Assyrian form
A	Ba ^c alat	Pahalati-	Pahara- (homophony)	Pahri ('distorted')
B	Ba ^c alat	Pahalati-	Pahra- (homoiphony)	Pahri
C	/Ba ^c lat/ [Ba ^c ilat ³]	Pahlati-	Pahra- (homoiphony)	Pahri

As was shown, all three scenarios are theoretically possible and regular. It depends rather on personal choices which scenario is held to be more probable. Since I take the Neo-Assyrian spelling seriously, for me, scenarios B and C are definitely more probable than scenario A. Since the Phoenician epenthetic vowel is probably not reflected in the Luwian spelling, scenario C is the most probable in my view.⁷

Accordingly, the reading of MANUS+MANUS is **pab(a)la-* or **pab(a)ra-*, which thus must be a Luwian word. Such a Luwian word is not attested yet, so we can hardly say anything about its meaning. There is obviously a connection between the depiction (two hands in a protective position, see Fig. 1) and the word, which thus might have some protective meaning, in which case it is hard not to recall the Hittite verb *pahš-* 'to protect', an *s*-extension of the root **peh₂(i)-* 'to protect'. This would require the restoration of the laryngeal from a position when it was followed by a consonant other than a stop (cf. Melchert 1994: 69), but its paradigm had many such cases. Although this verbal stem **pah-* (which may even be attested)⁸ could have provided the base of a pre-Luwian noun,⁹ and thus a connection is not impossible, it is obviously hard to prove without real attestations.¹⁰

4. CONCLUSIONS

The strange determinative MANUS+MANUS of the goddess Pahalati in Hama has no explanation. Hawkins's proposal neglected the structure of the writing system and was also called into question by a new attestation, a logogram for a Cilician toponym. Dillo's reading of the toponym and the determinative is palaeographically, linguistically, and geographically impossible. Nevertheless, exactly the combination of its usage both as a determina-

⁷ Annick Payne (pers. comm.) kindly informed me that the proposal of this paper is wrong since she identifies MANUS+MANUS with the sign CAPERE+CAPERE (allegedly following Dinçol *et al.* 2015, but this was only their transcription, the content of their claim was different, see above) with the phonetic value /ta/, which in her views excludes any other reading. Unfortunately, her claim is false: First, the sign in question (actually, CAPERE₂+CAPERE₂, L.42) is a different sign (unbound hands, such small details are significant, see, e.g., the different AVIS signs); second, Hieroglyphic Luwian signs can have both syllabic and logographic values (see, e.g., L.128 AVIS and the overview in Goedegebuure 2019). Finally, even if Payne's reading were correct, it does not explain the problems addressed here.

⁸ Cuneiform Luwian *pa-* was booked by Melchert (1994: 162) as the possible Luwian cognate, but he himself claimed that the meaning 'to protect' was a 'mere guess' and the contexts (Istanuwean texts) are indeed completely unclear (see the discussion in Simon 2020a with the critical assessment of other proposals; Melchert forthcoming *s.v.* provides a new solution and further discussion of more recent proposals). As I. Yakubovich kindly reminded me, this verbal stem may be attested in the Arzawan Luwic names *Anza-pahhadu* and ^d[I]M-ta-paddu, see his argumentation in Yakubovich (2010: 92-94, followed by Melchert 2013: 45), which is formally possible, but cannot currently be verified (cf. Simon 2020b, 2020c).

⁹ The derivational morphology requires further investigation, but Yakubovich 2017b: 18-23 made a plausible case that *arla-* 'pedestal, altar (?)' and **arl(a)-* 'place' (known from its derivatives) are derived from **ar-* 'to stand' (cf. Hittite *ar-* 'to stand') with a *-la-* suffix, which would fit the derivation of **pabla-* from **pah-*.

