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1. The discussion about the origin of the Hittite -gi conjugation continues nor is there an end in sight. In the circumstances there is something to be said for trying to enlarge the body of data available. In particular it would be advisable to operate not merely with Hittite data or proto-Hittite reconstructions but also with Anatolian in a broader sense. It seems unlikely that anything new can be said about Palac or Lydian but we ought to try to clarify at least the position of the Luvian group. The main aim of this paper is to collect the evidence of Hieroglyphic Luvian which certainly calls for a fresh appraisal. At the same time I shall try to provide a sketchy analysis of what we know about Cuneiform Luvian. I do not intend to make any statement about Proto-Anatolian or Indo-European or Indo-Hittite, but I shall be content, at this stage, to offer a relatively up-to-date collection of data. Oswald Szemerényi once wrote (1961, 20): "For the Platonicizing Indo-Europeanist insatiable thirst for more and more languages, for more and more data is the only road to salvation". I hope that he will not take it amiss if this paper dedicated to him in appreciation of all that he has done for Indo-European studies is only concerned with data and is so deficient in both theory and speculation.

2. In his Dictionnaire de la langue luvite, Laroche (1959, 141 and note 21 bis) attributes to Cuneiform Luvian only one -m (or -ei) conjugation which parallels the -mi conjugation of Hittite. This is not...
generally accepted. Both Meriggi (e.g., 1962b, 84 ff.) and Kammenhuber (e.g., 1969, 251) agree, for instance, in attributing to Cuneiform Luwian a third person singular present in -t which alternates with the more common -ti, and matches the third person sing. in -t of the Hittite -č conjugation (present). For Hieroglyphic Luwian, Meriggi (1966, 1, 64) recognizes the existence of third persons sing. and plural in t-a or t-å (in his transliteration) in alternation with -či, but argues that these forms are best taken as having a modal value, as so-called 'subjunctives' in contrast with the 'indicative' -či forms. Here too there is no agreement, and it has also been suggested that the forms match the -či forms of Cun. Luwian and Hittite (cf. e.g. Kammenhuber 1969, 251). More recently the new readings of the signs NH, 209 and 210 discussed in Hawkins, Morpurgo Davies and Neumann 1973 have considerably altered the data of the problem. What Meriggi read as -a and -ä can be read as -č and -čä so that in one instance at least, that of -čä, the comparison with Hittite and Cuneiform Luwian is phonetically more obvious.

In the case of Lycian the evidence has not altered in recent years in spite of the new epigraphical material. There are some relatively obscure forms in -nč (ačči etc.), but we have no evidence for -č forms of the type described above, and the regular endings are -či for the third pers. sing. and -čni for the third pers. plural. Thus Ly- cian has nothing to offer to our discussion, though, if it emerges that the two oldest members of the Luwian group do indeed have forms which do not fit immediately in the -či or -čni conjugation, while the youngest does not, this may be significant for our assessment of the forms in question.

3. We may start with a brief account of the Cun. Luwian evidence. The basic data are available in Laroche 1959 and the texts published afterwards add nothing or almost nothing.

Laroche (1959) lists 15 verbal forms which end in -či. When the evidence is available -ači appears in other forms of the stem (though the syllabic script makes it possible to assume that in some cases it may be purely graphic); -či may be part of the stem or a personal ending. Of these forms Laroche takes five as 2nd. pers. sing. imperatives: a) la-la-a-ti, pa-qa-pa-ša-ti, āa-a-ti, ṭa-ni-ya-ti, ti-ti-ša-a-ti. If so, -ači ought to be part of the stem, but we ought to notice that Meriggi (1962b, 84 ff.) makes a good case for taking pappāši as a third pers. singular present. Other six forms are labelled third sing. pres. by Laroche too: b) pa-ša-a-ti, ṭa-ni-ya-ša-sare (Laroche 1965, 46), ṭa-na-pa-ša-ša-te, ṭa-pa-ša-ša-ti, pa-ša-ša-ša-ti, ti-ti-ša-a-ti. Finally Laroche leaves without comment three other forms: c) ma-na-ša-a-ti, ōa-ōa-ša-ša-sare, ti-ti-ša-a-ti. For yet another form, ma-ša-a-ti, he leaves open both possibilities (3rd sing. pres. or 2nd sing. imperative). In most cases we are dealing with glosses in Hittite texts (marked as such either by obvious Luwian phonetic features or by the Glossenkollekt); the dialect status of the inflectional marker -č must remain doubtful, since -č could also be a Hittite ending (however improbable this seems). Only a few forms appear in Luwian texts though some are attested more than once. They are la-la-a-ti, ōa-ōa-ti, and ma-ša-a-ti. 9

