

# From ‘luminosity’ to ‘might’ and ‘glory’, ‘pre-eminence’: the word family of Luvian *\*pīha-*\*

José Luis García Ramón

1 The Luvian abstract *\*pīha-*, commonly interpreted as ‘luminosity, splendour; might’ (the latter “clearly secondary & exclusive to Storm-god” in H. Craig Melchert’s formulation, *DCL* s.v.) and traced back to *\*b<sup>h</sup>ēh<sub>2</sub>-o-*, a derivative of *\*b<sup>h</sup>eh<sub>2</sub>-* ‘to shine, be luminous’, is attested in some compound names and in a number of derivatives. The essentials of the different formations (translations as per Melchert)<sup>1</sup> may be summarized as follows:

- (1) Simplex: MN HLuv. *Pi-ha-á* (Hittite empire), also CLuv. *Pīha<sup>o</sup>* : HLuv. */Pīha<sup>o</sup>/* in compound names with second member CLuv. *°ziti-* ‘man’ : HLuv. VIR(*zi/a*) or *°mū(ya)-* : HLuv. */°mūwa-/* (: A.A.) ‘might’.
- (2) Derivatives:
  - (a) With *-ašši/a-* (pertinentive): CLuv. *\*pīhašši-* ‘luminous’ (: ‘provided with luminosity, splendour’), substantivised as ‘lightning’,<sup>2</sup> HLuv. “FULGUR”-*há-sá-* /*pīhassa-*/, rendered as ‘z’ ‘strength, might’ in the Phoenician version of the bilingual text of Karatepe (8<sup>th</sup> c.), referred to a king (§ 6.1). The forms of both languages clearly point to the existence of PLuv. *\*pīhašša/i-* which is assured by the secondary *-ašši-* derivative<sup>3</sup> CLuv. *pīhaššašši-* ‘of lightning’ (: *ḪI.ḪI-ašši-*), an epithet or (by-)name of Storm-god (: <sup>d</sup>U), as well as by the onomastics of the minor languages, e. g. MN Π(ε)ργασίς (Lycia), Πιγασσός (Caria), also Πιγες-αρμός “Glanz wie der Mond habend” (Lycia)<sup>4</sup> and Gk. Πήγασος (borrowed as *\*pēhašša-*), the name of the flying horse who brought lightning and thunder to Zeus (Hsd. *Th.* +).
  - (b) With *-amma/i-* (pertinentive): CLuv. *pīhamma/i-* (and variant *pīhaimma/i-*)<sup>5</sup> “imbued with splendour/might” (Melchert, *DCL* s.v.), also epithet or (by-)name of Storm-god, and HLuv.

\* This article has been written as part of the research project “The gods of Anatolia and their names” (PID2021-12635NB-C33 /AEI: Universitat de Barcelona / Universidad Complutense de Madrid / Universidade de Santiago de Compostela), and develops some of the issues that were addressed in the paper presented at the workshop held in Madrid, 22–24.5.2024. It is a pleasant duty to express my gratitude to José Virgilio García Trabazo (Santiago de Compostela), Riccardo Ginevra (Milano, UCSC), Ilja Yakubovich (Marburg), and Ana Vegas Sansalvador (Köln) for their indications and comments. For Hittite and Luvian terms reference is made to the lemmata in the standard dictionaries (*CHD*; Kloekhorst, *EDHIL*; Puhvel, *HED*; Tischler, *HEG*), and to Melchert, *DCL* (previously *CCL*) and Hawkins, *CHLI-3* from which most translations of texts are taken. Vedic translations are basically taken from (or rely on those by) Jamison and Brereton (2014).

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *DCL*, 219–220 s.v.v.; *CCL*, 176–177 s.v., also Starke (1990: 104–105). On the onomastic data cf. Melchert (2013: 33–35, 39, 43), also Laroche (1966: 139–140).

<sup>2</sup> Melchert, *DCL* s.v. (“Noun ‘lightning’ rather substantivized adjective *pīha-šša/i-*: ‘that which is luminous’”).

<sup>3</sup> Melchert, *DCL* s.v. (against a neuter *pīhaš-*, as per Starke 1999: 103). Alternatively Luv. *pīhaššašši-* has been explained as a recharacterisation of a basis form *pīhašša-*, itself a remodelation of *pīha-šša/i-* via a collective *\*-eh<sub>2</sub>-* (Sasseville 2018: 303–304), or as a decasual derivative in *\*-eh<sub>2</sub>-* of gen. sg. *\*-osjo* with individualizing function (Rieken fthc. § 7, also *passim* on the difference between “near-inflectional” *-ašša/i-* and derivational c. *-ašša-*).

