

*The Hieroglyphic Luwian demonstrative ablative-instrumentals zin and apin **

Petra M. Goedegebuure

Chicago

1. Introduction

Recent work on Luwian grammar has shown that the formal and semantic characteristics of the pronominal demonstratives *za-* “this” and *apa-* “that” are fairly well understood¹. The demonstrative adverbs of place and time on the other hand are not only formally less clear but also need further semantic demarcation. The proximal adverbs *zin*, *zati/zari*, *ziti/ziri* all presumably mean “here”, the non-proximal adverbs *apin* and *apati/apari* mean “there”, and *apin* is also translated with “then”². The adverb *zari* is also once used as an adverb of manner “thus, in this way”³.

Contrasting with this abundance of adverbial formations, the pronominal paradigm of *za-* and *apa-* shows a remarkable empty slot: the ablative-instrumentals of these demonstratives seem to be completely absent⁴. Melchert, *Luwians*, p. 191 assumes that the unattested ablative-instrumental of *za-* “this” must have been **zati*⁵. This view is supported by the existence of the ablative-instrumental of the Hieroglyphic Luwian interrogative/relative stem, REL-*a-ti* /kwadi/ (o.c., p. 191 n. 19). But, as I intend to show,

* I would like to thank Prof. O. Carruba, Prof. Th. van den Hout, Prof. C. Melchert, Prof. N. Oettinger, Prof. G. Pinault and Prof. M. Poetto for their very helpful remarks and suggestions, especially regarding the formal features of *zin* and *apin*, discussed in section 5. I am most grateful to Prof. E. Rieken for kindly sharing with me her article for the conference proceedings. I would like to mention here Dr. Th. Zehnder, who independently arrived at the same conclusion regarding the analysis of *zin* and *apin*. Needless to say, I take full responsibility for the contents of this paper.

¹ H. Craig Melchert, “Language”. In: *The Luwians*, Edited by H. Craig Melchert, Brill: Leiden - Boston 2003, pp. 190-191; Reinhold Plöchl, *Einführung ins Hieroglyphen-Luwische* (= Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie 8). Dresden: Verlag der TU Dresden 2003, pp. 69-71; Annick Payne, *Hieroglyphic Luwian* (= *Elementa Linguarum Orientis* 3). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag 2004, pp. 26-27. I will ignore the utterly flawed grammar of John Marangozis (*A Short Grammar of Hieroglyphic Luwian*, München 2003).

² Plöchl, *Einführung*, pp. 84-85; Payne, *Hieroglyphic Luwian*, p. 27.

³ Plöchl, *Einführung*, p. 84. Not mentioned by Payne, *Hieroglyphic Luwian*. The adverb *apati/apari* is not attested as an adverb of manner “thus” (*contra* John David Hawkins, *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions, Vol 1, Parts 1-3, Inscriptions of the Iron Age*. Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter 2000, p. 257, 258 (= CHLI)). The MARAŞ 4 § 15 attestation *á-pa-ara/i* as the rhotacized variant of /apadi/ is problematic because the date of this inscription, the mid-9th century B.C., is too early for rhotacism of intervocalic dental stops. This anachronism is avoided if we take *á-pa-ara/i* as the syllabic writing of POST-*ri* “afterwards” (compare the Empire attestation **a-pa+ra/i* “afterwards” on the EMIRGAZI altars § 3 (J.D. Hawkins, “Scripts and Texts”. In: *The Luwians*, p. 160), but probably also KARKAMIŞ A1a § 7, 10, 16, **a-pa+ra/i(-i)*).

⁴ Plöchl, *Einführung*, p. 70, 71.

⁵ Followed by Payne, *Hieroglyphic Luwian*, p. 26.

also *zin* and *apin* need to be analyzed as ablative-instrumentals, filling the hitherto empty slot in the pronominal paradigm.

In sections 2 and 3 I will discuss *zin* and *apin* respectively. Section 4 deals with the geographical and chronological distribution of these forms, and in section 5 I will present a formal analysis, linking our forms to Proto-Indo-European. As part of this discussion I will reconsider the difficult phrase *za-na a-pa-ha* in AŠŠUR a § 6.

The reanalysis of *zin* and *apin* sometimes leads to a different understanding of the context. I will therefore provide some alternative meanings for the following lexemes: (“*256”) *zi-pa-ta-ni-* “measuring scoop” (ex. 8); “AVIS”(-)*ta-wa/i-ni-* “stele (??)” instead of bird-offering (ex. 9); *a+ra/i-ma-za* “standing stone” (ex. 9); LINGERE-*ha-sa-* “good events, favor” instead of “luxury” (ex. 20, 21).

2. The demonstrative ablative-instrumental *zin*

Besides the demonstrative adverb *zati* (rhotacized *zari*) “here”, which is firmly established as the deictic adverb that locates events and situations in the vicinity of the deictic center, there exists another form based on the proximal demonstrative *za-* that seems to denote geographical proximity: the deictic element *zin*⁶. The examples in this section testify that *zin* as a locative adverb of place “here” certainly makes sense in all contexts in which it occurs. However, this still leaves unexplained why the adverbs *zin* and *zati* occur in the same text if both are to be understood as “here”:

- 1 | (“VITIS”) *wa/i-ia-ni-sa-pa-wa/i-* ‘ | *za-ri+i* | *sa-na-wa/i-ia-ta-* ‘⁷
And the vine was good **here**.

- 2 | *wa/i-na-* ‘⁸ | *á-pi-i* | *zi-na* | “AVIS”(-)*ta-wa/i-na-ri+i* | (“PES”) *u-pa-ha* ⁹

⁶ CHLI p. 59, 66; Payne, *Hieroglyphic Luwian*, p. 27; Plöchl, *Einführung*, pp. 69, 84-85. The sequence *zi-tà* in KARATEPE § XXXI can not represent *zin=ta*, which should have been spelled as either *zi-ta* or *zi-tá*, but has to be understood as /zila/ “thereafter” (see Elisabeth Rieken, this volume).

⁷ SULTANHAN § 7, mid-8th century B.C.; CHLI p. 466.

⁸ This sequence might also be read as **a-wa/i-na*, with ‘initial-a-final’ (Hawkins, *Luwians*, p. 159-161; H. Craig Melchert, “A Luwian Dedication”. In *Indo-European Perspectives. Studies in Honour of Anna Morpurgo Davies*, ed. J. Penney. Oxford University Press 2004, p. 373), although I am not certain whether each sequence with final non-phonemic *a* should be understood as this ‘initial-a-final’. SULTANHAN contains *a-wa/i-sa* (§ 3) besides *wa/i-sá* (§ 5) and *ni-pa-wa/i-sa-* (§ 48). In § 48 the sign *a* cannot indicate a vowel but has to be a space filler, and § 3 and § 5 show that *a=wa=as* and *wa=as* alternate within the same text. This text might therefore also contain *wa/i-na-* ‘ = *wa=an* besides *a-wa/i-na* = *a=wa=an* (§ 4). Melchert, *Luwians*, p. 210 assumes that spellings such as *wa/i-na* are simplifications of *wa/i-na-a*, and he therefore rejects genuine aphaeresis, not only for *a-wa/i-* but also for *apa-* “that”, *amu-* “I”, *ama/i-* “my” and *as-* “to be”. However, preliminary research on the orthography of *apa-* “that” shows that the ‘initial-a-final’ seems to be limited to texts not later than the early 9th century, but that aphaeresis (or simplified orthography?) is attested in all periods. For *apa-* we can discern the following complementary distribution. Until ca. 900 BC we find **a-pa-* and a few cases of *pa-*. Interestingly, and, as yet, unexplained is that only the dat.-loc.sg. in initial position can be written without ‘initial-a-final’. Forms with aphaeresis (now also including the acc.s. and abl.-instr.) continue to exist after 900 BC, but **a-pa-* is almost completely replaced by *á-pa-*. The only

I rededicated¹⁰ him with a “AVIS”-*ta-wa/i-ni here* (??).

