

Alexander J. J. Vertegaal

Signs of length

Towards an interpretation of non-filling plene spellings in Hieroglyphic Luwian

Abstract: In Vertegaal 2017, it was argued that *plene spellings* (<CV-V> sign sequences) in Hieroglyphic Luwian can be divided into two types: space-fillers on the one hand, and non-fillers on the other. This article focuses on plene spellings of the latter kind, as attested in texts from the Iron Age (CHLI). It is demonstrated that these non-filler plene writings are non-randomly distributed across morphemes and lexemes, indicating that this mode of spelling marks a phonetic feature. Using secure etymologies and analyses, it is proposed that non-filler (“linguistically real”) plene spellings mark the presence of long vowels or disyllabic sequences. The validity of this hypothesis is subsequently tested against less secure and doubtful etymologies as well as counterexamples. Finally, it is concluded that the hypothesis holds, thereby providing, for the first time, direct evidence for the writing of vowel length in Hieroglyphic Luwian.

Keywords: Luwian, hieroglyphs, plene writing, orthography, historical phonology

1 Introduction

Hieroglyphic Luwian texts contain one or multiple horizontal lines, whose reading direction changes boustrophedonically with every line: after each line which is read left-to-right, the next one is to be read right-to-left and vice versa. The lines themselves are made up of multiple vertical ‘sign columns’, each containing around two to four signs which are read from top-to-bottom. The signs themselves fall broadly into one of two categories. On the one hand, there are logograms, which are transliterated with capitals and represent an underlying concept or word, e.g. DARE for *piya*- ‘to give’. Syllabograms, on the other hand, are used to spell out words phonetically and are transliterated using italics e.g. *pi-ia-ha* ‘I gave’. They mainly consist of combinations of a consonant and a vowel. In addition, there is also a special sign which indicates the word boundary (𐎶; incised variant: 𐎶⁺), transliterated as |. With very few exceptions, this sign is placed at the top of a sign column, indicating that the beginning of a new word regularly coincides with the beginning of a new sign column, cf. Figure 1 (p. 160).

Alexander J. J. Vertegaal, Leiden University; a.j.j.vertegaal@hum.leidenuniv.nl

DOI 10.1515/IF-2018-0007




Fig. 1: TELL AHMAR 5, lines 2–3; CHLI (part 3, plate 96)

This example shows another marked tendency found in Hieroglyphic Luwian texts, namely the use of all available space. There are hardly any substantial gaps in the texts, which is a feature common to all texts datable to the Iron Age.

On numerous occasions, we encounter a conspicuous phenomenon in the texts transmitted to us, whereby the vowel of a CV-sign is graphically doubled by a separate vowel sign, such as *-ta-a-*, *-mi-i-* and *-nu-u-*. This feature has been called *plene writing* in analogy to structurally similar graphic practices in the cuneiform languages. The presence of plene writing in Hieroglyphic Luwian has not attracted much scholarly attention over the years, although it is a common feature in nearly all texts of the Iron Age corpus. In addition, plene-spelled vowel signs often stand out for their appearance in places where they do not seem to have any linguistic significance. This is exemplified well by ASSUR letter e §23 *|sa-na-wa/i-zi-na-a* ‘good’ (acc.sg.c.), cf. Figure 2.¹




Fig. 2: ASSUR letter e §23 *|sa-na-wa/i-zi-na-a*; CHLI (part 3, plate 311)

¹ In this as well as every subsequent figure, the black arrow indicates the direction of reading.

As this word is an acc.sg.c., we expect it to end in /-n/, and simply the sign ⟨na⟩ 𐎠 would express this ending sufficiently. Following ⟨na⟩, however, the stonemason added ⟨a⟩ 𐎠, which cannot represent a real phonetic or phonological vowel (in which case we would have to read /-na/). For this reason, word-final ⟨a⟩ is generally interpreted as a space-filler, which serves no linguistic purpose but is merely employed to fill the remaining space below ⟨na⟩, ensuring that the scribe could start a new word at the beginning of a new sign column without leaving a gap. To mark its linguistic irrelevance, this ⟨a⟩ is commonly transliterated as ⟨'⟩, yielding the transliteration |sa-na-wa/i-zi-na-' we find in CHLI: 536.

As I have argued in Vertegaal 2017: 239–244, this use of plene vowel signs as space-fillers is not limited to the sign ⟨a⟩ and the MARAŞ and ASSUR subcorpora. In fact, it may account for hundreds of plene writings of not only ⟨a⟩, but also ⟨i⟩ and ⟨u⟩ in the entire Iron Age corpus. The use of ⟨i⟩ and ⟨u⟩ as space-fillers is exemplified by KARKAMIŞ A2+3 §24 |(DEUS)TONITRUS-tā-ti-i (DN; abl.-ins.sg.) and ANCOZ 7 §14 |ā-sa-tu-u 'be' (ipv.3pl.), cf. Figure 3.




Fig. 3: KARKAMIŞ A2+3 §24 |(DEUS)TONITRUS-tā-ti-i and ANCOZ 7 §14 |ā-sa-tu-u; CHLI (part 3, plates 21 and 186, respectively)

The ablative-instrumental ending /-adi/ of the first example and the 3sg./pl. imperative ending /-(n)tu/ of the second example both have cognates in other Anatolian languages, from which we can safely infer that they must have ended in short unaccented vowels. The signs ⟨ti⟩ and ⟨tu⟩ would be perfectly capable of expressing these vocalic values by themselves, leaving the plene ⟨i⟩ and ⟨u⟩ unexplainable in linguistic terms. However, since ⟨i⟩ and ⟨u⟩ seem to fill a gap at the bottom of their respective sign columns, I have argued in Vertegaal 2017: 239–244 that they were also used as space-fillers. In order to mark all three space-filling vowel signs in a uniform way, I have suggested transliterating them using superscript:

-^a, -ⁱ and -^u. For the three words treated thus far, this yields: |*sa-na-wa/i-zi-na*^a, |(DEUS)TONITRUS-*tâ-ti*ⁱ and |*á-sa-tu*^u.

In the same paper, however, it was argued that not all cases of plene writing can be explained through space-filling. Many plene spellings did not help the scribe to fill a space which he would otherwise have to leave unwritten. Good examples are the ⟨a⟩ in KARKAMIŠ A11c §33 *za-a-ti-ia-za* ‘this’ (dat.-loc.pl.); the ⟨i⟩ in BABYLON 1 §9 (DEUS)TONITRUS-*ti-i* (DN; dat.-loc.sg.); the ⟨u⟩ in SULTANHAN §26 *wa/i-tu-u* ‘he’ (encl.3sg.dat.-loc.), cf. Figure 4.




Fig. 4: KARKAMIŠ A11c §33 *za-a-ti-ia-za*, BABYLON 1 §9 (DEUS)TONITRUS-*ti-i* and SULTANHAN §26 *wa/i-tu-u*; CHLI (part 3, plates 17, 210 and 259, respectively)

In *za-a-ti-ia-za*, the ⟨a⟩ does not fill a specific gap at the end of a word. In fact, the scribe could have omitted ⟨a⟩ and written ⟨ti⟩ 𐎲 and ⟨ia⟩ 𐎠 on top of each other in a separate column, which would have been more space-efficient. In the second example, the logograms ⟨DEUS⟩ 𐎠 and ⟨TONITRUS⟩ 𐎲 and the phonetic sign ⟨ti⟩ 𐎲 form a separate sign column which neatly reaches the bottom of the line. The placement of ⟨i⟩ does not contribute to a more efficient use of available space and does not fill any impending gaps. Therefore, it must have been placed there for another reason than mere aesthetics. Lastly, the sign ⟨u⟩ 𐎠 in *wa/i-tu-u* is also clearly not written in order to close off a sign column. Rather, it opens up a new one and even causes the next word to start halfway down the second sign column, which clearly deviates from common Iron Age practice. This indicates that the ⟨u⟩ was not used as a space-filler here and that the scribe of SULTANHAN must have added it for another reason.

These three examples are far from unique: in Hawkins' corpus of Iron Age Hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions (CHLI), I have counted as many as 517 plene spellings which are not easily explainable as space-fillers. These 'non-filling' plene

spellings form the main focus of this study, which aims to provide a plausible account for their presence.²

2 Systematic contrast

Assuming that the 517 plene spellings mentioned above were not written out of a need for space-filling, the question that then arises is: why *were* they added? Two plausible hypotheses spring to mind. First, these plene spellings might serve some aesthetic function, perhaps as another mode of space-filling. Second, they could mark a linguistic feature: word accent, vocalic length, vowel nasality, *vel sim*.

We can evaluate these two hypotheses by looking at the lexical items in which these plene spellings are found. In the case of the first hypothesis, we would expect to find plene vowel signs embedded in or attached to a wide variety of morphemes or lexemes without any meaningful pattern; in that case, the presence of a non-filling plene spelling would then be independent of the phonetic or phonological shape of its host. In the other scenario, we would rather expect the opposite: the non-filling plene spellings would then be limited to a select group of morphemes or lexemes. Some elements would show consistent or at least frequent use of plene writing, while others would not show any at all. This would indicate that their non-filling plene writing marks a specific phonetic peculiarity of certain morphemes or lexemes that the scribe wanted to express. A short investigation into the spelling of certain HLuw. lexical items, chosen for their relatively frequent occurrence, yields the following results, cf. Table 1 (p. 164).³

² Note that under the current definition, plene writings in the middle of the word, like the *i* in SULTANHAN §21 DEUS-*ni-i-zi* ‘god’ (nom./acc.pl.) will be counted as non-filler plene writings, under the assumption that the scribe also could have written DEUS-*ni-zi-i*, with a sure space-filler, as attested in, e.g., KULULU 1 §13. Naturally, one may disagree with this and analyse both (i.e. word-internal and word-final) plene spellings as potential space-fillers. Extending the definition of space-fillers in this way allows for an easier explanation for the difficult data presented in Section 7. On the other hand, it also requires one to account for the coexistence of two space-filling techniques (i.e. word-final and word-internal space-filling). For this research, only data from CHLI has been taken into account. Plene spellings in Empire period texts and texts published after CHLI await their own treatment.

³ For a full list of all HLuw. non-filler plene spellings, I refer the reader to the appendix. Words whose phonological structure is obscured by logographic writing or damage to the inscription have been omitted from this count. Also emended or added words have been left out.

Table 1: Distribution of non-filling plene spellings and non-plene spellings

	Non-filling plene spellings	Non-plene spellings	Space-filling plene spellings
<i>á-mi-</i> ‘my’ (nom.+acc.c.)	22	46	0
<i>á-pa-</i> ‘that’	0	131	1
CUM- <i>ni</i> ‘with’	0	116	0
(DEUS) <i>ku-AVIS-pa-pa-</i> (DN)	0	29	0
<i>i-zi-</i> ‘to do’	53	5	2
<i>kwa/i-</i> ‘who, which’	54	88	0
<i>ni-</i> ‘not’	9	8	11
<i>tá-ti-</i> ‘father’; <i>tá-ti-ia-</i> ‘paternal’	0	50	0
<i>wa/i-ni-t^o</i> ‘stele’	0	19	0
<i>za-</i> ‘this’ (nom.+acc.c.)	30	74	1

The distribution is clear: some vowels, such as the second *i* in *i-zi-*, the vowel in *kwa/i-* and the *a* in *za-* show non-filling plene writing quite often, while other vowels such as the *a* in *tá-ti-* and the *i* in CUM-*ni* never show non-filling plene writing. This indicates that non-filling plene writing was apparently reserved for words of a particular phonetic structure. In other words: some vowels (second *-i-* in *i-zi-i-*, *-a-* in *za-a-*) carry a certain linguistic property which the scribes could express by using non-filling – henceforth: ‘linguistically real’ – plene spellings. Other vowels (*-i-* in CUM-*ni*, *-a-* in *á-pa-*) lacking this feature were never written as such.⁴ This indicates that linguistically real plene writing is not a random phenomenon.

4 A different approach to demonstrate this distribution has been taken by Kloekhorst (2016). Rather than starting with morphemes and looking whether they are spelled with plene writing or not, one can also collect all plene spellings and look at which morphemes they are used in. Thus, Kloekhorst found that the sign ⟨*zi*⟩ is found 679 times in CHLI. In 110 cases, the ⟨*zi*⟩ is spelled plene: ⟨*zi-i*⟩. Now, 41 of these plene spellings occur word-finally as part of the nom./acc.pl.c. endings *-Ca-zi-i/-Ci-zi-i*: in each of these cases, however, we can interpret the plene ⟨*i*⟩ as a space-filler: *-Ca-ziⁱ/-Ci-ziⁱ*. The remaining 69 linguistically real plene spellings are used exclusively in only three different stems: *i-zi-i-* ‘to do’ and its derivative *i-zi-i-sa-ta-* ‘to honour’ (61×); *zi-i-na* ‘this’ (abl.ins.; 7×) and (“OCCIDENS”) *á-pa-zi-i-ti* (1×) ‘?’. The same is true for the sign ⟨*za*⟩, which is found 1219 times in CHLI. If we discard non-plene spellings and potential space-fillers, we are left 54 secure instances of linguistically real plene ⟨*za-a*⟩ (Kloekhorst l. c.). It appears that these linguistically real plene spellings are found in only two lemmata: INFANS.NI.*za-a-sa* ‘child’, attested once (KARKAMIŠ A4a §1) in a quite damaged line, and *za-a-* ‘this’, accounting for the remaining 53 linguistically real plene spellings. These restrictions indicate that linguistically real plene writing was reserved for specific morphemes which, as a result, must have had a special linguistic property.

Rather, it contrasts with non-plene writing and marks a linguistic, presumably phonetic, property which is present in some, but certainly not in all words.⁵

At the same time, it should be noted that linguistically real plene writing in Hieroglyphic Luwian is not absolutely consistent: the lemmata *i-zi-i-* ‘to do’, *za-a-* ‘this’ and *kwa/i-a-/kwa/i-i-* ‘who, which’ all have non-plene variants *i-zi-* (5×), *za-* (74×) and *kwa/i-* (88×) next to them.⁶ While this does not invalidate the non-random contrast found above, it does mean that the absence of linguistically real plene writing in rarely attested words may well be due to chance. We cannot use it when considering rare words to prove that they did not possess the linguistic feature(s) denoted by linguistically real plene writing. Only the *presence* of linguistically real plene writing is immediately relevant for our interpretation of a morpheme’s phonetic value.⁷

Having established that non-filler plene writing must represent a linguistic feature, we may now ask ourselves what this feature is. To uncover this feature, we need to analyse and compare all words in which linguistically real plene spellings are found, in order to see whether they have anything in common. In what follows, I will consider all morphemes in which linguistically real plene spellings are found, classified into three groups of descending relevance and followed by a treatment of problematic cases.

First, I will discuss those morphemes whose phonological interpretation is (quite) secure, either because of language-internal considerations or because of

5 Note that this observation lowers the probability of the hypothesis that linguistically real plene writing was used to mark the word accent. Barring clitic elements, almost every HLuw. word seems to have been accented, while only a select number of words and morphemes show linguistically real plene writing.

6 The 53 linguistically real plene spellings of *i-zi-i-* ‘to do’ make up 88% of its 60 attestations (not counting attestations of the weak stem *i-zi-ia-* or spellings with the sign ⟨*zi/a*⟩). This percentage is much higher than those of linguistically plene spellings found in, for instance, *za-(a-)sa* (35%) and *za-(a-)na* (11%). It remains to be seen whether these differences carry any importance for the interpretation of these words’ phonetic and phonological structure.

7 In a certain way, this situation is reminiscent of HLuw. rhotacism, which is a phonetic change by which intervocalic lenis dental stops appear as *r* in Hieroglyphic Luwian, cf. KULULU 5 §11 *a+ra/i-tu* ‘eat’ (imp.3pl.act.) /*arantu/* for **adantu/* < PIE **h₂d-éntu* (Morpurgo Davies 1982–1983: 250 fn. 16). However, not every lenis dental is spelled with rhotacism, and sometimes we find rhotacised forms next to non-rhotacised forms in the same text. For example, BULGARMADEN §13 contains the verbal form *ha+ra/i-ri+i* ‘smash’ (3sg.pres.act.; /-ri/), which is the rhotacised variant of **ha+ra/i-ti* (/di/). Two lines later, we come across BULGARMADEN §15 *ha+ra/i-tu* ‘id.’ (ipv.3sg.act.). This form is built on the same stem and must therefore also have had a lenis dental in its ending: /-du/. This /-du/, however, has not been rhotacised to /-ru/ (***ha+ra/i-ru*). For this reason, we cannot use one attestation without rhotacism to argue that the lemma itself was never rhotacised.

the presence of good cognates and strong etymologies. These examples allow us to pinpoint the function of linguistically real plene writing as precisely as possible and to formulate a working hypothesis.

The second group contains morphemes whose phonological interpretations and etymologies are less secure. Strictly speaking, we cannot use these examples as further evidence or counterevidence to the hypothesis stated in the previous section. At best, they can be used to make the hypothesis more or less plausible.

Thirdly, there are morphemes whose interpretations and etymologies are doubtful or downright unknown. They are too unreliable to play any significant role in determining the function of linguistically real plene writing, which renders them only tangentially relevant for the present discussion.

3 Group I: etymologically clear words

3.1 *za-a-sa* and *za-a-na* ‘this’

I will start my investigation of the linguistically real plene material with one of the lexemes that most often show plene writing in Hawkins’ Iron Age corpus: the proximal deictic pronoun *za-(a-)* ‘this’: (51×). Etymologically, we can compare this word to its cognates CLuw. *za-(a-)*, Hitt. *ka-a-* and perhaps also Pal. *ka-a-* ‘id.’, all of which continue PIE **kó-* ‘this’. The singular direct cases of their paradigms are given in Table 2.⁸

Table 2: Reflexes of PIE **kó-* ‘this’ in the Anatolian languages (direct singular cases)

	(Old) Hitt.	Pal.	HLuw.	CLuw.	PLuw.
nom.sg.c.	<i>ka-a-aš</i>	–	<i>za-a-sa</i> (8×), <i>za-sa</i> (15×) ⁹	<i>za-a-aš</i> (7×), <i>za-aš</i> (9×)	*/tsās/
acc.sg.c.	<i>ku-u-un</i>	–	<i>za-a-na</i> (6×), <i>za-na</i> (38×)	<i>za-am(=pa)</i> (2×)	*/tsán/
nom.-acc.sg.n.	(<i>ki-i</i>)	<i>ka-a-at(-)</i>	<i>za-a</i> (7×), ¹⁰ <i>za</i> (63×)	<i>za-a</i> (1×)	*/tsā/
nom.-acc.pl.n.	(<i>ke-e</i>)	–	<i>za-a-ia</i> (1×), <i>za-ia</i> (32×)	<i>za-a</i> (9×)	*/tsā/

⁸ The remarkable dative singular *za-(a-)ti* and the ablative-instrumental form *zi-(i-)na* are treated in Sections 7.1 and 6.3, respectively. The adverb *za-a-ti* ‘thus, here’, as well as the other (plural/oblique) case-forms of *za-(a-)*, are treated in Section 6.6.

