

## Linear A *du-pu<sub>2</sub>-re*, Hittite *tabarna* and their alleged relatives revisited\*

This article intends to be a comprehensive reassessment of a previous hypothesis connecting the Linear A sequence *du-pu<sub>2</sub>-re* and the Hittite royal title *t<sub>1</sub>labarna-*, as well as a series of Anatolian words, toponyms and personal names allegedly related to the latter and belonging to the semantic sphere of power. In the course of this survey, several Anatolian onomastic elements, mostly dated to the 1<sup>st</sup> millennium BCE, are disconnected from the Minoan sequence and the Hittite title, and receive new explanations (with various levels of security) in the framework of the Luwic (IE) languages. Likewise, I separate *Labranios* (a Cypriot epithet of Zeus) from Hittite *labarna-* and argue instead for the old theory that it is an adaptation of the Phoenician name of Mount Lebanon. The conclusion of this reassessment is that, while there may have been a Luwian noun *\*tapara-* ‘rule’, there are no independent grounds for linking any Anatolian material to Minoan *du-pu<sub>2</sub>-re* and no basis for assuming the latter meant ‘master’ (or similar).

*Keywords:* Linear A, Tabarna, Labarna, Luwic languages, Anatolian onomastics, Cilician names.

### 1. Introduction

Although the language of Linear A (LA), the logo-syllabic script of Minoan Crete, still eludes interpretation, the writing system itself cannot be considered wholly undeciphered. Decades of scholarship have shown that a significant number of syllabograms have phonetic values analogous to their Linear B (LB) counterparts. Particularly, through a set of independent contextual tests Duhoux (1989) has proved this to be the case with at least 30 syllabograms.<sup>1</sup> Inevitably, since LB is the product of an adaptation of LA to another language (Mycenaean Greek), which surely possessed a different phonemic inventory, we can hardly expect all phonetic values to be exact matches. They can, nevertheless, act as guiding phonetic approximations.

In a previous work (Valério 2007), I have dealt with a LA sequence which in this way reads *du-pu<sub>2</sub>-re*. It is found self-standing once (KO Za 1) and elsewhere in compounds, namely (*j*)*a-di-ki-te-te-du-pu<sub>2</sub>-re* (PK Za 8 and 15) and *pa-ta-da-du-pu<sub>2</sub>-re* (HT Zb 160) (*ibid.*: 8–9, citing

\* The content of this article derives mainly from a presentation made at the 1<sup>st</sup> session of the workshop ‘*Luwic*’ *Dialects: Inheritance and Diffusion* (University of Barcelona, October 23, 2013). The final text benefits from various comments, references and suggestions by I.-X. Adiego (U. Barcelona), A. Kassian (Russian Academy of Sciences), C. Melchert (UCLA), I. Yakubovich (U. Marburg) and J. G. Younger (U. Kansas). Thanks are also owed to R. Oreshko (U. Hamburg) for sending me a copy of his recent work. As usual, the responsibility for the views here contained, as well as any mistakes and shortcomings, is mine alone.

<sup>1</sup> These included a survey of the positional frequency of the suspected vowel (V) syllabograms, and listing sign alternations in LA-B pairs of sequences and within LA itself. Duhoux was cautious about the results: he considered different levels of security for each of the phonetic values depending on how many contextual tests confirmed them.

GORILA). I hypothesized that the compound *(j)a-di-ki-te-te-du-pu<sub>2</sub>-re* was to be segmented *(j)a=di-ki-te-te=du-pu<sub>2</sub>-re* and signified a periphrastic divine name: '(to?) the Diktaian Master', or similar. Thus, *du-pu<sub>2</sub>-re* would be the Minoan word for 'master, lord'. The basis for this interpretation included three morphophonological and contextual facts: (1) the existence of a Minoan stem *du-pu<sub>2</sub>-r-* (>*da-pu<sub>2</sub>-r-*), which I linked with LB *da-pu<sub>(2)</sub>-ri-to-* = alphabetical λαβύρινθος (with a well-known non-Greek suffix -νθος), i.e. 'labyrinth';<sup>2</sup> the similarity between *(j)a=di-ki-te-te=* and the name of Mount Dikte, aided by the fact the compounds with this string are limited to stone libation tables found at or near the Minoan peak sanctuary of Petsofas (near Palaikastro, East Crete), which later in the Archaic period was devoted precisely to to Diktaian Zeus (i.e. Zeus born on Mount Dikte); beyond phonetic resemblance, this supported the interpretation of *(j)a-di-ki-te-te<sup>o</sup>* as 'Diktaian'; (3) the attestation of LB *di-ka-ta-jo di-we* 'Diktaian Zeus' at Knossos, showing a Late Bronze Age Cretan background for this deity. However, on the side of semantics, the grounds to propose 'master' as the meaning of *du-pu<sub>2</sub>-re* were admittedly more fragile. I drew upon Evans' old idea that λαβύρινθος was the 'royal palace' of Knossos (see §2) and the presumable similarity of *da-pu<sub>(2)</sub>-r-/λαβύρινθος* to one of the titles of the Hittite kings, *tabarna-/labarna-*, as well as a series of words and onomastic elements from Anatolia and Cyprus presumably related to the latter and belonging to the sphere of (human and divine) power.

In this I followed mainly the work of Yakubovich (2002) on Hitt. *t/labarna-* and its connections. The title has been among the most hotly debated items of the Hittite vocabulary, with contending interpretations of its etymology, Indo-European (IE) and non-IE, including proposals of a traveling contact word (*Wanderwort*) (see §10). Although at present the author thinks it is impossible to quantify the plausibility of the competing IE and non-IE hypotheses (pers. comm.), Yakubovich (2002) contains the most extensive argument favorable to the migrating word hypothesis, which provided the basis for the interpretation in Valério (2007). Starting with the Luwo-Hittite form *(:)tapar-* 'to rule', long thought to be related to Hitt. *t/labarna-*, Yakubovich compiled a dossier of possible regional connections:

- 1.1) Luwo-Hitt. *tapar(r)iya-* 'to rule' and derivatives;
- 1.2) Hieroglyphic Luwian LEPUS+ra/i-i(a) 'authority' and derivatives;
- 1.3) The Hellenistic Cilician personal names Τβερασητας and Τβερημωσις (presumably reflecting *\*Tapara-zita/i* and *\*Tapara-muwa+zi*, respectively)
- 1.4) The Lycian personal name *Dapara-* = ΛΑΠΑΡΑΣ;
- 1.5) *Labranios* (ΛΑΒΡΑΝΙΟΣ), an epithet of Zeus in Cyprus;

---

<sup>2</sup> An identical suggestion (unknown to me until very recently) was made by Billigmeier (1989), but unfortunately it was limited to an abstract, with no follow-up paper ever being published (thanks are owed to B. Davis and J. Younger for helping me locate this reference). My own argument (Valério 2007: 7–8) was based on the following: LA *du-pu<sub>2</sub>-re* is reminiscent of LB *du-pu<sub>2</sub>-ra-zo* (KN V[3] 419.1) and *da-pu<sub>2</sub>-ra-zo* (EL 1 1.2), two non-Greek personal names or, rather, two variants of the same name. The Cu-CV-/Ca-CV- alternation is seen in two well-known LA-B pairs: LA *ku-pa<sub>3</sub>-nu* (HT 1, 3, 42, 49, 88, 117, 122) / *ku-pa<sub>3</sub>-na-tu* (HT 119.3), attested in likely Minoan lists of persons, and the non-Greek personal names *ka-pa<sub>3</sub>-no* (KN As[2] 1516.16) / *ka-pa<sub>3</sub>-na-to* (KN Df 1219) in LB tablets from Knossos. Since -zo is a common ending of non-Greek names in the LB records from Knossos, it seems that the names above and LB *da-pu<sub>(2)</sub>-ri-to-* contain a Minoan element *du-pu<sub>2</sub>-r<sup>o</sup>*. The most plausible explanation for the vocalism is that of Davis (2014: 242–243): *du-pu<sub>2</sub>-r-* reflects Min. /DúPúr-/ with an unaccented short /u/ that tended to be centralized to a schwa, whence /DəPúr/, transcribed in LB as *da-pu<sub>2</sub>-r-*, with a (I use "D" and "P" to represent what in my opinion are undetermined dental and labial obstruents). The LA texts are cited according to GORILA and those of LB follow DocMyC<sup>2</sup>.

- 1.6) The epithet of Zeus Labraundos (Λάβραυνδος), at the city of Labraunda, in Caria (with several variant spellings: ΛΑΒΡΑΥΓΝΔΟΣ ΛΑΒΡΑΙΓΝΔΟΣ; ΛΑΒΡΑΑΥΓΝΔΟΣ; ΛΑΒΡΑΙΝΔΟΣ; ΛΑΒΡΑΕΝΔΟΣ; Λάβρανδος; ΛΑΒΡΕΝΔΟΣ; and later Λαβρά[ν]δένς)
- 1.7) LB *da-pu/pu<sub>2</sub>-ri-to-* = alphabetical Greek λαβύρινθος

At the time, the author suggested that these forms were all derivatives of migrating South Anatolian \*/δaBar-/ ‘to rule’ and \*/δaBara-/ ‘power?’, /δ/ presumably corresponding to a voiced coronal fricative /ð/. Thus, Lyc. *Dapara* would be a direct product of \*/δaBara-/, while the Luwian forms would have undergone the development \*/δaBar-/ > \*/taBar-/. The lambdacist transcription of *Dapara* as Grk. Λαπταρας would reflect this alien /ð/, as would the *d* ~ *λ* alternation in *da-pu(2)-ri-to-/λαβύρινθος* and the varying *t/labarna-*.

In Valério (2007), I proposed this virtual \*/δaBar-/ to be related also to LA *du-pu<sub>2</sub>-re*, but to help explaining its vocalism, I augmented the dossier of possible Anatolian relatives to include:

- 1.8) A set of Carian personal names with the alleged element -DUbr- (where D apparently corresponded to either Car. *δ* or *t* → Grk. *δ*, and U seemed to match Car. *w*, now transliterated *ý* = Grk. *v*), including the alleged equivalences of the names *ksatýbr* → Ξανδυβερις and *smdýbrs* → Ζερμεδυβερος.
- 1.9) The Lycian place name *Tuburehi* = Grk. Τυβερισσος and the personal name *Tebursseli*.

A reassessment of my interpretation is now necessary, partly because of intrinsic problems (it admittedly depends on a number of undemonstrated connections) and partly because of its ramifications for the study of the language of LA. Given their phonological shape, the Carian names were one of the cornerstones of the hypothesis, but at the time I put it on paper, I had not yet had the opportunity to study comprehensively the entire dossier (which is gathered and discussed in Adiego 2007). In the meantime, the interpretation of LA *du-pu<sub>2</sub>-re* in Valério (2007) has gained some acceptance,<sup>3</sup> and its alleged ties to Hitt. *t/labarna-* and Lyc. *dapara/Λαπταρας* are now part of an argument by Davis (2014: 193–215) that the LA *d* series transcribed a “phoneme /θ/ that was realized in Minoan speech as allophones [ð] and [θ]”. In what follows, I will revisit the whole dossier.

## 2. (Non-)Greek λαβύρινθος and Carian Λαβράυνδα

The theories connecting λαβύρινθος and the Carian city Labraunda (Λαβράυνδα) can be traced back to Plutarch’s (*Greek Questions* 45, 2.302a) explanation of the local epithet of Zeus, Labrandeus (sic), as a derivative of λάβρος, an alleged Lydian word for ‘axe’. The Lydian word may have existed, but there is a chance the account of the ancient author owes to a folk etymology formulated at the end of the 1<sup>st</sup> millennium BCE, since Zeus Labraundos was characteristically depicted holding a double-axe in Achaemenid coins from Caria (Yakubovich 2002: 106–107, fn. 36.). At the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, Mayer and Kretschmer (apud Kretschmer 1896: 404) came up with the idea that Labraundos corresponded to “Cretan” λαβύρινθος. This notion emerged in connection with another theory by Kretschmer, namely that the toponymic suffixes -νθος (Aegean) and -νδα (Anatolia) are cognate and ensue from a Pre-Greek “substrate” language spoken on both sides of the Aegean Sea in prehistoric times. This idea is far

<sup>3</sup> See Younger (2011: 170, fn. 66) and Davis (2013: 42, 44; 2014).

from demonstrated,<sup>4</sup> but the crucial issue is not even the suffix, but the base morphemes, which require us to equate *λαβύρινθος* and *Λάβρων* (with all its variants; see §1). Already Kretschmer (1896: 404) had to do great phonological gymnastics and conjecture for both place-names a common preform *\*λαβρωνθος*.

We know now that this is far from the reality: the Late Bronze Age form of *λαβύρινθος* was *da-pu(2)-ri-to-*, reflecting most likely /dapʰúrintʰos/.<sup>5</sup> In fact, it is often neglected that the pair is not *synchronic*: *λαβύρινθος* is first attested in Herodotus (2.148), so more than seven centuries separate it from its Mycenaean predecessor. In LB itself there are no examples whatsoever of words interchanging LB *d* = /d/ and *r* = /l/, which means there is no support for assuming Myc. \*/dapʰúrintʰos/ ~ \*/lapʰúrintʰos/ and, more significantly, no basis for Lejeune's old idea that the *d* ~ *λ* spellings reflect Greek attempts to render a foreign sound. More likely, /dapʰúrintʰos/ is the original form and *λαβύρινθος* owes to later, if only obscure, phenomena.<sup>6</sup>

Finally, in his renowned work on the Knossos palace, Evans (1921: 6) picked up on the (unprovable) suggestions of Mayer and Kretschmer and further claimed the double axe of Bronze Age Crete was identical with the Lydo-Carian *λάβρων*. For him, this equation was the “key” to understand both Labraundos and the “Labyrinth”, which to his mind were to be “identified with the palace sanctuary of Knossos”. Such etymological speculations constitute the historiographical roots of the interpretation of Grk. *λαβύρινθος* as ‘royal palace’ (see §1). The fact remains that in its first attestation *λαβύρινθος* was used by Herodotus (2.148) to refer to a vast, partially-underground Egyptian mortuary complex, so not only we have no basis to infer ‘palace’ was its original sense, but it is actually the case that other meanings, such as ‘hypogeum’, would explain better the earliest uses of the word (see Sarullo 2008).

### 3. Cypriot Greek ΛΑΒΡΑΝΙΟΣ

In Cyprus, a cult to Zeus *Labranios* (ΛΑΒΡΑΝΙΟΣ) is known through a dozen of ex-votos from the Roman period (late 2<sup>nd</sup>–4<sup>th</sup> century), found at Fasoúla, 10 km to the north of Amathus, and at Chandría, to the north of Fasoúla in the Troodos Mountains (Mitford 1961: 111, nos. 12–13).