The issue of the function of *zin* and its alleged synonymy with *zati* (*zari*) is resolved if we take the Phoenician-Luwian correspondence between the proximal forms in KARATEPE § LXIII at face value:

3 ARHA-*wa/i-ta* “*69”*i-ti-wa/i* (LITUUS)*á-za-ti-wa/i-tà-sá á-ta₅-ma-za*
PORTA-la-na-ri+i zi-na¹¹

I shall delete Azatiwatas’ name from **these gates**.

4 ṣ̌ ymḥ šm ’ztdw **b-š’r** **z**
 who 3S-efface name (of) Azatiwada in/from-gate this
 (...) who effaces the name of Azatiwada **from this gate**.

Phoenician and HLuwian both have demonstrative proximal *pronouns* and demonstrative proximal *adverbs*:

	Phoenician	HLuwian
pro-/adnominal proximal demonstrative “this”	<i>z</i> (= <i>ze</i>)	<i>za-</i>
adverbial proximal demonstrative “here”	<i>k</i> (= <i>ko</i>)	<i>zati</i>

Figure 1 - Phoenician and HLuwian pronominal and adverbial proximal demonstratives

In view of the fact that both languages show a similar distribution in the syntax of demonstratives, we would expect that the alleged adverb *zin* corresponds with *k* “here” and adnominal *za-* with adnominal *z*. This finds support from all clauses with adnominal *za-*:

Clause	HLuwian	Phoenician
§ LIII	<i>za</i> “CASTRUM” <i>há<+ra/i>-ní-sà-za</i>	<i>h-qrt z</i>
§ LXV	CASTRUM- <i>ní-si za-ti</i>	<i>’yt h-qrt z</i>

exception is the 8th century ADIYAMAN 1 inscription, with **a-pa-si-i á-ta₅-ma-za* “that one’s name” (§ 8). There are also a few instances of *a-pa-* in texts that otherwise show *á-pa-* (*a-pa-ri+i* in KARATEPE Ho § XXXI; *a-pa(-ha)* in AŠŠUR a § 6 and *a-pa-zi* in AŠŠUR b § 8 and f+g § 21; *a-pa-sa-na* in TOPADA § 36 and *a-pa-sa-ha* in § 38 (see Alwin Kloekhorst, “The Preservation of **h*₁ in Hieroglyphic Luwian: Two Separate a-Signs”, *Historische Sprachforschung*, Heft 2004/117,1, p. 29 fn. 7, 32). If it is true that spellings such as *wa/i-na* are simplifications of **a-wa/i-na* but still represent /awan/, we need to explain why **a-pa-* was consistently replaced by *á-pa-* instead of being simplified to *pa-*. Clearly, the subject of aphaeresis and the chronological distribution of ‘initial-a-final’ require more research, incorporating the results of Kloekhorst’s study on the phonemic values of the signs *a* and *á*.

⁹ SULTANHAN § 12, mid- 8th century B.C.; CHLI, p. 466.

¹⁰ CHLI, p. 466 translates “afterwards I presented ...”. See now Melchert, *FsMorpurgo Davies* for a discussion of the verb (PES)*upa-* “to dedicate, furnish, give”.

¹¹ KARATEPE § LXIII, early 7th century B.C.; CHLI, p. 57.

§ LXVI	“PORTA”- <i>la-na za-ia</i>	<i>h-šʹrz</i>
§ LXXIIb	<i>za-ia</i> “PORTA”- <i>la-na</i>	<i>h-šʹz</i>

Figure 2 - Phoenician and HLuwian adnominal demonstratives

The question is now why *zin* in § LXIII should correspond with adnominal Phoenician *z* instead of with adverbial *k*. On the assumption that adverbs correspond with adverbs and adnominals with adnominals, the phrase PORTA-*la-na-ri+i zi-na* “from gate *zi-na*” should syntactically match *b-šʹrz* “from this gate”. Since the demonstratives *z* and *zi-na* both modify “the gate”, it follows that *zi-na* functions as an ablative in agreement with the ablative noun PORTA-*la-na-ri+i*.

The classification of *zin* as the ablative of *za-* and by analogy (*a*)*pin* as the ablative of (*a*)*pa-* would solve the mystery of the hitherto absent demonstrative ablative-instrumentals, noted for example by Melchert (*Luwians*, p. 191) and Plöchl (*Einführung*, p. 70)¹².

With this reanalysis of *zin* and *apin* the Corpus now contains ample evidence of the ablative-instrumental of *za-* and a few cases of (*a*)*pa-*. There are 20 assured attestations of *zin* and 6 of *apin*. Of these 26 forms, 6 *zin*-s and 4 *apin*-s modify an abl.-instr. noun. The 14 remaining *zin*-s occur either independently (2) or in a correlative series (12). One *apin* is substantively used, and the remaining one occurs in a correlative series with *zin*.

A noun phrase containing a proximal adnominal demonstrative (“this N”) usually refers to an object located in the immediate vicinity of the inscription, but sometimes the demonstrative expression refers to the inscribed object itself. Both uses occur simultaneously in MARAŞ 14 § 12:

5 |*za-wa/i-ta-* (“STELE”) *wa/i-ni-zaⁱ* |*z[i-i-]na* |LOCUS-*ta₄-ta-la-ti-i* | (“SA₄”) *sa-ni-wa/i-i*¹³

I shall overturn **this stele** out of **this precinct**.

The analysis of *zin* as an adnominal abl.-instr. of *za-* instead of an adverb finds further support in the antecedent demonstrative noun phrase |*za-na* |LOCUS-*ta₄-ta-li-i-na* “this precinct (acc.sg.)” in MARAŞ 14 § 2.

KARKAMIŞ A6 contains one self-referential expression and two attestations of adnominal *zin* referring to the sculptures accompanying the inscription of Yariris (for the correlative occurrences of *zin* in this inscription see ex. 13). The inscription is written on an orthostat, with originally on the left a procession of attendants and on the right a procession of prince, regent and children¹⁴. KARKAMIŞ A6 § 27 includes the self-referential expression “these stones”, referring to the basalt slabs which contain the inscriptions and sculptures.

¹² Plöchl (*Einführung*, p. 70) and Payne (*Hieroglyphic Luwian*, p. 26) assume formal identity between the abl.-instr. and the dat.-loc.sg. Melchert (*Luwians*, p. 191) on the other hand reconstructs an abl.-instr. with short final [-i] (CunLuw *zāi** = Hluw /tsadi/*), against the dat.-loc.sg. with long final [-i] (CunLuw *zāi*= Hluw /tsadi:/).

¹³ MARAŞ 14 § 12, early 8th century B.C.; CHLI, p. 266.

¹⁴ Hawkins, CHLI, p. 123.

- 6 | *zi-i-pa-wa/i* | “SCALPRUM”-*su-wa/i-ti-i* | “SCALPRUM”-*su-na-‘* | NEG₃-*i*
CUM-*ni* ARHA | *tà-ia*¹⁵
Whether he shall take away a stone **from these stones**, ...