By virtue of their plene spellings, Hittite *ka-a-aš* and CLuw. *za-(a)aš* are synchronically analysed as /kâs/ and /tsâs/ respectively, with a long accented vowel (Melchert 1994: 264; Kloekhorst 2008: s. v. *kā-/kū-/kī-*). It is generally assumed that the vowel of their preform, PIE **kó-*, was regularly lengthened in Proto-Anatolian (Kloekhorst 2014: 583f.; Melchert 2015a: 3f. “in closed syllables”). This same PANat. **kó-* is assumed to be the basis of the accusatives Hitt. *ku-u-un* /kôn/ (Kloekhorst 2008: 54f.; Melchert *ibid.*) and CLuw. *za-am(=pa)*, HLuw. *za-a-na* /tsân/ (Melchert 1994: 264). The CLuw./HLuw. and Pal. neuter singular forms must also go back to PIE **kó-*, and it is assumed that these represent /tsâ/ (Melchert 1994: 278) and /kâ-/ (Melchert 1994: 210), respectively. In these forms, plene ⟨(z)a-a⟩ in the Hieroglyphic Luwian forms therefore represents an underlying long accented vowel /â/.

3.2 *ni-i* ‘not’

Next, we have the prohibitive negation *ni-i* (also spelled *nī-i*) ‘not!’. In CHLI, it is attested nine times with linguistically real plene writing. Apart from this, we find 11 instances of ambiguous ⟨ni-i⟩ and ⟨nī-i⟩ (cf. fn. 10). Lastly, there are eight non-plene spellings: *nī*, *nī*. We also find HLuw. *nī-i-sá* with linguistically real plene spelling (against once non-plene *ni-sa*). Both variants are cognate with CLuw. *nī-iš* (18×), *nī-i-š°* (3×), *nī-i-iš* (5×), *ne-iš* (1×) and Palaic *nī-i* (1×).

All these cognate forms are commonly interpreted as having a long accented vowel /ī/ (Melchert 2003: 206; Kloekhorst 2008: s. v. *natta*), and again we see that, in Hieroglyphic Luwian, linguistically real plene writing corresponds to an underlying long accented vowel.

3.3 *pa+ra/i-i* ‘before’

Third on our list is the adverb *pa+ra/i-i* ‘before’, written securely with linguistically real plene ⟨i⟩ once: KARKAMIŠ A1a §16 *pa+ra/i-i^a*.¹¹ Notably, we never find

⁹ It is noteworthy that nine out of 15 attestations of non-plene *za-sa* (nom.sg.c.) stem from one and the same text: KARKAMIŠ A7.

¹⁰ This number does not include 12 attestations of *za-a* whose final ⟨a⟩ is ambiguous. This means that we cannot decide on the basis of its placement in the inscription whether we should take it as a space-filler or a linguistically real plene vowel. I would transliterate such cases as space-fillers (i.e. *za^a*) as per Vertegaal 2017.

¹¹ The ⟨i⟩ in this word represents a linguistically real plene vowel (which cannot be interpreted as a space-filler) and therefore I transliterate it using a full-size letter. The ⟨a⟩, on the other hand, can be taken as a space-filling vowel sign and is therefore transliterated using superscript.

non-plene *****pa+ra/i*** in the entire CHLI.¹² In addition, there are 14 attestations of **PRAE-*i***, whose interpretation and utility are unclear: the word-final (i) in these cases might well have been intended as linguistically real plene, but there is no way we can exclude their use as space-fillers at the end of a sign column. Direct cognates to this adverb are CLuw. *pa-ri-i* and Lyc. *pri* ‘forth’, but also connected are Hitt. *pa-ra-a* /prā/ ‘forth’ and Hitt. *pé-(e-)ra-an* ‘before, in front of’ ~ HLuw. *pa+ra/i-na* ‘id.’ ~ CLuw. *pâr-ra-(a-)an* ‘id.’ (prev., postpos.). These forms can be understood as lexicalised case forms of an ablauting paradigm ****pér-/pr-***, from which HLuw. *pa+ra/i-i*, CLuw. *pa-ri-i* and Lyc. *pri* continue the dative ****pr-éi***. We may therefore interpret HLuw. *pa+ra/i-i* as /prí/ (Melchert 1994: 248). Its spelling with linguistically real plene (i) reflects a long accented /í/.

3.4 LITUUS+*na-a-* ‘to see’

In TELL AHMAR 1 §11, we find a 3sg.pret.act. form of the verbal stem LITUUS+*na-(a-)* (attested 16 times as non-plene). This form is read as LITUUS+*na-tâ-a* by CHLI and ACLT, but a closer inspection of the placement of the signs on Hawkins’ hand-copy (CHLI [part 3, plate 100]) suggests otherwise, cf. Figure 5.




Fig. 5: TELL AHMAR 1 §11 LITUUS+*na-a-tâ*; CHLI (part 3, plate 100)

Admittedly, the order of the signs is quite messy here, with the last ⟨na⟩ 𒀭 of SUB-*na-na* ‘under’ written under the following LITUUS+*na-* 𒀭. However, the placement of ⟨a⟩ and ⟨tâ⟩ 𒀭 leaves no room for doubt: we should read LITUUS-*na-a-tâ* rather

¹² The context of TELL AHMAR 1 §5 *pa+ra/i* is severely damaged. The ligature *pa+ra/i* is found underneath the sign SUPER+*ra/i* which means that the scribe would have started writing this new word in the middle of the sign column. While this is not impossible (cf. the same text, §13 *zi-la*), it runs counter to the general trend of starting new words at the top of a sign column. Therefore, I exclude it from the present discussion.

than LITUUS-*na-tà-a*. The linguistically real plene spelling <-(n)a-a> finds a sound parallel in its Cuneiform Luwian cognate *ma-na-a* ‘to see’, whose paradigm shows lenis endings throughout (Morpurgo Davies 1982–1983: 257). Traditionally, the stem is analysed as /mnā-/ , based on the reconstruction of Starke (1980: 142ff.,) who traced it back to PIE **mneh₂*- (cf. Gr. μμνήσκω ‘to remind [oneself]’). This etymology is followed by Kimball (1999: 264), Kloekhorst (2014: 549) and Melchert (2015b: 161 fn. 6). Yet again, linguistically real plene spelling in Hieroglyphic Luwian corresponds to a long accented vowel.

3.5 Denominal verbs: “AUDIRE+MI”-*ti-i*- ‘to hear’ & (“COR”)za+ra/i-*ti-i*- ‘to desire’¹³

The verb ‘to hear’ is spelled with linguistically real plene writing four times in CHLI: TELL AHMAR 1 §25 “AUDIRE+MI”-*ti-i-tá* (3sg.pret.act.); KARKAMIŠ A6 §4, §5, §6 AUDIRE+MI-*ti-i-ta* (3pl.pret.act.). In addition, there are three non-plene attestations.¹⁴ This verb is commonly interpreted as a derivation from the word for ‘ear’, attested in CLuw. as *tumman(t)*-, with the PIE thematic verbal suffix **-iē/ó-* (Melchert 1993: 6). The same suffix features in the etymology of another denominal verbal stem: (“COR”)za+ra/i-*ti-i*- ‘to desire’. This verb is derived from the word for ‘heart’ (CLuw. *za-a-ar-za* /tsārd=sa/) and attested with linguistically real plene writing in TELL AHMAR 1 §20 ([^l“COR^l”])z[a]+ra-*ti-i-ta* (3sg.pret.act.). On four occasions, we find this word spelled with non-plene writing, e.g. KARABURUN §7 za+ra/i-*ti-ti*ⁱ.

In both verbs, the spellings of their 3sg.pret.act. ending with the signs <ta> and <tá> betray that the ending contained a fortis dental stop (/ta/) which did not undergo Proto-Anatolian lenition. This corroborates the commonly reconstructed preform for this ending, Panat. **-/iēto/*, where lenition is not expected. The question now is how this Proto-Anatolian **-/iēto/* developed to the Hieroglyphic Luwian form. It is generally assumed that the **é* was coloured to *i* by the *i* that immedi-

¹³ It is unclear whether (“LONGUS”)ia+ra/i-*i*- ‘to extend’ belongs to this class or to the ‘*i*-zi-*i*-class’ (cf. Section 5.1), whose strong and weak stems also end in *-i*- and *-ia*-, respectively. Its two linguistically real plene attestations KARKAMIŠ A15b §17 (“LONGUS”)ia+ra/i-*i-ha* (1sg.pret.act.) and TELL TAYINAT l. 2 frag. 1a (“LONGUS”)ia+ra/i-*i-tá* (3pl.pret.act.) can be explained in both cases.

¹⁴ Scil. BABYLON 2 §3 AUDIRE-*ti-ta* (3sg.pret.act.), KARKAMIŠ A27ff2 AUDIRE+MI-*t*[a...] (3sg./pl.pret.act.) and KARKAMIŠ A31 §14 AUDIRE+MI-*ti-ti* (3sg.pres.act.).

ately preceded it (Melchert 1994: 262). Thus PLuw. */ie/ > */ii/.¹⁵ It is likely that the linguistically real plene in HLuw. represents this original disyllabic sequence: /tummantiíta/. However, we cannot exclude that at some stage in pre-HLuw., this was contracted to /-î-/ or perhaps even /-i-/ . Thus, in these two verbs, the linguistically real plene spelling may in principle represent disyllabic /-ii-/ , long accented /-î-/ or short accented /-i-/ (but cf. Section 4).

The Cuneiform Luwian attestation 3sg.pret.act. *tu-um-ma-an-te-it-ta* ‘to hear’, which is commonly taken as a direct cognate of HLuw. AUDIRE+MI-ti-i-ta, may also have contained either a disyllabic sequence /-ii-/ or short accented /-i-/ . If the consistent absence of plene writing in the CLuw. spelling of this suffix is significant, it may suggest that an interpretation /-î-/ is unlikely for Cuneiform Luwian. Note, however, that this need not disprove a long accented /-î-/ for Hieroglyphic Luwian.

3.6 DELERE-*nu-u-na* ‘destroy’

Lastly, we turn to DELERE-*nu-u-na* ‘destroy’ (BABYLON 1 §15), an infinitive in /-una/ (Melchert 2003: 194). Apart from CLuw. *pa-aš-šu-u-na* ‘swallow’ (attested once, KUB XXIV 7 iii 31), this is the only infinitive spelled with linguistically real plene writing in both Luwian languages. The verbal stem underlying DELERE-*nu-u-na* is most probably /marnu-/, a *nu*-causative added to the root **mer*- ‘to disappear’ (CHLI: 154; Kloekhorst 2008: s.v. *mer*-). When the infinitive ending was added to the bare stem, the result must initially have been /marnuuna/, with a disyllabic sequence. This sequence may have been preserved as such in Hieroglyphic Luwian, or it could have been contracted to a long vowel (/marnūna/). Therefore, in this word too, Hieroglyphic Luwian linguistically real plene writing is used to represent either a disyllabic sequence [uu] or a long vowel [u:]. Unfortunately, it is not possible to recover the place of the accent in this form.

4 Setting up a working hypothesis

The examples treated in Section 3 show that linguistically real plene writing corresponds to a variety of different vowels. It is important to note that cases such as HLuw. *za-a-sa* ‘this’, where linguistically real plene writing corresponds to a

¹⁵ This colouring is also found in the outcome of PIE **ǵ^(h)e-*, which develops into PLuw. **i-* through phonetic *[ji-] < *[je-], cf. HLuw. (MANUS)*i-sà-tara/i-*, CLuw. *i-iš-ša-ra/i-*, Lyc. *izre(i)-* ‘hand’ < PIE **ǵ^hés-r-*.

long accented vowel, do not necessarily imply that linguistically real plene writing marks a combination of *both* vocalic length and the accent. It is also possible that linguistically real plene writing was used to mark either of these features. For instance, the scribe may have wanted to mark only that the / \acute{a} / was accented. The fact that it also was long may then simply be coincidental. Therefore, we must allow for two more possible functions of linguistically real plene writing: it may have marked simply an accented vowel / \acute{V} / or a long vowel / \tilde{V} /. All possible interpretations of linguistically real plene writing, based on the examples in Section 3, cf. Table 3.

Table 3: Possible interpretations of linguistically real plene spelling

		Possible interpretations			
		/ \acute{V} /	/ \tilde{V} /	/ \tilde{V} /	/VV/
Linguistically real plene spellings	<i>za-a-</i>	X	X	X	
	<i>ni-i</i>	X	X	X	
	<i>pa+ra/i-i</i>	X	X	X	
	LITUUS- <i>na-a-</i>	X	X	X	
	AUDIRE+ <i>MI-ti-i-</i>	X	X	X	X
	(“COR”) <i>za+ra/i-ti-i-</i>	X	X	X	X
	DELERE- <i>nu-u-na</i>	?	?	X	X

We could take from this list that in all good examples, Hieroglyphic Luwian linguistically real plene writing corresponds to a long accented vowel / \acute{V} /, and conclude that its function may well have been to mark a combination of both vocalic length and the accent. However, there are two other pieces of data that allow us to get a more precise picture. The etymological accounts of these examples (Sections 4.1 and 4.2) are unfortunately relatively uncertain, but nevertheless allow us to draw interesting conclusions about the phonetic interpretation of linguistically real plene writing.

4.1 Ablauting verbal suffix *-i/-ai-*

First, there are the verbal stems belonging to the *-i/-ai-*-class, cf. CLuw. *du-ú-pí-ti/du-pa-in-ti* = Lyc. *tubidi/tubeiti* ‘to strike’. This class of verbs is easily recognised by the characteristic ablaut in its stem: the weak stem ends in *-ai-*, while the strong stem shows a final *-i-*, which is occasionally spelled with plene writing in Cuneiform Luwian, cf. 3sg.pret. *tar-ši-i-ta* ‘?’, 1sg.pret. *la-ḫu-ni-i-ḫa* ‘to wash’. In addition, the strong stem shows lenited verbal endings,

which are the result of Proto-Anatolian lenition.¹⁶ There are four HLuw. verbs belonging to the *-i/-ai-* verbal class which show linguistically real plene (i) in their strong stem, as presented in the following list:

1. (*274)*ha-ta-li-i-* ‘to speak’: KARATEPE 1 Hu. §28 (*274)*ha-ta-li-i-ha*, MARAŞ 4 §2 ‘(*274)ʹ[*ha*]-*ta-li-i-ha* (pret.1sg.act.). Attested weak stem forms such as (*274)*ha-ta-la-i-ta* (pret.3pl.act.) confirm that this word belongs to the *-i/-ai-* class;
2. (LIBARE)*sa₅+ra/i-li-i-* ‘to offer’: KARKAMIŞ A1a §31 (LIBARE)*sa₅+ra/i-li-i-tú* (ipv.3sg.act.). The lenis ending in TELL TAYINAT 1 fr. 2 (LIBARE)ʹ*sa₅+ra/i-li-tà* (pret.3sg.act.) and the weak stem in (LIBARE)*sa₅+ra/i-la-i-ti* (pres.3pl.act.) show that the stem ends in *-i/-ai-*;
3. (SA₄)*sa-ni-i-* ‘to overturn, to remove’: ERKILET 2.2 *sa-ni-i-ti* (pres.3sg.act.). The weak stem is attested in HLuw. KARKAMIŞ A1a §4 (SA₄)*sá-na-i-ta* and CLuw. *ša-an-na-i-in-du*;
4. (PES₂.PES)*tara/i-pi-i-* ‘to attack, to plough’: KARKAMIŞ A2+3 §15 (“PES₂.PES”) *tara/i-pi-i-tu* (ipv.3pl.act.). The weak stem with *-ai-* is found in KARKAMIŞ A16a §7 |PES₂.PES-*pa-i-tu^u* (id.).

The *-i/-ai-* verbal suffix has been traced back to PIE **-eie/o-* by Melchert (1997: 134ff.) who proposes that **-eie-* developed into “**-eyi-*, whence contraction to **-ey-* and then regularly Luvo-Lycian (long) *-ī-*”. However, as Melchert himself points out, a preform 3sg. **-eie-ti* would not give the lenited endings we see in Luwian and Lycian. Therefore, he assumes that already in Proto-Anatolian, the accent was analogically retracted from the suffix to the root: **CVC-eiēti* >> **CVC-ēieti*. This, in turn, would lead to PLuw. **CVC-īdi* through regular phonetic development. At the same time, however, Melchert (ibid.) cites CLuw. *du-ú-pí-ti/du-pa-in-ti* whose plene writing compels him to reconstruct root accent: **CVC-eietī*. Synchronically, we therefore seem to have two accentual patterns for this class of verbs, which, when applied to the four HLuw. verbs treated above, yield the following possible phonological interpretations:

- /h(a)t(a)lí-/ , /sralí-/ , /s(a)ní-/ , /t(a)r(a)pí-/ (suffixal accent);
- /hát(a)lí-/ or /h(a)táli-/ , /sráli-/ , /sání-/ , /t(a)rápí-/ or /tár(a)pí-/ (radical accent).

¹⁶ In CLuw., lenis stops were written with singleton consonants: ⟨°V-ti⟩, not ⟨°V-Vt-ti⟩, while in Lycian, the difference was represented by using different signs: fortis ⟨t⟩ vs. lenis ⟨d⟩. In the HLuw. verbal system, lenis stops are only distinguishable in the 3sg. verbal endings. In the preterite, the lenis ending is spelled with the sign ⟨tà⟩ whereas the fortis ending is exclusively spelled using ⟨ta⟩ or ⟨tá⟩ (Rieken 2008). Lenis stops may also appear rhotacised, yielding pres.act. /-ri/, pret.act. /-ra/ etc.

Both analyses would satisfy the conditions for lenition of the verbal endings. Note, however, that interpretations involving a short accented stem-final vowel (i.e. ****/h(a)t(a)lí-/**, ****/sralí-/**, ****/s(a)ní-/**, ****/t(a)r(a)pí-/**) run into trouble: a short accented vowel does not trigger lenition. Therefore, the linguistically real plane spellings in the strong stem of these words cannot have been used to denote a short accented vowel / \acute{V} /. We may therefore strike this possibility from our list of hypotheses, leaving us with three possible interpretations for HLuw. linguistically real plane writing, cf. Table 4.

Table 4: Possible interpretations of linguistically real plane spelling

		Possible interpretations		
		/ \acute{V} /	/ \tilde{V} /	/VV/
Linguistically real plane spellings	<i>za-a-</i>	X	X	
	<i>ni-i</i>	X	X	
	<i>pa+ra/i-i</i>	X	X	
	LITUUS- <i>na-a-</i>	X	X	
	AUDIRE+ <i>MI-ti-i-</i>	X	X	X
	(“COR”) <i>za+ra/i-ti-i-</i>	X	X	X
	DELERE- <i>nu-u-na</i>	?	X	X
	(*274) <i>ha-ta-li-i-</i>	X	X	
	(LIBARE) <i>sa₅+ra/i-li-i-</i>	X	X	
	(SA ₆) <i>sa-ni-i-</i>	X	X	
	(PES ₂ .PES) <i>tara/i-pi-i-</i>	X	X	

4.2 Enclitic 3sg. =*tu-u*/=*tú-u* (dat.-loc.)

One final refinement can be made by looking at the sentence-initial clitic 3sg.dat.-loc. =*du* ‘he/she/it’, which is securely spelled with linguistically real plane seven times: <=*tu-u*> or <=*tú-u*>. We have already seen one attestation of these spellings in Section 1 (cf. Figure 4), where we cannot explain the plane vowel in terms of space-filling. A further 25 attestations of <=*tu-u*> or <=*tú-u*> are ambiguous: their plane vowel can be regarded as a space-filler or a linguistically real plane spelling.¹⁷ Lastly, 86 cases are written non-plane <=*tu*> or <=*tú*>. HLuw. =*du* has cognates in

¹⁷ As per Vertegaal 2017: 247, these examples will be interpreted as (potential) space-fillers by default, to avoid falsely interpreting them as linguistically real plane spellings.

CLuw. =*du* ‘for him’ (56×)¹⁸ and Palaic =*du* (5×), which are never spelled with plene writing (Carruba 1970: 44).