Yakubovich (2002: 104–105; see also 2009a: 268) advanced tentatively a connection with *labarna-*. In a way, this echoed a theory first expounded by Hall (1885 [1883]: clxviii–clxix), who compared Zeus *Labranios* to Zeus Labraundos (see §2). According to Hall, the cult of Zeus

<sup>4</sup> For recent discussions see de Hoz (2004) and Yakubovich (2009b: 9–11).

<sup>5</sup> Chadwick has pointed out that “*pu<sub>2</sub>* = *bu* is ... remarkable” (Ventris and Chadwick 1973: 538), and indeed the pronunciation of the interchanging *pu* = /pu, pʰu/ and *pu<sub>2</sub>* /pʰu/ ought to be /pʰu/. Although descriptions of the phonological system of Myc. Greek routinely include a phoneme /b/, they overlook the fact that there are no uncontroversial examples of /b/ in native Mycenaean words; the phoneme was absent or near absent from the language, a situation which was inherited from PIE (see Thompson 2005).

<sup>6</sup> LB *d* > alphabetical *λ* shift(?) is reminiscent of two Pamphylian glosses in Hesychius, who notes that standard Grk. δίσκος ‘discus, quoit’ and δάφνη ‘sweet bay’ were pronounced respectively as λίσκος and λάφνη at the city of Perge. As we will see in §8 and §10, 1<sup>st</sup> millennium Anatolian languages like Lydian and Lycian lacked initial /d-/, which was replaced with /l-/ in loanwords (at least in Lydian). This suggests that Pergaean λίσκος and λάφνη may have been the pronunciations of local Anatolians who spoke Greek as a second language. Since *λαβύρινθος* first appears in the work of Herodotus, a native of Halicarnassus (Caria), perhaps its *lambdacism* owes to similar reasons. As regards LB *p(2)* = /pʰ/ vs. alph. β (see fn. 5), it is tempting to speculate that /dapʰúrintʰos/ co-existed with \*/dawúrintʰos/ owing to different Greek strategies to render a foreign voiceless labial fricative (cf. Mongolian, which adapts Russian [f] as [pʰ], [pʰ] or [w] in loanwords; Svantesson 2005: 31). For LB *w* > alph. β, cf. the case of LB *mo-ri-wa-do* /mólivdos/(?) vs. μόλυβδος/μόλιβδος ‘lead’, certainly a borrowing in Greek.

*Labraundos* was taken by Carian settlers to Cyprus, where the toponymic epithet developed into *Labranios* through *multiple and irregular* sound changes.

A more economical explanation arose not much later from the pen of Ohnefalsch-Richter (1893: 220, 229), who equated Zeus *Labranios* with Phoenician *b'l lbnn* ‘Ba'al of Lebanon’,<sup>7</sup> a deity worshiped in Cyprus in Pre-Roman times. Syncretisms between Greek Zeus and Semitic Ba'al are far from unseen and this one was later accepted by Mitford (1961: 111, 143), who worked extensively on Cypriot epigraphy, as well as Lipiński (1995: 306–307), a Semiticist.

At first sight, the inexact phonological match between *lbnn* and *Labranios* might seem to deter the identification. Credit is due to Lipiński (ibid.) for his comparison of H. Luw. (MONS) *La-pa+ra/i-na-*, most probably ‘Mt. Lebanon’ (see Hawkins 2000: 414). *\*/Labrana/* and *\*/Labarna/* are both possible readings, but the former is more likely in the light of Hitt. *Lablana*, Hurr. *Lablahhi* ‘from/of Lebanon’ (< \**Lablan=jī*), Ugarit Akkadian [H]UR.S[AG *la*]-*ab-la-na* and Neo-Assyrian Akkadian *Labnāna* (see Del Olmo and Sanmartín 2003: 491). However, based on the Luwian form, Lipiński maintained that *Labranios* ‘of Mt. Lebanon’ was ultimately of Anatolian origin. This explanation is as implausible in historical terms as it is unnecessary. Greek and Phoenician-speaking communities coexisted in Iron Age Cyprus,<sup>8</sup> so Phoenician can be taken as the direct source of *Labranios*. As for H. Luw. *La-pa+ra/i-na- /Labrana-/*, it may be just the outcome of the characteristic Luwian *l > r* “flapping” in a previous form *\*Lablana-*, cognate with the abovementioned Hittite name of Mt. Lebanon.<sup>9</sup>

We only need to account for the phonological details of the Greek adaptation. In the Semitic languages the oronym contains /bn/, but since synchronically this cluster never occurs in native Greek words, *\*Λαβραν-* would be impossible as the Hellenic adaptation of Phoen. *Lbnn*. Thus, *Λαβραν-* with /br/ must have been the alternative. Finally, the ending *-ιος* may correspond to a well-attested ancient Cypriot Greek genitive suffix that occurs in ethnics (cf. e.g. *se-la-mi-ni-o-se* /Selaminios/ ‘from Salamis’) as well as in divine epiclesis (Egetmeyer 2010: 253–254, 260–261).

#### 4. Alleged Carian names with *\*-DUbr*

Now that LA *du-pu<sub>2</sub>-re* and LB *da-pu<sub>(2)</sub>-ri-to-* have been disconnected from the Carian place-name *Labraunda*, we need to reassess the dossier of Carian names that was crucial to the interpretation of the Minoan form. As stated above, I will now discuss all names listed in Adiego (2007) that could in theory contain a *-DUbr* element:

- 5.1) *ardybyrś* (E.Me 52)
- 5.2) *ardybyrś* (E.Me 52)
- 5.3) *dtýbr* (E.Th 2)
- 5.4) *dýbr* (E.Th 5)
- 5.5) *kšatýbr* (E.Th 2)
- 5.6) *kudtubr* (E.Th 9)
- 5.7) *smδýbrs* (C.Ha 1)

<sup>7</sup> This form is attested in an inscribed bronze bowl (KAI 31; cf. Masson and Sznycer 1972: 77–78).

<sup>8</sup> For a recent survey of the evidence for linguistic contact between Phoenician and Greek in Cyprus, see, e.g. Egetmeyer (2010).

<sup>9</sup> The consonantal divergence between Hurrian/Hittite/Ugarit Akkadian *lbln-* and Assyrian/Phoenician *lbnn* is best explained by a dissimilatory or assimilatory process involving this chain of sonants. I thank A. Kassian for suggesting this solution.

Two facts are relevant. First, the names remain opaque, and there is not the slightest hint of a connection to the semantics of power. Second, our present knowledge of Carian historical phonology does not suggest that Carian *y*, *ý* or *u* can have the same source of Luwian *a*, the implication being that any connection to Luw. *tapar-* ‘to rule’ cannot go back to a Proto-Luwic stage;<sup>10</sup> we would rather be forced to assume that *\*-DUbr* was a late borrowing in Carian, and that, like Minoan, it had differences in vocalism. Before considering borrowings, however, I believe the more recommendable method is to try to understand the Carian forms internally first and afterwards seek possible etymological explanations within a Luwic framework.

*ardybyrś*, the genitive of *ardubur-*, is the most transparent name of the group as it corresponds to the Αρδυβερος (KPN §86–6) of Greek sources. It is significant that neither form has a letter of nasal value. Adiego (2007: 333, 353) maintains the possibility of segmenting *ard-ybyr-* / Αρδ-υβερος based on the existence of a Carian name *ybrs-* at Hyllarima (C.Hy 1); at the same time, he compares tentatively the string αρδ-ορδ- of other Carian names in Greek transmission, but the analysis cannot be taken much farther.<sup>11</sup>

Three personal names from Thebes (Egypt), *dtýbr*, *dýbr* and *kšatýbr*, contain a string *-ýbr*; it is unclear whether *kudtubr* is also related. This small set is very difficult to analyze. *kšatýbr* has been compared to the Lycian name Ξανδυβερος (KPN §1061), but Car. *-t-* is not usually rendered by Grk. *-vδ-*. The problem is not insurmountable,<sup>12</sup> but in §5 we will see evidence that *kšatýbr* and Ξανδυβερος are to be separated. Thus, the easiest assumption is that the segmentable element in *dtýbr*, *dýbr* and *kšatýbr* is the one they all share: *-ýbr*. This view is consistent with (1) the proposed segmentation of *ard-ybyr-*; (2) the existence of a self-standing Carian name *ybrs-*; (3) the fact that *dýbr* leaves little margin for different segmentations.<sup>13</sup> In connection, I propose tentatively the segmentation of the latter name as *d-ýbr*, with a Luwic element *d-* = Ιδα- that I will discuss in §8).

The anthroponym *smδýbrs* (C.Ha 1) was at first compared to Ζερμεδυβερος (from Mylasa) by Blümel (1990: 38–39), when the decipherment of Carian was not yet fully settled. Melchert (1993c: 81) added the idea that Ζερμε-/sm- had the same source as Luw. *zal/rma-* ‘protection’, because the “omission of the pre-consonantal /r/ in the Carian version” is supposedly unsurprising. This would point to *\*sm-δýbrs*. However, given the lack of secure cases of other similar omissions, I think it is actually unexpected (see Adiego 2007: 413). A second obstacle to segmenting *\*sm-δýbrs* is the use of the Carian letter *δ*, usually matching Grk. *vδ*, absent from the remaining names in the dossier. Conversely, if we opt for a different analysis of the name as *\*smδ-ýbrs* it becomes possible to adduce acceptable comparanda for both elements. It is unclear whether the *-s* of *smδýbrs* is part of the stem (Adiego 2007: 283), but, if it was, then the

<sup>10</sup> Following Melchert (2003: 175–177, fn. 7), “Luwic” is used here to refer to a group of closely related dialects, including not just Luwian and Lycian, but also Carian, Pisidian, Sidetic (besides unattested dialects which left traces only in Greek-written onomastics). As Melchert notes, it remains an open question whether their affinity is due to a common origin in a unitary prehistoric language, to areal diffusion of innovations, or both. In any case, I use “Proto-Luwic” for reconstructions of (naturally hypothetical) proto-forms that *could* explain material shared by different Luwic dialects.

<sup>11</sup> Schürr (2002) further compares αρδ-ορδ- to the *\*(a)radu* of two Late Bronze Age names from Arzawa, *Tarhundaradu* and *Piyammaradu*, but the connection is hard to demonstrate as the meaning of the latter is uncertain.

<sup>12</sup> There is so far no unchallengeable instance of the letter *δ* (the one systematically rendered by Grk. *-vδ-*) in the Theban variety of the Carian alphabet (Adiego 2007: 222), so here *t* could be taking its place. In any event, the subcorpus of Carian inscriptions from Thebes is still not well understood and *δ* might in the future be discovered to be a part of it as well.

<sup>13</sup> In the latter case, we might entertain the possibility that *dýbr* is a self-standing name itself, but this would leave the question of why would *dtýbr* and *kšatýbr* spell the same element with *t*, if *d* was available at Thebes.

second component is similar to the abovementioned self-standing name *ybrs*- . Concerning \**smδ*-, the possible term of comparison is the anthroponym Ισεμενδα[...]ος (Caria; KPN §486), but I would further venture a connection with C. Luw. *zamm(n)ant(i)*- ‘having *zamna*-.’ This *zamna*- is a word of uncertain meaning but negative connotations that appears in Luwian onomastics of the 2<sup>nd</sup> millennium BCE (see Melchert 1993a: 276 and Yakubovich 2013a: 101). The idea is not wholly new: Neumann (2007: 399) already compared *smδybrs* to Σεμενδησις, a name from Cilicia (KPN §1396) that Houwink ten Cate (1961: 165–166) interpreted in the light of \**zamna*- . Still, Luwic \**zammant(i)*- /*tsammant(i)*/ seems like a more straightforward source for \**smδ*-.<sup>14</sup>

Not all loose ends can be tied. Taken together, Ζερμεδυβερος (Caria) and Ζερμουνδις (Lycia; KPN §383) still point to the existence of \*Ζερμ(ε)- and \*-(ε)δυβερος. This is difficult to reconcile with the above scenarios, unless Ζερμεδ- is some extended form of Ζερμ-. Hence, at present an impeccable analysis of this set of Carian names is unfeasible, but I think it has been demonstrated how difficult, if not impossible, it is to associate them all with a virtual, variable element \*-DUBR as I attempted previously. The above set of hypotheses, hinting at the isolation of -*ybyr*, -*ýbr* and -*ýbrs* (comparable to self-standing *ybrs*), is in my view the most economical.

Neumann (2007: 399) compared the Hellenized component \*-νβερ(i)- in names from Lycia (see next section) and Caria with Luwo-Hitt. *warri*- ‘helpful’, *warri*- ‘help’ and *warrai*- ‘to come in aid’. Are these Luwisms cognate with Car. *ýbr*-? One problem is the possibility (noted by Adiego 2007: 257) that Car. *ý* denoted a semivowel /y/ (counterpart to *y* = /y/), potentially the result of the fronting of /u:/ and /w/ in propitious environments. It is true that there is also evidence for *Umlaut* in Carian (cf. *en* ‘mother’ and *ted* ‘father’ < \**anni*- and \**tádi*-), which could have produced a front vowel and, as a consequence, motivated the fronting of *w*. However, the biggest difficult is that we would expect the development *ýbr* < \**yþeri* < Pre-Carian \**uweri*, from P.-Luwic \*\**uwar(r)i*-, not from \**warri*- . The following section pursues these matters by dealing with Lycian and Cilician onomastics that contain an element potentially related to Car. -*ybyr* and -*ýbr(s)*.

## 5. -νδυβερι- (Lycia) and -νδ/o(v)βα/ε/ηρα- (Cilicia)

Above Car. *kšatýbr* was compared to Ξανδυβερις. This name needs to be treated as well, but its assessment cannot be separated from a set of other personal names from Lycian and Cilicia containing a similar component:

### Lycia:

- 5.8) [Ε]ρμανδυβερ[ις] (KPN §355–17a)
- 5.9) Ξανδυβερις (KPN §1061)
- 5.10) \*Περπενδυβερις (gen. Περπενδυβεριος) (KPN §1242–1)

### Cilicia:

- 5.11) Ινδοβηρας / \*Ινδοβαρας (gen. Ινδοβαρου) (Bean and Mitford 1970: no. 176, 193 apud PHI)
- 5.12) Μιγδυβηρας (Bean and Mitford 1970: no. 180, 201 apud PHI)

<sup>14</sup> Houwink ten Cate’s interpretation of Σεμενδησις is also extended to Σεμνουτασις/Σεμνωτασις (TAM III,1: 74, 753–754, apud PHI) and Οσαμνωτασις (KPN §1118–2) from Pisidia.