KARKAMIŠ A6 § 30 continues with two references to the accompanying sculptures:

- 7 | *ni-pa-wa/i* | INFANS-*ni-na-ti-i* | *zi-i-na* | *ni-pa-wa/i* (“*474”) *wa/i-si-na-sa-ti* *zi-na*
REL-*sa* CUM-*ni* ARHA | *tà-ia*¹⁶
Or who shall take away (a child) **from these children** or (a eunuch) **from these eunuchs**, ...

The fairly restricted use of proximal demonstratives as either deictic or self-referential has some interesting consequences for the understanding of two other passages with *zin*. The dedicatory inscription of İSKENDERUN covers a tongue-shaped stone which Hawkins (CHLI, pp. 259, 260) identifies as a ceremonial mill-stone. The expression HORDEUM.SCALPRUM-*na* (or *179.SCALPRUM-*na*) in § 1 may very well denote a mill-stone, but I doubt that this word is the “internal reference to the monument itself”¹⁷. The defining feature of linguistic self-reference is the presence of a proximal demonstrative. The absence of *za-* in § 1 therefore speaks against the identification of our stone object with a mill-stone. On the other hand, the proximal demonstrative modifies another object in § 4:

- 8 (I brought this granary,
wa/i-tu-u-ta-ⁱ 4xMILLE 4xCENTUM *a-ta* (“CAPERE”)|*u-pa-ha* | *zi-i-na*
 (“*256”) *zi-pa-ta-na-ti*¹⁸
and I brought four thousand four hundred (measures of grain) into it, **by this zipatani-measuring tool (= scoop?)**).

The use of proximal *za-* with “*zipatani* measuring tool” either means that the object was in the immediate vicinity of the inscribed stone or it refers to the stone object itself. Considering the shape of the object and the fact that the logogram *256 points at stone, I prefer the latter option¹⁹.

¹⁵ KARKAMIŠ A6 § 27, end 9th -early 8th century B.C.; CHLI, p. 125.

¹⁶ KARKAMIŠ A 6 § 30, end 9th -early 8th century B.C.; CHLI, p. 125.

¹⁷ Hawkins, CHLI, p. 260.

¹⁸ İSKENDERUN § 4, late 9th century B.C.; CHLI, p. 259.

¹⁹ Hittite *zipaddan(n)i* is a small container for fluids or less-than-solid substances such as oil, lard, butter and honey (Harry A. Hoffner, *The Hittite Laws: A Critical Edition (Documenta et Monumenta Orientis Antiqui* 23). Leiden: E. J. Brill 1997, p. 144 n. 506). On the unclear position of *zipaddani* within the system of volume measures, see Theo P.J. van den Hout, “Maße und Gewichte. Bei den Hethitern”. *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und der Vorderasiatischen Archäologie*, hrsgb. von D.O. Edzard. Band 7 Lfg.7/8, 1990, p. 525. Grain, which as a mass has no shape, can easily be included in the group of fluids or semi-fluids. The shape of the stone object from İSKENDERUN, flat on one side and curved on the other, suggests that the *zipattanni* is not a bottle or some other kind of container but a scoop. This meaning fits well with products like lard, butter or grain, which are more easily measured by means of a scoop than by a bottle.

The other text-passage that needs to be reinterpreted is SULTANHAN § 12 (ex. 2, repeated here):

- 9 |*wa/i-na-* ‘|*á-pi-i* |*zi-na* |“AVIS”(-)*ta-wa/i-na-ri+i* | (“PES”) *u-pa-ha*
I rededicated him **with this “AVIS”-*ta-wa/i-ni-***.

The hapax AVIS(-)*tawani-* cannot denote a bird-offering as suggested by Hawkins (CHLI, pp. 466, 469), but must either be the inscribed object itself or a tangible and rather permanent entity in the vicinity of the stele, just like the once present statue of Tarhunzas (§§ 2, 17) or the vineyard which is protected by this Tarhunzas (§ 22). The stele itself is probably represented by the lexeme *armanza* in § 46²⁰. In all, this does not leave much room for a fourth object or location called AVIS(-)*tawani-*, especially since only the deity, the vineyard and the *armanza* “standing stone (?)” are referred to in the curse section (the deity probably in the missing lines of base side A, the vineyard in § 34 and the *armanza* in § 46). On the other hand, unlike the statue of Tarhunzas, the vineyard and the AVIS(-)*tawani-*, the *armanza* does not appear in the dedicatory section. Should we consider AVIS(-)*tawani-* as an alternative expression for *armanza* to solve this incongruency?²¹ Whatever the solution, the presence of *za-* “this” means that AVIS(-)*tawani-* is a permanent object instead of a bird-offering.

ALEPPO 2 § 12 possibly contains adnominal *zin*:

- 10 *mu-pa-wa/i* [x-x]-*sa zi-i-x-x* || |BONUS-*sa₅+ra/i-ti* |DARE-*tá*²²
Because of this (?) goodness (of mine) he gave to me ...

Thus far *zin* appeared as an adjective. The majority of *zin*-s however (11 attestations) occurs in the correlative sequence *zin ... zin* (... *zin*), with the exception of ÍZGİN 2 § 5 which has *apin ... zin* instead (see ex. 23). For the two independent *zin*-s see exx. 16 and 17.

The sequence *zin ... zin* (... *zin*) is the exact equivalent of the Hittite expression *kez ... kez* (... *kez*) (ex. 11). Since *kez* is the ablative of the proximal demonstrative *ka-*, this correspondence further supports the analysis of *zin* as ablative.

- 11 [*nu=mu kez* ^{URU} *Sunap*] *assis kezza=ma=mu* ^{18' URU} *Isdupistas kez=ma=mu*
[LÚ.MEŠ ^{URU} *Pittagalaissa* Š]EŠ.MEŠ LÚ.MEŠ ^{URU} *Malazziya=pat*²³
[At one side of me was (the town of) Sunap]assi, on another side of me (the town

²⁰The form *a+ra/i-ma-za* can be analyzed as the neuter participle of **a+ra/i-* = /*ar-*/ “to stand”. The participle “standing entity” is then easily transformed into “standing stone, stele”.

²¹It is possible to bring “AVIS” *tawani-* within the semantic field of *arama(n)za* “standing entity” if we may equate “AVIS” *tawani-* with CLuwian *dāwana/i-* “stalk, stem (?)” (H. Craig Melchert, *Cuneiform Luvian Lexicon*. Chapel Hill, 1993, p. 225), which in turn receives its meaning from the assumed equation with Hittite *dawani-* “Stamm, Stab (o.ä.)” (Johann Tischler, *Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar*, III/9 (T, D/2) p. 287). It still remains difficult to establish a connection with the *tawani*-apartments of KARKAMIŠ A11a § 19 (CHLI, p. 96, 99).

²²ALEPPO 2 § 12, late 10th - early 9th century B.C.; cf. Hawkins, CHLI, p. 236, 238, who presents a different analysis of *zi-i-x-x* as the object of “give”.

²³KBo 19.76 + KUB 14.20: 17'-18' (NH, CTH 61 II).

of) Isdupista, (and) **on a third side** of me [the inhabitants of (the town of) Pittagalaisa, br]others of in fact the inhabitants of (the town of) Malazziya.