Melchert (1994: 37) has argued that “it is also clear from spellings like *-tu-u* for the **enclitic** ‘(to) him’ that ‘scriptio plena’ in hieroglyphic spellings has an aesthetic function and does not mark length or accent” (emphasis in original). Indeed, it is a defining characteristic of clitics that they “are inherently without stress of their own” (Spencer & Luís 2012: 75). This makes it highly unlikely that =*du* was ever accented.¹⁹ Thus, we should dismiss the possibility that plene writing in these forms marks a long accented vowel (\tilde{V}). Instead, it is worth considering that the vowel may have been long and *unaccented*: /= $\text{d}\ddot{u}$ /. From a typological point of view, long (unaccented) vowels are certainly not barred from appearing in clitics, cf. Gr. $\pi\omega\varsigma$ ‘somehow’ and the pronominal clitics *mě* (1sg.acc.-gen.), *tě* (2sg.acc.-gen.), *nás* (1pl.acc.-gen.) and *vás* (2pl.acc.-gen.) in Czech.

Crucially, the interpretation of <=*tu-u*>/<=*tú-u*> as /= $\text{d}\ddot{u}$ /, with a long vowel, finds independent support from inner-Luwian evidence. Its corresponding sentence-initial clitic pronoun of the 1st person, /=*mu*/ ‘me’, drops its vowel when followed by clitics starting with a vowel other than *u* (Plöchl 2003: 64). For instance:

- (1) *wa/i-ma-tà^a |PRAE-na (PES₂)hwa/i-ia-ta*
 ‘They [the gods] marched before me.’ KARKAMIŠ A11b+c §11; CHLI: 103

In example (1), *wa/i-ma-tà^a* should be analysed as *wa=m(u)=ada*, that is, as a combination of =*wa* (quotative particle), =*mu* (1sg.acc.-dat.) and =*ada* (3pl.nom.c.). Notably, 3sg. =*du* behaves differently, cf.:

- (2) (‘(That) which I shall present to my brother in goodness,’)
|ARHA-pa-wa/i-tú-wa/i-tà-ta |kwa/i-sa |tà-i
 ‘whoever shall take it away from him’ ALEPPO 2 §18; CHLI: 236

The clitic chain starting after *ARHA* ‘away’ is =*pa=wa=du=ada=ta*, combining =*pa*= ‘but’ + =*wa*= (quotative particle) + =*du*= (3sg.dat.) + =*ada*= (nom.-acc.sg.n.) + =*ta* (locative particle).²⁰ The vowel of =*du* is clearly not elided here, as it is kept

¹⁸ This number is based on the attestations listed in Melchert’s *Cuneiform Luwian Lexicon* (1993). Interestingly, 55 of these are spelled with the sign DU; only one is written with TU.

¹⁹ It is true that clitics may become accented in some cases (cf. Spencer & Luís 2012 for examples from Bulgarian [83], Macedonian [89] and Modern Greek [91]), but these result from secondary stress. In these situations, stress is not an inherent feature of the clitic itself, so it is applied indiscriminately to multiple hosts. This is not the situation in HLuw., where we never find linguistically real plene spelling in such highly frequent clitics as =*ha* ‘and’, =*pa* ‘but’, etc. Rather, it seems limited to =*du* (3sg.dat.-loc.) and =*du* (2sg.dat.-loc., cf. Section 6.7).

²⁰ This interpretation of clitic chain-final /=*ata*/ as a combination of =*ada*= (nom.-acc.sg.n.) and =*ta* (locative particle) has been proposed by Rieken (2008: 641).

separate from the following =*ada*= with a glide: ⟨wa/i⟩. These different behaviours of =*mu* and =*du* are difficult to understand if both end in a short unaccented /u/. By taking the vowel of =*du* as long (and unaccented), we are able to account for this different treatment.²¹ Unfortunately, there are no generally accepted reconstructed Proto-Anatolian pre-forms for =*du* we can use to support or refute our hypothesis by tracing the expected phonetic developments.²²

Returning to our list of possible functions of linguistically real plene writing, we see that =*du* effectively rules out the possibility that the Luwian scribes used plene writing to represent both vocalic length and the accent / \acute{V} /. Two options are left, cf. Table 5.

Table 5: Possible interpretations of linguistically real plene spelling

		Possible interpretations	
		/ \acute{V} /	/VV/
Linguistically real plene spellings	<i>za-a-</i>	X	
	<i>ni-i</i>	X	
	<i>pa+ra/i-i</i>	X	
	LITUUS- <i>na-a-</i>	X	
	AUDIRE+ <i>MI-ti-i-</i>	X	X
	(“COR”) <i>za+ra/i-ti-i-</i>	X	X
	DELERE- <i>nu-u-na</i>	X	X
	(*274) <i>ha-ta-li-i-</i>	X	
	(LIBARE) <i>sa₅+ra/i-li-i-</i>	X	
	(SA ₆) <i>sa-ni-i-</i>	X	
	(PES ₂ , PES) <i>tara/i-pi-i-</i>	X	
	<i>tu-u/tú-u</i>	X	

²¹ This situation is reminiscent of Greek verse, where word-final vowels are elided only if they are short (Smyth 1956: 18). The (long vowel) of δῆ, for instance, is never elided in front of vowel-initial words, cf. Hom. *Il.* 4.180 καὶ δὴ ἔβη οἶκον δὲ φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν (although it does fall prey to epic correption). The short vowel of δέ, on the other hand, regularly disappears before words starting with a vowel, e.g. three times in Hom. *Il.* 1.199: θάμβησεν δ’ Ἀχιλεὺς, μετὰ δ’ ἐτράπετ’, αὐτίκα δ’ ἔγνω. By taking the vowel of HLuw. =*du* as long, we can explain the non-elision of its vowel in a similar way.

²² One anonymous reviewer suggests that we can explain the presence of a long vowel in =*du* ‘him’ (3sg.dat.-loc.) as the result of analogical processes. To her/his mind, the long vowel in the second-person orthotonic pronoun /tú/ ‘you’ (cf. Section 5.4) was taken over by its enclitic counterpart and yielded /=dū/ ‘you’ (dat.-acc.; cf. Section 6.7). As described in Yakubovich 2010: 171, this form eventually replaced the inherited third-person clitic, which therefore appears as /=dū/ with a long vowel in our Hieroglyphic texts.

As a working hypothesis, I therefore conclude that **linguistically real plene writing in Hieroglyphic Luwian was primarily used to mark a long vowel. In addition, it could also mark a disyllabic sequence.**²³ In many words, such as *za-a-sa* ‘this’ (nom.sg.c.), a long vowel happens to coincide with the word accent. However, I would argue that the presence of the accent had no bearing on the scribes’ choice to add a plene vowel.

5 Group II: words with less secure etymologies

We now turn to words and morphemes whose synchronic phonological analysis is still under debate. At best, they are compatible with the hypothesis that linguistically real plene writing marks vocalic length, yet they cannot really support it in any definite sense. On the other hand, the examples in this section are not secure enough to disprove the thesis that linguistically real plene writing marks vocalic length.

5.1 *i-zi-i-* ‘to do, make’

The verbal stem *i-zi-(i-)* ‘to do, make’ is very common in Hieroglyphic Luwian. It is securely spelled with linguistically real plene writing 53 times, as opposed to only five non-plene spellings.²⁴ In addition, there are various derivations from this stem which are also commonly written with linguistically real plene spellings, as follows:

²³ To some, it may seem a little awkward that one graphic device would have been employed to represent two phonetically distinct sequences. In this respect, it is interesting to consider the matter from the viewpoint of moraic phonology. Mora theory assigns weight units (‘morae’) to syllabic segments, which determine the weight of the syllable. Syllables of a CV structure are assigned one mora and they are taken as light. Syllables with a structure C \bar{V} , on the other hand, are treated as CV-V, with two morae, and are subsequently taken as heavy (Hyman 1985: 9f.). In terms of phonological weight, long vowels and disyllabic sequences are equivalent, both consisting of two morae.

²⁴ These are: KÖTÜKALE §6 *i-zi-ti* (3sg.pres.act.), KÖTÜKALE §3 *i-zi-[ha]* (1sg.pret.act.), İSPEKÇÜR §4 *i-zi-ha* (id.), KARATEPE 1 §18 Ho. *i-zi-tà* (3sg.pret.act.) and KARATEPE 1 §67 Hu. *i-zi-lá/i* (id.).

1. *i-zi-i-sa-t(a)-* ‘to honour’:
 - (a) KULULU 4 §12 *i-zi-i-sa-ta-ha* (1sg.pret.act.);
 - (b) KARKAMIŠ A1a §34, KARKAMIŠ A1b §2 & §3 *i-zi-i-sa-ta-i* (3sg.pres.act.);
 - (c) KARKAMIŠ A17b §3 *i-zi-i-sa-ta-tú^u* (ipv.3sg.act.);
 - (d) KARATEPE 1 §48 Ho. *i-zi-i-sa-tú-na* (inf.; its parallel KARATEPE 1 §48 Hu. has non-plene *i-zi-sa-tú-na*);
2. KARKAMIŠ A6 §15 & §17 *i-zi-i-sa-ta+ra/i(=wa/i=ma-za)* ‘honour’ (abl.-ins.);
3. MALPINAR §10 *i-zi-i-ia-t[i²-z]a²*, §14 *i-z[i]-i-ti-i-za* ‘performance’ (nom.-acc.sg.n.);
4. MARAŞ 14 §7 *i-zi-i-ia-tara/i-za^a* ‘performance, ritual’ (nom.-acc.sg.n.).

The verbal stem *i-zi-i-* is followed by lenited (and rhotacised) verbal endings, e.g. TELL AHMAR 1 §16 *i-zi-i-tà* (3sg.pret.act.), KULULU 5 §4 *i-zi-i-ri+i* (3sg.pres.act.). For this reason, Rieken (2007: 273) has reconstructed the proto-form of this stem as **Hīg-ie-*, with a secondary accent retraction from older **Hīg-ié-*. Kloekhorst (2016) notes that, while PIE **Hīg-ie-* would indeed yield lenited verbal endings, it leaves the near-consistent plene writing of the strong stem unexplained. He therefore reconstructs the stem as **Hīg-éi-/Hīg-i-*, exactly on account of its near-consistent plene writing and its inflectional similarities to CLuw. *ī-/i-* ‘to go’ (also with lenis endings).²⁵ However, since this reconstruction is based on the assumption that linguistically real plene writing marks vocalic length, it would be circular to use this verb as an argument in favour of this assumption. Nevertheless, it should be noted that the hypothesis of linguistically real plene vowels marking vocalic length does not create any serious problems for the interpretation of this verb.

5.2 *á-wa/i-i-* ‘to come’

The HLuw. verbal stem (PES)*á-wa/i-i-* ‘to come’ is found spelled with linguistically real plene writing on six occasions, while its non-plene variant (PES)*á-wa/i-* occurs 18 times.²⁶ Both the HLuw. form and its CLuw. cognate *a-ú-i-* ‘id.’ show lenis endings, e.g. HLuw. ISKENDERUN §2 (“PES”) *á-wa/i-tà* (3sg.pret.act.; with (tà)) ~ CLuw. *a-ú-i-ta* with single spelling of the *t* (Morpurgo Davies 1982–1983: 257). This verbal stem is usually interpreted as comprising a preverb meaning ‘hither’ + PIE **h₁éi-/h₁i-* ‘to go’. Melchert (1994: 66) argues that Cuneiform Luwian must have generalised the strong

²⁵ **Hīg-éi-/Hīg-i-* would be an athematic *i*-present, as is known from Skt. *kṣéti/kṣiyánti* < PIE **tk₁-éi-/tk₁-i-*, cf. LIV²: s. v. **tk₁éj-*.

²⁶ The linguistically real plene attestations are KULULU 1 §13 *á-wa/i-i-tu* (ipv.3pl.pres.); KARKAMIŠ A1a §17 PES-*wa/i-i-ha-á* (1sg.pret.), §21 & §24 PES-*wa/i-i-ha* (1sg.pret.); KARKAMIŠ A11b §14 PES-*wa/i-i-ha*; TELL AHMAR 2 §21 PES-*wa/i-i-ti* (3pl.(?)pres.) and GAZIANTEP 1. 2 PES-*wa/i-i-tiⁱ*.

stem $*h_1\acute{e}i-$, which regularly develops into PLuw. $*\acute{i}/$.²⁷ If Melchert's interpretation of CLuw. $a-\acute{u}-i-$ also holds for its cognate HLuw. (PES) $\acute{a}-wa/i-i-$, then the latter's linguistically real plene spelling would reflect a long vowel. This would fit our working hypothesis that linguistically real plene spelling marks vocalic length.

5.3 (DEUS)TONITRUS-*hu-ti-i* (DN)

The dat.-loc.sg. ending of the Storm-god's name is written twice with linguistically real plene: BABYLON 1 §9 (DEUS)TONITRUS-*ti-i* (cf. Figure 4) and PALANGA §7 TONITRUS-*hu-ti-i*. In addition, there are eight ambiguous cases ending in *-ti*, and ten non-plene forms ending in *-ti*. This name is also attested in Lycian, where we find *trqqas* (nom.sg.c.) and *trqqñti* (dat.sg.c.), and in CLuw.: ^DIŠKUR-*an-za* (voc.sg.c.), ^DIŠKUR-*un-ti* (dat.sg.c.). Nowadays, the commonly accepted etymology is PIE $*trh_2-u-(e)nt-$ (Kloekhorst 2006: 100; Melchert 2015a: 2). The attested forms in Luwian and Lycian indicate that this word originally must have shown ablaut: CLuw. ^DIŠKUR-*an-za* and Lyc. *trqqas* (presumably $/-H^w\text{ants}/$ and $/-k^w\text{as}/$, respectively) both seem to continue a full grade in the suffix: $*trh_2-u-\acute{e}nt-s$. The suffixes of HLuw. TONITRUS-*hu-ti(-i)* and Lyc. *trqqñti*, on the other hand, seem to show the zero-grade variant $*-nt-$.²⁸ In these two datives, it is most straightforward to assume that the accent therefore rested on the ending, so that we may explain all forms from an original hysterodynamic paradigm $*trh_2-u-\acute{e}nt-s/*trh_2-u-nt-\acute{o}s$.²⁹ For this paradigm, the reconstructed hysterodynamic dative ending is PIE $*-éi$. Now, on the basis of CLuw. *i-ti* 'go' (3sg.pres.act.) < PIE $*h_1\acute{e}i-ti$ and CLuw. *zi(-i)-ya-ri* 'lie' (3sg.pres.med.) < PIE $*\acute{k}éi-o-(ri)$, we know that PIE $*ei$ normally gives $/i/$ in Cuneiform Luwian (Melchert 1994: 265).³⁰ Without any evidence to the contrary, it is safe to assume

27 Cf. CLuw. 3sg.pres.act. *i-ti* 'goes'. Note that the length of the initial vowel cannot be deduced from the orthography, as word-initial spellings like $/V-C^\circ/$ are ambiguous with regard to plene writing. However, the lenited verbal ending *-ti* shows us that the preceding vowel was long and accented: CLuw. $\acute{i}di/$.

28 This is assumed by Melchert (2015a: 2), who cites Lyc. *trqqñt-* as continuing $*trh_2-wnt-$.

29 *Sic etiam* Kloekhorst (2008: 838), who notes that this name looks like the $*-nt$ -participle of an old *u*-present $*terh_2-u-$. In this regard, it is interesting to recall that a hysterodynamic inflection has been reconstructed for athematic $*-nt$ -participles on independent grounds by Beekes (1985: 64–77). This is corroborated by examples such as Skt. nom.sg.m. *san* < $*h_1s-\acute{e}nt-s$, acc.sg.m. *santam* < $*h_1s-\acute{e}nt-m$, gen.sg.m. *sataḥ* < $*h_1s-nt-\acute{o}s$.

30 Note that the CLuw. initial $(i-)$ in *i-ti* is ambiguous with regard to plene writing and does not tell us anything about the underlying vocalic length. However, the singleton ending $(-ti)$ (instead of $**(-it-ti)$) shows that lenition has taken place, which means that the preceding vowel *i-* must be long (and accented): $\acute{i}/$.

that this development was shared with Hieroglyphic Luwian, and that we should interpret (DEUS)TONITRUS-*hu-ti-i* as a direct continuation of a PIE hysterodynamic dative **nt-éi*, yielding */-ntí/*. If this is correct, then we see once more that the linguistically real plene spelling in Hieroglyphic Luwian corresponds to a long (accented) vowel, which is in accordance with the hypothesis proposed above.

5.4 *tu-u* ‘you’ (dat.-loc.)

In ASSUR letter *f+g* §16, we find the orthotonic personal pronoun *tu-u* ‘you’ (2sg.dat.-loc.), which is securely spelled with linguistically real plene writing. In CHLI, it is the only attestation of this particular form, while we have cognates in Palaic (acc.-dat. *tu-ú*, Carruba 1970: 44) and Middle/New Hittite (acc.-dat. *tu-uk*, cf. Kloekhorst 2014: 493). Because Luwian *tu-u* is free-standing (as opposed to enclitic =*du*, on which see Section 6.7), it is likely that its *-u* was accented. Still, it is not self-evident whether we should take the underlying vowel as long (*/tú/*) or short (*/tú/*). It is well-known that PIE **é* and **ó* in open syllables yield a long */á/* in Luwian, cf. CLuw. *na-a-ua-* ‘new’ < **néuo-*, CLuw. *ua-a-šu* ‘well’ < **uósu-* (Melchert 1994: 263f.). In his *Anatolian Historical Phonology*, Melchert generalises this open-syllable lengthening of accented vowels, arguing that **í* and **ú* also underwent lengthening to Luwian */í/* and */ú/*. Accordingly, he surmises that HLuw. *tu-u* is to be analysed as */tu:/*, to which he adds: “but not directly provable from spelling!” (1994: 262). Although it is quite possible that **í* and **ú* are lengthened in the same way as **é* and **ó*, I am not aware of any incontrovertible positive evidence, as all of Melchert’s examples require a secondary accent shift (ibid., 261f.). For this reason, I am hesitant to take the interpretation of HLuw. *tu-u* as */tú/* as absolutely secure. On the other hand, such an interpretation would be effortlessly compatible with the hypothesis that linguistically real plene writing marks an underlying long vowel.

5.5 *sá-a-* ‘to release’

One attestation of the verb *sa-* ‘to release’ is spelled with linguistically real plene writing: MARAŞ 4 §10 *sá-a-ha* (1sg.pret.act.). In the rest of CHLI, this verb is attested 11 times without plene writing. Cognates with the same meaning are found in Cuneiform Luwian and in Lycian. In Cuneiform Luwian, we find a *hi*-conjugated stem *ša-(a-)*: *ša-a-i* (3sg.pres.act.), *ša-(a-)at-ta* (3sg.pret.act.), *ša-(a-)an-du* (ipv.3pl.act.). In Lycian, on the other hand, we seem to be dealing with a *mi*-conjugated stem: *hadi* (3sg.pres.act.), *hāti*, *hati* (3pl.pres.act.), *hade* (pret.3sg.act.),

hâte (pret.3pl.act.), *hadu* (ipv.3sg.act.). The plene spelling in Cuneiform Luwian suggests a long (accented) vowel / \hat{a} /. This is also required by the Lycian 3sg. forms: they show the lenited endings *-di*, *-de* and *-du* (instead of their fortis counterparts *-ti*, *-te*, *-tu*), indicating that the vowel preceding them must have been long (and accented). It is most economical to assume that Hieroglyphic Luwian also had a long accented vowel / \hat{a} /. Within the hypothesis proposed here, we can now explain the unique linguistically real plene spelling of <(s)a-a> as a way of marking the length of the underlying vowel.