ลาาā occurs in KUB XXXV 88, obv. 113 (and in the parallel, and more fragmentary, text XXXV 89, 12):  laša-ša-ša-te, DUMU-in wa-al-li-it-ta la-la-a-ti-ša-ša [la-ša-[un-za]] GIS: GA.ZUK-zu.  kam-ša-ša-ša-ša-ša...

Laroche takes the form as an imperative; this would explain the shift from the past (wa-al-li-it-ta) to the present, and we have evidence for a ṭaša- by-form of the ṭaša- stem. Yet Kamunušpaš belongs to the same clause and has a nominative ending. In Laroche's interpretation it must be a nominative with the function of a vocative, though the real vocative (šama-ša-ša-ša-ša) is in fact attested. This is possible, but equally possible is to take la-la-a-ti as a third pers. sing. present with Kamunušpaš as its subject. A choice between the two interpretations is difficult to make.

ša-a-ti occurs only once in a very fragmentary text (KUB XXXV 88 i 8); Otten (1953, 58 ff.) takes it as third pers. sing. pres. but the evidence is not sufficient to decide.
The position of mu-u-wa-i is different. First, it is attested a number of times in similar passages. Secondly, though we are not clear about the meaning of the verb, we have some idea of the syntactical structure of the sentences where it appears.

The most complete text is KUB XXXV 24, 5 ff. (paralleled by 25, 7 and 43 III 6) which reads:

6. [na]-i-ya-ya-ta mu-tu-ya-i na-a-ya-i na-ya-i
7. [ti]-ti-ya-ti mu-ya-ya-i na-a-ya-i na-ya-i
10. mu-ya-ya-i na-ya-i na-ya-i na-ya-i na-ya-i

In I 5-7 three clauses are sufficiently preserved to allow us to see that they have the same structure (for a full restoration cf. Rosenkrantz 1965, 389). We start with the negative particle na-a-wa- followed by the reflexive -ti- and the Acc. pronoun ta. Then comes an AbI.-Instr. noun which indicates a part of the body (ba-ra-su[akati 'head']) and finally the verb mu-a-xi. In 8 ff. the pattern is different: the instr.-AbI. noun begins the clause and is followed by -ti- and -a-xi; then comes a Nom. sing. demonstrative sa-a-xi 'this' and the verb mu-a-xi. Laroche (1959, 72) leaves the possibility open that mu-a-xi be an imperative or an indicative, but the first interpretation must be excluded. In I 5, 6 (and 7) mu-a-xi follows the factual negative na-a-wa-; an imperative would be possible after na-xa, the prohibitive negative, but not after mu-a-xi. Twice here (I 11, 7, 8) and once in 43 III 11 mu-a-xi follows na-xa 'this', which cannot be a vocative but must be the subject of the sentence. If so, the verb can only be in the third person singular (cf. Rosenkrantz 1965 and see also Kammenhuber 1969, 261). In other words, it seems that in all its occurrences mu-a-xi must be third person singular.4

We may sum up. The evidence is meagre, but one verb at least (mu-a-xi) is attested eight times in Luwian texts with the function of a third person singular. In addition we have five or six different glosses which end in -a-x and are used in the same manner. It is remarkable that in no case the -ti termination follows a consonant (as for instance in Hittite pa-ti), but always follows -a-x. Presumably this means that the use of the -ti- ending is restricted to -a-x stems; in some instances (e.g. ma-xa) this is obviously true, but the internal evidence is not sufficient to disprove the alternative hypothesis that the ending was -a-x and not -ti.