- 5.13) \*Μοτονδοβερας (gen. Μοτονδοβερου) (SEG 37:1294.A39 apud *PHI*)<sup>15</sup>  
 5.14) \*Ουαξανδοβηρας (gen. Ουαξανδοβηρου) (Bean and Mitford 1970 apud *PHI*)  
 5.15) Ρωνδβερρας (KPN §1339-2) / \*Ρωνδοβερρας (gen. Ρωνδοβερρου) (DAW 44,6 [1896] 71,155 apud *PHI*)  
 5.16) Ταρκυνδβερρας (acc. Ταρκυνδβερραν) (KPN §1512-14)<sup>16</sup>

Ερμανδυβερις is easily segmented as \*Ερμα-νδυβερις ‘(The god) Arma is *nd.*’ or ‘*nd.* of Arma’. The structure of Περπενδυβερις is inferred by comparing it with Περπεννυνεμις (SEG 44.1156 apud *PHI*) and Περπενηνις (KPN §1242-2), both also from Lycia. Περπε-νηνις surely contains a reflex of Luwic \**nani*-, which traditionally is taken to be cognate with Luw. *nāni*- ‘brother’, but recently Oreshko (2014) argues for the existence of a homophonous Luwian word *nani*- ‘lord, leader’. The name is structurally analogous to Lyc. *Er̄mme-nēne/i-* = Ερμε-νηνις ‘Arma is [my] lord?’.<sup>17</sup> A priori this indicates that the first element is Περπε-, for which we can compare Carian *prp*- in the personal name *prp-wrik* (see Adiego 2007: 402).<sup>18</sup> The only obstacle to segmenting Περπε- is that Περπεννυνεμιος might also reflect \*Περπενδυνεμιος with assimilation of intervocalic \*-*nd*- (> \*-*nn*-); in favor of \*δυνεμιος, cf. Ερμαδονεμις (KPN §355-7).<sup>19</sup> In this case, the other two names could represent \*Περπενδυβερις and \*Περπε(v)-νηνις. Nevertheless, this is not a serious hindrance because \*Περπε(v)-νδυβερις is also possible.

Moving on to Cilicia, \*Μοτονδοβερας is not too difficult to analyze. The first component is in all likelihood a reflex of P.-Luwic \**muwatta*- ‘might, potency’, thus Moto-νδοβερας can be regarded as ‘*nd.* of might’ (or sim.). For the contraction of \**muwatta*- in Luwic onomastics of the 1<sup>st</sup> millennium BCE, cf. Lycian *Mutlēi* vs. the Hittite royal name <sup>m</sup>*Muwatalli*- = H. Luw. *Mu-wa/i-ta-li* ‘the mighty one’, perhaps connected as well to Μότυλος (Caria) and Μοταλις (Phrygia) (see Melchert 2013: 34, citing KPN §334 and Houwink ten Cate 1961: 103).

\*Ουαξανδοβηρας can be segmented as \*Ουαξα-νδοβηρας with relative security, since its first element is recognized in other Luwic names, particularly Car. *u/úksmu* = Ουαξαμοας/μωας (Isauria and Cilicia; KPN §1141, 2-3 and Adiego 2007: 427) ‘(having the might) of *waksa*’ or ‘(having) *waksa* might’.<sup>20</sup> I would like to suggest that Ξανδυβερις is a reduced variant of \*Ουαξανδυβερις, the probable Lycian version of \*Ουαξανδοβηρας.<sup>21</sup> This is further supported by the attestation of a Ξανδοβερος in Cilicia (Zgusta 1970: 35, apud Blümel 1992: 8). If

<sup>15</sup> Dagron and Feissel (1987: no. 11a). Based on the photograph provided the reading of M in this name seems plausible.

<sup>16</sup> It is uncertain to me whether Μανδουβιος (KPN § 856-3) belongs in this group.

<sup>17</sup> For the latter, see Houwink ten Cate (1961: 144). Cf. the Hieroglyphic personal name LUNA.FRATER<sub>2</sub> > *Arma-nani*? (Oreshko 2014: 618, citing Laroche 1966).

<sup>18</sup> Cf. also Πλαοπολινγις (Lycia; KPN §1208), which Schürr (2010: 191) directly compares to Car. *prpwrik*.

<sup>19</sup> Analyzed as \**Arma-tuna+mi* by Houwink ten Cate (1961: 134).

<sup>20</sup> The opaque \*ouαξα- is attested in several other Anatolian anthroponyms from Greek sources. It is comparable to Milyan *waxs(s)a*-, which was translated as ‘hero’ by Gusmani. Melchert (2004: 134) disagrees, stating (without providing a justification) that *waxssa*- conveys an inanimate object. Shevoroshkin (apud Melchert 2004: 134) initially suggested ‘heroic valor’, but now tentatively reads ‘fight(ers)’ and compares Hitt. *wah-nu-* ‘whirl’ / *wahessar* ‘swinging’ (Shevoroshkin 2010: 165). A cognate of Milyan *waxssa*- is also found in the Lycian personal name *Waxsepddimi*.

<sup>21</sup> Notice, however, that the personal name Ξανδαροιζας (Pamphylia) could in theory point to a different segmentation of Ξανδυβερις, unless here we have an extended form \**waksanda*- > Ξανδα-. The Pamphylian name appears to be formed with \*-οιζα, analogous to Πω(ι)ζις (Pisidia), which is a denasalized allomorph of Πωνζα- (< \**[K]runtiya*-) ‘Stag-god’ (as seen by Melchert 2013: 36).

this assessment is accepted, then we have to exclude any link to Car. *kšatýbr*, since the latter shows *ś* where *u/úksmu* has *s*.

It is not instantly clear how *Pωνδβερρας*/\**Pωνδοβερρας* to be split. Without doubt, the first component is the name of the Stag-god \*(*K*)*runtiya*, but the latter surfaces variedly as *Pω-*, *Pων-*, and *Pωνδ-* in onomastics of Greco-Roman Cilicia.<sup>22</sup> It is only through *Iνδοβηρρας*/\**Iνδοβερρας* that we can shed some light on its structure. One needs only to draw a parallel with *Iα-ζαρμας* '(Having the) protection of Iya' and *Pω-ζαρμας* '(Having the) protection of the Stag-god' (see Melchert 2013: 36, with refs.). In both cases we have pairs of theophoric names that interchange *Runtiya* and *Iya*, the Anatolian version of the Mesopotamian deity Ea. Combinatory analysis therefore hints at \**Pω(v)-νδοβερρας* '(Having the) *nd.* of the Stag-god' alongside a contracted \**I(α)-νδοβερρας* '(Having the) *nd.* of Iya'. Like *Pωνδβερρας*, *Ταρκυνδβερρας* is slightly ambiguous: should we segment \**Ταρκυνδ-βερρας*, \**Ταρκυν-βερρας* or \**Ταρκυ(v)-νδβερρας*? In light of all of the above, \**Ταρκυ(v)-νδβερρας* seems the most plausible composition, whence the likely meaning '(Having the) *nd.* of the Storm-god (Tarthunt)'.<sup>23</sup>

By now, it has become clear that *-νδυβερρι-* ~ *-νδο/νβα/ε/ηρρα-* denotes an attribute of the same kind as 'might' and 'protection', one that defined individuals and was considered a gift of the gods. It is also evident that its various spellings in Cilicia diverge from the Lycian version as regards the ending. This divergence suggests that the Cilician forms reflect a Luwic *a*-stem, while the Lycian variant conceals an *i*-stem whose ending moreover prompted the typical Lycian *Umlaut*. Thus: Cil. \*/*nduβæra*- vs. Lyc. \*/*nduβari*- / */nduβæri*-.

At least formally, *-νδυβερρι-* /*nduβæri*- is a direct match for Lyc. *ñtuweri*-, the noun that underlies the substantivized plural adjective *ñtuweriha* (*ñtuweri-ha*), attested in one of the Lycian inscriptions on the Pillar of Xanthos (T44b: 57): ...*se dewē: zxxaza: se ñtuweriha: ade*: 'and made a dedication<sup>(2)</sup> to the warriors and to the *ñt.*'s'.<sup>24</sup> In this inscription, context demands a descriptive of people, possibly an occupational term or collective title, and since we are dealing with a substantivized adjective (*-ha* is an adjective suffix), it seems self-evident that the *ñtuwerihe* are those who possess, belong, or are related to *ñtuweri*-, which might therefore be an attribute, as is *-νδυβερρι*- . The lack of further examples makes it very difficult to unveil the exact meaning of the word, but we have seen in the previous section that Neumann compared Lycian *\*-υβερρι* to Hitt. *warri*- 'help; helpful' and H. Luw. *wariya*- 'to help'. If we follow his idea, a possible etymology involves analyzing *ñtuweri*- as \**ñt(e)-(u)weri*, with Lyc. *ñte*- 'in(side)' and a reflex of Luwic *\*(u)wari*- 'help', which in turn leads to the possibility of its meaning being 'assistance' or similar.<sup>25</sup> This hypothesis admittedly rests on no independent evidence, but

<sup>22</sup> Cf. e.g. *Pω-ζαρμας* < \**Runt(iya)-zarma*-, *Pων-δερβεμις* < \**Runt(iya)-tarpami*-, and *Pωνδ-βιης* < \**Runt(iya)-piya*- (see KPN, Melchert 2013: 43 and the interpretations in this section).

<sup>23</sup> Alternatively, it is possible that *Ταρκυνδβερρας* reflect \**Tarhunt-warri* 'help to Tarhunt'? (Or 'from Tarhunt?') Cf. H. Luw. *TONITRUS-hu-wa/i+ra/i-i* /*Tarhu-warra/i-i*/ (Hawkins 2000: 192, 534, 537, apud Melchert 2013: 38). If so, a similar explanation is also conceivable for *Pωνδ-βερρας*, but not for the other forms.

<sup>24</sup> Against this equation one could raise a priori the objection that intervocalic Greek *-β-* normally renders Lyc. *-VbV-* rather than *-VwV-* (cf. *Pubieleje* > *Πιβιαλητι* and *xñtabura* = *Κενδαβορρα* vs. *xuwater-je* = *Κοατα*). Yet there is evidence for some oscillation between */β/* and */w/* in Lycian and related dialects. Thus Lycian has *xñtawā* 'to rule' and *xñtawata* 'rule, kingship' but Milyan features both *xñtaba-* 'regulate' > *xñtabaime/i-* 'ruling' and *xñtawaza-* 'rule' (Melchert 2004: 84, 136). Likewise, a cognate of Lyc. *xñtawat(i)* surfaces as the personal name *Γδεβετις* in Pisidia, while Mil. *xñtaba* 'ruler' corresponds to *Κενδηβα/ης* (Lycia) and *Κενδεβης* ~ *Κενδηβα/ης* (Cilicia) (KPN §576–5).

<sup>25</sup> Melchert (pers. comm.) brings my attention to the Hittite verbal phrase *anda warrissa* 'to come to the aid' found in *KBo* 5.8 i 18–20: *šA LÚ.MEŠ 𒌨Taggašta=ma kuiēš ÉRIN.MEŠ NARĀRĒ anda warrissanteš ešer n=at arħa parāšeššer*

it would explain most facts in a satisfactory way. First, in the text in the Pillar of Xanthos it would lead to a plausible interpretation of the word in its context: *dewē: zxxaza: se ñtuweriha* “dedication(?) to the warriors/soldiers and the auxiliaries/auxiliary troops(?)”.<sup>26</sup> Second, the basic sense of ‘assistance’ would square well with the semantic structure of the personal names above. Specifically, we could have theophorics with varying divine attributes, such as Ρω-ζαρμας ‘(Having the) protection of the Stag-god’ vs. Ρωνδ(ο)βεροας ‘(Having the) assistance of the Stag-god’, while Μοτο-νδοβεροας would make perfect sense as ‘(Having the) assistance of might’.

The etymology of -νδυβεροι- ~ -νδο/νβα/ε/ηροι- must remain hypothetical, but my main contention is that combinatorial analysis favors their segmentation as such. Therefore, they are not likely to be directly related to the Carian names with *ýbr-* (although they may share a common element), nor do they contain a virtual *\*-tapara* ‘ruler’, as Houwink ten Cate proposed for Ρωνδ(ο)βεροας (sic) and Ταρκυνδεροας. In conclusion, the Anatolian names discussed in the last two sections must be separated from LA *du-pu<sub>2</sub>-re*.

## 6. Lycian *Tubure-*, *-τοβορι-*, etc.

It is unclear whether Lyc. *Tubure-* in TL 69,2 (from Kyaneai) is another personal name or a sort of title (see Melchert 2004: 105).<sup>27</sup> Milyan features a noun *tuburi-*, attested in plural, which tips scales in favor of the latter option.

Likely, the same noun is the base of the place-name *Tuburehi* = Grk. Τυβερισσος. The Greek form must have been adopted from a third language (Carian?) or from a pre-Lycian form that had not undergone the well-known Lycian shift *\*s > h*. Thus, from a Lycian viewpoint, *Tuburehi* would mean ‘of/belonging to *Tubur(e)*’. Yakubovich (apud Valério 2007: 5) made the suggestion that the Lycian personal name *Tebursseli* might be toponymic, built on pre-Lycian *\*Tebur(e)si* = Τυβερισσος + a Luwic adjectival suffix *-li*,<sup>28</sup> but this cannot be confirmed.

Schürr (2012: 125) collects a possibly related form, the mythological name Τουβεροις, from Stephen of Byzantium (s. v. Υλαμοι), and at the same time directs our attention to the personal name Ερματοβορις (*KPN* §355–30). Interestingly, the latter is attested as a patronymic in an inscription from Tlos: Ερμοκρατης Ερματοβοριος ‘Hermokrates, son of Ermatoboris’. Colvin (2004: 62) has already suggested that this and other examples where father and son interchange Greek Hermes and the Anatolian Moon-god Arma as elements of their names point to an acknowledged (semantic) connection between the two, but this case opens the special possibility that Ερμο-κράτης ‘Might of Hermes’ is a translation of *\*Ερμα-τοβορις*. Similar cases are known: cf. Ορνεπειμις (= virtual Lyc. *\*Urne-pijēmi* ‘Given by the great one’ < Luwic *\*uranna/i-* ‘great’ + *\*piyamma/i-* ‘given’), a Lycian who is the son of Μεγιστόδοτος and whose

‘But the auxiliary troops of Taggašta who had come to help (my opponents) dispersed’ (Hoffner and Melchert 2008: 311). In my opinion, this Anatolian parallel gives some support to the hypothesis that Lyc. *ñtuweri-* is etymologically ‘assistance, aid’.

<sup>26</sup> We might compare typologically the Roman *auxiliarii* (< Lat. *auxilium* ‘help, assistance’) and *legiones adiutrices* (< *adjuvo* ‘to help’). The latter were “legions raised by the proconsul in the provinces for the purpose of strengthening the veteran army” (Lewis and Short 1891). Cf. also the Anatolian parallel in fn. 25.