<sup>4</sup> G. Neumann *apud* Starke (1990: 104–105). Lyc. B *pigasa*, n.pl. of *pigese/i-* ‘splendid’ (?) remains obscure (Melchert 2004: 124 s.v. *pigese/i-* “sense mere guess based in *Pixre*”; Starke 1990: 105 “keine sichere Aussage”).

<sup>5</sup> Both variants coexist (cf. KUB 38.6 + iv 2/3 <sup>d</sup>U *Kastam]a pi-ḫa-i-mi-iš<sup>d</sup> pi-ḫa-mi-iš<sup>d</sup> [d<sup>i</sup>]Milk[uš*) for one and the same form. *Aliter* Starke (1990: 314 n. 1089 *pīhaimma/i-* participle of *\*pīhaji-*, *pīhamma/i-* participle of *\*pīha-*), Kloekhorst, *EDHIL*, 674 s.v. (“to become powerful, strong”).

/p̄thammi-/ (*pi-ha-mi-sá*, (FULGUR)*pi-ha-mi-sa*), referred to kings, of controversial meaning (§ 6). The forms of both languages clearly point to PLuv. *\*p̄ihamma/i-*, which is also attested as name, *Pi-ha-mi* (Hittite empire), *Piḫm̄ma-* (: Πιγμοος, Lycia).

(c) Other formations:<sup>6</sup> CLuv. ( \ ) *p̄ihatta/i-* “splendour; might” in dat.-loc. *p̄ihatti*,<sup>7</sup> with derivative *p̄ihadd-ašši-*,<sup>8</sup> and the reflexes of the *Transponat* PLuv. *\*p̄eh<sub>2</sub>-ro-* in the onomastics of the minor languages, among others *Pixre-*, *Pigrēi-* (Lycia, with *\*-r-on-*), *Pixre-*, *Pixra-* (Caria) and *Pik(a)rm* (Caria), Πιγραμυς, Πιγραμοος (Lycia), a melting of *\*p̄ihra-* and *\*p̄ihamma/i-*.<sup>9</sup>

The current interpretation of Luv. *\*p̄ihā-* as “luminosity, splendour; might” fits perfectly with the reflexes of *\*b<sup>h</sup>eh<sub>2</sub>-* ‘to shine, be luminous’ in Core IE languages, and above all with the onomastic evidence in Luvian and the minor languages (§ 4). On the other hand, a sense ‘might’ (and ‘mighty’) has always been assumed for *\*p̄ihā-* (and for some of the derivatives in *-ašši/a-* and *-amma/i-*) in both Luvian branches, whereas the rendering of HLuv. FULGUR-*há-sá-* as Phoen. ‘z ‘strength, might’ in the Bilingual of Karatepe has led to the assumption that ‘might’ *vel sim.* was the original meaning of *\*p̄ihā-*<sup>10</sup> and even to trace back Luv. *\*p̄ihā-* to a root different from *\*b<sup>h</sup>eh<sub>2</sub>-*. In my opinion, any approach that disregards (or casts doubt) on the derivation of *\*p̄ihā-* from PIE *\*b<sup>h</sup>eh<sub>2</sub>-* ‘to shine, be luminous’ in favour of the basic meaning ‘might’ leaves the majority of instances in which the sense is undoubtedly ‘luminous’ (§ 2.2–3; § 4) unexplained – and indeed creates more problems than it solves. It is easier, and surely preferable, to assume for *\*p̄ihā-* ‘luminosity, splendour’, *\*p̄ihāšši/a-* ‘luminous’, *\*p̄ihā-mmi/a-* ‘id.’ a metaphorical conceptualisation as ‘might’, ‘mighty’, depending on the nature of the referents, as is indeed the case with ‘lightning’ (a specific characteristic of Storm-god), or with ‘king’, who are by nature ‘mighty’ and ‘mighty, glorious’ respectively. In a broader perspective, the conceptualisation of ‘luminosity, splendour’ as ‘might’, or as ‘glory’, ‘pre-eminence’ or as ‘authority, rule’ is well supported cross-linguistically (§ 4.2, 7). Once this possibility is accepted, there is little or no support for the idea that the basic meaning of *\*p̄ihā-* may be ‘might, power’ (or ‘pre-eminence’ or ‘glory’), and even less in favour of alternative etymologies based on *\*b<sup>h</sup>eiH-* ‘to hit, beat’ or *\*peḷH-* ‘to swell up’.<sup>11</sup> What remains to be clarified are the forms of the word-family of *\*p̄ihā-* ‘luminosity’ for which a connotation or translational sense of ‘might’ (or ‘glory’ or ‘pre-eminence’) can be assumed, and under which conditions.