- 12 “MANUS” (-) *la-tara/i-ha-ha-wá/i* | *á-TANA-wá/i-za*(URBS) | “TERRA+X” (-) *wá/i+ra/i-za* | **zi-na** | (“OCCIDENS”) *i-pa-mi*²⁴ | VERSUS-*ia-na* | *zi-pa-wá/i* (ORIENS) *ki-sà-ta-mi-i* | VERSUS-*na*²⁵
And I extended the Adanawa plain **on one side** towards the west and **on the other side** towards the east²⁶.

- 13 (The gods caused my name to cross the border,)
§ 4 *wa/i-ma-ta₅* | **zi-i-na** (“MÍ.REGIO”) *mi-za+ra/i*(URBS) | AUDIRE-*MI-ti-i-ta*
§ 5 *zi-pa-wa/i+ra/i* | *475-*la*(URBS)-‘ | AUDIRE+*MI-ti-i-ta* ||
§ 6 *zi-i-pa-wa/i-‘ mu-sá-za*(URBS) *mu-sà-ka-za*(URBS) *su+ra/i-za-ha*(URBS)
AUDIRE+*MI-ti-i-ta*²⁷
And men heard about it, about me, **on the one side** in Egypt, **on another side** they heard about it in Babylon(?), **and on the remaining side** they heard (about it) among the Musa, the Muska and the Sura²⁸.

Although the overall meaning of the next example is far from clear, the correlative pair *zin ... zin* refers to both sides of a river:

- 14 § 7 *wa/i-‘-ta* FLUMEN-*pi-na* | (“PES₂”) *hi-nu-ha* (COR) *á-ta₅(-)|na¹-sà¹-ha*
§ 8 *wa/i-ta* | **zi-na** FLUMEN-*pi-na* (“PES₂”) *hi-nu-ha*
§ 9 | *zi-ha-wa/i-ta* FLUMEN-*pi-i-na* (“PES₂”) *hi-nú-ha*²⁹
And I caused even (-*ha*) the *alasana*(-) to cross the river: I caused (them) to cross the river **on one side** and I caused (them) to cross the river **on the other side**.

The following considerations have led me to the readings and translation presented above. The causative verb (PES₂) *hinu-* “to cause to cross, pass” occurs in two different constructions. This verb is either accompanied by a double accusative or by an accusative and dative-locative. If one wishes to express that an object, expressed as an acc., crosses or passes a location, the location that is to be crossed or passed is also expressed as an acc. This

²⁴ KARATEPE Ho. § V: **zi-na** (“OCCIDENS”) *i-pa-mi*

²⁵ KARATEPE Hu. § V, early 7th century B.C.; CHLI, p. 49. Similarly KARATEPE Hu. § XXXII | **zi-na** | (“OCCIDENS”) *-pa-mi* | VERSUS-*ia-na* | *zi-pa-wa/i* | (“ORIENS”) *-ta-mi* | VERSUS-*na*.

²⁶ The Phoenician expression *l-m-mš’ šmš w-‘d mb’-y* is different in phrasing and syntax but similar in intention: “to-from-rising sun and-towards entry-its” > “from east to west”.

²⁷ KARKAMIŠ A6 § 4-6, late 9th - early 8th century B.C.; CHLI, p. 124.

²⁸ I prefer the translation “on this side ... another side ... the remaining side” instead of the more abstract “on one hand ... the other hand, ... the other hand” because the countries mentioned in these lines surround Karkamiš on all sides: Egypt to the south, Babylon to the east, and the Lydians, Phrygians and Urartians to the north in Anatolia.

²⁹ KARKAMIŠ A15b §§7-9, late 9th - early 8th century B.C.; CHLI, p. 131.

double-accusative construction requires the local sentence particle *-ta*³⁰. But if the *goal* of the movement is expressed instead of the location to be crossed, the goal appears in the dat.-loc.; in that case the sentence particle *-ta* is not present^{31 32}.

The clauses §§ 7, 8 and 9 contain the acc. FLUMEN-*pi-na* “the river” and *-ta* in the particle chain. The river is either the acc.-object of (PES₂)*hinu-* or the location crossed over. If the river is an acc.-object, it either should be made to pass to a goal (in the dat.-loc.), or the river should be made to cross a location (in the acc.). The presence of the particle *-ta* excludes the first option, but the second option is impossible as well. Although grammatically correct, it makes no sense to make a river cross something³³. What does make sense however is to make something cross a river. The river is therefore the ‘locatival’ acc., accompanied by the particle *-ta*; we now only need the acc.-object. I believe that this object can be found in the sequence read by Hawkins (2000: 131) as (X³)*á-ta₅(-)|sà-na-ha*, which is either the acc.sg.c. of (X³)*á-ta₅(-)|sà-na-* or the nom.-acc.pl.n. of (X³)*á-ta₅(-)|sà-n^o*. This leads to the following translation: “And I caused even the *ata-san(a)-* (or *ala-san(a)-*) to cross the river”.

Recently Theo van den Hout³⁴ discussed several lexemes that are determined by the logogram VAS/COR (*341). He has shown that this logogram originally determines two different but related lexemes, among others³⁵: (COR)(*a*)*tra/i-/atla/i-* c. “person” and (COR)*tan(i)-* c. “soul”. The sign in KARKAMIŠ A15b §7 read by Hawkins (CHLI, p. 131) as (X³) is, although damaged, quite similar to *341 in (“COR”)*a-tara/i-i-na* in the same inscription (§ 11). If we also read *ta₅* as *la*, we are left with (COR)*alasan-*, c. or (COR)*alasan-*, n., which might either denote a mental notion or a bodypart associated with mental notions³⁶.

Independent *zin* is also attested with the verb (PES₂)*hi-nu-* with a dat.-loc. and without the particle *-ta* in KARKAMIŠ A24, fragments 19+19b. The parallel clauses would call for another *zin* (*zi-na*) in the first clause, but the remnant of the sign preceding |*417.ANIMAL is too vague to decide whether it is indeed part of the sign *na*:

15 ...]x |*417.ANIMAL FLUMEN-*pi-i* “PES₂”(-)*hi-nú-[ha]*

³⁰ KARKAMIŠ A6 § 3: the acc.-object is “my name”, the location to be crossed is “the border”; KÖRKÜN § 3: the acc.-object is “me”, the ‘location’ to be crossed or transgressed is “the lord’s command”.

³¹ KARKAMIŠ A6 § 2, the acc.-object is “my name”, and the goal is “heaven”; KARKAMIŠ A24 fragm. 19+19a: the acc.-object is the *417. ANIMAL, goal is “the river”.

³² In Hittite the acc. of ‘traversed space’ is accompanied by *-kan*, the functional equivalent of Luwian *-ta* (Jacqueline Boley, *Dynamics of Transformation in Hittite: The Hittite Particles -kan, -asta, and -san*. (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 97). Innsbruck 2000, pp. 294-295). But unlike in HLuwian, the goal in Hittite would require *-kan* as well.

³³ Unless the author claims that he diverted the river on three different sides of the location of the inscription. This would have been a major achievement, even by modern standards.

³⁴ Theo van den Hout, “Self, Soul and Portrait in Hieroglyphic Luwian”, in P. Taracha (ed.), *Silva Anatolica. Anatolian Studies Presented to Maciej Popko on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. Warsaw 2002, pp. 171-186.

³⁵ For the other lexemes see van den Hout, *FsPopko*, p. 176, with references.