<sup>27</sup> The word is attested in the supposed genitive form *Tubureō* and accompanies the name of “*Ipresidaō* son of *Arñpaō*”.

<sup>28</sup> For another Lycian name formed with *-li*, cf. perhaps Lyc. *Erttimeli* = Αρτεμηλιν (acc.), based on the divine name Artemis (Melchert 2004: 94; 2013: 37).

name seems to be the Lycian translation of his father's Greek name (see Colvin 2004: 69 for the names and Melchert 2013: 48 for the interpretation). However, the prospect that Lyc. *tubure-/\*τοβορι-* means 'might'<sup>29</sup> presents a puzzling paradox: it cannot be related to a virtual Carian *\*-DUBR*, but it seems clear from its vocalism that it also has no connection to a virtual Luw. *\*tapara-* 'ruler', nor to the Lycian anthroponym (*D*)*dapara* (see the following sections). At best, *tubure-/\*-τοβορι-* could have a Carian equivalent in *kudtubr* (for which see §4).<sup>30</sup>

## 7. Alleged Luwian *\*tapara* 'ruler'

Part of Yakubovich's (2002) dossier was drawn from Houwink ten Cate (1961: 158–159 following the work of Bossert), who compiled a small set of onomastic material he thought contained a Luwian noun *\*tapara* 'ruler' ("or the like"), by comparison with Luw. *tapar-* 'to rule':<sup>31</sup>

- 7.1) <sup>d</sup>*Alitapara* (<sup>d</sup>*A-li-ta-pa-ra*) (KBo 5.1 i 10)
- 7.2) <sup>m</sup>*Pitta/ipara* (<sup>m</sup>*Pí-it-ta/ti-pa-ra*) (Laroche 1966: no. 1030)
- 7.3) <sup>m</sup>*Tiwatapara* (<sup>m</sup>*Ti-wa-ta-pa-ra*) (Laroche 1966: no. 1348)
- 7.4) <sup>m</sup>*Taprammi* (<sup>m</sup>*Tap-ra-am-mi*) = Hieroglyphic LEPUS+ra/i-mi<sup>32</sup>

Houwink ten Cate's view also requires revision. His inclusion of <sup>m</sup>*Pittapara* and <sup>m</sup>*Tiwatapara* relies on his idea that they present cases of haplology: thus *\*Pitta-tapara* > *Pittapara* and *\*Tiwata-tapara* > *Tiwatapara*. This claim is hindered by a number of obstacles. <sup>m</sup>*Pitta/ipara* is the name of a Kaskaean rebel leader and therefore it is unlikely to have been Luwian. The name of another Kaskaean rebellious chief, <sup>m</sup>*Pittaggatalli*, justifies a different segmentation, namely the isolation of *Pitta-* (cf. possibly Hittite *pitta-* 'allotment, gift'). This would yield as second component *-para*, which would also be feasible in the case of <sup>m</sup>*Tiwatapara* < *\*Tiwata-para*, the name of a Hittite landholder.<sup>33</sup> Luw. *Tiwata* 'Sun-god' as a self-standing onomastic element is grounded on H. Luw. SOLIS-wa-ta-muwa /Tiwatamuwa/ 'Tiwad is (my) might' (Laroche 1966: no. 1246). In any case, it should be noted that a segmentation as *\*Tiwa-tapara* is in theory possible, given the existence of an anthroponym *Tiwa-śarpa* beside <sup>md</sup>*UTU-śar-pí* (\**Tiwata-śarpi*?) (Laroche 1966: nos. 1344 and 1349).<sup>34</sup>

The divine name <sup>d</sup>*Alitapara* is a hapax in the Middle-Hittite Kizzuwatnaean ritual of Panikri (KBo 5.1). It is more promising in the sense that *Ali-* might correspond to Luw. *āl(i)-*

<sup>29</sup> Perhaps Καδοβορίς (KPN §500–16) contains the same element as Ερματοβορίς, but it is not to be excluded that this common component consisted only in the string *\*-οβορίς*.

<sup>30</sup> Other names may belong in this dossier as well, but I suspect that only additional epigraphical data would help clarify the issue: cf. Τοβορορος (Caria; KPN § 1577) and Περτατούβαρος (Pisidia; SEG 57: 1620–1621 apud PHI) (see e.g. Blümel 1992: 23 and Schürr 2014).

<sup>31</sup> Houwink ten Cate also cites a divine-name *\*160-tapara*, which is nowadays read as DEUS.VITIS-*ti*-PRAE-*ia* = *\*Tipariya-*, presumably a wine-god (see Hawkins 2000: 97) and hence to be excluded.

<sup>32</sup> See McMahon (1991: 53–54). This name appears in a bисcriptal seal from Ugarit (RS 17.231), but also in the seal impression (Sob II 92) of a tablet from Boğazköy (KUB 25.32) and on Boğazköy socle 2.

<sup>33</sup> See also Schuler (1965: 106–107). Melchert (forthcoming) has now argued that C. Luw. *par(a)-* means 'carry' (< PIE *\*bʰer-*). This would permit us to interpret tentatively <sup>m</sup>*Tiwata-para* as 'Brought forth by Tiwat' on the same model as *\*Tarhu-piya* 'Given by Tarhu(nt)' (for which see Melchert 2013: 47–48), while <sup>m</sup>*Pitta/ipara* can perhaps, *mutatis mutandis*, be compared to Grk. Δωροφόρος 'Gift-carrying'. The exact morphological details escape me.

<sup>34</sup> See Laroche (1966: nos. 1344 and 1349).

‘high’?<sup>35</sup> but, since it would now be our only genuine example of *\*-tapara* in names, we should be cautious.

The personal name *Taprammi* was used by a high-ranking contemporary of king Tudaliya IV. I suspect the least problematic way to analyze it is along the same lines as H. Luw. *Pi-ha-mi* (Melchert 2013: 34). The latter is cognate with C. Luw. *piha(i)mma/i-* ‘imbued with splendor, resplendent’,<sup>36</sup> a denominative adjective constructed from the noun *\*piha-* ‘splendor’ (see Melchert 1993a: 176).<sup>37</sup> In our case, *\*Taprammi* would mean ‘imbued with *tapra-*’, which ironically can only be conciliated with *\*tapara* if we assume some irregular syncope.

## 8. Lycian *Dapara*

Houwink ten Cate (1965: 118, 159) and Yakubovich (2002: 95–96; 2009b: 231) connect the alleged Luwian onomastic element *\*tapara-* ‘ruler?’ to the Lycian personal name *Dapara*, which is rendered as Λαπαρας in Greek in a Lycian bilingual inscription from Karmylessos (TL 6).<sup>38</sup> As we will see (§10), Yakubovich (2009b: 231) now proposes the source of both to be pre-Luw. *\*dabara-* ‘power’ (vel. sim.).

The first obstacle to this etymology, as noted by Yakubovich (2002: 96, n. 10) himself, is that the medial Grk. π corresponds to Lyc. -p-, not -b-, thus indicating a voiceless bilabial stop that is inconsistent with the voiced sound of his Pre-Luw. *\*dabara-* > Luw. *\*tapara-* /tabara/.

The second obstacle lies in the interpretation of the initial dental. In synchronic terms, the equation *Dapara* = Λαπαρας has been cited as proof of the widely accepted notion that Lyc. *d* denotes a phoneme [ð]. This phonological interpretation is likely, but, based on other evidence (namely borrowings and the distribution of Lyc. *d* and *t*<sup>39</sup>), not on this pair. Paradoxically, it seems typologically strange that Lyc. [ð], a voiced non-sibilant coronal fricative, would cause a lambdacist spelling in Greek. In theory, Grk. δ, which represented a voiced coronal stop /d/, would be the optimal choice for rendering [ð]; resorting to λ = /l/ for a coronal fricative would seem to me justified only in the event that it had a lateral articulation, i.e. if it was pronounced at least some of the time as a lateral coronal fricative [ʒ].<sup>40</sup> Moreover, regardless of the precise pronunciation of *d*, it is obviously a Lycian sound. The very old theory that *d* ~ λ indicate different strategies of rendering a special “substratum” sound (see e.g. Heubeck 1957) would only make sense if Lyc. *Dapara* and Grk. Λαπαρας were *independent* transcriptions of a foreign

<sup>35</sup> Strauss (2006: 304) credits Hutter (with ref. to Zinko 1994: 76) with the interpretation of *Alitapara* as a “Mischkompositum” from Hurr. *allai-* ‘Herrin’ and Luw. *tapara* ‘Fluch’, but the actual form of the latter is *taparu-* ‘something evil’ (Melchert 1993a: 207–208).

<sup>36</sup> Melchert (2013).

<sup>37</sup> The noun *\*piha-* is unattested but its existence is well-grounded on onomastics (ibid.).

<sup>38</sup> Neumann (2007: 36) cites three other examples of Λαπαρας in Greek inscriptions (in Rhodes, Palaia Isauria and Letoon/Xanthos), but cf. also Δαπάρας (Myra, 2<sup>nd</sup> cent. BCE; Petersen and von Luschan 1889 apud PHI) and Δαπάραι (dat. sg.) (Telmessos, 183/4 BCE; Clara Rhodos 2 (1932) 172,3 apud PHI).

<sup>39</sup> See Van den Hout (1995) and Melchert (2008: 49). On one hand, Iranian /d/ is transcribed with the digraph ſt-, not *d*, in the Lycian rendering of the name of Darius, ſtarijeus- (cf. Mod. Greek Ντάνιελ instead of \*\*Δάνιελ for *Daniel*, because δ = [ð]). On the other hand, Iranian θ could be adapted as *d*, as seen in Lyc. *xssadrapa-/xssaθrapa-* ‘satrap’ < Ir. *\*xšaθra-pā-van* ‘protector of the kingdom/power’.

<sup>40</sup> This is the case of Amis, an Austronesian language of Taiwan, in which [ʒ], [ð], [ɸ], and [d] constitute different dialectal pronunciations of /ð/ (Maddieson and Wright 1995: 47). In fact, the articulation of [ʒ] and [ð] is so close that these two sounds are not found to contrast in any language in the UPSID sample of 451 world languages (Maddieson 1984).

name (with a foreign sound), from a third source. Since to my knowledge there is no evidence for a third, non-IE language in Lycia as late as the second half of the 1<sup>st</sup> millennium BCE, this theory is unfounded. Most likely, *Dapara* is simply a Lycian name that was Hellenized in the bilingual and the Greek rendering of Lyc. *d*. It is true that Lyc. *d* is normally rendered with Grk. δ (cf. *Edrijeuse-hñ* > Ιδριεύς/Εδριεύς; *Esedeplēme/i* / *Sedeplēmi* > Ασεδεπλημις; *Idazzala* > Ειδασσαλα), but there is also the case of *Xesñtedi* > Κεσινδηλις,<sup>41</sup> suggesting that in certain cases (allophonically?) Lyc. *d* might have been pronounced as something other than a non-sibilant coronal fricative.

Two points that usually go unmentioned in discussions of *Dapara* are: 1) Lycian avoids word-initial *d*-; 2) when words beginning with geminate *dd*- follow a copulative *se*, the two fuse and de-gemination takes place: cf. *ddewē* > *se=dewē* (see Melchert 2004: 9). *Dapara* too follows a copulative, *se=dapara* (ibid.: 92), so its actual self-standing form must be *\*Ddapara*. This has implications for the etymology and pronunciation of the name. There is the possibility that Lyc. *ddV-* reflects earlier *\*VdV-*, and therefore I would like to suggest as a working hypothesis that *\*Ddapara* contains *Ida-*, a fairly common Luwic formant of names that appears in Hellenized transcriptions as Ιδ(α)-/Ειδ(α)-. This suggestion finds a degree of support in Myl. *Ddxug[a]*, which, despite being damaged, invites a comparison with Car. *dquq* and Greek-written Ιδαγυγος (as proposed tentatively by Adiego 1995: 27, n. 9). Notice that the segmentation of the Carian name as *d-quq* is independently supported by the existence of *quq* as a self-standing name. The term of comparison is the abovementioned Lyc. *Ida-zzala* > Ειδα-σσαλα, alongside *Zzala* > Σαλας (see Adiego 2007: 334). If this proposition is correct, what we have is *\*Idapara* > *Ddapara*, with the same kind of (accent-driven?) aphaeresis seen in Mylian and Carian. Given the Lycian avoidance of initial *d*, we would expect this consonant to undergo gemination after aphaeresis in order to keep up with the phonotactic demands of the language (Van den Hout 1995: 135).

Irrespective of the etymology of (*se=*)*dapara*, it seems that the λ of Λαπαρας renders the “simple” intervocalic *d*, possibly owing to circumstances like those of *Xesñtedi* > Κεσινδηλις (if the latter is not the result of dissimilation).<sup>42</sup> Just why intervocalic *d* would be perceived as a close to a Greek lateral must remain a matter of speculation,<sup>43</sup> but based on the present analysis I would keep *Ddapara* separated from *\*tapara-*.

## 9. Cilician Τβερα/η-

Houwink ten Cate (1961: 159) analyzed as compounds with Luw. *\*tapara-* four personal names from Hellenistic Cilicia: Τβερασητας (*\*Tapara-zita/i*), Τβερημωσις (*\*Tapara-muwa+zi*), Ρωνδβερρας (*\*Ru(n)-tapara*), and Ταρκυνδβερρας (*\*Tарhu(nt)-tapara*). The last two names were already treated in §5, so this section deals with the other two. The starting point is the combinatorial comparison with other Greek-written Anatolian anthroponyms:

<sup>41</sup> For all these onomastic forms see Melchert (2004).

<sup>42</sup> However, I would not entirely exclude that *Xesñtedi* > Κεσινδηλις involves some kind of dissimilation of the voiced coronal fricative because of the preceding voiced coronal stop.

<sup>43</sup> I would at least annotate the possibility that, in this position and in fast-speech, the sound may have been flapped. A similar explanation could account for the match between the Carian place-name Μύλασα (Mylasa) and the *Mutamutassa* from cuneiform sources (via *\*Mudasa?*) (see Carruba 1996: 23, apud Adiego 2007: 342), if the equation is valid.