5.6 Ablative-instrumental ending *-Ca-a-ti/-Ca-a-ri+i*

The ablative-instrumental ending is spelled with linguistically real plene <Ca-a> on three occasions: ALEPPO 2 §24 MALUS-*la/i-a-ti* ‘malice’, BOYBEYPINARI 1 §4 *kwa/i-a-ti* (Goedegebuure 2010: 9) and the personal name SULTANHAN §45 *wa/i-su-SARMA-ma-sa-a-ri+i*. The effects of rhotacism are visible in the latter example, indicating that the ending contained a lenited dental /d/. This is corroborated by the cognates of this ending in Cuneiform Luwian and Lycian. In Cuneiform Luwian, we find that the ending is consistently spelled with a singleton, <Ca-(a-)ti>, while in Lycian, the sign <d> is used: <-Vdi>. I follow Kloekhorst 2014: 554f. by taking the lenition in these endings to have been caused by a preceding long accented vowel (*-/ \hat{V} ti/ > PAnat. */- \hat{V} di/). In Hittite, we find evidence for this Proto-Anatolian long vowel in the archaic ablative ending *-āz*, cf. *tāk-na-a-az* /tgnâts/ ‘earth’ and *ḫa-an-ta-a-az* /Hantâts/ ‘forehead’. Also in Cuneiform Luwian, the ablative(-instrumental) ending is found spelled with plene writing, for example *ma-al-li-ta-a-ti* ‘honey’. The Proto-Anatolian ancestors of Hittite *-āz*, CLuw. *-ādi* and Lyc. *-edi* have been reconstructed as **-ōti* and **-ōdi* (Kloekhorst 2014: 555). The latter is expected to yield both CLuw. and HLuw. /- \hat{a} di/ with a long vowel, which neatly co-occurs with the three linguistically plene writings under scrutiny here.

At the same time, it should be underlined that Hieroglyphic Luwian shows many ablative-instrumental forms that do not show any signs of a long vowel. Only three of the over 200 phonetically spelled ablative-instrumental forms attested in the Iron Age corpus are written securely with linguistically real plene writing. Even though it has been stated in Section 2 that linguistically real plene writing never occurs with absolute consistency within one lexical item, its extreme rarity in the case of the ablative-instrumental is somewhat disconcerting. That said, a scarcity of plene spellings in ablative-instrumentals is not limited to Hieroglyphic Luwian. Cuneiform Luwian preserves 273 ablative-instrumentals with phonetically spelled

endings.³¹ The vast majority (202; 74%) of these are spelled non-plene as ⟨Ca-ti⟩; only 56 (26%) attestations are written with plene spelling: ⟨Ca-a-ti⟩. Naturally, as long as Cuneiform Luwian plene writing of -a- lacks a detailed study, any interpretation of these ratios remains necessarily speculative. Assuming, however, that Cuneiform Luwian plene writing marks vocalic length (as it does in Hittite), we must account for the relatively frequent occurrence of non-plene ⟨Ca-ti⟩ in one way or another. Kloekhorst (2014: 555) solves the problem by assuming that there were two different abl.-ins. endings in Proto-Anatolian: accented *-ōdi and unaccented *-ti. In the Luwic languages, he argues, the lenited variant was generalised, yielding both accented PLuw. *-ōdi and unaccented *-odi. Through regular development, these turned into Luw. CVC-ādi ~ ČVC-adi.

Admittedly *ad hoc*, but nonetheless possible, is the suggestion that the Iron Age HLuw. ending -adi was generalised at the expense of -ādi. MALUS-la/i-a-ti, wa/i-su-SARMA-ma-sa-a-ri+i, kwa/i-a-ti and perhaps also za-a-ti (cf. Section 6.6) would thereby represent archaic forms.

5.7 ā-pi-i ‘back, afterwards’

The adverb ā-pi(-i) ‘back, afterwards’ is attested with linguistically real plene writing twice: SULTANHAN §12 ā-pi-i; SULTANHAN §41 ā-pi-i(-wa/i-tā^a), alongside two ambiguous plene spellings ā-piⁱ (SULTANHAN §3, §45). In addition, CHLI lists non-plene ā-pi 23 times. Notably, all four examples of linguistically real plene ā-pi-i stem from the SULTANHAN inscription, which raises the possibility that we are dealing with a peculiarity of a certain scribe, rather than a pan-HLuwian linguistic phenomenon. I will leave this question open for now. Nevertheless, the assumption that the linguistically real plene writings of ā-pi-i are *sprachwirklich* does not pose any immediate danger to the hypothesis that linguistically real plene marks vocalic length, as I will argue here.

Since Oshiro 1988: 251f., HLuw. ā-pi(-i) has been connected to HLuw. ā-pa-na ‘behind’ and Hitt. a-ap-pa-an ‘id.’, which are further related to Lyc. epñ ‘afterwards’ and epi (local adverb) as well as CLuw. (a-)ap-pa-an ‘behind’ and a-ap-pa ‘back, again’.³² These forms are petrified case-forms of an old nominal paradigm, with HLuw. ā-pi(-i) and Lyc. epi both containing an old athematic dative-locative ending (either *-ēi or *-i). Now, if the final -i of ā-pi(-i) truly continued the PIE locative singular ending *-i, as Hawkins suggests (CHLI: 555), then it would be hard to

³¹ Numbers based on a manual count in Melchert 1993.

³² The existence of an enclitic =appi in Cuneiform Luwian is not assured (Melchert 1993: s. v. appi).

explain why the SULTANHAN scribe wrote a linguistically real plene vowel after *á-pi* in §12 and §41. The hysterodynamic dative-locative singular ending **-éi*, on the other hand, would be much less problematic. As we have already seen in Section 5.3, a PAnat./PIE diphthong **éi* is expected to yield a long vowel /*í*/ in both Hieroglyphic and Cuneiform Luwian. The scribe may have wanted to express this using linguistically real plene spelling in HLuw. *á-pi-i* /ʔ(a)pí/.

One could object to this scenario that a desinentially accented proto-form **Hp-éi* is difficult to reconcile with Hitt./CLuw. *a-ap-pa*, which is presumed to continue a radically accented allative **Hóp-o*/**Hép-o*. In other words, we would expect to find Hitt./CLuw. ***ap-pa-a* < **Hp-ó* in that case. However, we must not forget that attested Hitt./CLuw. *a-ap-pa* itself cannot be the regular outcome of PIE **Hópo*, from which we would expect ***a-pa* (with a lenited stop). For this reason, Kloekhorst (2014: 558f.) has proposed that Hitt. *a-ap-pa* and all related forms continue an ablauting paradigm with either static inflection (nom. **Hóp-s*, gen. **Hép-(o)s*, with generalised radical accentuation) or mobile inflection (nom. **Hóp-s*, gen. **Hp-ós*). It is worth noting that the expected dat.-loc.sg. of the latter paradigm is exactly **Hp-éi*, which would regularly develop into HLuw. *á-pi-i*.

5.8 *ti-i-wa/i-t°* ‘Sun-god’

The name of the Sun-god is spelled with linguistically real plene writing twice: in KÜRTÜL §6 (DEUS) *ti-i-wa/i-ti-x* and as the second part of the composite personal name KARATEPE 1 §1 Hu.¹ (LITUUS) *á-za-ti-i-wa/i-tà-sá*. It is cognate with Hitt. *šīuatt* ‘day’, CLuw. *Tiṭad* ‘Sun-god’ and Pal. *Tiṭat* ‘id.’. According to Kloekhorst (2008: s. v. ^(D)*šīuatt*) these words continue an ablauting paradigm: pre-PAnat. nom.sg. **diéu-t-s*, acc.sg. **diu-ót-ṃ*, gen.sg. **diu-t-ós*. Already in Proto-Anatolian, the full grade of the suffix **-ot-* must have been generalised throughout the paradigm. The Luwian forms must continue PAnat. **diu-od-* (with zero grade in the root), which would develop into PLuw. **tiúod-* through regular lengthening of accented vowels in open syllables before [w], cf. Melchert 1994: 240.³³ Thus, the plene spelling in HLuw. *ti-i-wa/i-t°* is found in a place where we would expect to find a long accented vowel.

³³ Note that a full-grade variant of the root PAnat. **diéuod-* would not yield the Luwian forms. Rather, it would probably develop to pre-Luw. **tiáuad-*, parallel to pre-PAnat. **d^hgémV-* ‘earth’ > PLuw. **dīámV* > CLuw. *tiyammi* ‘id.’. Then, pre-Luw. **tiáuad-* would give Luw. ***tiáwad-* through the same lengthening of accented vowels in open syllables.

6 Group III: words with unclear etymologies

In this section, we turn to morphemes and words that are very difficult to interpret phonologically. They often have neither good cognates nor convincing etymologies. For this reason, they are of limited use for testing our hypothesis.

6.1 *a/i*-stem nouns/adjectives

In terms of tokens, the largest group of linguistically real plene spellings consists of direct case endings of nouns and adjectives belonging to the *a/i*-stem class, which is traditionally referred to as the ‘*i*-mutation’ class. A defining feature of this class is that the stem of its common-gender nouns and adjectives contains *-i-* in the direct cases (nominative and accusative). Words of this class continue original PIE consonant stems, *i*-stems and thematic stems (also including adjectives with the suffix *-ia-*), cf. Norbruis in prep. b.

In Hawkins’ Iron Age corpus (CHLI), I have counted 189 linguistically real plene writings of ⟨i⟩ in the endings ⟨-Ci-i-s^o⟩ (nom.sg.), ⟨-Ci-i-na⟩ (acc.sg.) and ⟨-Ci-i-zi⟩ (nom./acc.pl.). These include the participles in *-mi-(i-)*, e.g. KULULU 2 B1 *u-wa/i-mi-i-sá* ‘drinking’; KARKAMIŠ A11b §1 *á-za-mi-i-sa* ‘loved’; derivations with the ‘ethnic’ suffix *-wa/i-ni-(i-)*, e.g. HAMA 8 §1 *i-ma-tu-wa/i-ni-i-sa*(REGIO) ‘Hamathite’; genitival adjectives in *-a-si-(i-)*, e.g. BOYBEYPINARI IVD3 *á-pa-si-i-na* ‘that’.

A full list of forms can be found in the appendix to this article. Ever since this stem class was first identified by Starke in 1982: 408f. fn. 3, scholars have tried to explain the origins of its stem-final *-i-* in various ways (see Rieken 2005: 51f. for a short *Forschungsgeschichte*). Starke himself (l. c.) traced the *-i-* back to the PIE ablauting suffix **-ih₂-/-ieh₂-* (‘*devī*-suffix’), used to form feminine nouns in various Indo-European languages. This connection was followed by both Oettinger (1987: 42) and Melchert (1994: 261; 2003: 187 etc.), and the latter analyses the vowel as long (/ī/) on account of plene writing in Cuneiform Luwian. More specifically, “The length of the inserted *-ī-* is assured by plene spellings such as nom.sg. *da-a-u-i-īš* ‘eye’ (where the accent is surely on the first syllable)” (Melchert 2003: 188). Rieken (2005) rather derives the *i*-mutated forms from an older ablauting *i*-stem paradigm *-i-/-oi-*. To account for the length of the mutation-*i* in the nom./acc.sg.c., she envisages an accent shift from the root to the *-i-*, analogous to the suffixal accentuation in the oblique cases. Subsequently, this accented *-i-* would have been lengthened (id.: 67) as follows:

pre-Luw. nom.sg.c. **CVC-ís* > **CVC-īs* > **CVC-īš*.

However, the length of the mutation-*i* in Cuneiform Luwian is not beyond doubt. Rieken (2017) herself has recently collected and analysed all plene spellings of -*i*- in Cuneiform Luwian. One of the conclusions she reaches is that “there is no reason to assume that the *i*-mutation vowel was long” (2017: 27).

If this conclusion also holds for the -*i*- in Hieroglyphic Luwian *a/i*-stem nouns and adjectives, we cannot interpret their frequent plene spellings as markers for underlying vowel length.

One possible reconciliation of both data sets takes the same point of departure as Rieken 2005, assuming that the Luwian *a/i*-stem paradigm originates from inherited *i*-stem paradigms. One could assume that, in time, the inherited -*ei*-/*i*- ablaut was levelled out by extending the oblique variant -*ei*- to the direct cases of the paradigm. This replaced the original nom.sg.c. **C-i-s* and acc.sg.c. **C-i-n* endings by nom.sg.c. **C-ei-s* and acc.sg.c. **C-ei-n*, which would develop to **C-ī-s* and **C-ī-n* through regular phonetic development.³⁴

6.2 Pronominal paradigms: *kwa/i-(i-)/kwa/i-(a-)* ‘who, which’; *za-(a-)/zi-(i-)* ‘this’

Linguistically real plene writing also features heavily in the pronominal paradigms of *kwa/i-(i-)/kwa/i-(a-)* ‘who, which’ and *za-(a-)/zi-(i-)* ‘this’. Their paradigms are given in Table 6.

The direct singular cases of *za-(a-)* have already been treated in Section 3.1, and we will return to the ablative-instrumental *zi-i-na* and the dative-locatives singular *kwa/i-a-ti^(ci)* and *za-a-ti* in Sections 6.3 and 7.1, respectively. The other case forms of these two pronominal stems will be treated here.

The direct cases of the HLuw. relative/interrogative pronoun nom.sg.c. *kwa/i-i-sa_x*, acc.sg.c. *kwa/i-i-na*, nom.pl.c. *kwa/i-i-zi* and acc.pl.c. *kwa/i-i-zi* all show an -*i*- which is lacking in the oblique cases (Melchert 2003: 191). In addition, the -*i*- is often spelled with linguistically real plene writing. This corresponds well to the

³⁴ A different line of development is taken by Norbruis (in prep. b), who argues that the plene spellings in *a/i*-stem words are simply space-fillers, used in penultimate position. While this explanation avoids the difficulty of having to explain the mismatch between CLuw. non-plene spelling and HLuw. linguistically real plene spelling, it still faces the challenge of accounting for two concurrent space-filling practices. In addition, it should address cases like KARKAMIŠ A11c §25 (“FLUMEN+MINUS”) *sâ-ku+ra/i-wa/i-ni-i-zi-ha* ‘of Sakura’ (nom.pl.), where the plene spelling is not found in penultimate position.

³⁵ Note that this count does not include KARKAMIŠ A17c §1 *kwa/i-a-ti* and §2 *kwa/i-a-tiⁱ*, whose interpretation is unsure. Their form suggest that they originally must have been dative-locatives or ablative-instrumentals.

Table 6: HLuw. *kwa/i-(i-)/kwa/i-(a-)* ‘who, which’ and *za-(a-)/zi-(i-)* ‘this’

		Linguistically real plene	Non- plene		Linguistically real plene	Non- plene
nom.sg.c.	<i>kwa/i-i-sa_x^(-a)</i>	34×	85×	<i>za-a-sa</i>	8×	14×
acc.sg.c.	<i>kwa/i-i-na^(-a)</i>	1×	5×	<i>za-a-na</i>	5×	39×
nom.-acc.sg.n.	<i>kwa/i-a-za</i>	5×	5×	<i>za-a</i>	7×	59×
dat.-loc.sg.	<i>kwa/i-a-ti⁽⁻ⁱ⁾</i>	4×	4×	<i>za-a-ti</i>	11×	25×
nom.pl.c.	<i>kwa/i-i-zi</i>	2×	9×	<i>za-a-zi</i>	9×	13×
acc.pl.c.	<i>kwa/i-i-zi</i>	2×	1×	<i>za-a-zi</i>	7×	5×
nom.-acc.pl.n.	<i>kwa/i-ia</i>	0×	11×	<i>za-a-ia</i>	1×	32×
dat.-loc.pl.	—	—	—	<i>za-a-ti-ia-za</i>	3×	5×
abl.-ins. ³⁵	<i>kwa/i-a-ti</i>	1×	0×	<i>zi-i-na</i>	4×	11×

frequent plene spellings we find in its CLuw. cognates: alongside 34 non-plene CLuw. *ku-iš*, we find five plene *ku-i-iš*, and alongside one non-plene *ku-in*, there are three attestations of *ku-i-in*. Lastly, three counts of non-plene *ku-in-zi* contrast with two plene *ku-i-in-zi*. The plene spellings of Cuneiform Luwian are thus significant and indicate that the vowel in the relative/interrogative pronoun was long.³⁶ If this is true, the CLuw. data may show independent support for length of the *-i-* in HLuw. *kwa/i-(i-)*. The nom.-acc.sg.n. *kwa/i-(a-)za* is usually analysed as /k^wantsa/, with the thematic ending /-an/ followed by the particle =sa/za, which is commonly attached to singular neuter nom.-acc. forms (Melchert 2003: 191; Yakubovich 2015: 15). To explain the linguistically real plene writing in this form in terms of vocalic length, one could argue that the vowel was analogically lengthened after other case-forms containing a long /ā/, such as *kwa/i-a-ti* (dat.-loc.sg., cf. Section 7.1) and the ablative-instrumental form *kwa/i-a-ti*.³⁷

³⁶ To this view, one could object that the plene written ⟨i⟩ was used as a glide [wi] here, similarly to plene ⟨i⟩ in CLuw. *da-a-u-i-iš* (Section 6.1). Note, however, that the scribes did not deem it necessary to write a glide between a labiovelar and /i/ in the Hittite paradigm of *ku-iš* /k^wis/, *ku-in* /k^win/, *ku-it* /k^wit/ etc. (We only find one attestation of *ku-i-it* in OS, for which cf. Kloekhorst 2014: 433.) If both the CLuw. form and the Hittite form had the same underlying phonetic structure [k^wis], [k^win] etc., then I would expect them both to be written in the same manner. Rather, the fact that the CLuw. forms were written differently from the Hittite forms by the very same scribes suggests to me that they were phonetically distinct.

³⁷ Phonologically, it is also possible to analyse nom.-acc.sg.n. *kwa/i-a-za* as /k^wât=sə/, showing the expected reflex of PIE pronominal nom.-acc.sg.n. ending *-ód, which we also find in *za-a* ‘this’ < PIE *kód/, cf. Pal. *ka-a-at*. Note, however, that this leaves unexplained why the element =za/sa is present in *kwa/i-a-za* while it is missing in *za-a*.

Lastly, we find linguistically real plene writing of *a* in the oblique and plural cases of *za-(a-)* ‘this’. The nom./acc.pl.c. HLuw. *za-a-zi* has cognates in CLuw.: nom.pl.c. *zi-(i-)in-zi* and acc.pl.c. *zi-i-in-za*, containing an *i*. At first sight, the distribution of the *i* in the CLuw. paradigm may suggest influence from the *i*-mutated paradigms. However, the *-i-* in CLuw. *zi-(i-)in-zi* occasionally shows plene spelling (Rieken 2017: 23). This does not correspond well to the synchronic CLuw. mutation-*i*, which was only spelled with plene writing in specific environments, as has been argued in Section 6.1.³⁸ The CLuw. forms with *i* may therefore be old (at least the nom.pl.c.), meaning that the vocalism of HLuw. *za-(a-)zi* must be secondary. Analogical replacement of original HLuw. **zi-i-zi* >> *za-(a-)zi* on the basis of the singular cases *za-(a-)sa* and *za-(a-)na* is perfectly understandable, as it would have regularised the paradigm. The long accented vowels of the singular forms *za-a-sa* and *za-a-na* would have been taken over in the plural cases, where they were represented by linguistically real plene writing. A similar analogy must have taken place in the case of dat.-loc.pl. *za-(a-)ti-ia-za*, which formally looks like the dat.-loc.sg. form *za-(a-)ti* with the synchronic dat.-loc.pl. ending *-anz*, and possibly also in the case of *za-(a-)ia*, the nom.-acc.pl.n., whose origins are unclear.