³⁶ Van den Hout, *FsPopko*, p. 186. We might consider equating one unknown with another unknown and adduce CLuwian *alašša/i-* “?” (Melchert, *LuvLex* p. 8).

|*zi-ha-wa/i-* ‘ *417. ANIMAL FLUMEN-*pi-i* “[P]ES₂”(-)*hi-[nu-ha]*³⁷
 [On one side (??)] [I] made the *417.ANIMAL pass to the river, and **on the other side** [I made] the *417.ANIMAL pass to the river.

And finally, substantively used *zin* occurs twice as an ablative of separation (although the sentence meaning of the AŠŠUR attestation remains rather unclear):

16 (Also, send me a woman (for) *waspa*-/a woman’s *waspa*.)
zi-pa-wa/i-na | (“69”) *sa-na-tu*³⁸
 Let them seek for her/it **from here**.

17 *zi*³⁹-*pa-wa/i* | FLUMEN-*pi* | ARHA PES₂(-)*za-na-ha* DEUS-*ni*⁴⁰-*zi*⁴⁰
 And I ...-ed the gods away **from here** to the river.

There remain one, possibly two instances of *zin* in broken context: MALPINAR § 9 *zi-wa/i* [and KARKAMIŠA 16a § 3, which should be read as either]x REL[?]-*na-* ‘ REL[?]-*na*’ | DEUS-*ni-i-na* | *i-zi-i-ti* or]x *zi-na-* ‘ *zi-na-* ‘ | DEUS-*ni-i-na* | *i-zi-i-ti* (CHLI, p. 191).

3. The demonstrative ablative *apin*

The non-proximal deictic or anaphoric equivalent of *zin* is *apin*. The demonstrative *apin* is usually interpreted as a temporal demonstrative adverb “then⁴¹” or as a locative adverb “there⁴²”. Only once we find *apin* paired with *zin* “there/on that side ... here/on this side” (İZĞİN 2 §§ 4-5). This is also the only case in which *apin* occurs as an independent form; in all other cases *apin* is followed by an ablative noun (KARKAMIŠ A11a § 11, 11b+c § 14, A12 § 14, A23 § 6)⁴³. This observation in itself provides a strong indication for the ablatival status of *apin*.

The demonstrative *apa-* can be used to refer to an object or location in the non-textual world at a certain distance from the deictic center (see section 5 for a possible instance in the AŠŠUR letters). In almost all instances however, *apa-* is used as an anaphoric emphatic pronoun or adjective. In other words, *apa-* mainly refers backwards within the text. This is also the case in KARKAMIŠ A11b+c where **a-pi-i-na* | REGIO-*ni-ia-ti* “those countries (abl.)” in § 14 refers back to **a-pa-ia* | REGIO-*ni-ia* “those countries (acc.pl.)” in § 11-12.

³⁷ KARKAMIŠ A24 frags. 19+19a, late 9th - early 8th century B.C.; CHLI, p. 138.

³⁸ AŠŠUR e § 19, late 8th century B.C.; CHLI, p. 536.

³⁹ One could also read *za* here although the reading *zi-* /*zin*/ makes contextually more sense than *za[n]* (acc.sg.) (Hawkins, CHLI, p. 254). On the other hand, /*zan*/ might be a rare variant of /*zin*/, as I will argue for AŠŠUR a § 6 (ex. 27).

⁴⁰ MARAŞ 8 § 8, early 10th century B.C.; CHLI, p. 253.

⁴¹ Hawkins, CHLI, p. 95, 103, 114, 119; Payne, *Hieroglyphic Luwian*, p. 27; Plöchl, *Einführung*, p. 85.

⁴² Hawkins, CHLI, p. 98, 370; Payne, *Hieroglyphic Luwian*, p. 27.

⁴³ The two remaining instances of *pin* are less than certain: ANCOZ 4 § 2 *p[i[?]]-na*[...] (late 8th century B.C.); TELL TAYINAT 2 frg 1b § iii *pi[?]-ha-wa/i-t[â]* (DEUS)SOL[(8th century B.C.).

(They (i.e., the gods) marched before me and I wasted those countries. I brought in the trophies),

18 *a-wa/i* **a-pi-i-na* |REGIO-*ni-ia-ti* (FULGUR)*pi-ha-mi-sa* SUPER+*ra/i-a* |PES-*wa/i-i-ha*⁴⁴
and glorified I came up **from those countries**.

The phrase **a-pi-na* VIA-*wa/i-[ti]* “that campaign, abl.” in KARKAMIŠ A12 § 14 occurs in a broken but similar context. Although the word VIA-*wa/i-* “road, expedition, campaign” itself is not mentioned before, the actions of war described in §§ 2-7⁴⁵ certainly qualify as an antecedent for the phrase **a-pi-na* VIA-*wa/i-[ti]*:

19 *a-w[a/i]* **a-pi-na* VIA-*wa/i-[ti]* “FUL[GUR]”-*ha[-*⁴⁶
Glorified [...] **from that campaign**.

The remaining two instances of adnominal **apin* occur in comparable contexts. In both cases the abl. noun phrase **a-pi-na* LINGERE-(*ha-*)*sa-ti* “those good events/that (divine) favor” (usually translated as “luxury”⁴⁷) refers back to the immediately preceding clauses describing the divine favors bestowed upon the author Katuwas:

20 (My lord Tarhunza, Karhuha and Kupapa loved me because of my justice, wherefore they made my father’s and grandfather’s lands *mitasari-* for me, and [they brought forth] for me the Grain-God and the Wine-god.)
**a-mu-pa-wa/i* **a-pi-na* LINGERE-*sa-ti* *kar-ka-mi-si-za* (URBS)
(DEUS)TONITRUS-*ti* DEUS.DOMUS-*tà* [*261.]PUGNUS-*ru-ha*⁴⁸
Because of that (divine) favor I myself *constructed* temples for Karkamišean Tarhunzas⁴⁹.

⁴⁴ KARKAMIŠ A11b+c § 14, late 10th- early 9th century B.C.; CHLI, p. 103.

⁴⁵ “[To those fields my fathers] and forefathers had not marched, but the gods Tarhunzas, Karhuhas and Kubaba *walked* (?) before me, and I *carried* in the chariot(ry), and I took [...]. I wasted the riverland of the city Sapisi, and the walls/fortresses of the city Awayana I ...-ed down with 100 ...” (CHLI, p. 113).

⁴⁶ KARKAMIŠ A12 § 14, late 10th-early 9th century B.C.; CHLI, p. 114.

⁴⁷ J.D. Hawkins and A. Morpurgo-Davies, “On the Problems of Karatepe: The Hieroglyphic Text”, *Anatolian Studies* 28 (1978), p. 106; Hawkins, CHLI, p. 59.

⁴⁸ KARKAMIŠ A11a § 11, 10th-early 9th century B.C.; CHLI, p. 95 “But I myself then *constructed* (?) the temple(s) with luxury for Karkamišean Tarhunzas”.