Τβερη-μω-σις <sup>44</sup> (*T.- <i>muwa</i> -zi-) 'Man of <i>t.</i> might'	Τβερα-σητας <sup>45</sup> (*T.- <i>zita</i> -) ' <i>T.</i> man'
Οπρα-μω-σις / Οπρα-μουα-σις <sup>46</sup> (* <i>Uppara</i> - <i>muwa</i> -zi-) 'Man of superior might'	Ουπρα-σητας <sup>47</sup> (* <i>Uppara</i> - <i>zita</i> -) 'Superior man'
Πορδα-μωα-σις <sup>48</sup> (* <i>P.</i> - <i>muwa</i> -zi) 'Man of <i>p.</i> might'	Πορδα-σητας (* <i>P.</i> - <i>zita</i> -) ' <i>P.</i> man'

The patterning of these names implies that Τβερα/η- is an adjective qualifying the named individual or his might. Possibly, it contains the PIE adjectival suffix *-ro-*, also seen in Luwic \**uppara*- 'superior' (< PIE \**uperó*-) (Melchert 2013: 44), but this is less than certain. A priori, \*'Man with a ruler's might' or \*'Ruler man' are acceptable meanings for Τβερημωσις and Τβερασητας, respectively. Besides clarifying the morphological and semantic structure, the above comparisons also supply us with phonological clues. By Hellenistic times Luwic \**uppara* (VCVRV) has been ubiquitously reduced to Ο(υ)πρα- (VCRV) in the onomastics of Lycia, Pamphylia, Isauria and Cilicia, probably through accent-driven syncope.<sup>49</sup> If we transport these observations to our case, it seems expectable that \**tapara*- would resurface not as Τβερα/η-, but rather as \*\*ΤΒβρα-, in Hellenistic Cilician onomastics. Even if we started with \**tapra*-, Lycian Πιγραμος (\**Pihra*-*muwa*) suggests that, at least in Lycia, the outcome would have been \*\*ΤΒβρα-. It stands to reason that Τβερα/η- must reflect something else.

The key is the cluster Τβ-. A survey of late Greek-written Anatolian onomastics in *PHI* reveals that it is very rare:

Region	Anthroponym	Reference
Caria	Κυτβελημις / Κοτβελημος	KPN §771 / Myl 12.14 apud Blümel (1992)
Caria	[Κ]υατβης (acc. Κυατβην)	KPN §765
Caria	Σαγγοτβηηοις	MyL 12.3 apud Blümel (1992)
Pisidia	Τβημης / *Τβημις (in patr. Τβημεους)	KPN §1522
Cilicia	*Τβωτ-ς (in patr. Τβωτος)	Bean-Mitford (1970: 185,205, apud PHI)
Cilicia	*Τβιος (in patr. Τβιου)	KPN §1523
Cilicia	*Τβερασητας (in patr. Τβερασητα)	KPN §1521-2
Cilicia	Τβερημωσις (in gen. Τβερημωσιος)	KPN §1521-1

<sup>44</sup> KPN §1521-2.

<sup>45</sup> KPN §1521-1.

<sup>46</sup> KPN §1099-4, 7.

<sup>47</sup> KPN §1099-11.

<sup>48</sup> Dagron and Feissel (1987: no. 11a). The reading given is Πορδαμοαξιος (patronymic), but in my opinion, the photograph provided permits us to correct it to Πορδαμοασιος.

<sup>49</sup> Differently Pisidian Ουπρερ-, now persuasively explained by Adiego (2012: 20) as a secondary development \**Uppara* > *Upra* (Ουπρα) > \**Upr*- > Ουπρερ-, only in compounds. Melchert (2013: 44) reaches a similar conclusion independently. It remains to be seen whether Οβρα/ι- (seen e.g. in Οβρασητας) belongs here. If it were so, we would probably have to assume a voicing of \**VprV* > -*VbrV* motivated by a prohibition of voiceless stops between a vowel and a sonorant in the underlying Luwic dialect(s).

Let us put the evidence from Caria aside for a moment. Some of the names from Pisidia and Cilicia elicit comparisons with other anthroponyms that might help unveil the historical source of the cluster:

Kβ-	Tβ-	Tou-
LYC. Κβαῖμιος <sup>50</sup>	PIS. Τβημης / *Τβημις	PIS. *Τουημις <sup>51</sup>
ISAUR. *Κβιας <sup>52</sup>	CIL. *Τβιος	
LYC. Κβαδης <sup>53</sup>	CIL. *Τβωτ-ς	

These potential correspondences suggest that τβV from Pisidia and Cilicia can also appear in roughly the same area as τouV, but matches κβV from Lycia and Isauria.<sup>54</sup> In this way, they evoke the different outcomes of P.-Anat. *dw*V (or unstressed *duw*V) in Lycian and Milyan. As is well-known, Milyan features *tb*V, probably /tɸV/, where Lycian has *kb*V, likely /cɸV/ with a palatal stop.<sup>55</sup> cf. Mil. *tbi* vs. Lyc. *kbihu* ‘twice’ (< \**dwis*u-).<sup>56</sup> In fact, among the personal names in the table, \*Κβιας/\*Τβιος can be compared to Lyc. *kbije* ‘another, second’ (< \**dwiy*o-) and probably means ‘second-born child’.<sup>57</sup> Further potential matches are possible if we take all this into consideration.

Kβ-	Tβ-	Tou-
LYC. Κβαῖμιος <sup>58</sup>	PIS. Τβημης / *Τβημις	PIS. *Τουημις
ISAUR. *Κβιας (cf. Lyc. <i>kbije</i> ‘another; second’)	CIL. *Τβιος	
LYC. Κβαδης	CIL. *Τβωτ-ς (cf. H. Luw. PN <i>Tu-wa/i-ti</i> <sup>59</sup> and Mil. <i>Tuwada</i> <sup>60</sup> )	
LYC. Κβα-μοας <sup>61</sup>		PIS. Τουα-μου-σις <sup>62</sup>
Lyc. <i>kbatra</i> ‘daughter’ < * <i>twatra</i> < * <i>tuwatra</i>		LYCAON. Τουατρις <sup>63</sup> < * <i>tuwatri(ya)</i> - ‘daughterly’? (or ‘little daughter’?)

<sup>50</sup> KPN §562.

<sup>51</sup> MAMA VIII 358 apud PHI.

<sup>52</sup> KPN §563.

<sup>53</sup> KPN §560. Cf. also Melchert (2004: 106).

<sup>54</sup> I follow Melchert (2013: 31) in his cautious note that assignment of Greek-transmitted names to specific Anatolian languages can be done only in variable degrees of assurance, hence my use of e.g. ‘in/from Lycia’ instead of ‘Lycian’.

<sup>55</sup> Kloekhorst (2008a: 125). Melchert (2008: 49) speaks of a “front velar”.

<sup>56</sup> It is important to stress that if Lycian *k* really represents a palatal stop /c/, then in theory it could also have been transcribed with *t* in Greek. In this case, τβ would have been used for /cɸ/ as well. I thank Adiego (pers. comm.) for pointing this out.

<sup>57</sup> As suggested by Shevoroshkin (1978: 247). For a typological parallel cf. Latin numerical names *Primus*, *Secundus*, and so forth.

<sup>58</sup> In this case, it must be noticed that, alongside Pisidian Γβαῖμιος (KPN §205), Κβαῖμιος might reflect Lyc. *xba-* instead of *kba-*.

<sup>59</sup> Hawkins (2000: 308)

<sup>60</sup> Melchert (2004: 106).

<sup>61</sup> KPN §563.

<sup>62</sup> Brixhe et al. (1987: no. 26).

<sup>63</sup> KPN §1585–3.

If this is correct, then names written with  $\tau\beta V$  in Caria ought to find a similar explanation. It seems to be the case. Κυτβελημιος and Κοτβελημος are known to match the Carian personal name *qtblem-* (Adiego 1993: 235; 2007: 408), but these seem moreover analogous to Mil. *qetbeleimi-* (as first seen by Shevoroshkin 1978: 252). Melchert (2004: 126) considers the latter to be an adjective (attested twice in plural), but attempts no translation. I would like to propose that both the Carian and the Mylian items go back to a Proto-Luwic participial adjective *\*Hwitwalāim(a/i)-* ‘vivified, animated’ (or sim.). I base this on a hypothetical denominative verb *\*Hwitwalāi-* ‘to make be alive, vivify’, ultimately from a P.-Luwic adjective *\*Hwitwal(i)-*, which survived in C. Luw. *huitwal(i)-* ‘alive, living’ (for the latter see Melchert 1993a: 84).<sup>64</sup> I believe this etymology is not difficult to harmonize with current views on Mylian and Carian phonology<sup>65</sup> and implicates a regular development P.-Anat. *\*dwV* > Car. / Mil. *tbV*.

Σαγγοτβηηοις, also from Caria, is opaque, but it can be segmented as Σαγγο-τβηηοι- in the light of Σαγγως (KPN §1369), another Greek-written Carian name.<sup>66</sup> I will only note that this *\*τβηηοι-* might be cognate with Cilician Τβερα/η- and that nothing a priori prevents it from having Proto-Luwic status.<sup>67</sup>

This digression reinforces the notion that  $\tau\beta V$  conceals etymological P.-Anat. *\*dwV*, including instances from unstressed *\*duwV*. Thus Cilician Τβερα/η- is not likely to derive from a virtual Luw. *\*tapara*, but rather from a Proto-Anatolian adjective whose form is close to *\*d(u)wara-*. Based on this reconstruction, I would like to suggest an Anatolian reflex of PIE *\*dwēh₂-ró-* ‘long (of time and space)’, cognate with Grk. δηρός (Doric δῆρόν) ‘long’, Skt. *dūrā* ‘far (of time and space)’, and Arm. *erkar* (\*< *dwār?*) ‘long’.<sup>68</sup> Τβερημωσις and Τβερασητας would make perfect sense as ‘Man of long-lasting might’ and ‘Long-lasting man’. The immediate obstacle is that no direct descendant of P.-Anat. *\*dwāra-* is attested among the Anatolian languages, but this absence is mitigated by the existence of the Hittite adverb *tuwa* ‘far’ (with Kloekhorst 2008b: 904–905, compare Attic δήν and Doric δοάν/δάν ‘long, for a long while; far’) and the adjective *tuwala-* ‘far’ (see Tischler 1994: 486–489). We may add C. Luw. *dūwazza-*, traditionally translated as ‘wide’, but now argued by Yakubovich (2013b: 163–164) to be an absolute superlative ‘the most wide, broad’. The PIE etymon is thus well represented in Anatolia. In theory, if Luwian possessed an adjective *\*tuwala-* ‘far, long, wide’ like Hittite, then it

<sup>64</sup> For C. Luw. *huitwal(i)-* ‘alive, living’, see Melchert 1993a: 84. For the etymology see Puhvel (1991: 354–355) and Kloekhorst (2008b: 355–356). More tentatively, P.-Luwic *\*Hwitwal(i)-*, if it ever was an *a*-stem, could also be the source of the personal name Κοτβαλως (Caria; I. Amyzon 2.4), probably a match for Car. *qtblo* (see Adiego 2007: 408, with refs.); likewise, Κοτβηους (Lydia; KPN §707–1) might be a variant of Carian Κυατβης = *qutbe* (ibid.). However, in these two cases the cluster *-tβV-* would appear broken with a labial vowel in the Greek transcription (-τοβV-).

<sup>65</sup> Cf. the fate of the Storm-god’s name: Lyc. *trqqñt*, Car. *trqδ*, Luw. *Tarhunt-* < P.-Anat. *\*trHʷант-* (Kloekhorst 2008a: 138; see also Adiego 2007: 331–332). Mylian is written with the Lycian alphabet, so that Myl. *q* should represent a sound close to that of Lyc. *q*, which according to Kloekhorst (2008a: 124–125) was a labialized velar /kʷ/ < P.-Anat. /Hʷ/. Car. *q* is interpreted a possible uvular stop by Adiego (2007: 244) and as a labialized velar by Kloekhorst (2008a: 138).

<sup>66</sup> Attested in patronymic form: Σαγγωδος (see Blümel 1992: 21).

<sup>67</sup> *\*-τβηηοι-* is also reminiscent of Car. *tbridbδś* (at Memphis), possibly a paponym or appellative (Adiego 2007: 273, 421). A priori, if *tbr(i)ə* is somehow related to *\*-τβηηοι-*, then we would expect *\*\*tberidbδś*, since Grk. η systematically reflects Car. *e* (Adiego 2007: 236). However, it cannot be excluded that in *tbridbδś* some sort of vowel reduction took place because of stress (I thank Adiego for pointing this out to me in a pers. comm.).

<sup>68</sup> For the PIE root and derivatives, see Mallory and Adams (1997: 356–357; 2006: 298–299); for the Armenian etymology see Martirosyan (2010: 266–267).

might have undergone the characteristic “flapping” *l* > *r*, as well as syncope, thereby yielding a form \**tuwara*- that would explain our Cilician Tβερα/η-.

Regardless of the future of this hypothesis,<sup>69</sup> the point to be retained is that Tβερημωσις and Tβερασητας are unlikely to contain a reflex of \**tapara* ‘ruler’.

## 10. Hittite *l/tabarna-* and Luwian (:)*tapar-* ‘to rule’

It is well known that *l/tabarna-* was used as a title by Hittite monarchs since the Old Hittite period and was apparently the personal name of at least one early king. Almost all rulers of Hatti down to the fall of Hattusa bore it, the exceptions being Suppiluliuma I and his immediate successors (Soysal 2005: 189–190). This has elicited the comparison with the case of Roman *Caesar* (> German *Kaiser* ‘Emperor’; Russian царь ‘Czar’), which began as a *cognomen* and evolved to an imperial title (Tischler 1988: 348–349). According to the *CHD* (L–N: 43), the distribution of the lexeme in Hittite “seems to confirm the theory that *labarna* or *tabarna*” was initially a personal name borne by an early ruler, but afterwards became the traditional title of the king of Hatti as a means of establishing a dynastic link with the ancestral Labarna. Besides Hittite, *l/tabarna-* appears in Hattic, Akkadian, Palaic, Luwian, and possibly Hurrian (see Soysal 2005 for a useful list of the attestations of the word). Hittite uses both spellings, but the remaining languages all spell the word exclusively with *ta-*, with the exception of Luwian, in which only the variant with *la-* is attested.<sup>70</sup> A detailed account of the myriad of attempts to etymologize *l/tabarna-* in the Hittitological literature would make this survey too long, so I will focus only on those with ramifications for the present discussion.<sup>71</sup>

Non-IE etymologies of *l/tabarna-* include the hypothesis of a Hattic loanword in the IE Anatolian languages (among others, see recently Soysal 2005 and Kassian 2009–2010: 357–362), but no proposal has ever brought forth a full explanation of its meaning and morphology in acceptable Hattic terms.<sup>72</sup> Of course, on its own this does not prove that the word is not Hattic.