In what follows, an attempt will be made to show that the semantics of Luv. *\*p̄ihā-* ‘luminosity, splendour’ basically reflects that of PIE *\*b<sup>h</sup>eh<sub>2</sub>-*, and is neatly different from those of the terms for ‘might’, ‘power’ (Luv. *mūya-*, Hitt. *innara-*), ‘pre-eminence’ (Luv. *hantili-*) or the like, as the evidence for *p̄ihā<sup>o</sup>* and *mūya<sup>o</sup>* in compound names clearly shows (§ 4). The basic meaning of ‘luminosity’ (with derivative ‘(imbued) with luminosity’, and

<sup>6</sup> On the possibility of a substantivised adjective in *-ai(ia)-* (acc.pl.n.) in HLuv. *pi-ha-ia* MARAŞ 8, § 4 (“*piha-*, “?” cf. Hawkins, *CHLI*-3, 551), cf. Yakubovich *apud* Sasseville (2018: 304).

<sup>7</sup> Melchert 2013: 34; *DCL* s.v. (“Hittitized form depending on Luvian stem”).

<sup>8</sup> Sense obscure: “one of splendor”, “Modifier of bread and cities” (*CHD* P-257)?

<sup>9</sup> Adiego Lajara (2007: 397); Melchert (2013: 34).

<sup>10</sup> Lastly Kloekhorst, *EDHIL* 674–676 s.v. *p̄ihā-* (“onomastic element, ‘strong’(?)”, “*p̄ihā-* ‘power, strength’, *p̄ihā(i)mmi-* ‘powerful, strong’, *p̄ihāššašši* ‘of power, of strength’”).

<sup>11</sup> As to *\*b<sup>h</sup>eiH-* ‘to hit’ cf. Hajnal (1995: 126, 157 n. 161 *\*p̄ihó-* *\*/poiḫó-/* from *\*b<sup>h</sup>oiḫ<sub>2</sub>ó-*: Skr. *bhayá-* ‘Schrecken, Not’), with reference to MN *Pig/xesere* (Lycia), which the author (1995: 35 n. 26) interprets as */Piḫe-stero-* “evtl. ‘Furcht vertreibend’” (*\*b<sup>h</sup>oiḫ<sub>2</sub>o-storh<sub>3</sub>o-*). As to *\*peḷH-* ‘to swell up’ cf. Kloekhorst, *EDHIL* 675–676. These proposals have not been substantiated in detail and can be left out of discussion at this point. The possibility of two different, homonymous roots *\*b<sup>h</sup>eh<sub>2</sub>-* (1. ‘shine’, 2. ‘be mighty’) is mere *ad hoc* speculation.

substantivisation as ‘lightning’) is compatible with a metaphoric realisation as [might], when the referent is inherently (or conceptualised as) mighty, as is the case of lightning, of Storm-god, or of a king: this applies to CLuv. *\*pīḥašši-* ‘luminous’ (and ‘lightning’, and derivative *pīḥaššašši-* ‘of lightning’) and *pīḥamma/i-* ‘luminous’ (§ 5), as well as to their counterparts HLuv. /pīhassa-/ (“FULGUR”-*há-sá-*) and /pīhammi-/ (*pi-ha-mi-sá*, (FULGUR)*pi-ha-mi-sa*), both with human referents, namely kings, which mirror the conceptualisation of ‘luminosity’ as ‘might’ and/or ‘glory’ and/or ‘authority, rule’ (§ 6), as attested in other Indo-European traditions (§ 7).

2 Some remarks on Luv. *\*pīḥa-* and on its special position among (and in contrast with) the reflexes of PIE *\*b<sup>h</sup>eh<sub>2</sub>-* ‘to shine, be luminous’ as attested in the Core Indo-European languages (Ved. *vi-bhā* : YAv. *vi-uuā*, Gk. *φάε et al.*) and on the semantics and distribution of *\*pīḥa-* and its derivatives in the two branches of Luvian are in order at this point.