¹⁰ An anonymous reader suggests that one could read MANUS+MANUS only as "*pab*", which would be fitting as a determinative and it would be an abbreviated writing in the case of the toponym (such as *MI(REGIO)* 'Egypt' [ALEPPO 7 §7] or *MONS.TU* for Tudhaliya), which would even bypass the problem of the imperfect correspondence between the theonym and the toponym. In formal terms, the reader's suggestion would practically mean that we are dealing with a logogram for the verb 'to protect', which is certainly possible, but it has the disadvantage that the existence of the verbal stem **pah-* is currently only a theoretical possibility, as per above. Note also that the connection between the underlying word **pahra-* and the shape of the sign can also be explained in that way that the logogram was actually a logogram for the toponym *Pahra-* and not for a word **pahra-* (on logograms for toponyms in Hieroglyphic Luwian see now Schürr 2022). In this case, the shape of the logogram could have simply been created on the base of the assonance of the toponym with the (alleged) verb **pah-*.

tive and as a logogram provides a clue to its decipherment, since there is a homoiophonous or even homophonous settlement in Cilicia, Pahr-, which explains how the same sign could have been used in both functions in accordance with the regular rules of the usage of the determinatives. As a side-effect, we now know more about the geography of the campaign of Suppiluliuma in Cilicia.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This paper was written in the framework of the research project *The gods of Anatolia and their names (continuity, importation, interaction): a philological and linguistic approach* (PID2021-124635NB-C31) financed by the Spanish Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness. I am very grateful to H. Craig Melchert for providing me with his dictionary ahead of publication as well as Holger Gzella for an inspiring discussion of the Phoenician material. Needless to say, I am solely responsible for the views presented here.

REFERENCES

- ACLT = Yakubovich I. 2007-2009, *Annotated Corpus of Luwian Texts*. <http://web-corpora.net/LuwianCorpus> (last accessed: 8 January 2023)
- Bauer A.H. 2021a, Hieroglyphic Luwian /*hinu(wa)*⁽ⁱ⁾/, *hi-nu-wa/i*- ‘to move, cause to pass’, in *eDiAna*. <https://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary.php?lemma=1442>
- Bauer A.H. 2021b, Hieroglyphic Luwian /*warp(i)*-/, (ARMA)wa/i+ra/i-pi- ‘weapon, tool’, in *eDiAna*. <https://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary.php?lemma=2182>
- Dillo M. 2016, The location and erection of the Storm-god stela from Arsuz: deciphering the unreadable Luwian city name in Cilicia as the port of *Urassa/i*, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 73: cols. 40-62.
- Dinçol B., Dinçol A., Hawkins J.D., Peker H., Öztan A., Çelik Ö. 2015, Two new inscribed Storm God stela from Arsuz (İskenderun) ARSUZ 1 and 2, *Anatolian Studies* 65: 59-77.
- eDiAna = Hackstein O., Miller J.L., Rieken E. (eds), *Digital Philological-Etymological Dictionary of the Minor Ancient Anatolian Corpus Languages*, München – Marburg. <https://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/>
- Friedrich J., Röllig W., Amadasi Guzzo M. G. 1999, *Phönizisch-Punische Grammatik*, Roma, Pontificio Istituto Biblico.
- Goedegebuure P. 2019, The Hieroglyphic Luwian signs *128 (AVIS ‘Bird’) =*wa_x* and *30 = *HAPA*, in A. Süel (ed.), *IX. Uluslararası Hititoloji Kongresi Bildirileri. Çorum 08-14 Eylül 2014. Acts of the IXth International Congress of Hittitology. Çorum, 08-14 September 2014*. Çorum, T.C. Çorum Valiliği İl Kültür ve Turizm Müdürlüğü Yayınları, 295-316.
- Hawkins J.D. 1995, *The Hieroglyphic Inscription of the Sacred Pool Complex at Hattusa (SÜDBURG)*. *With an Archaeological Introduction by Peter Neve*, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz.
- Hawkins J.D. 2000, *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions I. Inscriptions of the Iron Age*, Berlin – New York, Walter de Gruyter.
- Krahmalkov Ch.R. 2001, *A Phoenician-Punic Grammar*, Leiden – Boston – Köln, Brill.
- Laroche E. 1960, *Les hiéroglyphes hittites I. L'écriture*, Paris, Klincksieck.
- Marazzi M. 1990, *Il geroglifico anatolico. Problemi di analisi e prospettive di ricerca*, Roma, Dipartimento di studi glottoantropologici, Università La Sapienza.
- Marazzi M. (ed) 1998, *Il geroglifico anatolico. Sviluppi della ricerca e venti anni della sua “ridecifrazione”. Atti del Colloquio e della tavola rotonda. Napoli – Procida, 5-9 giugno 1995*, Napoli, Istituto Universitario Orientale.
- Melchert H.C. 1994, *Anatolian Historical Phonology*, Amsterdam – Atlanta, Rodopi.
- Melchert H.C. 2013, Naming Practices in Second- and First Millennium Western Anatolia, in R. Parker (ed.), *Personal Names in Ancient Anatolia*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 31-49.