Credit is due to Carruba (1986: 203f, apud Melchert 2003a: 18) for demonstrating that the *t-/l-* orthographic alternation, peculiar to the Hittite spellings of the title, has no parallel in the various Hattic borrowings in Hittite. Starting from the consensus that Proto-Anatolian \**d* was devoiced to *t* word-initially in Hittite and Luwian, Melchert (2003a: 18–19) has suggested an alternative account. He argues that if devoicing occurred first in “pre-Hittite”, then a hypothetical “pre-Luwian” form \**dabarna-* would have been borrowed into pre-Hittite as *labarna-*, with */l/* as a substitute for “foreign” word-initial */d/*. To account for all facts, he further postulates (following an idea by Tischler) that Hitt. *labarna-* “was later (but still prehistorically) altered to *tabarna-* by association with the Luwo-Hitt. verb *tapar(r)iya-* ‘to rule’,” when the devoicing of initial \**d* had already taken place in the latter language. Contrary to certain claims, Melchert’s hypothesis is typologically sound. It finds support in Lydian, which borrowed the

<sup>69</sup> Melchert (pers. comm.) suggests as alternative comparandum Lyc. *tuwere/i*. I think that this is formally tempting and worth mentioning as a possibility, but the sense is unclear and, in my opinion, the suggested meaning ‘celebrant’ (or sim.), or person “responsible for prescribed offerings” (see Melchert 2004: 74, with refs.) would not square well with the semantics we expect for Tβερημωσις / Tβερασητας.

<sup>70</sup> The primacy of *labarna-* in Luwian seems to have lasted beyond the Empire period, as early 1<sup>st</sup> millennium Assyrian texts (see *RIMA* 3) mention *Lubarna*, the name (or title?) of a king of Pattin/Unqu.

<sup>71</sup> A relatively recent summary from the beginnings of the discipline onward is given in Soysal (2005: fn. 7), but cf. also Tischler (1991: 34, 116–119) and *CHD* L–N: 43.

<sup>72</sup> Thus Soysal (2005), for example, interprets the title as a half-obscure *ta=par=na* ‘the thousand *na*’ without being able to explain the alleged morpheme *-na*.

Aeolic Greek divine names Δαμάταρ (gen. Δάματος) ‘Demeter’ and Δέυς ‘Zeus’ respectively as *lamētru* and *lefš/lewš*. Apparently, Lydian prohibited the voiced coronal stop in initial position (Melchert 2003b: 181, fn. 13; Yakubovich 2005: 87, n. 50). Accordingly, Lyd. *d*, which can occur at the beginning of words, is thought to represent a coronal fricative /ð/, while actual [d] would have existed only as an allophone of /t/ in certain environments (thus being spelled with *t*), but not word-initially (Melchert 2008: 58–59). The use of Lyd. /l-/ as the optimal replacement for Grk. /d-/ is not without parallels in contemporary languages.<sup>73</sup> The main issue with Melchert’s hypothesis is that it requires demonstration that the devoicing of initial stops is a post-Proto-Anatolian development that took place separately in Hittite and Luwian.

Whatever the phonological explanation, if *labarna-* was the original form, then it is tempting to think it was later changed to *tabarna-* by folk etymology, under the influence of *tapar(r)iya-* ‘rule, authority’. If this is the case, it seems more likely that it was contaminated in its usage as a royal title. There are facts that mitigate both in favor and against this notion, but it would be beyond the scope of this paper to review them in detail.<sup>74</sup> What is significant for our current purposes is the distinct possibility that the *t-l-* alternation is *not* the reflex of different Hittite strategies to spell a special sound of a non-IE word from some *ad hoc* linguistic adstrate, such as a voiceless lateral affricate /tɬ/<sup>75</sup> or a voiced coronal fricative /ð/. Together with the above analyses of λαβύρινθος and *Dapara*/Λαπαρας, this makes it even more difficult to maintain LA *du-pu<sub>2</sub>-re* and Hittite *l/tabarna-* as manifestations of the same contact word.

As hinted above, Hittite and Luwian possess an array of lexemes routinely involved in attempts to etymologize *l/tabarna-*. Their revision is not of secondary importance, as we are trying to determine whether they can all be connected to a traveling contact word associated with kingship. The most original forms appear to be Luw. (:)*tapar-* ‘to rule’ and Luwo-Hitt. *tapar(r)iya-* ‘order, ruling; authority’, which yields denominative verb *tapar(r)iya(i)-* ‘to order, rule’ (geminated *-rr-* is secondary; see Kloekhorst 2008b: 830). The last two have cognates in H. Luwian: LEPUS+*ra/i-ia*<sup>76</sup> or \**tapariya-* ‘authority’ and (“LIGNUM”).LEPUS+*ra/i-(ia)* or \**tapari(ya)-* ‘to decree, govern, with its reduplicated form \**tatapari(ya)-*. I would also include here the C. Luwian noun *taparamman-* ‘ruling, governing’ which on the model of *āhra-* ‘pain,

<sup>73</sup> For instance, Yaqui (a Uto-Aztec language of NW Mexico) replaced foreign [d] with either [r] or [l] in Spanish loanwords: cf. Yaqui *lios* < Sp. *dios* ‘god’ (Estrada Fernández 2009: 834, 844–846). The deployment of [l] as substitute for a dental stop is unsurprising, since lateral approximants are routinely articulated with an occlusion — the defining feature of stops — in the dental/alveolar region (Ladefoged and Maddieson 1996: 182–183). The preference for [l] over [t] (the voiceless dental/alveolar stop) as a substitute is also acceptable if we assume that in [d] the feature of voicing was perceptually favored by native speakers of Lydian.

<sup>74</sup> Yakubovich (2009b: 230) objects that altering the king’s title would have constituted an unacceptable case of *laesio majestatis*. This is not an issue if we assume the contamination operated in Luwian after it borrowed Hitt. *labarna*: foreignisms are often opaque and thus more liable to folk etymology. English has a ready parallel in *sovereign* (< Mid. Eng. *souerain* < Old Fr. *soverain* ‘princely, chief’ < Late Lat. \**super-ānus* ‘chief, highest’), an opaque Galicism altered under influence of the unrelated *reign* (< Lat. *regnare* ‘to have royal power, rule’) (Skeat 1993 [1884]: 479 and Fowler *et al.* 2011 [1911]: 834). I know of no record of an English monarch feeling offended after being referred to as *sovereign*. The problem is that we would have to assume that *tabarna-* emerged in Luwian (where it left no traces) and then was re-borrowed into Hittite when Luwian had already become a prestige language.

<sup>75</sup> The idea of a “/tɬ/” sound is as early as Forrer (1922: 183, n. 1) and has often been repeated in the literature (e.g. Tischler 1988: 350). For the explicit proposal of /tɬ/ see e.g. Kloekhorst (2008b: 521).

<sup>76</sup> The reading of the logogram LEPUS as \**tapa-* is well-established, but its motivation remains obscure. Different attempts to connect a hypothetical Luw. \**tap(p)a-* ‘hare’ to Latin *lepus* or Armenian *napastak* (dialectal *lapustrak*, *labastag*) have, all of them, problems (see e.g. Arbeitman 1988: 77 and Katz 2001: 216 apud Yakubovich 2002: 98). In fact, by comparison with Massiliot Grk. λεβηρίς, Lat. *lepus*, *-oris* might be a borrowing from a non-IE western European language (see de Vaan 2008: 335).

woe' > *āhramman-* 'state of pain' (see Melchert 1993a: 4–5) points to a noun *\*tapara-* 'rule'. These words have a number of secondary derivatives in both Hittite and Luwian.<sup>77</sup>

Although all members of this group seem interrelated, it is not easy to explain them as derivatives from a single common source. The main issue is the difficulty to associate C. Luw. *tapar-* 'to rule' with Luwo-Hitt. *tapar(r)iya-* 'rule, authority' morphologically, despite obvious semantic ties. For Oettinger (1979: 384, apud Starke 1990: 259–260), the athematic stem of *tapar-* is structurally atypical of PIE-inherited verbal forms in Luwian, whence he concludes it most likely is of secondary origin. This idea was followed by Starke (ibid.), who argued that *tapar-* was back-formed from Luw. *tapar(r)iya(i)-* 'to rule' (which in turn is a denominative verb from the noun *tapar(r)iya-*) on the model of verbs like *lawarr(iya)-* 'destroy(?)', but his proposal faces serious morphological obstacles.<sup>78</sup> Still, the notion that *tapar-* is a secondary form based on *tapar(r)iya(i)-* remains the most economical.<sup>79</sup> According to Melchert (1997: 87–88), *tapar-* is a *non-present* stem back-formed from a *present* stem *tapari(ya)-*<sup>80</sup> by analogy with Luwian pairs of unextended non-present vs. extended present, such as Luw. *kup-* / *\*kupiya-* 'to plot, scheme' (cf. also Hitt. *karuš-ten* / *karušsiye-* 'to be silent'). If Melchert is correct, then both verbal stems ultimately go back to the noun *tapariya-*.

In the meantime, for *l/tabarna-* itself Melchert (1993b: 107; 1997: 87–88; 2003a: 19) suggests an IE etymology partially linked to attempts by several scholars (starting with Hrozný 1917, apud Tischler 1991: 118) of connecting Luw. *tapar-* to Latin *faber* 'artificer',<sup>81</sup> Old Church Slavonic *dobr-ъ* 'good' and Middle High German *tapfer* 'massive, firm; brave'. He reconstructs a PIE adjective *\*d<sup>h</sup>ub<sup>(h)</sup>-ro-*<sup>82</sup> 'capable' as the source of a virtual substantivized adjective *\*tapar-* 'powerful', which in turn would have yielded *tapar-iya-* '(sphere of) command' through the adjectival suffix *-iya-* (cf. C. Luw. *tummaniya-* 'obedience' < *tummant-* 'ear, hearing'; Melchert 1990: 91). The semantic and morphological aspects of this scenario need a brief comment. Se-

<sup>77</sup> For the cuneiform material see Tischler (1991: 116), Melchert (1993a: 203) and Kloekhorst (2008: 829–830); for the forms in H. Luwian, see Hawkins (2000: 629–630). As regards the remaining Anatolian relatives, Hittite has the agent noun <sup>lú</sup>*tapariyalli-* 'commander' (< \**tapariya-*) and the gloss-wedge form (:)*taparammehit-* 'position of commanding', probably a Luwian borrowing derived from *taparamman* on the model of *handawat(i)-* 'king' > \**handawatahit-* 'kingdom'. H. Luwian also has the agent noun *LEPUS+ra/i-ia-li-* = *\*tapariyal(i)-* 'governor' (= Luwo-Hitt. <sup>lú</sup>*tapariyalli-*), which produces the factitive verb *LEPUS+ra/i-ia-la-* = *\*taparahlit-* 'to be/make governor', as well as *LEPUS+pa+ra/i-hi-* = *\*taparahit-* '(position of) authority' (nom.-acc. sg.), which is independent from Luwo-Hitt. (:)*taparammahit-*, and the hapax *LEPUS-RA/I-ta-na* = *\*taparitan* 'authority (acc. sg.)'? The latter is at first sight baffling, but I think Yakubovich's (pers. comm.) suggestion that it this a syncopated version of the noun *\*tapari(ya)ta-* 'command' is compelling; the process would be analogous to that of Hitt. *\*piyatta- > pitta-* 'allotment, gift' (see Puhvel 1979: 213).

<sup>78</sup> Starke's argument is that this verb's infinitive, *lauwarruna*, is identical with that of *tapar-*, *taparuna* (he also cites (:)*palhā* and its inf. *palhuna*, but according to Melchert 1993a: 164 there is no stem *\*palhiya-* attested for this verb). This is complicated by the fact that the two verbs are conjugated with different stems in the Pret. 3<sup>rd</sup> sg: (:)*ta-pa-ar-ta* ~ *ta-párt-a* vs. *la-wa-ar-ri-it-ta* (Melchert 1993a: 126, 207).

<sup>79</sup> For Kloekhorst (2008b: 831), *tapar-* could be from an IE source only if its stem was /tbar-/, from a root of the structure *\*Tb<sup>(h)</sup>er-* (where *T* = dental stop). However, he admits that if *tapar-* is IE he cannot offer plausible cognates and, more importantly, his treatment does not exclude back-formation as a way to account for its atypical structure.

<sup>80</sup> According to Melchert (1997: 87), seventeen out of eighteen attestations of (:)*tapar-* are non-presents.

<sup>81</sup> Armenian *darbin* 'smith' has since long been cited as a cognate of Lat. *faber* (Meillet 1894: 165, apud Schrijver 1991: 102), but Melchert (2003a: 19, fn. 18) rejects this on phonological grounds. Yakubovich (2002: 103, fn. 26, owing to a suggestion by Kassian; 2009: 267–268) proposes the Armenian word to be a borrowing from an Urartian cognate of Hurr. *tabrinni* 'blacksmith'.

<sup>82</sup> For those skeptical about both *\*a* and *\*b* as PIE phonemes, this would naturally be *\*d<sup>h</sup>eb<sup>h</sup>-ro-*.

mantics are less problematic if with Melchert (pers. comm.) one assumes *\*dʰab(ʰ)ro-* had a semantic range similar to that of German *tüchtig* ‘capable; big; good’, which can explain the diversification to Lat. *faber* ‘artificer (skillful working with various materials)’, OCS *dobrъ* ‘good’ and virtual Luw. *\*tapar-* ‘powerful’, although MHG *tapfer* ‘valiant’ < ‘heavy’ (< P.-Germanic *\*dapra-* ‘heavy’; see Kroonen 2013: 89) remains difficult. But the real conundrum lies in morphology. In order to maintain the development PIE *\*dʰab(ʰ)ro-* > P. Anat. *\*dabro-* > Luw. *\*tapar-*, Melchert (1993b) needs to resort to his Anatolian “law of finals”, according to which *\*Cro-* would have regularly shifted to *Car-*. Yet this rule is not consensual and a possible counterexample is found in Hitt. *gim(ma)ra-* ‘countryside, field’ and C. Luw. *im(ma)ra-* ‘open country’ < PIE *\*ǵʰim-ro-*.<sup>83</sup> In addition, we have seen that C. Luw. *taparamman-* points to a noun *\*tapara-* ‘rule’ which is also able to account for *tapariya-* (< *\*tapar(a)-iya-*), but can hardly be the outcome of PIE *\*dʰab(ʰ)ro-*, or, for that matter, reconciled with *\*tapra-*, the presumable component of the name *Taprammi*.