2.1 Luv. *\*pīḥa-* (*\*b<sup>h</sup>éh<sub>2</sub>-o-* ‘pertaining to (heavenly) light’), the only reflex beyond doubt of PIE *\*b<sup>h</sup>eh<sub>2</sub>-* in Anatolian, beside probably HLuv. *pa-ta /pata-/* (or /*pāta-/*) meaning ‘shining (right)’<sup>12</sup> (*\*b<sup>h</sup>ə<sub>2</sub>-to-*, or *\*b<sup>h</sup>eh<sub>2</sub>-to-*), is an internal derivative of the root-noun *\*b<sup>h</sup>eh<sub>2</sub>-* ‘luminosity, radiance’ (cf. Ved. *bhā-tvakṣas-* ‘having the energy of radiance’, also ŚB, JB ...), beside *\*b<sup>h</sup>oh<sub>2</sub>-* (Hom. *φῶς* ‘warrior’<sup>13</sup> § 4.2), actually the counterpart of Core IE *\*b<sup>h</sup>éh<sub>2</sub>-es-* ‘light, shine’ (Ved. *bhās-* [bha.as-] ‘light, gleam’,<sup>14</sup> also YAv. MN *Bāḥha-* (gen. *-ahe* Y. 13.124),<sup>15</sup> with the same semantics as Ved. *bhānū-* ‘id.’ or Gk. *φάος* : PGk. *\*p<sup>h</sup>áues-*). The pertinent derivatives PLuv. *\*pīḥašši-* and *\*pīḥamma/i-* ‘imbued with *\*pīḥa-*’ were practically synonymous at a stage prior to substantivisation as ‘lightning’, which is assured for *\*pīḥašši-* (but not for *\*pīḥamma/i-*) in Cuneiform Luvian, and may be assumed for both forms in Hieroglyphic Luvian (§ 6), as the notation by means of the pictographic logogram FULGUR (L. 200).

2.2 Luv. *\*pīḥa-* and its derivatives basically reflect the semantics of PIE *\*b<sup>h</sup>eh<sub>2</sub>-* ‘to shine, be luminous’, but it conspicuously does not fit the pattern of the Core Indo-European languages in one point, namely the striking reduction of the referents of PIE *\*b<sup>h</sup>eh<sub>2</sub>-* in Anatolian, which are almost exclusively limited, via the substantivisation as ‘lightning’, to a Storm-god (probably more than one) and to prominent humans, namely kings. Contrarily, referents of the reflexes of PIE *\*b<sup>h</sup>eh<sub>2</sub>-* in Vedic (*bhā* and *bhā-*, *bhās-* ‘light’, *bhānū-* ‘radiance’), or in

<sup>12</sup> In the binomial *a-ra-pa-ta /ara-pata/* as per Barnes (2022–2023: 38–50), who proposes *\*b<sup>h</sup>ə<sub>2</sub>-teh<sub>2</sub>-* “well appearing”, “permissible, of sanctioned behavior”) for *-pa-ta* and identifies it with Toch. B (-)*pāte* : A (-)*pāt* (PToch. *\*pate* : *\*b<sup>h</sup>ə<sub>2</sub>-to-* “appearance”) in the binomial Toch. B *ere pāte* : A *arāmpāt* “form [: Skr. *rūpa-*] (and) appearance” (2022–2023: 42–43). In my opinion, the first member HLuv. /*ara-/* (: Toch. B *ere*) may be understood as ‘fitting’ (*\*h<sub>1</sub>oreh<sub>2</sub>-/\*h<sub>1</sub>oro-*, from *\*h<sub>1</sub>ar-* ‘to fit together’: Hitt. adv. : *āra-* ‘(it is) right’, Ved. *ṛtá-*, Av. *aša-* ‘right(ness)’, better than as ‘upright’, ‘arising’ (from *\*h<sub>1</sub>er-* ‘to rush forwards’), whence ‘appearing’ (as per Barnes 2022–2023: 44–50): the binomial may thus be interpreted as \*[FITTING – SHINING (RIGHT)] (this topic will be treated in detail elsewhere). On the other hand, the obscure Palaic ptc. *panāgant-* can hardly be traced back to a causative ‘to make visible’ of *\*b<sup>h</sup>eh<sub>2</sub>-* (like themat. *\*b<sup>h</sup>-n-h<sub>2</sub>-o/e-* : Ved. *bhān-a-* ‘to tell, mention’, and Gk. *\*p<sup>h</sup>an-*, pres. *\*p<sup>h</sup>an-jo/e-* : φαίverv), and is temptatively assumed to belong to a verb “to depart” (*vel sim.*, cf. *eDiAna* s.v.). *Non liquet*.