⁴⁹ Hawkins (CHLI, p. 98) notices a possible correspondence between *apin* in A 11a § 11 and *zala* in A2+3 § 9. Although these clauses indeed describe how the speaker builds temples for the deity, there is a subtle difference. In A11a § 11 the speaker builds temples ‘because of the divine favour’, but in A2+3 § 9 he builds the temples ‘out of goodness in return (= *zala*)’ (**a-mu-pa-wa/i-tu* |*za-ia* (DEUS)TONITRUS-*sa* DEUS.DOMUS-*tà* |BONUS-*sa*<+*ra/i*>-*ti-i* *za-la* *261.PUGNUS-*ru-ha* “and I constructed these temples of Tarhunzas for him with goodness in return”). In A11a § 11 the ablative noun phrase denotes the ‘divine goodness’, in A2+3 § 9 it denotes ‘speaker’s goodness’. This is why A2+3 § 9 can add ‘in return’ to emphasize the reciprocal nature of the building activities. For *zala* as “in return, umgekehrt”, see Frank Starke, *Untersuchungen zur Stammbildung des keilschrift-*

- 21 (She always gave to me my enemies, but me she did not give to the enemies.)
 a-mu-pa-wa/i* **a-pi-na* | **LINGERE-*ha-sa-ti* *za-ia* [PORT]A^{??}-MI[-*ia*]^{??}]
 (DEUS)*ku*+AVIS-*pa-pa* AEDIFICARE-MI-*[ha]*⁵⁰
Because of that (divine) favor *I* built these [gat]e[s] for Kupapa.

By adjoining the demonstrative *apa-* to LINGERE-*ha-sa-ti*, this word must now refer to an antecedent noun or preceding stretch of discourse. The term “luxury”, if understood as abundance, might still refer to the agricultural wealth in KARKAMIŠ A11a, but this cannot be the case in KARKAMIŠ A23 § 6 (ex. 21). I therefore suggest a more abstract meaning such as “good/positive events, (divine) favor” for LINGERE-*ha-sa-*, which finds support from the Phoenician equivalent *mn ‘m* in KARATEPE § VI and XXXVI. The translation of *mn ‘m* as “luxury”⁵¹ gives the impression that this meaning is well-established for Phoenician. This is not the case: the noun *mn ‘m* does not occur outside KARATEPE and is furthermore only attested once in Biblical Hebrew where it is translated with “friandises, Leckerbissen, dainties” (Ps. 141: 4). This contextually established meaning is sometimes used to arrive at “fine food, dainty” for Phoenician *mn ‘m*⁵². Most scholars however derive *mn ‘m* directly from *n ‘m* “good, fortune”⁵³ by means of the prefix *m-*. One of the functions of this prefix is to derive abstract nouns from its base⁵⁴. We therefore find the following translations for *mn ‘m*: “prosperity”⁵⁵, “something like “pleasure””⁵⁶, “good things”⁵⁷, “well-being”⁵⁸, “bien-être”⁵⁹, “welfare”⁶⁰, etc. etc.

luwischen Nomens. (StBoT 31). Wiesbaden 1990, p. 351 with n. 1241 (“Adverbiell gebrauchter Pl.N.A.n. des Adjektivs *zala(i)-* “entgegengesetzt, umgekehrt, abweichend”).

⁵⁰KARKAMIŠA23 § 6 (+) A26a1+2 § c, 10th-early 9th century B.C.; Hawkins, CHLI, p. 119 gives the following translation, without join: “And I myself *then* [constructed (?)] these [buildings (?)] with luxury”.

⁵¹Hawkins and Morpurgo-Davies, *AS* 28 (1978), p. 106; Hawkins, CHLI, p. 59; K. Lawson Younger, Jr. “The Phoenician inscription of Azatiwada. An integrated reading”, *Journal of Semitic Studies* 43 (1998), p. 23.

⁵²A. Dupont-Sommer, “Azitawadda, roi des danouniens. Étude sur les inscriptions phéniciennes de Karatepe”, *RA* 42 (1948), p. 165, 169 (“douceurs, friandises”); John C.L. Gibson, *Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions. Vol. 3, Phoenician Inscriptions.* Clarendon Press: Oxford 1982, p. 57 (“fine food, dainty”); id. J. Hoftijzer and K. Jongeling, *Dictionary of the North-West Semitic Inscriptions.* 2 vols. (Handbuch der Orientalistik, part 1: Nahe und der Mittlere Osten, 21.1-2). Leiden/New York/Cologne: E. J. Brill 1995, p. 662.

⁵³Hoftijzer and Jongeling, *DNWSI*, p. 738.

⁵⁴J. Friedrich and W. Röllig, *Phönizisch-Punische Grammatik.* (AnOr 46). 2. Aufl. Roma 1970, p. 96 (§ 200).

⁵⁵A.M. Honeyman, “Epigraphic Discoveries at Karatepe”, *PEQ* 18 (1948), p. 26.

⁵⁶I.J. Gelb, “The Contribution of the New Cilician Bilinguals to the Decipherment of Hieroglyphic Hittite”, *BiOr* 7/5 (1950), p. 136.

⁵⁷Roger T. O’Callaghan S.J., “The Great Phoenician Portal Inscription from Karatepe”, *Orientalia* 18 (1949), p. 175.

⁵⁸Johs. Pedersen, “The Phoenician Inscription of Karatepe”, *Acta Orientalia* 21 (1950-1953), p. 39.

In the next example *pin* functions adverbially as an ablative of cause:

- 22 § 7 *wa/i-mu-u-ta á-mi-zi ara/i-i-zi na ha[-si-ta] ||*
 § 8 [*á-mu-pa-*]*wa/i-mu-ta* (FEMINA³)*ara/i-na* |*pi*²*-na* (COR)*ha-si-ha*⁶¹
 [They did] not re[call (?)] my times on my behalf. **Therefore** [I] recalled (?) my time.

The final example probably contains the correlative pair **apin ... zin* “there/on that side ... here/on this side”:

- 23 § 4 **a-wa/i-tá *a-pi-[na] || [...]*286-wa/i-ni-zi(URBS) FINES+ha-zi POST-ni ||*
a-tá i-zi-i-tà
 § 5 *zi-pa-wa/i-ta hi²-li-ki-||zi(URBS) FINES+ha-zi POST-ni a-tá i-zi-i-tà ||*⁶²
On that side he added the frontiers of the city ..., **on this side** he added the frontiers of the city Hilikki.

The expression *apin ... zin* is probably not the equivalent of the more common deictic sequence *zin ... zin* (... *zin*) discussed above (*contra* Hawkins CHLI, p. 318). Lack of context prevents a final judgment, but it seems that this unique occurrence of *apin ... zin* corresponds with the equally rare use of *apez ... kez* “on that side ... on this side” in Hittite.

Hittite “on this side ... on the other side” is usually expressed by means of Old Hittite *edi ... ket/ket ... edi* or post Old Hittite *kez ... edez/edez ... kez*. It is very important to note the difference between *kez ... kez* and *edez ... kez/kez ... edez*. Only the latter expression contains a distinction between the near side and the far side of the speaker, but if this distinction is not important or if different sides of the speaker or deictic center are referred to, *kez ... kez* is used. This is the case in Hittite ex. 11 and the HLuwian exx. 12 and 13 (exx. 14 and 15 lack context). In the following example on the other hand, the speaker is referring to the near side and the far side of a point of reference, the river, which does not coincide with his own position:

- 24 § 48 [*ta*]*kku* ARAD-*as huwāi n=an āppa kuiski uwatezzi takku manninkuwan*
*ē[*pzi*]*⁴⁹ *nu=sse*^{KUŠ}*E.SIR-us pāi takku ÍD-az 2 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR pāi*⁵⁰ *edi ÍD-*
*az nu-sse 3 GÍN.KÙBABBAR pāi*⁶³

If a male slave runs away and someone brings him back, if he captures (him) nearby, he gives him shoes. If (he captures him) **on this side** of the river, he gives 2 sheqels of silver. If (he captures him) **on that side** of the river, he gives him 3 sheqels of silver.