6.3 *zi-i-na*, *á-pi-i-na*

One major innovation of HLuw. which is not found in CLuw. is its use of special ablative-instrumental forms in the deictic pronouns (Goedegebuure 2007). For *za-(a-)* ‘this’ we find *zi-i-na* (2×), *zi-i-pa-wa/i^(-a)* (2×; analysis: /^o=pa=wa/) with linguistically real plene writing. Unsure are MALPINAR §9 *zi⁻ⁱ-wa/i[...]* and KARKAMIŠ A6 §4 *zi⁻ⁱ-na*, as the ⟨i⟩ in these attestations may also be interpreted as a word-internal space-filler, cf. Vertegaal 2017: 253. Lastly, CHLI contains 11 non-plene occurrences: *zi-na*, of which five occur in the KARATEPE bilingual inscription. For the distal deictic pronoun *á-pa-* ‘that’, we find linguistically real plene *pi-i-na* **a*, in KARKAMIŠ A11b §14, next to four attestations of non-plene *á-pi-na* and *pi-na* **a*. It is tempting to compare these pronominal adverbs to similar ones in Cuneiform Luwian. There we find one attestation of *a-pa-ti-i-i[n]* ‘thus’ (vs. three times *a-pa-ti-in*) and two of *ku-ya-a-ti-i-in* ‘as; how?’ (vs. six *ku-ya-(a-)ti-in*), whose

³⁸ Rieken (2017: 3) argues that the length of *zi-i-in-zi/zi-i-in-za* was analogically taken over from the case-forms containing *za-a-*. Since we are dealing with two different vowels, however, this solution does not seem attractive. Rather, I follow Melchert (2009: 114), who claims that *zi-i-in-zi* goes back to PIE **koi*, which also yielded Hitt. *ke-e* (Kloekhorst 2012: 259, cf. also Skt. *te* and Hom. Gr. *τοι*, both nom.pl.m. < PIE **toi*). The addition of the plural marker *-nzi* (whatever its origins), which is ubiquitous among nouns and adjectives, would be trivial.

plene spellings suggest that the *-i-* was long. Unfortunately, however, there is no secure etymology to substantiate this suggestion.

6.4 Genitive singular ending *-Ca-si-i*

Another innovation of HLuw. is its use of a genitive singular ending in *-Ca-si(-i)*. Its word-final *i* is securely spelled with linguistically real plene writing on the following three occasions:

1. KARKAMIŠ A1a §32 (PANIS)*tu+ra/i-pa-si-i* ‘bread’;
2. BABYLON 1 §7 “AEDIFICIUM”-*si-i* ‘building’(?);
3. ADIYAMAN 1 §8 *pa-si-i-^{*}a* ‘that’.

According to Melchert (2012: 279), building on Yakubovich 2008: 211, this ending originates in the PIE gen.sg. ending **-osio*. He argues that unaccented non-high vowels would have developed into [ə] in word-final position: PANat. **[-osyə]*. This [ə] later merged with /i/ after it was coloured to [i] by the preceding glide: **[-osyə]* > **[-osyi]* > Luw. */-as(s)i/*.³⁹ If this scenario is true, we would have an unaccented, short vowel in HLuw. *-Ca-si-i*, which is difficult to reconcile with its linguistically real plene spelling. However, we can also imagine that the colouring of [ə] > [i] in word-final **-osio* > **-osiə* > **-osii* happened in the same way as **-ie-* to **-ii-* in “AUDIRE+MI”-*ti-i-tā* (cf. Section 3.5). In the latter case, we have seen that the plene spelling may represent a disyllabic sequence /ii/ or a long vowel /ī/. The same interpretation is thus applicable to the HLuw. genitives in *-Ca-si-i*: PIE **-osio* > PANat. **-osiə* > pre-Luw. **-osii* > HLuw. */-asii/* or */-asī/*. This all necessarily remains very speculative.

6.5 *á-mi-i* ‘my’ (dat.-loc.sg.)

The dat.-loc.sg. of ‘my’ is attested 32 times in CHLI. Six times, we can be sure that its *-i* is spelled with linguistically real plene writing: KARKAMIŠ A6 §8 *á-*

³⁹ As a parallel to this development, Melchert (2012: 279) provides Hittite *takku* ‘if’ < **tok^we* and *nekku* ‘not?’ < **nek^we* (but cf. Kloekhorst 2008: 97, where a case is made for general loss). Recently, Sideltsev & Yakubovich (2016: 34 fn. 32) have argued that the distribution between *-kki* and *-kka* in Hitt. *kuiški* ‘something’ may also be explained in this way. According to them, pre-Hitt. **-Cke* > **-Ckə*, after which the shwa was coloured by the vowel in the preceding syllable: if the preceding syllable contained [i(:)], then the word-final shwa merged with /i/, e.g. nom.sg.c. *kuiški*, nom.-acc.sg.n. *kuitki*, dat.-loc.sg. *kuedanikki*. In all other cases, the new word-final shwa merged with /a/: nom.pl.c. *kuiēšqa*; acc.pl.c. *kuiušga*.

mi-i^a; BOROWSKI 3 §9 *mi-i^a*; TELL AHMAR 1 §14 *mi-i^a*; TELL AHMAR 2 § *mi-i^a*; TELL AHMAR 1 §20 *mi-i-ha-wa/i^a*; ALEPPO 2 §17 *mi-i-pa-wa/i^a* ‘my’. 17 cases of *á-mi-i/mi-i-a* are ambiguous: their plene vowel signs may or may not have been used as space-fillers. We also find nine non-plene attestations of *á-mi/mi^a*. The HLuw. paradigm of *á-mi* ‘my’ is very peculiar. On the one hand, its nom.-acc.sg.n. *á-ma-za* next to nom.sg.c. *á-mi-i-sa* and acc.sg.c. *á-mi-i-na* suggest that the paradigm behaves like an *a/i*-stem (cf. Section 6.1). On the other hand, the paradigm also contains the dat.-loc.pl. *á-mi-ia-za* /ʔ(a)mianz/ and the abl.-ins. *á-mi-ia-ti* /ʔ(a)miadi/. This rather suggests that the stem was synchronically interpreted as an *-i(a)*-stem, and ACLT also lists this word as such: “ami(ya)”. The dat.-loc.sg. of *-ia*-stems shows two different endings: *-i* and *-ia* (cf. HLuw. *tadiya* ‘fatherly’: dat.-loc.sg.c. *tá-ti⁽⁻ⁱ⁾* and *tá-ti-ia*). The ending *-ia* looks very archaic and must be the older of the two, while the ending *-i* could easily have been introduced from other stem-classes (e.g. the *a/i*-stems), cf. Norbruis in prep. a. It is clear that *á-mi-i* contains this analogical ending *-i*, but we may ask ourselves how it came to be incorporated in the paradigm of *á-mi-i(a)* ‘my’. It is not unthinkable that a pre-Luwic stem */ʔami-/ enlarged by the dat.-loc. ending /-i/ first yielded */-i-i/. in a disyllabic sequence. The linguistically real plene writing in HLuw. *á-mi-i* would then be an attempt by the scribes to render a preserved disyllabic sequence or the result of contraction to /-ī/.

6.6 *za-a-ti* ‘thus, here’

CHLI contains one example of the adverb *za-a-ti* ‘thus’ (CHLI); ‘here’ (ACLT) with linguistically real plene spelling: KARKAMIŠ A19j *za-a-ti*. In addition, we find 16 attestations which are spelled non-plene, either with rhotacism (i.e. *za-ri+i*) or without, as in *za-ti*. Goedegebuure (2010) proposes considering the adverb *zati/zari* as an old ablative-instrumental, which was later replaced by *zi-(i)-na* (cf. Section 6.3). This interpretation takes *zati/zari* as the regular reflex of Proto-Anatolian **-ôdi* (< PIE **-ôti*), which we would expect to yield /*â*/, cf. Section 5.6. If Goedegebuure’s identification of *za-(a)ti* as an old ablative-instrumental is correct, then the linguistically real plene spelling would correspond to a long accented /*â*/, supporting our hypothesis. At the same time, the rarity of linguistically real plene writing in *za-a-ti* (only once in 17 attested cases) would correspond neatly to the overall rarity of linguistically real plene spellings in the ablative-instrumental case ending. Alternatively, one may also account for the linguistically real plene spelling by virtue of analogy. The long accented /*â*/ present in the direct cases of *za-a* ‘this’ could easily have been introduced in its cognate adverb *za-(a)ti*.

6.7 Miscellanea

Lastly, linguistically real plene writing is found in various uncommon lexical items whose etymology is unknown or still debated. Consequently, these words cannot be used to support or contradict an interpretation in terms of vocalic length or accent, cf. Table 7.

Table 7: Miscellaneous lexical items with linguistically real plene writing

Attestation	Text
(“OCCIDENS”) <i>ā-pa-zi-i-ti</i> ‘?’	MARAŞ 7 Side A
<i>HĀ+LI-i-sa</i> (PN)	BOYBEYPINARI 2 §17
(CASTRUM) <i>ha+ra/i-ni-i-sā</i> ‘fortress’	KARATEPE 1 §23 Ho.
(“LOQUI”) <i>ha-ti-i-ti</i> ‘to speak, proclaim’ (3sg./pl.pres.act.)	ASSUR letter <i>f+g</i> §1
<i>kar-ka-mi-i-si-sa</i> ₅ (URBS) ‘Carchemishean’	GÜRÜN §1 <i>b</i>
<i>kwa/i+ra/i-i</i> ‘since, if’ (3×)	KARKAMIŞ A11 <i>c</i> §30 & §31; KARKAMIŞ 13 <i>d</i> §5
¹ <i>ma-li-i-TONITRUS-pa-sā</i> (PN)	KARKAMIŞ A7 §7
<i>ma-sa-ha-ni-i-ti</i> ‘to make grow’ (3sg.pres.act.)	SULTANHAN §22
SUB- <i>na-a-na</i> ^a ‘under’, ‘demote’ (with <i>i-zi-i-</i>) (preverb)	ALEPPO 3 §4
<i>na-a-pa</i> ‘?’	ASSUR letter <i>f+g</i> §5
OMNIS+ <i>MI-ni-i-ma-za</i> ₄ ‘all’; <i>ta-ni-mi-i-(ha-a-wa/i)</i> ⁴⁰ ‘every’ (dat.-loc.sg.)	KARATEPE 1 §50 Ho.; KARKAMIŞ A6 §20
(INFANS) <i>ni-mu-wa/i-i-za-sa</i> (2×) ‘child’; <i>ni-mu-wa/i-i-za-sa</i> ‘child’	TELL AHMAR 1 §1 & §19; MARAŞ 4 §1
CRUS- <i>nú-wa/i-mi-i-na</i> ‘to set up’	SULTANHAN §3
¹ <i>pa-na-mu-wa/i-ti-i-sa</i> (PN)	BOYBEYPINARI 2 §17
(“CULTER”) <i>pa+ra/i-tú-ni-i-tú</i> ‘to sever’(?) (imp.3pl.act.)	KARKAMIŞ A11 <i>c</i> §27
<i>pa+ra/i-i</i> (= <i>ha</i> ^a)	KARKAMIŞ A1 <i>a</i> §10
<i>pi-i-ha-mi-na</i> ‘glorified’	KARKAMIŞ A27 <i>o</i>
SERVUS- <i>lā/i-a-sa</i> (PN)	BABYLON 2 §1
SUPER+ <i>ra/i-a-wa/i-ta</i> ‘high’ (CHLI); ‘over’ (ACLT)	TELL AHMAR 5 §12
PUGNUS- <i>ri+i-i-ia-ha</i> ‘exalted’ (CHLI); ‘solemnly’ (ACLT)	KARKAMIŞ A15 <i>b</i> §2
(MANUS.*273)(-) <i>su-hi-i-ti-ha</i> (1sg.pret.act.)	KARKAMIŞ A15 <i>b</i> §14
<i>tara/i-pa-a-ti</i> ‘to trample’(?)	KARAHÖYÜK §22
<i>tā-ti-i</i> ‘father’ (dat.-loc.sg.)	MARAŞ 4 §8
MONS- <i>ti-i</i> ‘mountain’ (dat.-loc.sg.)	CALAPVERDI 1 §3

Attestation	Text
= <i>tu-u</i> ‘you’ (2sg.dat.-loc.encl.; 3×) ⁴¹	ASSUR letter <i>c</i> §5; ASSUR letter <i>a</i> §4; ASSUR letter <i>f+g</i> §15
“9”- <i>wa/i-i-za(-ha-wa/i-tū)</i> ‘ninth part’ (2×)	KARKAMIŠ A13 <i>d</i> §4 & §7
“(∗187)zū”- <i>mi-la-a-na</i> ‘?’	ASSUR letter <i>c</i> §8

7 Difficult cases

In Sections 3 to 6, we have seen all the data supporting or at least compatible with the hypothesis that linguistically real plene writing marks vocalic length or a disyllabic sequence. In this section, we will consider the evidence which *prima facie* threatens this hypothesis. In most cases, strong etymological considerations seem to preclude the presence of a long (accented) vowel in places where we find linguistically real plene spelling. Closer inspection, however, reveals that almost all of these potential counterexamples can be explained in alternative ways.

7.1 *za-a-ti* and *kwa/i-a-ti* (dat.-loc.sg.)

The dative-locative singular of the paradigm of *za-(a-)* ‘this’ (cf. Sections 3.1 and 6.2) is *za-(a-)ti*, which is spelled 11 times as *za-a-ti* with linguistically real plene writing; *za-ti* with non-plene writing is found 25 times in the Iron Age corpus. The dat.-loc.sg. of *kwa/i-(i-)/kwa/i-(a-)* ‘who, which’ is *kwa/i-a-ti*, found with linguistically real plene spelling four times. Its non-plene variant *kwa/i-ti* is also attested four times.

Goedegebuure (2010: 3–5) has argued that *za-(a-)ti* must contain a fortis dental stop to account for the consistent absence of rhotacism. She also connects dat.-loc.sg. *za-(a-)ti* to its direct cognate in Hittite: *ke-e-ti* / *kēdi*/. Both HLuw. *za-(a-)ti* and Hitt. *ke-e-ti* can be used to reconstruct the proto-form PIE **kéd^hi* (Kloekhorst 2012: 258, further specifying Goedegebuure 2010: 14). This **kéd^hi* would have undergone Čop’s Law in Proto-Luwic, eventually yielding **/tsāti/* with a fortis dental /t/ and a

40 But cf. Section 7.2.

41 Unlike its third-person counterpart /=du/, second-person /=du/ is not attested before a vowel-anlauting clitic. Therefore, we cannot judge whether it would show elision of its vowel or not (cf. Section 4.2).

short /á/. If HLuw. *za-(a-)ti* still represented expected /tsáti/, then its linguistically real plane spelling would correspond to a short accented vowel, which runs counter to our hypothesis. However, given the innerparadigmatic pressure exerted by the long stem-vowel variants *za-a-as* (nom.sg.c.), *za-a-na* (acc.sg.c.), *za-a* (nom.-acc.sg.n.) and *za-a-ti* (adv.), analogical leveling of an older dative-locative singular [†]*za-ti* /tsáti/ >> *za-a-ti* /tsáti/ seems quite trivial.

The linguistically real plane writing of parallel *kwa/i-a-ti* is problematic for the same reasons: by virtue of Čop's Law, we would expect its proto-form ^{*}*k^wéd^hi* (cf. Hitt. *ku-e-da-ni* [OS]) to yield HLuw. ^{*}/k^wáti/ with a short vowel. In this case too, analogy would not be unexpected: the parallel dative-locative singular *za-a-ti* or other forms of the paradigm with a long vowel (such as the abl.-ins. *kwa/i-a-ti*) could have served as models, transforming [†]*kwa/i-ti* into *kwa/i-a-ti*.

7.2 *kwa/i-ti-i=ha*, *ku-AVIS-pa-pa-a=ha* [...], and abl.-ins. [°]*Ca-ti-i=ha*

We now turn to several attested forms which all have in common that they show an unexpected linguistically real plane vowel immediately preceding the enclitic conjunction *=ha* 'and'.

First, there is the HLuw. indefinite pronoun 'anyone, anything', consisting of the relative/interrogative pronoun *kwa/i-* and *=ha* 'and'. The dative-locative singular of this pronoun is attested twice with linguistically real plane writing: KULULU 1 §14 *kwa/i-ti-i-ha* and KARKAMIŠ A6 §25 *kwa/i-ti-i-ha* 'someone, anyone'. Two non-plane forms are found: HAMA 4 §5 *kwa/i-ti-ha* and AKSARAY §8 *kwa/i-ti-ha_x*. In accordance with our hypothesis, we should take the linguistically real plane *i* as representing a long vowel: /k^watī=ha/.⁴² However, this is at odds with the spelling of the unextended form of the dat.-loc.sg. relative pronoun *kwa/i-(a-)ti* (eleven attestations) and dative-locative singular forms of the other pronouns: *za-(a-)tiⁱ* 'this' (36×) and (*á-*)*pa-tiⁱ* 'that' (47×). These forms never show plane spellings of the *i* which cannot be interpreted as space-fillers. In addition, the sparsely attested Cuneiform Luwian cognates of these pronominal datives, viz. *ku-ṽa-at-ti* 'who/which' (four attestations) and *a-pát-ti/a-pa-a-at-ti* 'that' (2×) do not show plane writing of their final vowel, suggesting that it was short in Cuneiform Luwian.

Next is the name of the god Kubaba, spelled *ku-AVIS-pa-pa-* in HLuw. CHLI contains 44 phonetic spellings of this name, but only once do we find linguistically real plane spelling: KARKAMIŠ A19r *ku-AVIS-pa-pa-a-ha* [...] (acc.sg.c.) with the

⁴² There is no reason to assume that the *-i-* in these forms was disyllabic.

addition of the enclitic conjunction =*ha*.⁴³ The linguistically real plene ⟨a⟩ suggests that the stem-final vowel is long: /ā/. Again, however, there is comparative evidence which renders this implausible. More specifically, the same name is also attested in Hittite as ^D*Ku-pa-pa*^o (38×), ^{D(MUNUS)}*Ku-pa-a-pa*^o (2×), ^D*Ku-ba-ba* (1×), ^D*Ku-ba-pa* (1×) or ^D*Ku-pa-ūa*_a (2×) (van Gessel 1997: 264–266), never with plene writing of the final *a*.

Lastly, we return to the HLuw. ablative-instrumental ending, whose plene spellings of *a* were examined in Section 5.6. In this section, we will take a closer look at its other vowel, *i*. It is spelled with linguistically real plene writing on three occasions in the Iron Age corpus:⁴⁴

1. ARSLANTAŞ (Tell Ahmar) §6 (BOS)*wa/i-wa/i-ti-i=ha* ‘cow’;
2. KARKAMIŞ A15b §1 (DEUS)*SOL-tā-ti-i=ha* (DN);
3. KARATEPE 1 §49 Hu. *ha-tā+ra/i-ti-i=hā* ‘life’.

The linguistically real plene writing in these attestations compels us to interpret these ablative-instrumentals as /-ādi/ with a long final vowel /ī/. However, this is not borne out by the Cuneiform Luwian evidence. Of all CLuw. ablative-instrumentals in Melchert’s *Cuneiform Luwian Lexicon* (1993) and Yakubovich’s ACLT (the latter lists 284), not one is spelled with plene spelled word-final *i*, which rather indicates that the final vowel was a short /-i/.