Interestingly, Yakubovich (2009b: 216, n. 11; 231) now traces *l/tabarna-* back to pre-Luw. *\*dabra-* ‘rule’ and considers his earlier *\*dabara-* as a secondary formation by analogy with the vocalism of *\*dabar-na*. His revision, which is only secondarily concerned with the etymology of the word,<sup>84</sup> is based on four Anatolian anthroponyms attested in the Old Assyrian sources of the early 2<sup>nd</sup> millennium BCE: *Šupilapra*, *Walapra*, *Wašatapra*, and *Watapra* (spelled with sign DA/TÁ).<sup>85</sup> In Yakubovich’s opinion, *Walapra* and *Watapra* are variants of the same name and contain an independent element *l/tapra*, corresponding to Luw. *\*dabra-* ‘rule’. The alternating spellings, much like *l/tabarna-*, would indicate hesitations in transcribing an early Luwian voiced *\*d* by speakers of Hittite. Some reservations must be expressed, however. First: while *Šupilapra* is probably Hittite,<sup>86</sup> it is not clear if the remaining names are Hittite, Luwian, or something else (e.g. Hurrian). Second: it is not certain that *lapra* and *tapra* are correctly segmented and (should they be Hittite) represent a Luwian borrowing. In the case of *\*Wa-lapra*/*\*Wa-tapra* it is not obvious what would *Wa-* be, and Kassian (2009–2010: 358–359) duly notes that *\*Wala-pra*/*\*Wata-pra* are also possible segmentations. Third: we are dealing with early 2<sup>nd</sup>-millennium BCE texts written in the Old Assyrian language and script, which possesses unambiguous means of transcribing a voiced stop /d/; therefore, one would need to assume the scribes involved were not Assyrians, but Nesites working for the Assyrians and struggling to write Luwian onomastics with a foreign sound. Tempting as it is to posit pre-Luw. *dabra- > tapra-*, the evidence is not uncontroversial and, even if *\*dabra* existed as a self-standing element, there are no grounds to assume its meaning was ‘rule’.

It is worthwhile pointing out that, regardless of which source one prefers, Melchert’s or Yakubovich’s, there is an explanation — if only theoretical — of how *l/tabarna-* might have

<sup>83</sup> I find compelling the proposed connection with PIE *\*ǵʰeim-* ‘winter’ (cf. Hitt. *gimma-* ‘winter’), whence *\*ǵʰim-ro-* ‘winter (steppe)’ > ‘open country’ (Benveniste apud Puhvel 1997: 179).

<sup>84</sup> It is only in a footnote that Yakubovich retrieves his 2002 suggestion that this and other (allegedly) related forms “may have a non-Indo-European, ‘Minoan’ origin”.

<sup>85</sup> Spellings of these names and texts where they appear (apud Yakubovich 2009b: Table 25): *Šu-pi-lá-áp-ra* (KUG 8.7, in Hecker 1966: 13); *Wa-lá-áp-ra-a* (TC 3 191.22, in Ulshöfer 1995: 316); *Wa-ša-tap-ra* (Kt 89/k 383 2, in Donbaz 1993: 134); *Wa-tá-áp-ra* (CCT 1 6c.13, in Eisser and Lewy 1930: 20).

<sup>86</sup> *Šupi-lapra* seems to contain *šuppi-* ‘pure’, which in the texts of the imperial period occurs exclusively in Hittite. Zehnder (2010: 7) claims that *šuppi-* has no valid IE etymology. Nevertheless, in the *Kārum*-period it occurs in personal names with transparent Anatolian etymologies. Hence, <sup>m</sup>*Šuppi-uman* (‘of the pure one’) is formed through the addition of the well-known Hittite ethnic suffix; likewise, *Šuppi-nika* (‘sister of the pure one’) contains the exclusively Nesite *-nika*. <sup>m</sup>*Šuppi-hšu* (‘male offspring of the pure one’) and <sup>m</sup>*Šuppi-hšušar* (‘female offspring of the pure one’) contain forms of *\*h(a)šu-*, a noun comparable to H. Luw. (NEPOS) *hasu-* ‘progeny, descendant’ (for these cases see Melchert 2003a: 16–17, Yakubovich 2009b: 216–217 and Zehnder 2010: 278–279).

been derived in Anatolian terms. It was formulated by Starke (1980–1983: 406) based on the parallel of C. Luw. *im(ma)ra-* ‘open country’ > \**immar-na* > <sup>d</sup>*Immarn-iya* ‘(deity) of the open country’. It works with Yakubovich’s \**dabra-* if the vocalism of \**dabarna-* was the outcome of anaptyxis after the syllabification of interconsonantal /r/: pre-Luw. \**dabr-na-* > \**dabṛna-* > \**dabarna-* → Hitt. *labarna*.<sup>87</sup> The same process can be hypothesized for Melchert’s \**dabar-*, only more straightforwardly, as it would be unnecessary to posit anaptyxis after the addition of *-na-*.

In the end, the question whether *l/tabarna-* is related to Luw. *tapariya-*, etc. remains open. I would insist that the original semantics of the title *need not* be linked to kingship if truly it is just the crystallized personal name of a memorable early Hittite monarch — again, we can compare the case of Roman *Caesar*, whose imperial connotations are secondary.<sup>88</sup>

## 11. Concluding remarks

As Kassian (2009–2010: 359) duly notes, the overarching problem with positing a Minoan-Anatolian contact word is that we need to assume an adstrate lexeme that not only travelled through different regions (Aegean, south-central Anatolia, Cyprus) during a long time-span (from the early 2<sup>nd</sup> to second half of the 1<sup>st</sup> millennium BCE), but did so while maintaining at all times a stable coronal fricative [ð] that prompted similar spelling alternations in several languages and scripts of the ancient Eastern Mediterranean.

The foregoing has showed that while there are grounds to link LA *du-pu<sub>2</sub>-re* and Grk. *da-pu(2)-ri-to-/λαβύρινθος*, there is no compelling way of connecting these Aegean forms to the Anatolian material, see the table on the next page.

Even if the interpretations put forward here are not always indisputable, the onomastics of 1<sup>st</sup>-millennium BCE southern Anatolia that we have scrutinized are more cogently explained as containing diverse elements of Luwic tradition, and none can be shown to contain a virtual form \**tapara* ‘ruler’ or a relative of Minoan *du-pu<sub>2</sub>-re*. At the same time, a Phoenician rather than an Anatolian etymology can be advanced (or rather reestablished) for *Labranios*, the Cypriot epithet of Zeus. The one item that remains suspicious is Ερματοβορίς (vis-à-vis ‘Ερμο-κράτης ‘Might of Hermes’) from Lycia, but neither the isolation of \*-τοβορί- nor its equivalence to Grk. κράτης (semantically) or Lyc. *tubure-* (etymologically) can be confirmed independently. Finally, not even the onomastics of the 2<sup>nd</sup> millennium BCE have shown conclusive traces of \**tapara* ‘ruler’, but, somewhat paradoxically, a Luwian noun reconstructed with the same phonetic shape and a meaning close to ‘rule’ looks like the best way to account for Luw. *tapariya-* ‘rule, authority’ (> *tapar(r)iyā(i)-* ‘to rule’ > *tapar-* ‘to rule’) and *taparamman-* ‘ruling’. It remains unclear whether this noun would be related to the Hittite royal title *l/tabarna-* and, if it were, whether the relation is etymological (direct) or owes to folk etymology (indirect). This is the reason that virtual Luw. \**tapara-* ‘rule’ would now be the most promising item. Nevertheless, I see no compelling reason to associate it with LA *du-pu<sub>2</sub>-re*, so I conclude there is no Anatolian link leading to the interpretation of the Minoan sequence as ‘master’. It is to be seen whether the alternative ‘cave that housed the cult of a local divinity’, suggested by Sarullo (2008), can throw light on all instances of LA *du-pu<sub>2</sub>-re* and its Aegean relatives. This, however, must be left for another occasion.

<sup>87</sup> I thank Yakubovich for suggesting this development (pers. comm.).

<sup>88</sup> This holds true even if the explanation of *Caesar* as ‘one delivered through a caesarian section’ (< Lat. *caeso* ‘to cut’) by Pliny the Elder (Plin. *Nat. 7.7. s. 9*) is the product of folk etymology.

Region	Word(s)	Proposed etymology
Aegean	LA <i>du-pu<sub>2</sub>-re</i>	Uncertain; ‘cult cave’(?) (see Sarullo 2008)
	LB <i>da-pu(2)-ri-to-</i> / Grk. λαβύρινθος	Min. <i>du-pu<sub>2</sub>-re</i> /DəPúr(i)-/ ‘?’ + -vθ- (see fn. 2) ‘underground complex’(?)
Anatolia	Hitt. <i>l/tabarna-</i>	Uncertain (originally a personal name?). Cf. <i>La[b]arnaš</i> in the Old Assyrian sources
	Luw. <i>tapar(r)iya-</i> ‘rule, authority’ (> <i>tapar(r)iya(i)</i> - ‘to rule’ > <i>tapar-</i> ‘to rule’) and <i>taparamman-</i> ‘ruling’	Luw. noun * <i>tapara-</i> ‘rule’(?), of uncertain origin
	<sup>4</sup> <i>Alitapara</i> (Kizzuwatna)	Uncertain
	* <i>Taprammi</i>	* <i>tapra-</i> + adj. suffix - <i>a(i)mmi-</i> ‘imbued with <i>tapra</i> -’(?)
	- <i>vδυβερι-</i> (LYC.) - <i>vδ/o(v)βα/ε/ηρα-</i> (CIL.)	Comparable to Lyc. <i>ñtuweri-</i> ‘?’. Perhaps Luwic <i>anda</i> + <i>warri-</i> > ‘aid, assistance’(?)
	Car. <i>ybyr</i> and <i>ýbr(s)</i>	Uncertain (related to Luwo-Hitt. <i>warri-</i> ‘help’?)
	T <sub>1</sub> <i>βερα/η-</i> (CIL.) * <i>τβηηρι-</i> (CAR.)	P.-Anat. * <i>dwāra-</i> ‘far, long’(?)
	Lyc. * <i>Ddapara</i> ( <i>se=dapara</i> )	Luwic * <i>Id(a) + (a)ppara</i> (?)
	Lyc. <i>Tubure-</i>	Uncertain
	* <i>-τοβορι-</i> (LYC.)	A Lycian word for ‘might’(??)
Cyprus	Labraunda (CAR.)	Uncertain
	Cypr. Grk. <i>Labranios</i>	Phoen. <i>lbnn</i> /Labnān/ ‘Lebanon’ + Grk. adjective suffix - <i>ios</i>

## References

- Adiego Lajara, Ignacio-Javier. 1993. *Studia Carica. Investigaciones sobre la escritura y lengua carias*, Barcelona.
- 1995. Contribuciones al desciframiento del cario. *Kadmos* 34, 18–34.
- 2007. *The Carian Language*. Leiden: Brill.
- Arbeitman, Yoel L. 1988. Iranian “Scribe”, Anatolian “Ruler”, or Neither: A City’s Rare Chances for “Leadership”. In Y. L. Arbeitman (ed.). *Fucus. A Semitic/Afrasian Gathering in Remembrance of Albert Ehrman*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 1–101.
- Bean, George E. and Mitford, Terence B. 1970. *Journeys in Rough Cilicia 1964–1968, Etc.* (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Phil-Hist. Klasse. Denkschriften Band 102). Graz/Vienna/Colonia: Kommisionsverlag.
- Billigmeier, Jon-Christian. 1989. The Linear A Libation Formula Revisited. *American Philological Association: 121<sup>st</sup> Annual Meeting: Boston, Massachusetts, December 27–30, 1989: Abstracts*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 109.
- Blümel, Wolfgang. 1990. Zwei neue Inschriften aus Mylasa aus der Zeit des Maussollos. *Epigraphica Anatolica* 16, 29–43.
- 1992. Einheimische Personennamen in griechischen Inschriften aus Karien. *Epigraphica Anatolica* 20, 7–34.
- Brixhe, Claude, Drew-Bear, Thomas, and Kaya, Durmuş. 1987. Nouveaux monuments de Pisidie. *Kadmos* 26/2, 124–192.
- Carruba, Onofrio. 1986. Tabarna: Chattisch oder Indogermanisch? IX. *Turk Tarih Kongresi, Ankara, 21–25 eylül 1981. Kongreye Sunulan Bildiriler*, 201–206.
- 1996. Neues zur Frühgeschichte Lykiens. In F. Blakolmer *et al.* (eds.), *Fremde Zeiten. Festschrift für Jürgen Borchardt*. Wien: Phoibos Verlag, 26–33.

- CHD = Güterbock, H. G., Hoffner, H. A., and van den Hout Th. P. J. (eds.). 1983. *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*, Chicago.
- Clara Rhodos 2 = Maiuri, Amedeo. 1932. *Monumenti di scultura del Museo archeologico di Rodi I* (Clara Rhodos. *Studi e materiali pubblicati a cura dell' Istituto storico-archeologico di Rodi 2*), Rhodes: Istituto storico-archeologico.
- Colvin, Stephen. 2004. Names in Hellenistic and Roman Lycia. In S. Colvin (ed.), *The Greco-Roman East: Politics, Culture, Society* (Yale Classical Studies 31), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 44–84.
- Dagron, Gilbert, and Feissel, Denis. 1987. *Inscriptions de Cilicie*. With the collaboration of Antoine Hermary, Jean Richard and Jean-Pierre Sodini. (Travaux et Mémoires du Centre de Recherche d'Histoire et Civilisation de Byzance. Collège de France. Monographies 4). Paris: De Boccard.
- Davis, Brent 2013. “Syntax in Linear A: The Word-Order of the ‘Libation Formula’”. *Kadmos* 52, 35–52.
- 2014. *Minoan Stone Vessels with Linear A Inscriptions* (Aegaeum 36). Leuven: Peeters.
- De Hoz, Javier. 2004. De cómo los protogriegos crearon el griego y los pregriegos lo aprendieron. In P. Bádenas de la Peña et al. (eds.), *Lenguas en contacto: El testimonio escrito*. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 35–56.
- De Vaan, Michiel. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of Latin (and the other Italic Languages)*. Leiden: Brill.
- Del Olmo Lete, Gregorio, and Sanmartín, Joaquín. 2003. *A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition*. Translated by Wilfred G. E. Watson. Part 1 and 2. Leiden / Boston: Brill.
- DocMyc<sup>2</sup> = Ventris, Michael, and Chadwick, John. 1973. *Documents in Mycenaean Greek*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Donbaz, Veysel. 1993. Some Remarkable Contractors of 1-B Period Kültepe Tablets II. In M. Mellink et al. (eds.), *Aspects of Art and Iconography: Anatolia and its Neighbors. Studies in Honor of Nîmet Özgûç*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu. Pp. 131–54.
- Duhoux, Yves. 1989. Le linéaire A: problèmes de déchiffrement. In Y. Duhoux, T.G. Palaima and J. Bennet (eds), *Problems in Decipherment*, Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters, 59–119.
- Egetmeyer, Markus. 2010. *Le dialecte grec ancien de Chypre. Tome I: Grammaire; Tome II: Répertoire des inscriptions en syllabaire chypro-grec*. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter.
- Eichner, Heiner. 1975. Die Vorgeschichte des hethitischen Verbalsystems. In H. Rix (ed.), *Flexion und Wortbildung. Akten der Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Regensburg, 9.–14. September 1973*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 71–103.
- Eisser, Georg and Lewy, Julius. 1930. *Die altassyrischen Rechtsurkunden von Kultepe*. Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Ägyptischen Gesellschaft 33. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs.
- Estrada Fernández, Zarina. 2009. Loanwords in Yaqui, a Uto-Aztec language of Northwestern Mexico. In M. Haspelmath and U. Tadmor (eds.), *Loanwords in the World's Languages: a Comparative Handbook*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 823–845.
- Evans, Arthur. 1921. *The Palace of Minos at Knossos. Vol. I: The Neolithic and Early and Middle Minoan Ages*. London: Macmillan and Co. Ltd.
- Forrer, Emil. 1922. Die Inschriften und Sprachen des Hatti-Reiches. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 76, 174–269.
- Fowler, Henry W., Fowler, Francis G. and Crystal, David. 2011 [1911]. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary: The Classic First Edition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- GORILA = Godart, Louis and Olivier, Jean-Pierre. 1976–1985. *Recueil des inscriptions en linéaire A*, 5 volumes, Paris: É. De Boccard.
- Hall, Isaac H. 1885 [1883]. A Temple of Zeus Labranios in Cyprus. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 11, clxvi–clxx.
- Hawkins, John D. 2000. *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions*. Volume I. Part I, II: Texts; Part III: Plates. Berlin/New York: W. de Gruyter.
- Hecker, Karl. 1966. *Die Keilschrifttexte der Universitätsbibliothek Giessen*. Giessen: Universitätsbibliothek.
- Heubeck, Alfred. 1957. Linear B und das ‘aegaeische Substrat’. *Minos* 5, 149–153.
- Hoffner, Harry A., and Melchert, Craig H. 2008. *A Grammar of the Hittite Language*. Vol. 1: *A Reference Grammar*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Houwink ten Cate, Philo H. J. 1961. *The Luwian Population Groups of Lycia and Cilicia Aspera during the Hellenistic Period*. Leiden: Brill.
- Kassian, Alexei. 2009–2010. Hattic as a Sino-Caucasic language. *Ugarit-Forschungen* 41, 309–447.