⁵⁹ M. Dunand, “Une nouvelle version des inscriptions phéniciennes de Karatépe”, *Bulletin du Musée de Beyrouth* 8 (1949), p. 26; François Bron, *Recherches sur les inscriptions phéniciennes de Karatépe* (Hautes études orientales 11). Geneve: Droz 1979, p. 44.

⁶⁰ Wolfgang Röellig *apud* Halet Çambel, CHLI II (1999), p. 51.

⁶¹ KARKAMIŠ A 5a § 7 - § 8, 8th century B.C.; CHLI, p. 182.

⁶² ÍZGÍN 2 § 4 - § 5, 11th-10th century B.C.; CHLI, p. 316, 318.

⁶³ KBo 6.2 i 48-50, § 22 (OS, CTH 291), ed. Hoffner, *Laws*, pp. 31-32.

Additionally, the locative adverbs *edi* or *edez* always refer to locations that are not mentioned before. But when the area located at the other side of a point of reference, such as a river, mountain range or person, is either mentioned before or implied in the discourse, *edi* / *edez* are replaced by anaphoric *apiya* in Old Hittite and *apez* in post-Old Hittite, and not by *ket* ... *ket* or *kez* ... *kez*:

- 25 § 7 [LÚ] ^{URU}HASSI LUGAL-*i menahhanda zahhiya uit* ⁸ [n=a]n[?] ^mLi-KASKAL-*is mazze nu apiya takkalit* ⁹ [k]ēd=a LUGAL-*us takkalit*⁶⁴
 [The man] from Hassi went on campaign against the king. Lipalsi withstood [hi]m. He closed on[?] (him) **on that (= his) side**, while the king closed on[?] (him) **on this side**.

The ‘other side’ is not simply beyond the point of reference, the enemy, it is also connected with the location of Lipalsi who has just been mentioned. Therefore the adverb *apiya* has an anaphoric connotation which is completely absent from the meaning of *edi* / *edez*. This is also illustrated by the next example where *apezza* refers to an anaphorically colored ‘other side’:

- 26 § 31 *uit=ma* ^{LÚ}KÚR [(*Pishurus anda āras*)] ^{URU}Karahⁿ[(*a*)s]s=a ³² ^{URU}Maristas
 Š[(À ^{LÚ}KÚR) *ēsta (nu=ssi apēz* ^{LÚ}KÚR ^{URU}Taqqast)]as ZAG-as *ēsta* ³³
kēzza=ma=ssi [(^{URU}Talmaliyas ZAG-as *ēs*)]ta⁶⁵
 Thereupon the enemy of Pishuru barged in and the cities Karahna and Marista [were] in the midst of the enemy. **On the other (= the enemy’s) side** the country Taqqasta was its border, but **on this side** Talmaliya was its border.

Since the use of Luwian *zin* ... *zin* is similar to the use of Hittite *ket* ... *ket* / *kez* ... *kez*, I infer that the use of *apin* ... *zin* is the equivalent of *apiya* ... *ket* / *apez* ... *kez*. If it were the equivalent of *edi* ... *ket* / *edez* ... *kez*, the reference point should be present in the clauses containing *apin* and *zin*, just as ‘the river’ is the point of reference in ex. 24. The absence of such a reference point in ex. 23 means that *apin* is used anaphorically⁶⁶, like *apiya* and *apez* in exx. 25 and 26, although the antecedent is difficult or even impossible to find in view of the pitiful state of the inscription.

⁶⁴ KBo 7.14 + KUB 36.100 obv. 7-9 (OS, CTH 15).

⁶⁵ KUB 1.1 + KUB 19.61 ii 31-33 (NH, CTH 81), ed. Heinrich Otten, *Die Apologie Hattusilis III: das Bild der Überlieferung*. (StBoT 24). Wiesbaden 1981, pp. 12-13.

⁶⁶ If the reference point were present in these two clauses we would probably have evidence for a HLuwian binary demonstrative system consisting of *za*- ‘this’ and *apa*- ‘that’, because only in that case *apin* might non-anaphorically refer to the ‘other side’. As it stands now, our anaphoric *apin* is allowed both in a binary and a ternary demonstrative system. This still allows the possibility that Luwian contains a third term comparable to Hittite *aši*, which is accidentally not attested in the corpus of Hieroglyphic (and Cuneiform) Luwian texts.

4. Geographical and chronological distribution

The demonstrative ablatives *zin* and *apin* appear from west to east and from north to south, and from the earliest to the latest texts. There is therefore no restriction regarding place or time:

	11 th -10 th	1.10 th -e.9 th	1.9 th -e.8 th	m.8 th	1.8 th	e.7 th
Malatya (Izgin)	<i>zi-C</i> <i>*a-pi-[na]</i>					
Tabal (Sultanhan)				<i>zi-na</i>		
Commagene (Ancoz)					<i>pi-na</i>	
Cilicia (Karatepe)						<i>zi-na</i> <i>zi-C</i>
Gurgum (Maraş 8, 14, Iskenderun)		<i>zi-C</i>	<i>zi-i-na</i>			
Amuq (Tell Tayinat)				<i>pi-C</i>		
Kargamis (A5a, 6, 11a, 11b+c, 12, 15b, 23, 24)		<i>*a-pi-(i-)na</i>	<i>zi-(i-)na</i> <i>zi-(i-)C</i>	<i>pi-na</i>		
Tell Ahmar (Aleppo 2)		<i>zi-i-x-x</i> (??)				
Aššur					<i>zi-C</i>	

Figure 3 - Geographical and chronological distribution of *zin* and *apin*

5. Formal analysis and possible etymology

After the functional analysis of *zin* and (**a*)*pin* in the previous sections, I will now try to delve into a formal analysis.

The first explanation that comes to mind is nasalization⁶⁷ as attested for REL-*i-ta(-na)* /*kwidan*(n)/ “wherever”, etc., but also for CLuwian *apati*(n) “thus” and *kuwati*(n) “as, how?”⁶⁸. If *zin* and *apin* are nasalized forms of *zi* and *api* respectively, we should find the latter two forms with ablative, instrumental or adverbial function. This is indeed the case for *zi* (see ex. 6 |*zi-i-pa-wa/i*; ex. 12 |*zi-pa-wá/i*; ex. 13 *zi-pa-wa/i+ra/i*, *zi-i-pa-wa/i-‘*; ex. 14 |*zi-ha-wa/i-ta*; ex. 15 |*zi-ha-wa/i-‘*; ex. 16 *zi-pa-wa/i-na*; ex. 17 *zi-pa-wa/i*). However, the distribution of *zi* before the consonants of the conjunctions *-ha* and *-pa* versus *zin* in all other environments points at *zin* in all instances. The lack of *zi* in other phonological environments speaks against the nasalization hypothesis.

For *api* - *apin* we would have to adduce the amply attested *api*, but T. Oshiro⁶⁹ has already analyzed this adverb as /*appi*/ “back, again”, cognate of Hittite *appa*. Even if one were to reject Oshiro’s findings and reclassify *api* as somehow belonging to the

⁶⁷ Onofrio Carruba, “Nasalization im Anatolischen”, *SMEA* 24 (1984), p. 57-69.

⁶⁸ Carruba, *SMEA* 24 (1984), p. 62-63.

⁶⁹ Terumasa Oshiro, “*api* in Hieroglyphic Luwian”, *ArOr* 56/3 (1988), pp. 246-252.

demonstrative *apa-*, we still would like to find freestanding *api* in ablative or instrumental contexts. This is clearly not the case.