<sup>13</sup> As demonstrated by Peters (1993: 105: “... in voreinzelsprachlicher oder eher urgriech. Zeit kreierte Wurzelnomen (oder *-t*-Stamm?) *\*b<sup>h</sup>ə<sub>2</sub>-t-* ‘der immer wieder glänzt, leuchtet’”).

<sup>14</sup> Lat. *fās* ‘divine law, tradition’ (*\*b<sup>h</sup>éh<sub>2</sub>-es-* ‘utterance’) reflects the meaning ‘to say’ of *for, fārī* ‘to utter’ (originally ‘to make oneself visible’), which is secondary with respect to the original ‘to be visible’.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Mayrhofer, *IranPN* I/31 n°81. YAv. MN *Auuarathrabāḥhō* (Y. 13.106) may conceal a gen. *\*<sup>o</sup>bāḥhō* of *\*b<sup>h</sup>a.as-* (J. Schindler *apud* Mayrhofer, *IranPN* I/27 n°61).

Homer (φάε, °φάεσσα and continuants φαίνεσθαι, also intensive παμφαίνο/ε-) which are characteristically ‘luminous, bright’, e. g. ‘dawn’, ‘sun’ and other heavenly and natural phenomena or domains, also of momentative \**leuk-/\*luk-* ‘to become visible’ (Ved. *roc/ruc* : pres. *roc-a-te*, intensive *ruruc-é*, *rocana-* ‘light space’)<sup>16</sup> are taken over in Anatolian by the reflexes of the latter, namely Hitt. *lukk-ta* ‘to dawn’,<sup>17</sup> *lalukki-mi* ‘to shine’ (with <sup>d</sup>UTU *šiu-*, but not <sup>d</sup>U), *lalukkeš-mi* ‘to become luminous’, *lalukkima-* ‘radiance’ (OH+), also *lukke-mi* ‘to set fire’ (NH+). This is evident in minimal pairs with Dawn and Sun (and Sun-Goddess), morning star, and other celestial phenomena or domains:

As to Dawn, cf. KBo 3.34 i 19 *mān lukkat nu ABI LUGAL ḫalzaiš* “when it dawned, the father of A. called up” (*Palace chronicle*, OH/NS) as against the collocation [DAWN (\**h<sub>2</sub>usos-*) – LUMINOUS (\**b<sup>h</sup>eh<sub>2</sub>-ḡti<sub>h</sub>2-*)] (Ved. *uśás-* (*vi*)*bhātī-* : YAv. *ušāḡham ... viuuaiītm* : → Ἥως φαينوμένη\* (*Il.* 9.618 ... ἄμα δ’ ἠοῖ φαينوμένηφι), e. g. RV III 61.5a *āchā vo devīm uśásam vibhātīm ... / ... d prá rocānā ruruce raṇvásaṃdyk* “To the goddess Dawn, radiating widely, ... / ... She of delightful aspect has shone forth through the shining realms”,<sup>18</sup> Hom. φάε (*Od.* 14.502 φάε δὲ Χρυσόθρονος Ἥως “was gleaming Dawn of gilden thron”: impf. \**b<sup>h</sup>éh<sub>2</sub>-e-t*).

As to Sun (-God, -Goddess) cf. KUB 48.88 obv. 4 [*ŠA* <sup>d</sup>UTU *lalu*] *kkimi ŠA* <sup>d</sup>U *kalmešni* ... (prayer of Paduhepa, NH) “or the [radia]nce [of the Sun God], for the lightning of the Stormgod [...], KBo 25.112 ii 11/3 *tuyāttu* <sup>d</sup>[UT]U-*i dandukešni* <sup>d</sup>UTU-*uš zik* DINGIR.MEŠ-*naša ištarna lalukkiuṣanza*] [DINGIR-*uš* SAL.LUGAL *zik* “mercy, o Sun Goddess! Among mortals you are the Sun Goddess but among the gods you are a resplendent deity, a queen” (invocation of Hattic deities, OS). Contrarily, RV X 121.6a *yām krāndaśī āvasā tastabhāné ... /c yātrādhi sūra údito vibhāti* “Toward whom the two battle lines [= heaven and earth] looked, /... (those) upon which the risen sun radiates”, RV IX 23.2c *rucé jananta sūryam* “They have begotten the sun, for it to shine”, as well as *Od.* 13.9 πρὸς ἠέλιον ... παμφανόοντα “toward the blazing sun”.