Next we ought to establish what other forms are attested for the -ti verbs, i.e. for the verbs which have -a-x forms. Here too the evidence is unsatisfactory. None of the -a-x forms stands besides a third singular in -ti, though we have -ti forms from at least 23 different verbs. From ma-xa- we have besides ma-xa- a third personal plural mu-antt and a participle mazama. Besides the glosses na-pa-xa-i, ka-xa-xa-i and na-pa-xa-xa-xa-1 we also have a third sing. preterite anta-ta, a first pers. sing. imperative anantallu and two third pers. sing. imperative anapatta and na-anapatta. From the stem lala- in addition to la-la-xa-i we also know a third pers. plural lalant, a third pers. sing. preterite lalatt, a third pers. sing. imperative lalatru or laladu and a third pers. plural imperative lalantu.

We may also wonder whether Luwian offers any other evidence for a contrast of endings similar to that of the Hittite -ti and -mi conjugations. In the active the answer is negative. The only doubtful form is pa-a-i-ya-i of the Istanuvian rituals (cf. Laroche 1959, 77, and also Kammenhuber 1969, 324), which could be a unique example of a third person imperative in -a rather than -a-x, but we do not know any other form of the verb nor are we at all clear about its meaning. In the middle or passive Laroche notices a contrast between -ti and -ta-xi forms in the third person sing. present and -mu and -ta-xu forms in the third pers. sing. imperative. Yet, while the -ti and -mu forms are well documented, the same is not true of the -ta-xi and -ta-xu forms. In three cases only -ta-xi and -ta-xu are found in verbs of which we know other forms too: haltittar i may derive from the same stem as the third
pers. sing. active ḫaltatti; ẖ-DidEnter and ḫ-Into may belong
to a stem ẖi- 'to see', if ḫ-Into is in fact a preterite third
person singular from the same verb. The data are not clear. At any rate,
even if we accept the validity of these forms, we may notice that the
Luwian -tī verbs have both -ā and -tari passive forms: aq̄ārā 'it is
made, it becomes' belongs together with aq̄ā 'he makes', while ḫaltatti
seems to have a passive ḫaltittari. This comes as no surprise
since the position of Hittite is not very different (cf. e.g. Watkins
1969, 84).

Finally it is also worthwhile to call attention to the fact that the
-ātī glosses go hand in hand with -atā imperatives.

4. The evidence of Hieroglyphic Luwian is more rewarding. In what
follows we shall concentrate on the First Millennium texts and shall
ignore the evidence of the Second Millennium which is too obscure to
yield any helpful data (but see 4.2.1. end). The values adopted for
some of the most frequent signs are those first discussed in Hawkins,
Morpurgo-Davies, Neumann 1973, and the transliteration follows the
tables published in Hawkins 1975.6

4.1. The conjugation of Hier. Luwian is still imperfectly known but
a few facts are clear. We summarize them in the following table which
concerns the present and past active and the imperative:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Past</th>
<th>Imperative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sing. 1st pers.</td>
<td>-ātī</td>
<td>-āa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd pers.</td>
<td>-ātī</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd pers.</td>
<td>-tī</td>
<td>-ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plur. 1st pers.</td>
<td>-mī-na (?)</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd pers.</td>
<td>-bāmī</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd pers.</td>
<td>-tī</td>
<td>-tāa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is not absolutely clear whether -mī-na is a present or a past
ending, though it seems likely that it can have present value (the main
evidence comes from the as yet unedited KULULU strips).6 Also, the
Asur letters provide some evidence for two other verbal endings, though
the interpretation is too doubtful to allow us to give them a place in the
table. -ha-na (in *'69'/-دخول-نا, ASSUR b, 2; g, 4; *386+381-
-دخول-نا ASSUR a, 3) could be a first person plural preterite ending,
while -tē-ṇa (e.g. in u-Entering-ṇa ASSUR c, 3, na#:THU5-Entering-ṇa ASSUR c, 3;
g, 1 (cf. also BOYRZØYNARI 2, TV D 1), *77+587-Entering-ṇa, ASSUR c, 4; g, 2)
could be a second person plural preterite. Yet these suggestions cannot
be based on a strictly contextual analysis but only on an attempt
to fill the vacant slots in the table with morphologically plausible
forms. Finally, it is also conceivable that the Assur letters offer
evidence for a -tā ending which is neither third sing. preterite nor
third plural preterite, but here the level of uncertainty is at its
maximum.