In short, we have to accept the reality of the functional abl.-instr. *zin* and *apin*, but how does this relate to the expected formal pronominal abl.-instr. ending *-ati*? One thing is obvious, our forms on *-in* do not belong to any *pronominal* paradigm. Instead, I would like to suggest that *-(i)n* might be the reflex of a PIE adverbial ending **(i)m*.

G. Dunkel⁷⁰ has collected evidence from Greek, Latin and Hittite⁷¹ to build a case for an ending “of the form **-m* with instrumental and ablative functions, found primarily in adverbs and extraparadigmatic forms” (o.c. 63)⁷². He mentions for example the Latin demonstrative adverbs *illim* and *istim*, with ablative function (o.c. 67) and the Homeric Greek adverbial ending $\text{-}\theta\epsilon\upsilon$ which is exclusively ablative in function (o.c. 68). Dunkel further cites instrumentals in **-im*, such as the Latin instrumentals of time *olim* and *interim*, and the instrumental of route *utrimque* “on both sides”⁷³ (o.c. 77-78).

Final Proto-Anatolian **-m* becomes *-n* in Luwian⁷⁴. We therefore may add *zin* and *apin* without difficulties to the list of ablatives and instrumentals in **(i)m*. The ending of *zin* and *apin* is either *-in* (reflex of **-im*) or *-n* (reflex of **-m*). An ending *-n* instead of *-in* is possible in view of the fact that *ziti/ziri* occurs besides *zati/zari* “here” and that *api-* is attested as an alternative stem for *apa-*⁷⁵. We might further adduce AŠŠUR a § 6 as evidence for the ending *-n*, added to the stem *za-* instead, if the following analysis is correct:

27 (You by no means dictated a letter to me.)

[NEG₂-a-wa/i |tara/i-paⁱ-mi-i-sa |za-na |a-pa-ha (“PES₂”)a+ra/i-ta-‘ |ka+ra/i-mi-sà(URBS)]⁷⁶

Did not even (*-ha*) Tarpamis come **from here to there** (to you), to Kar(ka)mis?
((So) why did you/he by no means send me the *atuni*?)

The forms *zan* and *apa(n)* are usually analyzed as acc.sg.comm. expressing time, “now and then”⁷⁷. If we may isolate a pronominal abl.-instr. *-n* instead of *-in*, *zan* could be an

⁷⁰George E. Dunkel, “B. Delbrück and the Instrumental-Ablative in **-m*”. In: Emilio Crespo and José Luis García Ramón, *Berthold Delbrück y la sintaxis indoeuropea hoy* (Colloquium der Idg. Gesellschaft. Madrid 1994). 1997, pp. 63-83.

⁷¹Dunkel treats *mān* and *mahhan* as adverbs of manner, hence as instrumentals on *-ām*, and not as accusatives (*Delbrück*, p. 73). For *duwan* “far” and *peran* “in front” as instrumentals see p. 71-72.

⁷²M. Lejeune (*Les adverbies grecs en -θεν* (Publications de l’Université de Bordeaux, 3.). Bordeaux: Delmas 1939) already reconstructed a Latin adverb **im* “de là” (p. 394) and a PIE adverb **en* “à partir de là” (p. 404).

⁷³The Hittite equivalents are the lateral instrumentals *ket* “on this side” and *šiet* “on one side”.

⁷⁴H. Craig Melchert, *Anatolian Historical Phonology*. Rodopi: Amsterdam 1994, p. 278.

⁷⁵Nom.sg.c. *á-pi-sa* (TELL TAYINAT 2 line 2 fr 6, line 4 fr 10b-a), acc.s.comm. *á-pi-na* (TELL TAYINAT 2 line 5 fr 10a-b § ii), *á-pi-pa*-... (HAMA 4 § 9, if this is indeed an acc. and not the local adverb /appi/), nom.pl.comm. *á-pi-zi* (TELL TAYINAT 2 line 1 fr 2a § ii), acc.sg.comm. of the gen.adj. *á-pi-si-na* (HAMA 4 § 5). See Plöchl, *Einführung*, p. 70.

⁷⁶AŠŠUR a § 6, late 8th century B.C.; CHLI, p. 534, 542.

ablative of separation “from here”. In that case, *apa* should mean “to there”⁷⁸ with reference to the Addressee. The reference to the Addressee (“to there where you are”) is trivial in a binary demonstrative system (in which the non-proximal term refers to non-first persons and/or large distance). Alternatively, *apa-* may be the second term in a ternary demonstrative system, like Hittite *kā-*, *apā-*, *ašī*⁷⁹. Irrespective of the semantics of the demonstrative *apa-*, we may take *apa* here as purely deictic, as referring to the location of Addressee in the real world.

Understanding *zin* and *apin* as *adverbial* forms that became included in the pronominal paradigm leaves room for vestigial remains of an original *pronominal* abl.-instr. *-ati*, as in REL-*a-ti* in BOYBEYPINARI 2 § 4ab, noted by Melchert (*Luwians*, p. 191 n. 19). Treating REL-*a-ti* as a subordinating conjunction “how” (Hawkins, CHLI, p. 336) instead of as an interrogative modifier of the abl.-instr. *hu-pi-tā-ta-tā-ti* (Melchert (l.c.)), does not affect the formal analysis because REL-*a-ti* as “how” certainly derives from “in what way”, i.e., an instrumental of manner. What is important on the other hand is whether this abl.-instr. still functions within a pronominal paradigm (Melchert’s solution) or within an adverbial paradigm as a conjunction (Hawkin’s solution). I opt for the latter in view of the far older CLuwian conjunction *kuwati(n)* “as, how?” (Melchert, *LuvLex*, p. 117)⁸⁰.

To conclude, I surmise that the HLuwian abl.-instr. ending *-(i)n* (< PIE **(i)m*) originally belonged to an adverbial paradigm. Already at the beginning of the first millennium *-(i)n* replaced the original pronominal abl.-instr. ending *-ati*, still attested in REL-*a-ti*. CLuwian evidence suggests that the pronominal abl.-instr. ending *-ati* was already included in the adverbial paradigm in the second millennium. It still needs to be established if and in what way the CLuwian adverbial instr. (?) *zand/ta* competes with CLuwian adverbial *-ati*, and the relation of all these Luwian forms with Hittite *ket*, *kez*, *kedand/ta* and the other Hittite demonstratives.

⁷⁷ Hawkins, CHLI, p. 542; Plöchl, *Einführung*, p. 70 (“hin und wieder; ab und zu”). Differently Anna Morpurgo Davies (“The personal endings of the Hieroglyphic Luwian verb”, *KZ* 94 (1990), p. 101, 103): “Did not Tarpamis *move* this and that to Carchemish?”.

⁷⁸ If *zan* means “from here”, we might treat *apa* (instead of *apan*) as a directional demonstrative adverb. I will not go into the consequences of this view here, but one would need to take into account the Hittite local adverbs ending in *-n* and *-a*. Dunkel, *Delbrück*, p. 71, already treats adverbs like *peran* as instrumentals, while José Luis García Ramón claims the same for the local adverbs on *-a* (“Adverbias de dirección e instrumental indoeuropeo”, *Delbrück*, p. 139).

⁷⁹ Petra Goedegebuure, “The Hittite 3rd person/distal demonstrative *asi* (etc *uni*, *eni*.)”, *Die Sprache* 43(1) (2002-2003[2004]), pp. 1-32.

⁸⁰ The conjunction *kuwati(n)* is probably the old abl.-instr. of the interrogative stem (*contra* Melchert (*LuvLex*, p. 117-118)).