- Katz, Joshua T. 2001. Hittite *ta-pa-ka-li-ya-aš*. In O. Carruba and W. Meid (ed.), *Anatolisch und Indogermanisch – Anatolico e indo-europeo: Akten des Kolloquiums der Indogermanische Gesellschaft ‘Anatolio e indo-europea’* (Pavia 22.–25. September 1998). Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck, 205–237.
- Kloekhorst, Alwin. 2008a. Studies in Lycian and Carian Phonology and Morphology. *Kadmos* 47, 117–146.
- 2008b. *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden: Brill.
- KPN = Zgusta, Ladislav. 1964. *Kleinasiatische Personennamen*, Prague: Tschechoslowakische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Kretschmer, Paul. 1896. *Einleitung in die Geschichte der Griechischen Sprache*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Kroonen, Guus. 2013. *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Germanic*. Leiden: Brill.
- Ladefoged, Peter and Maddieson, Ian. 1996. *The Sounds of the World’s Languages*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Laroche, Emmanuel. 1966. *Les noms des Hittites* (Études linguistiques 4). Paris.
- Lejeune, Michel. 1972. *Phonétique historique du mycénien et du grec ancien*. (2<sup>nd</sup> impression 1987). Paris: Éditions Klincksieck.
- Lewis, Charlton T. and Short, Charles. 1891. *A Latin Dictionary. Founded on Andrews’ edition of Freund’s Latin dictionary. revised, enlarged, and in great part rewritten by. Charlton T. Lewis, Ph.D. and. Charles Short, LL.D.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Lipiński, Edward. 1995. *Dieux et déesses de l’univers phénicien et punique* (Studia Phoenicia 14). Leuven: Peeters.
- Maddieson, Ian. 1984. *UCLA Phonological Segment Inventory Database* [Retrieved online: <http://web.phonetik.unifrankfurtde/upsid.html>].
- Maddieson, Ian, and Wright, Richard. 1995. The vowels and consonants of Amis—a preliminary phonetic report. *Fieldwork Studies of Targeted Languages III* (UCLA Working Papers in Phonetics) 91, 45–65.
- Mallory, James P. and Douglas Q. Adams (eds.). 1997. *Encyclopedia of Indo-European Culture*. London/Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers.
- Mallory, James P. and Douglas Q. Adams. 2006. *The Oxford Introduction to Proto-Indo-European and the Proto-Indo-European World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- MAMA VIII = Calder, William M. and Cormack, James M. R. 1962. *Monuments from Lycaonia, the Pisido-Phrygian Borderland, Aphrodisias* (Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua 8). Manchester: University Press.
- Martirosyan, Hrach K. 2010. *Etymological Dictionary of the Armenian Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden: Brill.
- Masson, Olivier and Sznycer, Maurice. 1972. *Recherches sur les Phéniciens à Chypre*. Geneva and Paris: Droz.
- Meillet, Antoine. 1894. Notes arméniennes III. *Etymologies, Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 8, 164–165.
- Melchert, H. Craig. 1990. Adjective Stems in *\*-iyo-* in Anatolian. *Historische Sprachforschung* 103, 198–207.
- 1993a. *Cuneiform Luvian Lexicon*. Chapel Hill: self-published.
- 1993b. A New Anatolian ‘Law of Finals’. *Journal of Ancient Civilizations* 8, 105–113.
- 1993c. Remarks on Some New Readings in Carian. *Kadmos* 32, 77–86.
- 1997. Traces of a PIE Aspectual Contrast in Anatolian? *Incontri Linguistici* 20, 83–92.
- 2003a. Prehistory. In H. C. Melchert (ed.), *The Luwians*. Leiden: Brill, 8–26.
- 2003a. Language. In H. C. Melchert (ed.), *The Luwians*. Leiden: Brill, 170–210.
- 2004. *A Dictionary of the Lycian Language*. Ann Arbor: Beech Stave Press.
- 2008. Lycian. In R. D. Woodard (ed.), *The Ancient Languages of Asia Minor*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 46–55.
- 2013. Naming Practices in Second and First Millennium Western Anatolia. In R. Parker (ed.) *Personal Names in Ancient Anatolia* (Proceedings of the British Academy 191). Oxford: Oxford University Press for the British Academy, 31–49.
- Forthcoming. New Luvian Verb Etymologies. To appear in a Festschrift.
- Mitford, Terence B. 1961. Further contributions to the epigraphy of Cyprus. *American Journal of Archaeology* 65, 93–151.
- Öettinger, Norbert. 1979. *Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbums*. Nürnberg: Hans Carl.
- Öhnefalsch-Richter, Max H. 1893. *Kypros, die Bibel und Homer*. Berlin.
- Oreshko, Rostislav. 2014. The Strange Case of Dr. FRATER and Mr. DOMINUS: a Re-Consideration of the Evidence Concerning Luwian *nani-*. In P. Taracha and M. Kapelus (eds.), *Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Hittitology, Warsaw, 5–9 September 2011*. Warsaw, 614–631.
- Petersen, Eugen A. H., and von Luschan, Felix. 1889. *Reisen im südwestlichen Kleinasiens*. Vol. II, *Reisen in Lykien, Milyas und Kibyrratis*. Vienna.

- PHI = Packard Humanities Institute, The. 2012. *Searchable Greek Inscriptions — A Scholarly Tool in Progress* [<http://epigraphy.packhum.org/inscriptions/main>].
- Puhvel, Jaan. 1979. Hittite words with initial *pít/pát* sign. In E. Neu and W. Meid, *Hethitisch und Indogermanisch* Vergleichende Studien zur historischen Grammatik und zur dialektgeographischen Stellung der indogermanischen Sprachgruppe Altkleinasiens, Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, 209–217.
- 1991. *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*. Vol. 3: Words beginning with *H*. (Trends in Linguistics Documentation 5). Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- 1997. *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*. Vol. 4: Words beginning with *K*. (Trends in Linguistics Documentation 14). Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- RIMA 3 = Grayson, A. Kirk. 1996. *Assyrian Rulers of the Early First Millennium BC II (858–745 BCE)*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Rüster, Christel and Wilhelm, Gernot. 2012. *Landschenkungsurkunden hethitischer Könige*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Sarullo, Giulia. 2008. The Cretan Labyrinth: Palace or Cave? *Caerdroia* 37, 31–40.
- Schrijver, Peter. 1991. *The Reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Latin*. Amsterdam / Atlanta: Rodopi.
- Schuler, Einar. 1965. *Die Kaškäer: Ein Beitrag zur Ethnographie des alten Kleinasiens*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Schürr, Diether. 2002. Karische Parallelen zu zwei Arzawa-Namen. *Kadmos* 41, 163–167.
- 2010. Spätkarisch: Regionalisierung und Lautentwicklungen. In R. Van Bremen and J.-M. Carbon (eds.), *Hellenistic Karia: Proceedings of the First International Conference on Hellenistic Karia, Oxford, 29 June–2 July 2006*. Paris: Aoustonius, 187–205.
- 2012. Lykische Genitive. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 115, 118–126.
- 2014. Lykische Orte und ihre Namen: drei Namentypen. In P. Taracha (ed.), with the assistance of M. Kepelus, *Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Hittitology, Warsaw, 5–9 September 2011*, Warsaw: Agade Publishing, 743–774.
- SEG = Chaniotis, Angelos, Corsten, Thomas, Papazarkadas, Nikolaos, and Tybout, Rolf (eds.), *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*. Leiden: Brill.
- Shevoroshkin, Vitalij. 1978. Studies in Hittite-Luwian Names. *Names* 26, 231–257.
- 2010. Four Notes on Milyan. In T. M. Nikolaeva (ed.), *Issledovanija po lingvistike i semiotike: sbornik statej k jubileju Vjach. Vs. Ivanova* (Studies in Linguistics and Semiotics: A Collection of Articles for the Anniversary for Vyacheslav V. Ivanov). Moscow: Languages of Slavonic Culture, 156–167.
- Skeat, Walter W. 1993 [1884]. *The Concise Dictionary of English Etymology*. Ware: Wordsworth Editions Ltd.
- Soysal, Oğuz. 2005. On the Origin of the Royal Title *tabarna* / *labarna*. *Anatolica* 31, 189–210.
- Starke, Frank. 1980–1983. *Labarna*. *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und vorderasiatischen Archäologie* 6. Berlin.
- 1989. *Untersuchungen zur Stammbildung des keilschrift-luwischen Nomens*. *StBoT* 31. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Strauss, Rita. 2006. *Reinigungsrituale aus Kizzuwatna: ein Beitrag zur Erforschung hethitischer Ritualtradition und Kulturgeschichte*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Svantesson, Jan-Olof; Tsendina, Anna; Karlsson, Anastasia; and Franzén, Vivian. 2005. *The Phonology of Mongolian*. Oxford: University Press.
- TAM III, 1 = Herbedey, Rudolf (ed.). 1941. *Tituli Asiae Minoris, III. Tituli Pisidiae linguis Graeca et Latina conscripti*, 1. *Tituli Termessi et agri Termessensis*, Vienna: A. Hoelder-Pichler-Tempsky.
- Tischler, Johann. 1988. *Labarna*. In E. Neu, C. Rüster (eds.), *Documentum Asia Minoris Antiqua. Festchrift für Heinrich Otten zum 75. Geburtstag*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 347–358.
- 1991. *Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar*. Mit Beiträgen von Günter Neumann und Erich Neu. Teil III, L. 8, T, D/1. Innsbruck.
- . 1994. *Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar*. Mit Beiträgen von Günter Neumann und Erich Neu. Teil III, L. 10, T, D/3. Innsbruck.
- Thompson, Rupert J. E. 2005. Two notes on Mycenaean labial stops. *Živa Antika* 55, 107–115.
- Ulshöfer, Andrea M. 1995. *Die altassyrischen Privaturkunden*. ATU 4. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- Valério, Miguel. 2007. ‘Diktaian Master’: A Minoan Predecessor of Diktaian Zeus in Linear A? *Kadmos* 46, 3–14.
- Ventrí, Michael, and Chadwick, John. 1973. *Documents in Mycenaean Greek*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yakubovich, Ilya. 2002. Labyrinth for Tyrants. *Studia Linguarum* 3 (Memoriae A.A. Korolev dicata). Ed. A. S. Kassian and A. V. Sidel'tsev. Moscow: Languages of Slavonic Culture, 93–116.

- . 2005. Lydian Etymological Notes. *Historische Sprachforschung* 118, 75–91.
- . 2009a. Two Armenian Etymologies. *Caucasian and Near Eastern Studies XIII*, Tbilisi, 266–272.
- . 2009b. *Sociolinguistics of the Luvian Language*. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2013a. Anatolian Names in *wiya*- and the Structure of Empire Luwian Onomastics. In A. Mouton et al. (eds.), *Luwian Identites: Culture, Language and Religion Between Anatolia and the Aegean*. Leiden: Brill, 87–123.
- . 2013b. The Degree of Comparison in Luwian. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 118, 155–168.
- Younger, John G. 2011. A view from the sea. In: E. Hallager (gen. ed.), *The seascape in Aegean Prehistory*. Athens: The Danish Institute at Athens, 161–183.
- Zehnder, Thomas. 2010. *Die hethitischen Frauennamen: Katalog und Interpretation* (Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie 29). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Zinko, Christian. 1994. Die Hethiter: Volk zwischen indogermanischer Tradition und kleinasiatisch-autochthonen Einflüssen. *Mitteilungen der Grazer Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 4, 54–82.
- Zgusta, Ladislav. 1970. *Neue Beiträge zur kleinasiatischen Anthroponymie* (Dissertationes orientales 24). Prague: Academia.

Мигель Валерио. Линейное А *du-pu<sub>2</sub>-re*, хеттское *tabarna* и их гипотетические когнаты.

В статье подробно рассматривается и заново оценивается предположение о связи линейного А *du-pu<sub>2</sub>-re* и хеттского царского титула *t/labarna-*, а также целого ряда фонетически схожих appellативов с семантикой власти и могущества, топонимов и антропонимов, происходящих из Древней Анатолии. Автор отделяет от форм *du-pu<sub>2</sub>-re* и *t/labarna-* некоторые анатолийские ономастические единицы, относящиеся преимущественно к 1-му тыс. до н.э., предлагая для них независимую этимологию на основе языков лувической подгруппы. Также автор разделяет кипрский эпитет Зевса *Labranios* и хеттское *labarna-*, защищая старую гипотезу о *Labranios* как об адаптации финикийского названия Ливанского хребта. В результате тщательного пересмотра материала автор приходит к выводу, что, несмотря на возможное существование лувийского субстантива *\*tapara-* ‘власть’, у нас нет независимых доводов ни в пользу связи минойского *du-pu<sub>2</sub>-re* с какими-либо формами из анатолийских языков, ни в пользу того, что *du-pu<sub>2</sub>-re* вообще значит ‘господин’ (или нечто близкое).

**Ключевые слова:** линейное письмо А, табарна, лабарна, лувические языки, анатолийская ономастика, киликийские имена.