In conclusion: The semantics of Luv. \**pīḡa-* ‘luminosity, splendour’ and its derivatives reflect the inherited meaning of PIE \**b<sup>h</sup>eh<sub>2</sub>-* (‘to shine, luminous’) as well as \**leuk-/\*luk-* (‘to become visible, luminous’), but characteristic referents of both roots, such as ‘dawn’, ‘sun’, celestial phenomena or spaces, have only been taken over in Anatolian only by *lukk-ta*, *lalukk-* and affixed stems.

**2.3** Luvian \**pīḡa-* ‘luminosity, splendour’, may also be used for (concrete) ‘lightning’, beside substantivised *pīḡašši/a-*.<sup>19</sup> The latter is not, however, the specific term for ‘lightning’ in Anatolian: it stands in concurrence with the specific term *uṣanteuṣant-*, *uṣantema-*, *uṣanteuṣantema-* (NH) ‘lightning (beam)’, also ‘thunderbolt’ (all lexicalised derivatives of *uṣantai-mi* ‘to glow, light’, not ‘to lighten’ properly) as well as *kalmeš(ša)na-*, *kalmiš(ša)ni-* ‘(fire)bolt’ (also ‘(fire)brand’), which are explicitly connected with *tetḡim(m)a-* ‘thunder(bolt)’, *tetḡeššar* ‘id.’, ‘storm’, *tetḡuṣar* ‘id.’ (: *tetḡai-* ‘to thunder’, also *titḡiška/i-*, cf. the collocation [*tetḡimaš uṣantemaš (uṣanteuṣantemaš)*] ‘thunder (and) lightning’ (§ 5). On the other hand, it is worth remembering that the specific term for ‘might, strength, power’ is

<sup>16</sup> The same referents occur also with stative *lalukk-i-*, fientive *lalukk-eš-* in the framework of Watkins system (1971: 83–87 = 1994: 1. 178–182).

<sup>17</sup> Cf. also *lukta* (OH+) ‘at dawn’, ‘the following morning’, *luk(k)atta-*, *luk(k)at(t)i-* (OH) ‘a time of day, namely dawn’ (*CHS* s.vv.).

<sup>18</sup> For further data for Ved. *bhā* and *roc/ruc* cf. Roesler (1997: 78–90, 113–119).

<sup>19</sup> A similar situation is that of Ved. *bhās-* ‘light, gleam’ (\**b<sup>h</sup>éh<sub>2</sub>-es-*), *bhānū-* ‘id.’ beside specific *vi-dyūt-* ‘lightning, ray, bolt’, and φάος beside Gk. ἀστεροπή, ἀστραπή ‘lightning’ (§ 5.2).

CLuv. *mūya-* (: A.A.) : HLuv. /*mūwa-*/\* (‘push, impetus’, originally \*‘motion’ (PIE \**m(i)eyh₁-* ‘to move’, Lat. *mouēre*, Ved. *mīv*),<sup>20</sup> beside Hitt. *innarauār* (and *innarauātār*) ‘strength’ (\**innara-*: \**en-h₂ner-ó-* ‘having force in oneself’), or quasi-synonymous CLuv. *ḥantili-* ‘foremost’ (§ 5).

3 Once assumed that no difference in meaning is originally to be recognised between pertinentive PLuv. \**pīḥašša/i-* and \**pīḥamma/i-*, the fact is that, in purely descriptive terms, the situation was not the same in the two branches of Luvian.

In Cuneiform Luvian, *pīḥaššašši-* ‘of the lightning’ (derivative of \**pīḥašši-* ‘lightning’, not of \**pīḥa-*) and *pīḥamma/i-* ‘imbued with luminosity’ (: derivative of \**pīḥa-*), which preserves the non lexicalised sense are not strictly synonymous. They are both, however, pragmatically fitting as epithets or by-names of Storm-god, who is characteristically connected both with ‘luminosity’ and with concrete ‘lightning’. Whether *pīḥaššašši-* and *pīḥamma/i-* refer in all instances to one or to different Storm-gods remains an open question,<sup>21</sup> which will not be addressed here.