4.2. In addition to the forms mentioned above we also find verbal
forms which end in -ī or -īa (pī-ī, tā-ī, tā-īa etc.). There is
little doubt that in a number of instances, at least, they are used
as third persons, mostly singular (see below 4.4.1.) and that they al-
ternate in parallel or identical contexts with the -tī forms of the
present. It is customary to mention the -ī/-īa endings as if they were
odities contrasted with the 'normal' -tī endings. This may be correct,
but not from a statistical point of view, as shown by the following
figures (which are based on an analysis of the more legible and com-
plete texts of the First Millennium):

| Third pers. sing. in -tī | ca. 28 different verbs |
| -ī / -īa forms | ca. 33 different verbs |

If we contrast -ī and -īa forms, it is clear that -ī prevails:
-ī forms: ca. 28 different verbs
-īa forms: ca. 15 different verbs

The same verb may have both -ī and -īa forms though the evidence
is limited:

| Verbs with both -ī and -īa forms | ca. 10 different verbs |
| Verbs with -ī forms only | ca. 18 different verbs |
| Verbs with -īa forms only | ca. 5 different verbs |
4.2.1. The list which follows is necessarily tentative and arbitrary; limitations of space make it impossible to justify every reading and every interpretation, but since such a list is nowhere available it seemed necessary to make a first attempt at its compilation. Brackets join together -i and -ia forms which are assumed to belong to the same verbal stem. Owing to the difficulty of the script and to the vagaries of the logographic rendering it is possible that I have separated stems which ought to be treated as identical. For a number of readings of collated texts I am indebted, as always, to Mr. J. D. Hawkins.