Comparing these ablatives to the pronominal dat.-loc.sg. *kwa/i-ti-i-ha* and the deity name *ku-AVIS-pa-pa-a-ha*, a striking similarity emerges: in all cases, the unexpected plene vowel is followed by the clitic =*ha* ‘and’. It is highly unlikely that this is a coincidence. The presence of the clitic =*ha* must in some way or another be related to these unexpected linguistically real plene spellings. There are several ways to explain this correlation in terms of a causal connection. A few possible explanations are mentioned here:

1. **Aesthetic reasons.** To the scribe, writing ^o*-i-ha* may somehow have been more convenient, or otherwise preferable to writing ^o*-ha^a* (with a filler vowel sign). While this is theoretically possible, we have several examples of *Ci-ha* where space-filling is employed by adding an extra word-final ⟨a⟩, e.g. BULGARMADEN §6 *ā-mi-ia-ti-ha^a* ‘my’ /ʔ(a)miadi=*ha*/. In order to uphold this theory, one would have to account for the distribution of two different space-filling practices.

⁴³ Note, however, that the ⟨a⟩ in KARKAMIŞ A6 §21 (DEUS)*ku+AVIS-pa-pa^a* is ambiguous.

⁴⁴ At first sight, the final sign of KARKAMIŞ A11c §34 (BONUS)*wa/i-sa₅+ra/i-ti-i* ‘goodness’ (abl.-ins.) cannot be explained as a space-filler. However, one can also take it as a space-filler belonging to the following word *pa-tiⁱ-*a*. The resulting spelling *pa-tiⁱ⁻ⁱ-*a* with two consecutive identical space-filling vowel signs is rare but certainly not unparalleled, cf. Vertegaal 2017: 254.

2. **Phonetic lengthening.** Alternatively, one could set up a general phonetic rule, by which every short vowel is lengthened after the addition of /-h(a)/. This would be a very powerful rule with a large number of counterexamples.
3. **Accent shift.** Another possibility is that the addition of the clitic =*ha* triggered an accent shift. In unextended *kwa/i-(a-)ti*, *ku-AVIS-pa-pa* and *Ca-(a-)ti*, the accent was originally on the penultimate syllable.⁴⁵ It is possible that the addition of =*ha* attracted the accent. Thus pre-HLuw. *[k^wáti=ha] > *[k^watí=ha]. The resulting form would then be expected to undergo lengthening of short accented vowels in open syllables, yielding [k^watí=ha].⁴⁶ In a way, the situation would be reminiscent of Latin, where the addition of =*que* ‘and’ causes a similar shift of accent: *bónus* + =*que* > *bonús=que* (Weiss 2009: 111).⁴⁷ The biggest problems with this hypothesis are that there are no secure clitic-induced accent shifts attested elsewhere in Anatolian, and there are no unequivocal cases of lengthening before =*ha*.⁴⁸

None of these options is without problems, and I will not insist on any of them. I can only emphasise that the linguistically real plene writing in the three ablative instrumentals in °-*ti-i-ha*, *ku-AVIS-pa-pa-a-ha*, *kwa/i-ti-i-ha* and possibly also *ta-ni-mi-i-ha(-a-wa/i)* (cf. Section 6.7) must in some way be connected to the presence of =*ha*. Therefore, they do not necessarily damage the overall picture that linguistically real plene writing marks vocalic length or a disyllabic sequence.

7.3 1sg. =*mu-u*

The 1sg.dat.-loc. enclitic =*mu* ‘me’ is written with linguistically real plene spelling only once in the entire CHLI, scil. KARKAMIŠ A5a §7 *wa/i-mu-u-ta*, cf. Figure 6 (p. 194). There are 25 additional ambiguous attestations of (=mu-u) in CHLI.

This single secure linguistically real plene =*mu-u* is opposed to around 140 non-plene attestations of (=mu). As mentioned in Section 4.2, the vowel of =*mu* is

⁴⁵ For Hittite, this is suggested by the plene writing in ^D*Ku-pa-a-pa* (2×).

⁴⁶ Cf. Section 5.4 and Melchert 1994: 261f.

⁴⁷ Cf. also Spencer & Luís 2012: 85–89 for references to similar phenomena in Polish and Macedonian.

⁴⁸ David Sasseville kindly brings to mind CLuw. *la-al-pí-i-in=ti-i-t-ta* ‘eyelash’ /lalpin=di=ta/ (KUB 32.10+ i? 10; acc.sg.c.), where the presence of a pronominal clitic coincides with the plene writing of *i*. This situation stands in contrast to five attestations of non-plene *la-al-pí-in* without any clitic. This correlation between plene spelling and clitics looks similar to the one described for HLuw. here. However, in the absence of a full investigation of CLuw. plene writing, the significance of the presence or absence of plene writing remains unclear.



Fig. 6: KARKAMIŠ A5a §7 *wa/i-mu-u-ta*; CHLI (part 3, plate 65)

frequently elided when it is combined with clitics that start in a vowel, cf. *wa/i-ma-sá*, representing =*wa* (quot.ptcl.) + =*mu* ‘me’ + =*as* ‘he/she’ (nom.sg.c.). This also suggests (but does not prove) that its vowel was short.

Contrary to the other personal pronoun clitics we have seen, namely =*tu-u* (2sg.) and =*tu-u* (3sg.), dat.-loc.sg. =*mu(-u)* has well-attested cognates in the other Anatolian languages: CLuw. =*mu* (11 attestations) ‘for me’, Palaic =*mu* and Hittite =(m)*mu*. Nothing in the spelling of these related forms suggests the presence of a long vowel.

Because there is strong diachronic and synchronic evidence suggesting that the /u/ in HLuw. =*mu(-u)* synchronically cannot have been long, I must leave the linguistically real plene spelling in KARKAMIŠ A5a unexplained for now.

7.4 Quotative particle =*wa/i-a*

According to a count based on ACLT, the quotative particle /=*wa/* is attested over 1450 times in CHLI corpus as part of sentence-initial clitic chains. Only once do we find it spelled securely with linguistically real plene writing: ASSUR letter e §2 *sa-pi-su+ra/i-wa/i-a-ti* ‘Peace (be) to you!’, cf. Figure 7.



Fig. 7: ASSUR letter e §2 [||] *sa-pi-su+ra/i-wa/i-a-ti*; CHLI (part 3, plate 311)

The analysis of this phrase as /sapisur=wa=di/, containing *sapisur*- ‘peace’ and the clitic =*di* ‘you’ (2sg.dat.-loc.refl.) is confirmed by ASSUR letter *f+g* §2 *sa-pi-su+ra/i^a-wa/i-ma-za* /sapisur=wa=mants/ ‘id.’, where only =*di* is replaced by =*manz*, the plural form of the same reflexive dat.-loc.pl. pronominal clitic. I have no explanation for this highly unusual and rare spelling.

8 Conclusion

We began with the observation that plene spellings in Hieroglyphic Luwian can be divided into those which can be interpreted as space-fillers and those which cannot. It has been the aim of this article to account for the presence of the latter group of 517 ‘linguistically real’ or ‘linguistic’ plene spellings.

Next, we established that linguistically real plene writing is not a random phenomenon: it is only found in some morphemes (e.g. *za-a-*, *i-zi-i-*, *-tu-u/-tú-u*) while it is completely absent in others (e.g. the *-a-* in *á-pa-* and *tá-ti-* and the *-i* in CUM-*ni*). This indicates that linguistically real plene spelling was deliberately (though inconsistently) used in some words to mark a certain linguistic/phonetic feature. On the basis of *za-a-* ‘this’, *ni-i* ‘not’ (proh.), *pa+ra/i-i* ‘before’, LITUUS+*na-a-* ‘to see’, the verbs in *-i/-ai-* and the clitic =*du* ‘him’, the hypothesis was formulated that linguistically real plene writing, in principle, marks a long vowel (either accented or unaccented). In addition, the denominal verbs “AUDIRE+*MI*”-*ti-i-* ‘to hear’ and (“COR”) *za+ra/i-ti-i-* ‘to desire’ as well as the infinitive form DELERE+*nu-u-na* seem to indicate that it could also represent a disyllabic sequence.

For the lexemes and morphemes treated in Section 5, linguistically real plene writing is found conveniently in places where we would expect the presence of a long vowel or disyllabic sequence according to our current analyses. The items under scrutiny in Section 6, on the other hand, do not have secure etymological accounts, but it has been shown that they do not contradict the notion that linguistically real plene writing is primarily a marker of vocalic length.

The few items listed under Section 7 at first sight seem to contradict the hypothesis. 15 of them (*za-a-ti* [11×] and *kwa/i-a-ti* [4×]) can be explained through trivial analogical development, however. Eight true plene writings (*kwa/i-ti-i-ha* [2×], *ku-AVIS-pa-pa-a-ha*, *-Ca-ti-i-ha* abl.-ins. [3×], =*mu-u*, =*wa/i-a*) remain, occurring in places where neither a long vowel nor a disyllabic sequence is attested.⁴⁹

⁴⁹ Note that under a wider definition of space-filling, by which also penultimate vowel signs can be space-fillers, these 8 counterexamples could be readily explained. The problems complicating such an account, however, are listed in fn. 2.

Nevertheless, these are not numerous enough to disprove the hypothesis, which I hereby maintain: linguistically real plene writing in Hieroglyphic Luwian was used to mark long vowels or disyllabic sequences. Incidentally, and for the first time, this conclusion provides direct evidence for the presence of a phonemic difference between long and short vowels in Hieroglyphic Luwian.

This conclusion has consequences for future research into the morphemes listed in Section 6 which do not have a good etymology. The insight that these morphemes may well have contained a long vowel will limit the number of possible historical scenarios, serving as a guide for future etymological endeavours.

Acknowledgements: This research was conducted within the project *Splitting the mother tongue: The position of Anatolian in the dispersal of the Indo-European language family*, as funded by the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO). My sincere gratitude is due to Alwin Kloekhorst, Stefan Norbruis, David Sasseville and Zsolt Simon for their extensive comments on earlier versions of this paper. I take full responsibility for both the views expressed in this paper as well as any remaining errors.

Appendix: List of linguistically real plene attestations in CHLI

Text	Plene spelling (line no.)
ADIYAMAN 1	<i>pa-si-i-[*]a (4)</i>
ADIYAMAN 1	<i>kwa/i-i-sa</i> (2)
ADIYAMAN 2	<i>i-z[i]-i-[tā]</i> (1)
ALEPPO 2	<i>i-zi-i-ha(-)si</i> (3)
ALEPPO 2	<i>MALUS-la/i-a-ti</i> (6)
ALEPPO 2	<i>mī-i-pa-wa/i-[*]a (4)</i>
ALEPPO 2	<i>kwa/i-a-za</i> (5)
ALEPPO 2	<i>kwa/i-i-ha</i> (3)
ALEPPO 2	<i>za-a-zi</i> (5)
ALEPPO 2	<i>za-a-zi-pa-wa/i-mu</i> (2)
ALEPPO 2	<i>BONUS-mi-i-sa</i> (1)
ALEPPO 2	<i>mī-i-sa-[*]a (2)</i>
ALEPPO 2	<i>kwa/i-i-ha</i> (3)
ALEPPO 3	<i>i-zi-i-ha</i> (3)
ALEPPO 3	<i>SUB-na-a-na^a</i> (3)
ANCOZ 1	<i>za-a-ti</i> (1)
ANCOZ 7	<i>i-zi-i-ha</i> (C)

Text	Plene spelling (line no.)
ANCOZ 7	<i>i-zî-i-ti</i> (C)
ANCOZ 7	<i>za-a-zî-ha</i> (B)
ANCOZ 7	<i>kwa/i-i-sa</i> (B)
ANCOZ 7	URBS- <i>nî-i-zî^a</i> (B)
ANCOZ 10	<i>kwa/i-i-sa</i> (2)
ANKARA	CAELUM- <i>sa-[sî]-i-z[i]</i> (3)
ARSLANTAŞ (Tell Ahmar)	("BOS") <i>wa/i-wa/i-ti-i-ha</i> (4)
ASSUR letter <i>a</i>	NEG ₂ - <i>a-wa/i</i> (2)
ASSUR letter <i>a</i>	<i>u-nu-ha-wa/i-tu-u-ta</i> (1)
ASSUR letter <i>a</i>	<i>tara/i-pa-i-mi-i-sa</i> (2)
ASSUR letter <i>b</i>	<i>sa-na-wa/i-i-zi</i> (3)
ASSUR letter <i>c</i>	"(*187) <i>sû</i> "- <i>mi-la-a-na</i> (3)
ASSUR letter <i>c</i>	<i>â-pi-ha-wa/i-tu-u-ta</i> (2)
ASSUR letter <i>c</i>	<i>nî-i^a</i> (2)
ASSUR letter <i>c</i>	*187(-) <i>tu-wa/i-i-za</i> (2)
ASSUR letter <i>d</i>	<i>sa-na-wa/iⁱ-i-zîⁱ</i> (2)
ASSUR letter <i>e</i>	<i>nî-i</i> (2)
ASSUR letter <i>e</i>	<i>kwa/i-i-ha</i> (1)
ASSUR letter <i>e</i>	<i>sa-pi-su+ra/i-wa/i-a-ti</i> (1)
ASSUR letter <i>e</i>	<i>kwa/i-i-sâ</i> (4)
ASSUR letter <i>e</i>	<i>kwa/i-i-sâ-wa/i-sa</i> (2)
ASSUR letter <i>f+g</i>	("LOQUI") <i>ha-ti-i-ti</i> (f1)
ASSUR letter <i>f+g</i>	[<i>wa/i</i>]- <i>tu-u-wa/i-na</i> (g1)
ASSUR letter <i>f+g</i>	<i>na-a-pa</i> (f1)
ASSUR letter <i>f+g</i>	<i>nî-i^a</i> (f2 [2×], f4)
ASSUR letter <i>f+g</i>	PRAE- <i>i</i> (f1)
ASSUR letter <i>f+g</i>	<i>tu-u</i> (f3)
ASSUR letter <i>f+g</i>	<i>wa/i-tu-u-ta</i> (f2)
BABYLON 1	(DEUS)TONITRUS- <i>ti-i</i> (4)
BABYLON 1	"AEDIFICIUM"- <i>si-i</i> (4)
BABYLON 1	DELERE- <i>nu-u-na</i> (7)
BABYLON 1	<i>kwa/i-a-za</i> (3, 4)
BABYLON 1	<i>a-tâ-ti-li-i-sa</i> (5)
BABYLON 1	BONUS- <i>mi-i-na</i> (2)
BABYLON 1	CAPUT- <i>ti-i-sa</i> (1)
BABYLON 1	¹ FEMINA- <i>ti-i-na</i> (2)
BABYLON 1	INFANS- <i>nî-i-na</i> (2)
BABYLON 1	<i>mi-i-na-*a</i> (2)
BABYLON 1	<i>kwa/i-i-sa</i> (4)
BABYLON 1	<i>kwa/i-i-ta</i> (4)
BABYLON 2	<i>i-zî-i-ha</i> (1)
BABYLON 2	<i>i-zî-i-tâ</i> (1)
BABYLON 2	SERVUS- <i>lâ/i-a-sa</i> (1)
BOHÇA	HEROS- <i>li-i-sa</i> (1)
BOHÇA	¹ <i>ku+ra/i-ti-i-sâ</i> (1)

Text	Plene spelling (line no.)
BOR	PONERE- <i>u-ha</i> (3)
BOR	PONERE- <i>u-ta</i> (11)
BOR	HEROS- <i>li-i-sa-a</i> (1)
BOROWSKI 1	<i>i-zi-i-tà</i> (3)
BOROWSKI 1	<i>â-mi-i-s[a²]</i> (3)
BOROWSKI 3	<i>mi-i-a</i> (4)
BOROWSKI 3	<i>za-a-na</i> (3)
BOROWSKI 3	<i>za-a-sa</i> (2)
BOROWSKI 3	<i>za-a-sa</i> (5)
BOROWSKI 3	IUDEX- <i>wa/i-ni-i-sa</i> (1)
BOYBEYPINARI	HÁ+LI- <i>i-sa</i> (IVB2)
BOYBEYPINARI	¹ <i>pa-na-mu-wa/i-ti-i-sa</i> (IVB2)
BOYBEYPINARI	<i>i-zi-i-ti</i> (IIIA2)
BOYBEYPINARI	<i>ni-i-pa-wa/i</i> (IIIB)
BOYBEYPINARI	<i>kwa/i-a-ti</i> (IVD)
BOYBEYPINARI	<i>za-a-ha</i> (IVD2)
BOYBEYPINARI	<i>za-a-pa-wa/i</i> (ID)
BOYBEYPINARI	<i>za-a-ti</i> (IIID)
BOYBEYPINARI	<i>â-pa-si-i-na</i> (IVD3)
BOYBEYPINARI	¹ <i>â-za-mi-i-sâ</i> (IC)
BOYBEYPINARI	<i>mi-i-sa</i> (IVC1)
BOYBEYPINARI	<i>mi-i-sâ²</i> (IVC3)
BOYBEYPINARI	<i>kwa/i-i-sa</i> (IIID)
BULGARMADEN	PRAE- <i>i-ha</i> (2)
BULGARMADEN	HEROS- <i>ti-i-sâ</i> (1)
ÇALAPVERDİ 1	MONS- <i>ti-i</i> (2)
CEKKE	ASINUS(ANIMAL)- <i>i-za</i> (rev. 2)
CEKKE	<i>su+ra/i-i-zi</i> (rev. 9)
ÇİFTLİK	NEG ₂ - <i>a-ha</i> (2)
ÇİFTLİK	(DEUS)TONITRUS- <i>hu-ti-i-sa</i> (2)
ÇİFTLİK	[<i>tû</i>]- <i>wa/i-[ti]-i-sa</i> (1)
ÇİFTLİK	[<i>tû</i>]- <i>wa/i-ti-i-sa</i> (1)
ÇİFTLİK	DEUS- <i>ni-i-zi</i> (4, 6)
ÇİFTLİK	OMNIS- <i>mi-i-zi</i> (4)
ÇİFTLİK	<i>tû-wa/i-ti-i-sa</i> (2)
DARENDE	MANUS _x (-) <i>tu-ma-ni-i-na</i> (URBS) (2)
EĞREK	TONITRUS- <i>hu-wa/i+ra/i-i-sâ</i> (1)
EĞREK	<i>wa/i+ra/i-pa-sa-hi-i-sâ</i> (1)
EĞRİKÖY	(“IUDEX”) <i>tara/i-wa/i-ni-i-sa</i> (3)
EĞRİKÖY	(DEUS)TONITRUS- <i>hu-ti-i-sâ</i> (1)
ERKİLET 1+2	<i>sa-ni-i-ti</i> (2.2)
ERKİLET 1+2	<i>kwa/i-i-sa-ha</i> (1.2)
ERKİLET 1+2	<i>kwa/i-i-sâ-ha</i> (2.2)
GAZİANTEP	<i>kwa/i-i-sa</i> (2)
GÜRÜN	<i>kar-ka-mi-i-si-sa₅</i> (URBS) (2)