In Hieroglyphic Luvian the situation is partly different, as far as the scarce evidence allows us to state (§ 6): the two derivatives have a human referent (actually a king) and it seems that their meanings differ from those of their Cuneiform counterparts, once /*pīḥassa-* (‘FULGUR’-*hā-sá-*: *hapax*) is rendered as Phoen. ‘z ‘strength, might’ in the Bilingual of Karatepe (8th c.), and the epithet /*pīḥammi-* ((FULGUR)*pi-ha-mi-sa* in Karkamiš, 10/9<sup>th</sup> c.; *pi-ha-mi-sá* in Kōrkūn, 9<sup>th</sup> c.) still defies conclusive interpretation (§ 6).

The fact that, at least in the available written records, the reflexes of both \**pīḥašša/i-* and \**pīḥamma/i-* have the Storm-god as referent in Cuneiform Luvian, and a king in Hieroglyphic Luvian, may well be conditioned by the different genre of the documents, not necessarily by a semantic shift during the chronological gap between both *corpora*. With this reservation, it seems preferable to treat the evidence from Cuneiform Luvian and from Hieroglyphic Luvian separately.

4 In the absence of direct evidence of \**pīḥa-* as common appellative, a basic meaning ‘luminosity, splendour’, as suggested by its etymology (\**b<sup>h</sup>éh₂-o-* § 2.1), is confirmed by its occurrences in compound names, and by comparison with onomastic evidence for CLuv. *mūya-* : HLuv. /*mūwa-*/: (A.A.) ‘might’. Some few clues prove indeed decisive in favour of \**pīḥa-* ‘splendour’ (and \**pīḥašši/a-* ‘lightning’) and not ‘might, force, power’, namely the co-existence of both terms as the members of a unique possessive compound (4.1), and the

<sup>20</sup> Melchert, *DCL*, 186-187 (s.vv. \**mūwa-* and the following); Valério (2023: 266–270).

<sup>21</sup> CLuv. *pīḥaššašši-* and *pīḥamma/i-* are both well attested as epithets (or by-names) of a Storm-god (<sup>d</sup>U), e. g. KUB 6.45 iii 32/3 <sup>d</sup>U *pīḥaššaššiš* ENYA *nepišaš* LUGAL-uš “Storm-god *pīḥaššaššiš*, my lord, the king of heaven” (prayer of Muwatalli II) and KUB 6.46 ii 31 <sup>d</sup>U *pīḥamiš* [(DINGIR.MUNUS-TUM ŠA)] <sup>r</sup><sup>d</sup>U *pīhami ŠA* <sup>URU</sup>Šanaḥuitta “the Storm-god *pīḥamiš* and the goddess consort of the Storm-god *pīḥamiš* of the city Šanaḥuitta” (great prayer of Muwatalli II to *Pīḥašši-*). The fact that the two epithets refer to a Storm-god does not necessarily mean that they are fully synonymous nor that they refer to *one* Storm-god. Both terms occur indeed in contiguity in KUB 38.12 rev. iii 18’/9’ (cultic inventory of the protective deity <sup>d</sup>LAMMA of Karahna: NH†) <sup>d</sup>U <sup>URU</sup>*tarmaliia* <sup>d</sup>LIŠ.GIBIL <sup>d</sup>U *pi-ḥa-<sup>l</sup>aš-ša<sup>l</sup>-aš-ši-eš* / <sup>d</sup>U ḪI.ḪI <sup>d</sup>U *pi-ḥa-i-mi* <sup>d</sup>U *mijannaš* (Starke 1990: 103; Hutter 1995: 88). This may suggest that the two epithets are not exactly equivalent, or that they have not the same referent(s), even though they are not very different from each other – and could be variants of the Storm-god. For a detailed, albeit inconclusive, discussion of the topic, cf. Hutter’s “Versuch einer Charakterisierung” (1995: 87–89: *pīḥaššašši-* “der zum Blitz gehörige Wettergott”, “Wettergott des Blitzes”, *pīḥa(i)mma/i-* as “leuchtender / blitzender Wettergott”). The author himself acknowledges that “phänomenologisch zwischen dem Wettergott des Blitzes und dem blitzenden Wettergott kein allzu großer Unterschied auszumachen ist” (Hutter 1995: 89).