ā-lā-na-ṣa-ia 'covets', KARATEPE, LXV, 351.
ā-la-ṣa-ia (?), CARCHEMISH A 15 b
ā-saṣ-ia 'speaks', SULTANHAN, d
ā-saṣṣa-ia, KARATEPE, LXII, 339; LXXVIII, 362
('*471')ā-sa-ia, BABYLON stele, 5
CAPERE-i, see tu-i
CRUS-i, see ta-i
CRUS, CRUS-im-ṣa-ia, CRUS, CRUS-ia 'passes on' (?), CARCHEMISH A 11 a, 6;
A 11 c, 2; A 31/2, 4
CRUS, CRUS-im-ṣa-ia, CARCHEMISH A 6, 8
DARE-i, see pt-ta-ia
*ša-ia, see SOLUM-MI-na-ia
ši-ia-ṣa-ia 'honours', CARCHEMISH A 1 a, 5; A 1 b, 3
*kuarā, cf. REL-aad-ia and ('*69+RA/IA') REL-aad-i 'takes', KÖRKÜN, Ch/A 4 (cf. Morpurgo Davies, Hawkins 1979)
LITIUS, LITIUS-im-ṣa-ia, SULTANHAN, 5
MALLUS-i, MALLUS-im-ṣa-ia, 'MALLUS-i-aa-ia, 'MALLUS-i-aa-ia' 'hammers, breaks away', BABYLON stele, 6; BOYBEYPINARI 1, I D, II B, [II C]; 2, III C 2, IV C 2, IV B 3; CARCHEMISH A 2, 4;
11 a, 6; A 11 c, 3; A 14 a, 6; A 14 b, 4; A, 18 a, 2; [A 20 a, 27], A 27 e 3, 3; [HIN 9, B 2]; CERVEKE, 11; MARAŞ 8, 5; TIL BARSIP, 2, 6
'MALLUS-i-ia, CARCHEMISH A 25 b 2, 1; KARABURUN, 3 6
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MANUS, *218-ā-e-tu-ha-ia, CEKEKE, 10
mu-za-ia-i, *287-wa-ia-i, SULTANHAN, c; KAYSERI, 4
pa+LITIUS-la-mi-ia-i, TIL BARSIP, 2, 7
pa-1a-za-ia-ia, SULTANHAN, 7
(VAS) pa+ta-ia-ia, SULTANHAN, 5
pa-aa-rel-i, SULTANHAN, 5
pa-aa-ia, BABYLON stele, 5
'PES₃/⁻(-)ā-ia, SULTANHAN, 4
'PES₂/⁻(-)ā-ia, BOX, 4
pī-ia-ia, DARE-i 'gives', BABYLON stele, 6; CARCHEMISH A 13 d, 4
(DARE-i); KULULU strip 2, 1 (twice); Fr. 1, rev. 1 (twice), 2; KULULU 1, 6; AKSARAY, 5
(pt-ta-ia-i 'gives' BOÇA, 2
pt-ta-ia-ia BOÇA, 3 (twice)
FONERRE-wa-ia-i, see tu-ia-ia-i
REL-ia-i 'sires', SULTANHAN, 5
REL-ia-ia, KARATEPE, XXXIV, 179 (Hu)
REL-ia-ia, see ('*69+RA/IA') REL-aad-i
za-ta-ia-ia-ia, SULTANHAN, 6
za-ia-ia (pt-ia/i) 'sacrifices, offers', BOLKANMADEM, 4
za-ta-ia, CARCHEMISH A 1 a, 5
SCRIBA-RÁ/I-ia (-)ā-ia, CARCHEMISH A 6, 8; A 11 a, 6; [A 11 c, 2]
SCRIBA-RÁ/I-ia (-)ā-ia, CARCHEMISH A 24, 5; A 31/2, 4
SOLUM-MI-ia-i, SOLUM-MI-i 'sits', KARATEPE, LIV, 313 (Hu), XXIV, 128;
za-ia, CRUS-im-ia-i 'stands', SULTANHAN, base 8 (za-ia); ALEPPO, 2, 6;
BABYLON stele, 5; CARCHEMISH A 3, 2; A 18 h; HERKWESEN, 3;
KARATEPE, LXV, 407 ('CRUS-i'); SULTANHAN, 3, base 8, 9
za-ia, CRUS-ia, KARATEPE, XLVIII, 262 (za-ia, Hu; CRUS-ia, Ho); CERVEKE, 11
za-ia-i, ALEPPO, 2, 4, 5; BOYBEYPINARI 2, IV C 3; KÖRKÜN, 4 A;
KÖÜRÜMLE, 5; CARCHEMISH A 3, 3; A 15,
za-ia-i, 'CAPERE-ia, CARCHEMISH [A 4 a, 2]; A 6, 8, 9; HAMATH 4, 3
('CAPERE'-ia, reading by J.D. Hawkins), HAMATH 5, 1
tal of the relative pronoun and read as *ka.ka or *ka.ka. The most plausible suggestion is that, just as we have a wa/i sign with double vocalism, we also have a REL sign which can be used phonetically with double a/i vocalism. If so, there is no difficulty in reading pa-ad-REL-i as pashka/ka, just as we read mu-wa/i-i as manati.

A text not yet fully edited offers the second exception. One of the KULULU strips (2, 1) has the sentence:

68 OVIS-na 1ta-li-ad 1pa-šla-i-ad-ta-la | pš-la-i | ku-ki-ad-ta-na

REL-na wa/i-st-i

"Lalis gives 68 sheep to Parsatas so that/because he ... for the ... "

If wa/i-st-i is a verb it is likely to be a third person singular (from a verb hitherto unattested in Hieroglyphic), but the whole clause is far from clear and this analysis may be entirely wrong.

As a general rule we can still hold to the point that -i and -ia must follow an -a- vowel. The presumption is that -a- belongs to the verbal stem but the nature of the script prevents us from actually proving that we are not dealing with -at or -ati endings. A form such as pt-pa-na-ta could be read pipas-tu and this would call for a segmentation pipas-at; on the other hand could be read pipas-tu (with a thematic suffix) and this would call for a segmentation pina-ati. It and ta-i ('takes' and 'stands') are certainly built on -a- stems, but the forms attested could easily be derived from *ta-at.