Text	Plene spelling (line no.)
GÜRÜN	<i>kwa/i-i-sa</i> (5)
HAMA 1–3, 6–7	<i>i-zi-i-tâ</i> (1.3, 2.3, 3.2, 7.2)
HAMA 1–3, 6–7	<i>za-a</i> (6.2)
HAMA 4	<i>i-zi-i-ha</i> (2)
HAMA 4	<i>kwa/i-i-sâ</i> (3)
HAMA 8	<i>za-a-na</i> (2)
HAMA 8	<i>i-ma-tu-wa/i-ni-i-sa</i> (REGIO) (1–2)
ISKENDERUN	<i>wa/i-tu-u-taⁱ</i> (3)
IZGIN	<i>î]-zi-i-ha</i> (8)
IZGIN	<i>i-zi-i-ha</i> (4, 5)
IZGIN	<i>i-zi-i-tâ</i> (6, 7)
IZGIN	<i>i-zi-i-tu</i> (19)
IZGIN	IUDEX- <i>ni-i-na</i> (10)
IZGIN	<i>kwa/i-i-sa</i> (20)
IZGIN	COR- <i>tara/i-i-na</i> (17)
JISR EL HADID fr.	“*179”(-) <i>pa+ra/i-ia-si-i-na</i> (1.1)
KARAHÖYÜK	<i>tara/i-pa-a-ti</i> (11)
KARAHÖYÜK	<i>kwa/i-i(a)-sa</i> (11)
KARAHÖYÜK	<i>kwa/i-i(a)-sa-pa-wa/i</i> (11)
KARATEPE 4	¹ DEUS- <i>nî-i-sâ</i> (1)
KARATEPE 1 Ho.	<i>i-zi-i-hâ</i> (15)
KARATEPE 1 Ho.	<i>i-zi-i-ha</i> (8, 10)
KARATEPE 1 Ho.	<i>i-zi-i-sa-tû-na</i> (48)
KARATEPE 1 Ho.	OMNIS- <i>MI-nî-i-ma-za₄</i> (50)
KARATEPE 1 Ho.	<i>kwa/i-i-pa-wâ/i</i> (53)
KARATEPE 1 Ho.	<i>kwa/i-i-pa-wa/i-ara/i</i> (28)
KARATEPE 1 Ho.	<i>kwa/i-i-ta-na</i> (20)
KARATEPE 1 Ho.	(CASTRUM) <i>ha+ra/i-nî-i-sâ</i> (23)
KARATEPE 1 Ho.	(OVIS.ANIMAL) <i>hâ-wâ/i-i-sâ</i> (48)
KARATEPE 1 Ho.	FLUMEN- <i>para/i-i-sâ</i> (48)
KARATEPE 1 Ho.	FRONS- <i>li-i-sâ</i> (50)
KARATEPE 1 Ho.	¹ CAPUT- <i>tî-i-zi</i> (20)
KARATEPE 1 Ho.	OMNIS- <i>MI-i-sâ</i> (48)
KARATEPE 1 Hu.	(*274) <i>ha-ta-li-i-ha</i> (28)
KARATEPE 1 Hu.	<i>ha-tâ+ra/i-ti-i-hâ</i> (49)
KARATEPE 1 Hu.	¹ (LITUUS) <i>â-za-ti-i-wa/i-tâ-sâ</i> (1)
KARATEPE 1 Hu.	<i>i-zi-i-[...]</i> (44)
KARATEPE 1 Hu.	<i>i-zi-i-ha</i> (8)
KARATEPE 1 Hu.	<i>i-zi-i-hâ</i> (9, 10, 15)
KARATEPE 1 Hu.	<i>i-zi-i-tâ</i> (3)
KARATEPE 1 Hu.	<i>i-zi-i-wa/i</i> (69)
KARATEPE 1 Hu.	<i>nî-i-pa-wa/i</i> (72)
KARATEPE 1 Hu.	<i>kwa/i-i-ta-na</i> (34)
KARATEPE 1 Hu.	<i>â-TANA-wa/i-nî-i-sâ</i> (2)
KARATEPE 1 Hu.	CAPUT- <i>tî-i-sâ</i> (1)

Text	Plene spelling (line no.)
KARATEPE 1 Hu.	OMNIS- <i>MI-i-sá</i> (48)
KARATEPE 1 Hu.	<i>kwa/i-i-na</i> (2)
KARKAMIŠ A1a	(LIBARE) <i>sa₅+ra/i-li-i-tú</i> (5)
KARKAMIŠ A1a	(PANIS) <i>tu+ra/i-pa-si-i</i> (5)
KARKAMIŠ A1a	<i>i-zi-i-ha</i> (4)
KARKAMIŠ A1a	<i>i-zi-i-sa-ta-i</i> (5)
KARKAMIŠ A1a	<i>pa+ra/i-i-*a</i> (3)
KARKAMIŠ A1a	<i>pa+ra/i-i-ha^a</i> (2)
KARKAMIŠ A1a	PES- <i>wa/i-i-ha</i> (3, 4)
KARKAMIŠ A1a	PES- <i>wa/i-i-ha-*a</i> (3)
KARKAMIŠ A1a	<i>kwa/i-a</i> (2)
KARKAMIŠ A1a	<i>kwa/i-a-za</i> (6)
KARKAMIŠ A1a	<i>kwa/i-i-ha</i> (3 [2×])
KARKAMIŠ A1a	<i>kwa/i-i-ta</i> (1)
KARKAMIŠ A1a	<i>za-a-ti-i</i> (5)
KARKAMIŠ A1a	<i>za-a-zi</i> (1 [2×], 3, 4, 5, 6)
KARKAMIŠ A1a	(SCALPRUM.CAPER ₂) <i>u-pa-ní-i-na</i> (2)
KARKAMIŠ A1a	DEUS- <i>ní-si-i-na</i> (4)
KARKAMIŠ A1a	¹ BONUS- <i>ti-i-sa</i> (3)
KARKAMIŠ A1a	INFANS- <i>ní-i-na</i> (4)
KARKAMIŠ A1a	<i>mi-i-sa-*a</i> (2, 3)
KARKAMIŠ A1a	PANIS.PITHOS- <i>ní-i-na</i> (5)
KARKAMIŠ A1a	<i>kwa/i-i-sa</i> (5 [2×])
KARKAMIŠ A1a	<i>kwa/i-i-sa-pa-wa/i</i> (5)
KARKAMIŠ A1a	<i>ta-ní-mi-i-sa</i> (2)
KARKAMIŠ A1b	<i>i-zi-i-sa-ta-i</i> (2, 3)
KARKAMIŠ A1b	FEMINA- <i>ti-i-sa</i> (2)
KARKAMIŠ A1b	<i>mi-i-sa-*a</i> (2)
KARKAMIŠ A1b	VIR- <i>ti-i-sa</i> (2)
KARKAMIŠ A2	(PES ₂ .PES) <i>tara/i-pi-i-tu</i> (5)
KARKAMIŠ A2	<i>za-a-ia</i> (5)
KARKAMIŠ A2	<i>za-a-sa</i> (2, 4)
KARKAMIŠ A2	<i>kwa/i-i-sa</i> (4)
KARKAMIŠ A3	<i>za-a-sa</i> (3)
KARKAMIŠ A3	<i>za-a-ti-i</i> (3)
KARKAMIŠ A3	(CAELUM.*286.x) <i>sá-pa-tara/i-i-sa</i> (1)
KARKAMIŠ A3	<i>kwa/i-i-zi</i> (1, 2 [2×])
KARKAMIŠ A4a	<i>sù-wa/i-ní-i-sa</i> (2)
KARKAMIŠ A5a	<i>wa/i-mu-u-ta</i> (2)
KARKAMIŠ A5a	<i>wa/i-tu-u-ta</i> (4)
KARKAMIŠ A5a	<i>ara/i-i-zi</i> (2)
KARKAMIŠ A6	<i>á-mi-i^a</i> (3)
KARKAMIŠ A6	AUDIRE+ <i>MI-ti-i-ta</i> (2 [2×], 3)
KARKAMIŠ A6	<i>i-zi-i-ha</i> (4)
KARKAMIŠ A6	<i>i-zi-i-sa-ta+ra/i-wa/i-ma-za</i> (5 [2×])

Text	Plene spelling (line no.)
KARKAMIŠ A6	<i>kwa/i-a-ti</i> (8)
KARKAMIŠ A6	<i>kwa/i-i^a</i> (6, 7)
KARKAMIŠ A6	<i>kwa/i-i-ia</i> (3)
KARKAMIŠ A6	<i>kwa/i-ti-i-ha</i> (8)
KARKAMIŠ A6	<i>ta-ni-mi-i-ha-a-wa/i</i> (6)
KARKAMIŠ A6	<i>za-a-pa-wa/i</i> (3)
KARKAMIŠ A6	<i>zi-i-na</i> (9)
KARKAMIŠ A6	<i>zi-i-pa-wa/i</i> (8)
KARKAMIŠ A6	<i>zi-i-pa-wa/i-a</i> (3)
KARKAMIŠ A6	[CAPUT ⁷]- <i>ti-i-sa</i> (1)
KARKAMIŠ A6	AUDIRE+ <i>MI-ma-ti-mi-i-sa</i> (1)
KARKAMIŠ A6	CAPUT- <i>ti-i-sá</i> (1)
KARKAMIŠ A6	DEUS.AVIS- <i>ta-ni-sâ-mi-i-sa</i> (1)
KARKAMIŠ A6	FINES+ <i>hi-ti-i-na</i> (1)
KARKAMIŠ A6	¹ <i>i-a-ra/i-ri+i-i-sa</i> (1)
KARKAMIŠ A6	¹ <i>ka-ma-ni-i-ia</i> (3)
KARKAMIŠ A6	INFANS- <i>ní-i-sa-wa/i-sá</i> (4)
KARKAMIŠ A6	LITUUS+ <i>ta-sa-pa-CERVUS-wa/i-ti-i-sa</i> (1)
KARKAMIŠ A6	<i>kwa/i-i-sá</i> (9)
KARKAMIŠ A6	<i>kwa/i-i-zi</i> (4–5)
KARKAMIŠ A6	SERVUS- <i>la/i-ti-i-zi</i> (3)
KARKAMIŠ A7a	¹ <i>ka-ma-ni-i-sá</i> (1)
KARKAMIŠ A7c–d	¹ <i>ma-li-i-TONITRUS-pa-sá</i> (1)
KARKAMIŠ A7j	<i>â-sa_s-za-mi-i-sa</i> (2)
KARKAMIŠ A7j	IUDEX- <i>ní-i-sa</i> (1)
KARKAMIŠ A11a	<i>i-zi-i-ha</i> (5)
KARKAMIŠ A11a	<i>kwa/i-a-ti</i> (2, 3, 5)
KARKAMIŠ A11a	(*33(1)) <i>mi-tâ-sa_s+ra/i-i-na</i> (3)
KARKAMIŠ A11a	<i>mi-i-sa-*a</i> (2)
KARKAMIŠ A11a	<i>kwa/i-i-sa</i> (6)
KARKAMIŠ A11b	PES- <i>wa/i-i-ha</i> (5)
KARKAMIŠ A11b	<i>pi-i-na-*a</i> (5)
KARKAMIŠ A11b	<i>kwa/i-a-ti-i</i> (3)
KARKAMIŠ A11b	<i>za-a</i> (6)
KARKAMIŠ A11b	<i>za-a-sa</i> (1)
KARKAMIŠ A11b	(LITUUS) <i>â-za-mi-i-sa</i> (1)
KARKAMIŠ A11b	“IUDEX”- <i>ni-i-sa</i> (1)
KARKAMIŠ A11b	DOMINUS- <i>na-i-ni-i-na</i> (5)
KARKAMIŠ A11b	DOMINUS- <i>na-ní-i-sa</i> (3)
KARKAMIŠ A11b	INFANS.NEPOS- <i>si-i-sa</i> (1)
KARKAMIŠ A11b	<i>mi-i-na-*a</i> (2, 5)
KARKAMIŠ A11b	<i>mi-i-sa-*a</i> (3)
KARKAMIŠ A11b	<i>mi-i-zi-*a</i> (3)
KARKAMIŠ A11b	REGIO- <i>ni(-)DOMINUS-i-sa</i> (1)
KARKAMIŠ A11b	URBS+ <i>MI-ni-i-sa</i> (1)

Text	Plene spelling (line no.)
KARKAMIŠ A11b	VACUUS- <i>ti-i-sa</i> (2)
KARKAMIŠ A11c	(“CULTER”) <i>pa+ra/i-tú-ni-i-tú</i> (4)
KARKAMIŠ A11c	<i>kwa/i+ra/i-i</i> (5 [2×])
KARKAMIŠ A11c	<i>kwa/i-a-ti</i> (2)
KARKAMIŠ A11c	<i>kwa/i-a-za</i> (6)
KARKAMIŠ A11c	<i>za-a-ti-ia-za</i> (3, 6)
KARKAMIŠ A11c	<i>za-a-zi</i> (5, 6)
KARKAMIŠ A11c	<i>za-a-zi-pa-wa/i-tá</i> (2)
KARKAMIŠ A11c	(“FLUMEN+MINUS”) <i>sâ-ku+ra/i-wa/i-ni-i-zi-ha</i> (3)
KARKAMIŠ A11c	“PORTA”- <i>la/i/u-ni-si-i-zi</i> (6)
KARKAMIŠ A11c	DEUS- <i>ní-i-zi</i> (5)
KARKAMIŠ A11c	<i>kwa/i-i-sa</i> (2)
KARKAMIŠ A11c	URBS+ <i>MI-ni-i-na</i> (5)
KARKAMIŠ A11c	VIR- <i>ti-ia-ti-i-na</i> (4)
KARKAMIŠ A12	*275- <i>i-ta</i> (3)
KARKAMIŠ A12	“IUDEX”- <i>ní-i-sa</i> (1)
KARKAMIŠ A13d	“9”- <i>wa/i-i-za-ha-wa/i-tú</i> (4)
KARKAMIŠ A13d	9 ²¹ - <i>wa/i-i-za</i> (6–7)
KARKAMIŠ A13d	<i>kwa/i+ra/i-i</i> (5)
KARKAMIŠ A13d	<i>za-a-ti</i> (5, 8)
KARKAMIŠ A13d	[k] <i>wa/i-i-sa</i> (8)
KARKAMIŠ A13d	<i>kwa/i-i-sa</i> (2)
KARKAMIŠ A14a	¹ <i>su-hi-i-sa</i> (1)
KARKAMIŠ A14b	<i>kwa/i-i-sa</i> (4)
KARKAMIŠ A15a	<i>pa+ra/i-li-i-sa</i> (5)
KARKAMIŠ A15a	AEDIFICIUM- <i>sa-wa/i-za-ti-i-na</i> (4)
KARKAMIŠ A15b	(“LONGUS”) <i>ia+ra/i-i-ha</i> (3)
KARKAMIŠ A15b	(DEUS) SOL- <i>tâ-ti-i-ha</i> (1)
KARKAMIŠ A15b	(MANUS.*273)(-) <i>su-hi-i-ti-ha</i> (3)
KARKAMIŠ A15b	<i>i-zi-i-ha</i> (2)
KARKAMIŠ A15b	PUGNUS- <i>ri+i-i-ia-ha</i> (1)
KARKAMIŠ A15b	(“COR”) <i>â-tara/i-i-na</i> (2)
KARKAMIŠ A15b	“LINGUA”- <i>la-ti-i-na</i> (4)
KARKAMIŠ A15b	<i>â-mi-i-na-pa-wa/i(-)^{ul}-mu^l</i> (2)
KARKAMIŠ A15b	<i>â-mi-i-sa</i> (4)
KARKAMIŠ A15b	DOMINUS- <i>na-ni-i-sa</i> (4)
KARKAMIŠ A15b	FLUMEN- <i>pi-i-na</i> (2)
KARKAMIŠ A15b	PONERE- <i>mi-i-na</i> (2)
KARKAMIŠ A15b	REGIO- <i>ni-si-i-na^a</i> (4)
KARKAMIŠ A15b	<i>kwa/i-i-sa</i> (top)
KARKAMIŠ A15b	<i>za-ma-ti-i-na^a</i> (top)
KARKAMIŠ A16a	NEG ₂ - <i>a</i> (2)
KARKAMIŠ A16a	DEUS- <i>ni-i-na</i> (2)
KARKAMIŠ A17b	<i>i-zi-i-[-]</i> (2)
KARKAMIŠ A17b	<i>i-zi-i-sa-ta-tú-u</i> (2)

Text	Plene spelling (line no.)
KARKAMIŠ A17c	<i>kwa/i-a-ti</i> (1)
KARKAMIŠ A17c	<i>kwa/i-a-ti-i</i> (2)
KARKAMIŠ A17c	MONS(-) <i>wa/i-ti-i-sa-wa/i-sa</i> (1–2)
KARKAMIŠ A19b	<i>i-zi-i-ha</i> (1)
KARKAMIŠ A19j	<i>za-a-ti</i> (2)
KARKAMIŠ A19r	<i>ku-AVIS-pa-pa-a-ha</i> (1–2)
KARKAMIŠ A21	NEG ₂ - <i>a-pa-wa/i-mu</i> (5)
KARKAMIŠ A23	<i>kwa/i-a-ha</i> (4)
KARKAMIŠ A24	(ASINUS ₂ .ANIMAL) <i>tú+ra/i-la-ka-li-si-i-zi</i> (2)
KARKAMIŠ A24	“PUGNUS”(-) <i>wa/i+ra/i-mi-i-na</i> (4)
KARKAMIŠ A24	REX- <i>ti-i-sa</i> (3, 5)
KARKAMIŠ A24 fr. A15	<i>ta-ni-mi-i-sa</i> (1)
KARKAMIŠ A26f	<i>i-zi-i-tâ-a</i> (3)
KARKAMIŠ A27bb*	<i>za-a-[p]a-wa/i-mu</i> (1)
KARKAMIŠ A27h	<i>kw[a/i]-i-z[i]</i> (1)
KARKAMIŠ A27o	<i>pi-i-ha-mi-na</i> (1)
KARKAMIŠ A29d+i	NEG ₂ - <i>a-pa-w[a/i? ...]</i> (2)
KARKAMIŠ A29f1+2	<i>za[...]wa/i-tu-u-ta</i>
KARKAMIŠ A29f1+2	ANNUS- <i>li-i-sa</i> (2.2)
KARKAMIŠ A30h	<i>kwa/i-i-sa-ha</i> (1)
KARKAMIŠ A31 (+ A30b 1–3)	<i>i-[zi-i]-tâ</i> (1)
KARKAMIŠ A31 (+ A30b 1–3)	<i>i-zi-i-ha</i> (2, 3)
KARKAMIŠ A31 (+ A30b 1–3)	<i>i-zi-i-ti</i> (5)
KAYSERİ	<i>[ha]ra/i-[na-w]â/i-ni-sa-pa-wa/i-tu-u-ta</i> (5)
KIRÇOĞLU	<i>i-zi-i-(sa)-tâ-ta^a</i> (2)
KÖTÜKALE	<i>kwa/i-i-sa</i> (5)
KULULU 1	<i>â-wa/i-i-tu</i> (5)
KULULU 1	¹ <i>tu-wa/i-ti-sâ-pa-wa/i-tu-u-ta</i> (4)
KULULU 1	<i>kwa/i-ti-i-ha</i> (6)
KULULU 1	<i>â-tara/i-i-na</i> (5)
KULULU 1	¹ <i>tu-wa/i-ti-i-sâ</i> (1)
KULULU 1	<i>mara/i-ta-mi-i-na</i> (5)
KULULU 2	(DEUS) <i>sâ-ta-si-i-zi</i> (B4)
KULULU 2	(DEUS) SOL- <i>wa/i-tâ-mi-i-sa</i> (A1–2)
KULULU 2	“EDERE”- <i>tâ-mi-i-sa</i> (B1)
KULULU 2	¹ <i>pa-nu-ni-i-sa</i> (A1)
KULULU 2	<i>u-wa/i-mi-i-sâ</i> (B1)
KULULU 4	<i>i-zi-i-sa-ta-ha</i> (3)
KULULU 4	DEUS- <i>ni-i-zí</i> (1)
KULULU 4	DOMINUS- <i>ni-i-sa₄</i> (2)
KULULU 5	<i>i-zi-i-ri+i</i> (4)
KÜRTÜL	(DEUS) <i>ti-i-wa/i-ti-x</i> (3)
MALPINAR	<i>i-z[i]-i-ti-zaⁱ</i> (3)
MALPINAR	<i>i-zi-i-hâ</i> (1)
MALPINAR	<i>i-zi-i-ia-t[i? -z]a²</i> (3)