- Melchert H.C. forthcoming, *A Dictionary of Cuneiform Luvian*, Ann Arbor – New York, Beech Stave.
- Niehr H. 2014, Religion, in H. Niehr (ed.), *The Arameans in Ancient Syria*, Leiden – Boston, Brill, 127-203.
- Payne A. 2018, Determination in the Anatolian Hieroglyphic Script: The Late 10th and Early 9th Centuries BC, *Altorientalische Forschungen* 45: 102-121.
- Payne A. 2019, Compound Determination in Anatolian Hieroglyphic, in: E. Cancik-Kirschbaum, J. C. Johnson (eds), *Encoding metalinguistic awareness: Ancient Mesopotamia and Beyond*, Gladbeck, PeWE, 65-96.
- PNA = Parpola S. (ed.) 1998-2011, *The Prosopography of the Neo-Assyrian Empire I-III.*, Helsinki, The Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project.
- Poetto M. 1993, *L'iscrizione luwio-geroglifica di Yalburt. Nuove acquisizioni relative alla geografia dell'Anatolia sud-occidentale*, Pavia, Iuculano.
- Sasseville D., Yakubovich, I. 2017, Hieroglyphic Luwian /atr(i)-/, *á-tara/i-*, COR-*tara/i-* 'person, self', in *eDiAna*. <http://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary.php?lemma=308>
- Schürr D. 2022, Luwische Städte- und Länderglyphen, *Hungarian Assyriological Review* 3: 49-61.
- Simon Zs. 2016, Zum hieroglyphen-luwischen Zeichen CAELUM (*182), *Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires* 2016/4: 159-162 (No. 96).
- Simon Zs. 2018, Sapaziti, Sapalulme und die Suppiluliumas von W/Pal(a)stin(a/i), *Altorientalische Forschungen* 45: 122-132.
- Simon Zs. 2020a, Cuneiform Luwian *pa-* '(unknown)', in *eDiAna*. <https://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary.php?lemma=871>
- Simon Zs. 2020b, Miscellaneous: Arzawa Luwic **pa-* 'to protect', in *eDiAna*. <https://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary.php?lemma=872>
- Simon Zs. 2020c, Miscellaneous: Arzawa Luwic **pahh(a)-* 'to protect', in *eDiAna*. <https://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary.php?lemma=873>
- Yakubovich I. 2010, *Sociolinguistics of the Luvian Language*, Leiden – Boston, Brill.
- Yakubovich I. 2017a, Hieroglyphic Luwian /attan(i)-/, COR-*ni-* 'soul, self', in *eDiAna*. <https://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary.php?lemma=525>
- Yakubovich I. 2017b, The Luwian word for 'place' and its cognates, *Kadmos* 56: 1-27.
- Yakubovich I. 2019, The Mighty Weapon of Tarhunt, in P.S. Avetisyan, R. Dan, Y.H. Grekyan (eds), *Over the Mountains and Far Away. Studies in Near Eastern history and archaeology presented to Mirjo Salvini on the occasion of his 80th birthday*, Oxford, Archaeopress, 544-559.