Text	Plene spelling (line no.)
MALPINAR	<i>ni-i-wa/i</i> (5)
MALPINAR	(DEUS)SOL- <i>ti-i-sa</i> (3)
MALPINAR	POST+ <i>ra/i-i-sá</i> (5)
MALPINAR	POST+ <i>ra/i-i-sa</i> (6)
MALPINAR	<i>kwa/i-i-sa</i> (3)
MALPINAR	<i>u-si-na-si-i-sa</i> (5)
MARAŞ 1	(DEUS)[...] - <i>ti-i²-sá</i> (5)
MARAŞ 1	<i>á-mi-i-zi</i> (4)
MARAŞ 1	¹ <i>la+ra/i+a-ma-si-i-sa</i> (1)
MARAŞ 1	¹ TONITRUS.HALPA- <i>pa-ru-ti-i-ia-sa</i> (1)
MARAŞ 1	<i>ku+ra/i-ku-ma-wa/i-ni-i-sá</i> (URBS) (1)
MARAŞ 1	LEPUS+ <i>ra/i-ia-li-i-sa</i> (1)
MARAŞ 1	REX- <i>ti-i-sa</i> (1)
MARAŞ 2	FEMINA- <i>ti-[i]-sá</i> (1)
MARAŞ 4	[([*] 274) <i>ha</i>]- <i>ta-li-i-ha</i> (1)
MARAŞ 4	<i>i-zi-i-ha^a</i> (5)
MARAŞ 4	NEG ₂ - <i>a-ha</i> (3 [2×])
MARAŞ 4	<i>ni-mu-wa/i-i-za-sa</i> (1)
MARAŞ 4	<i>sá-a-ha</i> (3)
MARAŞ 4	<i>tá-ti-i</i> (3)
MARAŞ 4	([*] 274) <i>u-pa-ti-tà-si-i-na</i> (1)
MARAŞ 4	(“COR”) <i>á-tara/i-i-na</i> (5)
MARAŞ 4	¹ TONITRUS.HALPA- <i>pa-CERVUS₂-ti-i-ia-sa</i> (1)
MARAŞ 4	<i>ku+ra/i-ku-ma-wa/i-ni-i-sa</i> (URBS) (1)
MARAŞ 4	<i>tá-ti-i-sa</i> (3)
MARAŞ 5	“[OVIS.ANIMAL]” <i>ara/i-ti-wa/i-li-i-na</i> (1)
MARAŞ 7	(“OCCIDENS”) <i>á-pa-zi-i-ti</i> (1)
MARAŞ 8	(“VACUUS”) <i>ta-na-ti-i²-na</i> (3)
MARAŞ 8	<i>kwa/i-i-sa</i> (5)
MARAŞ 8	REX- <i>ti-i-sa</i> (13)
MARAŞ 11	<i>za-a-wa/i-ta</i> (3)
MARAŞ 14	[z] <i>a-a-tiⁱ</i> (4)
MARAŞ 14	<i>i-zi-i-ia+ra/i</i> (3)
MARAŞ 14	<i>i-zi-i-ia-tara/i-za^a</i> (4)
MARAŞ 14	<i>ni-i-sá</i> (5)
MARAŞ 14	<i>z[i-i]-na</i> (5)
MARAŞ 14	INFANS- <i>ni-i-sa</i> (3)
MARAŞ 14	LOCUS- <i>la/i-ta-li-i-na</i> (2)
MARAŞ 14	<i>mi-i-sa</i> (3)
MARAŞ 14	- <i>si-i-sa</i> (2)
MEHARDE	<i>i-zi-i-tà-pa-wa/i-tú</i> (A4)
MEHARDE	<i>za-a-ti</i> (A9)
MEHARDE	<i>za-a-wa/i</i> (A1)
MEHARDE	<i>kwa/i-i-sà</i> (C1; C8)
NİĞDE 1	<i>i-zi-i-tà</i> (1)

Text	Plene spelling (line no.)
PALANGA	TONITRUS- <i>hu-ti-i</i> (3)
PALANGA	FLUMEN.DOMINUS- <i>i-sá</i> (1)
QAL'AT EL MUDIQ	"URBS+MP"- <i>ni-i-na</i> (2)
SHEIZAR	<i>mi-i-zi-[*]a</i> (3)
SHEIZAR	<i>kwa/i-i-sa</i> (4)
ŞIRZI	<i>i-zi-i-tâ</i> (2)
ŞIRZI	<i>â-mi-i-na</i> (2)
SULTANHAN	<i>â-pi-i</i> (4)
SULTANHAN	<i>â-pi-i-wa/i-tâ^a</i> (F1)
SULTANHAN	CRUS- <i>nú-wa/i-mi-i-na</i> (2)
SULTANHAN	<i>ma-sa-ha-ni-i-ti</i> (6)
SULTANHAN	NEG ₂ - <i>a</i> (F2)
SULTANHAN	<i>ni-iⁱ</i> (E1)
SULTANHAN	<i>kwa/i-i-pa-wa/i</i> (3)
SULTANHAN	<i>wa/i-su-SARMA-ma-sa-a-ri+i</i> (F2)
SULTANHAN	<i>wa/i-tu-u</i> (6)
SULTANHAN	<i>za-a-na</i> (1)
SULTANHAN	<i>za-a-zi</i> (4)
SULTANHAN	"FEMINA"- <i>na-ti-i-sa</i> (F3)
SULTANHAN	<i>â-pa-si-i-zi</i> (3)
SULTANHAN	<i>â-ru-ni-i-zi</i> (3)
SULTANHAN	DEUS- <i>ni-i-zi</i> (5)
SULTANHAN	HEROS- <i>li-i-sá</i> (1)
SULTANHAN	<i>ka-ti-i-sa</i> (F1)
SULTANHAN	<i>ta-[*]375-li-i-sa</i> (F3)
SULTANHAN	<i>tu-wa/i+ra/i-sâ-si-i-na</i> (1)
SULTANHAN	<i>wa/i-ia-ni-i-sa</i> (6)
TEKİRDARBENT 1	<i>i-zi-i-tiⁱ</i> (2)
TELL AHMAR 1	([[*]]COR[[*]]) <i>z[a]+ra/i-ti-i-ta</i> (6)
TELL AHMAR 1	(INFANS) <i>ni-mu-wa/i-i-za-sa</i> (1, 5)
TELL AHMAR 1	"AUDIRE+MP"- <i>ti-i-tá</i> (7)
TELL AHMAR 1	<i>i-zi-i-tâ</i> (5 [2×])
TELL AHMAR 1	<i>i-zi-i-wa/iⁱ</i> (7)
TELL AHMAR 1	LITUUS+ <i>na-a-tâ</i> (4)
TELL AHMAR 1	<i>mi-i-[*]a</i> (4)
TELL AHMAR 1	<i>mi-i-ha-wa/i-[*]a</i> (5)
TELL AHMAR 1	<i>pa-si-i-[*]a</i> (5)
TELL AHMAR 1	<i>kwa/i-i</i> (5)
TELL AHMAR 1	<i>za-[a]-ti^{i-a}</i> (6)
TELL AHMAR 1	<i>za-a-sa</i> (7)
TELL AHMAR 1	"CAELUM"- <i>si-i-sa</i> (1, 7)
TELL AHMAR 1	... <i>sâ-ia-mi-i-sá</i> (1)
TELL AHMAR 1	20- <i>tâ-ti-i-sa</i> (4)
TELL AHMAR 1	CRUS- <i>ni-[mi]-i-sa</i> (5)
TELL AHMAR 1	DOMINUS- <i>na-ni-i-sa</i> (3)

Text	Plene spelling (line no.)
TELL AHMAR 1	<i>ha+ra/i-na-wa/i-ní-i-sa-ha</i> (URBS) (2)
TELL AHMAR 1	^l <i>ara/i-ia-hi-na-si-i-sa</i> (1)
TELL AHMAR 1	^l <i>ha-pa-ti-la-si-i-sa</i> (1)
TELL AHMAR 1	INFANS- <i>ni-i-na</i> (4)
TELL AHMAR 1	<i>mi-i-n[a]-*a</i> (8)
TELL AHMAR 1	REX- <i>ti-i-sa</i> (1)
TELL AHMAR 1	REX- <i>ti-i-sâ</i> (2)
TELL AHMAR 2	<i>mi-i-*a</i> (7)
TELL AHMAR 2	NEG ₂ - <i>a-pa</i> (8)
TELL AHMAR 2	NEG ₂ - <i>a-pa-wa/i</i> (7 [2×], 8)
TELL AHMAR 2	[NEG ₂]- <i>a-pa-wa/i-ti</i> (7)
TELL AHMAR 2	PES- <i>wa/i-i-ti</i> (9)
TELL AHMAR 2	<i>za-a-ti-wa/i</i> (9)
TELL AHMAR 2	<i>za-ti-i</i> (9)
TELL AHMAR 2	(DEUS)SOL- <i>wa/i-ti-i-na</i> (5)
TELL AHMAR 2	(FEMINA.FEMINA) <i>â-ma-na-sa₅+ra/i-i-na</i> (8)
TELL AHMAR 2	(PES ₂) <i>tara/i-za-mi-i-sa</i> (3)
TELL AHMAR 2	FEMINA- <i>ti-[i-na]</i> (10)
TELL AHMAR 2	FEMINA- <i>ti-i-na</i> (7)
TELL AHMAR 2	<i>ha+ra/i-na-wa/i-ni-i-sa</i> (URBS) (2)
TELL AHMAR 2	<i>mi-i-na-*a</i> (7)
TELL AHMAR 2	<i>kwa/i-i-sa</i> (7)
TELL AHMAR 2	REX- <i>ti-i-sa</i> (1, 2)
TELL AHMAR 4	<i>i-zi-i-ha</i> (2)
TELL AHMAR 5	SUPER+ <i>ra/i-a-wa/i-ta</i> (4)
TELL AHMAR 5	<i>za-a-pa-wa/i-ta</i> (3)
TELL AHMAR 5	<i>za-a-sa</i> (3)
TELL AHMAR 5	<i>za-a-ti-i</i> (2)
TELL AHMAR 5	<i>za-a-zi</i> (1)
TELL AHMAR 5	<i>za-a-zi-pa-wa/i</i> (1)
TELL AHMAR 5	<i>za-a-zi-wa/i</i> (2)
TELL AHMAR 5	CORNU+CAPUT- <i>mi-i-sa</i> (4)
TELL AHMAR 5	<i>mi-i-sa-*a</i> (1)
TELL AHMAR 5	<i>kwa/i-i-sa</i> (5)
TELL AHMAR 5	REX- <i>ti-i-sa</i> (1)
TELL AHMAR 5	<i>tâ-ti-i-sa</i> (1, 3)
TELL AHMAR 5	COR- <i>tara/i-i-na</i> (4)
TELL AHMAR fr. 5	<i>za-a-ti-ia-za</i> (3)
TELL TAYINAT 1 frr. 3–5, 6	<i>kwa/i-a-za</i> (3)
TELL TAYINAT 2	<i>i-zi-i-tâ</i> (1.2a; 1.3)
TELL TAYINAT 2	NEG ₂ - <i>a-pa</i> (3.3)
TELL TAYINAT 2	<i>kwa/i-i-sâ</i> (5.12)
TELL TAYINAT 2	<i>kwa/i-i-zi</i> (2.1b)
TELL TAYINAT 2	REX- <i>ti-i-sa</i> (1.2a)
TOPADA	COR- <i>tara/i-i-na</i> (8)

Text	Plene spelling (line no.)
TULEIL 2	<i>hara/i-na-wa/i-ni-i-sa</i> [(URBS ²)] (4)
TULEIL 2	<i>kwa/i-i-sa</i> ² (4)

Abbreviations

- ACLT Ilya S. Yakubovich (2013–). *Annotated Corpus of Luwian Texts*. URL: <http://web-corpora.net/LuwianCorpus/search/> (visited on 07/2017).
- CHLI J. David Hawkins (2000). *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions*. Vol. 1: *Inscriptions of the Iron Age*. Berlin & New York: de Gruyter.
- LIV² Helmut Rix (2001). *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben. Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstammbildungen*. Unter Leitung von Helmut Rix bearbeitet von Martin J. Kümmel, Thomas Zehnder, Reiner Lipp, Brigitte Schirmer. 2nd ed. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Bibliography

- Beekes, Robert S. P. (1985). *The Origins of the Indo-European Nominal Inflection*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.
- Carruba, Onofrio (1970). *Das Palaische. Texte, Grammatik, Lexikon*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- van Gessel, Ben H. L. (1997). *Onomasticon of the Hittite Pantheon*. Vol. 1. Leiden & Boston: Brill.
- Goedegebuure, Petra M. (2007). “The Hieroglyphic Luwian demonstrative ablative-instrumentals *zin* and *apin*”. In: *VI Congresso Internazionale di Ittitologia, Roma, 5–9 settembre 2005, Parte I*. Ed. by Alfonso Archi & Rita Francia. Roma: CNR – Istituto di Studi sulle civiltà dell’Egeo e del Vicino Oriente, 319–334.
- Goedegebuure, Petra M. (2010). “The Luwian demonstratives of place and manner”. In: *ipamati kistamati pari tumatimis. Luwian and Hittite Studies Presented to J. David Hawkins on the Occasion of his 70th Birthday*. Ed. by Itamar Singer. Tel Aviv: Yass, 76–94.
- Hyman, Larry M. (1985). *A Theory of Phonological Weight*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Kimball, Sara E. (1999). *Hittite Historical Phonology*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.
- Kloekhorst, Alwin (2006). “Initial laryngeals in Anatolian”. In: *Historische Sprachforschung* 119, 77–108.
- Kloekhorst, Alwin (2008). *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden & Boston: Brill.
- Kloekhorst, Alwin (2012). “Pronominal morphology in the Anatolian language family”. In: *Altorientalische Forschungen* 39, 254–264.
- Kloekhorst, Alwin (2014). *Accent in Hittite. A Study in Plene Spelling, Consonant Gradation, Clitics, and Metrics*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Kloekhorst, Alwin (2016). “The prehistory of HLuw. *izi(ya)*–”. Paper presented at the 3rd *Luwic Dialects: Inheritance and Diffusion* workshop. Barcelona, February 2016.
- Melchert, H. Craig (1993). *Cuneiform Luwian Lexicon*. Chapel Hill.
- Melchert, H. Craig (1994). *Anatolian Historical Phonology*. Amsterdam & Atlanta: Rodopi.
- Melchert, H. Craig (1997). “Denominative verbs in Anatolian”. In: *Studies in Honor of Jaan Puhvel*. Vol. 1: *Ancient Languages and Philology*. Ed. by Dorothy Disterheft et al. Washington, DC: Institute for the Study of Man, 131–138.
- Melchert, H. Craig, ed. (2003). *The Luwians*. Leiden & Boston: Brill.
- Melchert, H. Craig (2009). “The animate nominative plural in Luwian and Lycian”. In: *Die Sprache* 48, 112–117.

- Melchert, H. Craig (2012). "Genitive case and possessive adjective in Anatolian". In: *Per Roberto Gusmani. Studi in ricordo*. Linguistica storica e teorica. Ed. by Raffaella Bombi & Vincenzo Orioles. Vol. 2.1. Udine: Forum, 273–286.
- Melchert, H. Craig (2015a). "Hittite historical phonology after 100 years (and after 20 years)". Paper presented at *Hrozný and Hittite: The First 100 Years*. Charles University, Prague, November 12th, 2015.
- Melchert, H. Craig (2015b). "Lycian *alaha-* and *alaha/ehali-*". In: *Genres épigraphiques et langues d'attestation fragmentaire dans l'espace méditerranéen*. Ed. by Emmanuel Dupraz & Wojciech Sowa. Rouen & Le Havre: Publications de Université de Rouen et du Havre, 153–163.
- Morpurgo Davies, Anna (1982–1983). "Dentals, rhotacism and verbal endings in the Luwian languages". In: *Historische Sprachforschung* 96, 245–270.
- Norbruis, Stefan (in prep. a). "The Hittite dative-locative of *i-* and *ija-* stems, the Luwic paradigm of personal names, and the Proto-Anatolian allative".
- Norbruis, Stefan (in prep. b). "The origin of the '*i*-mutation' paradigm and the prehistory of the Luwic nominal stem classes".
- Oettinger, Norbert (1987). "Bemerkungen zur anatolischen *i*-Mutation und Genusfrage". In: *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 100.1, 35–43.
- Oshiro, Terumasa (1988). "*api* in Hieroglyphic Luwian". In: *Archív Orientální* 56.3, 246–252.
- Plöchl, Reinhold (2003). *Einführung ins Hieroglyphen-Luwische*. Dresden: TU Dresden.
- Rieken, Elisabeth (2005). "Neues zum Ursprung der anatolischen *i*-Mutation". In: *Historische Sprachforschung* 118, 48–74.
- Rieken, Elisabeth (2007). "Hieroglyphen-luwisch *i-zi-ia-*. Ein Beitrag zur Rekonstruktion der urindogermanischen Kulturgeschichte". In: *Darъ Slovesny. Festschrift für Christoph Koch zum 65. Geburtstag*. Ed. by Wolfgang Hock & Michael Meier-Brügger. München: Sagner, 263–275.
- Rieken, Elisabeth (2008). "Die Zeichen <ta>, <tá> und <tà> in den hieroglyphen-luwischen Inschriften der Nachgroßreichszeit". In: *VI Congresso Internazionale di Ittologia, Roma, 5–9 settembre 2005, Parte I*. Ed. by Alfonso Archi & Rita Francia. Roma: CNR – Istituto di Studi sulle civiltà dell'Egeo e del Vicino Oriente, 637–649.
- Rieken, Elisabeth (2017). "Word-internal plene spelling with <i> and <e> in Cuneiform Luwian texts". In: *Вопросы языкового родства* 15.1, 19–30.
- Sideltsev, Andrej & Ilya S. Yakubovich (2016). "The origin of Lycian indefinite pronouns and its chronological implications". In: *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 70.1, 75–124.
- Smyth, Herbert Weir (1956). *Greek Grammar*. Rev. by Gordon Myron Messing. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Spencer, Andrew & Ana R. Luís (2012). *Clitics. An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Starke, Frank (1980). "Keilschriftluwisch *manā-tti* 'sehen', *mammanna-i* 'schauen'". In: *Kadmos* 19, 142–148.
- Starke, Frank (1982). "Die Kasusendungen der luwischen Sprachen". In: *Serta Indogermanica. Festschrift für Günter Neumann zum 60. Geburtstag*. Ed. by Johann Tischler. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft, 407–425.
- Vertegaal, Alexander J. J. (2017). "Filling in the facts". In: *Altorientalische Forschungen* 44.2, 235–260.
- Weiss, Michael (2009). *Outline of the Historical and Comparative Grammar of Latin*. Ann Arbor & New York: Beech Stave.

- Yakubovich, Ilya S. (2008). "The origin of Luvian possessive adjectives". In: *Proceedings of the 19th Annual Indo-European UCLA Conference*. Los Angeles, November 3–4, 2007. Ed. by Karlene Jones-Bley et al. Washington, DC: Institute for the Study of Man, 193–217.
- Yakubovich, Ilya S. (2010). *Sociolinguistics of the Luvian Language*. Leiden & Boston: Brill.
- Yakubovich, Ilya S. (2015). *The Luwian Language*. URL: <http://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199935345.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199935345-e-18> (visited on 10/21/2015).