4.4. So much for the morphology. We turn now to the function of the -i/-ta forms. Meriggi, to whom we owe one of the most recent statements about them (1966, i, 64), argues that the -i/-ta forms (t-a / t-i in his transliteration) have both singular and plural functions; he also finds that the same verb can have both -i or -ia and -ti (sing.) or -nti (plural) forms. This speaks against the suggestion that the contrast between -i/-ia on the one hand and -ti on the other hand is due to a different conjugational pattern. Moreover Meriggi finds that the syntactical usage of the -i/-ta forms differs from that of the -ti and -nti forms and argues that -i/-ia have a modal value similar, so
to speak, to that of a subjunctive. His conclusion is that there is no reason to compare these forms with those of the Hittite -ḫḫi conjugation.

4.4.1. My picture is somewhat different. There is a great deal of evidence for a singular use of -i or -ia; a typical text could be

**Aleppo 2, 4:**

\[
\text{[\text{ARIA-pa-xa/i-ta}} | \text{REL-xa} | \text{t-d-i}}\]

\[
\text{pa-pa-xa/i-s} \quad \text{([CARCHARHIS] DEUS) TONITRUS} \text{ harr/i-ni-xa/i-ni-xa-xa} | \text{URBS) DEUS LUNA-xa} | \text{[LOPIN] t-xa-xa/i-ta-tu}}
\]

"who (sing.) takes it away,
let Tarhunzas and the Moon God of Harran curse him".

(The reading of the final verb rests on Hawkins' collation).

On the whole I have counted at least 85 different occurrences of -i / -ia forms with a clear singular subject. Other instances occur in texts too broken to allow a syntactical interpretation.

There are six passages where conceivably -i or -ia forms could be used as plurals, but in three of them at least the evidence is far from compelling. In CARCHANHIS A 11 a, 6 the subject of the verb CRUS. CRUS-i is likely to be -ata, a neuter pronoun which picks up the neuter plural word for 'gates' of the previous sentence. In Anatolian it is not surprising to find a neuter plural subject with a singular verb. The syntax of KARATEPE, LIV (Hu.) is far from clear (see Hawkins, Morpurgo Davies 1978, 105); if the subject of SOLIUM-MI-xa-i is REGIO-ni-ta RUM-ia we have again a neuter plural subject. Finally, in SULTANHAM, 4 we find two nouns in coordination as the subject of PES-i(-)t-d-i:

\[
\text{[[\text{TERRA}}|t-a-t-a-SEL-xa/i-ni-xa-pa-xa/i-ta-i] | \text{pa-xa/i-ta-ta-i}}\]

\[
\text{SUPR-xa/i-i] PES-x](-)t-d-i \quad \text{wa/i-ta-ni-xa-xa}}
\]

"and parwalie will come up from the earth and wine"

It seems preferable to attribute *gilamia* to this clause rather than to the following clause, as suggested by Meriggi. The word order is significant; *gilamia* is an amplification of the clause and it is

parwalie, not parwalia ... *gilamia* which determines the number of the verb. These three examples do not contradict the bulk of the evidence. Yet in three other texts an -i form definitely has a plural subject. A fourth text probably calls for correction on different grounds and will be discussed below (4.4.2.).

1) **SULTANHAM, 5:**

\[
\text{wa/i-ta-wa/DEUS-ni-i-ni} | \text{MUS-ta-ti-i} \quad \text{tara/i-pi-xa/i} | \text{CRUS-i} \]

"for him the gods will stand ... in badness"

2) **KULULI 1, 5-6:**

\[
\text{wa-xa/i-ta-ta-pa-xa/i-ta} | \text{wa-xa/DEUS-ni-i-ni-xa-i-xa} | \text{ta-xa/i-ta-ta} \quad | \text{ni-i} | \text{[RIL-ti-xa-xa} | \text{pi-ta-s-xa}}
\]

"May these gods come well for Tuatatis and let them not give it (him??) to anyone(else)"

(The reading is based on Hawkins' collation; cf. also Hawkins 1971, 115).

3) **ÇİFİLİK, 3-4:**

\[
\text{ni-xa/t-xa/DEUS} | \text{TONITRUS-hu-xa-xa} | \text{DEUS} | \text{pi-ta-xa-xa-xa} | [\text{SOLIUM}-MI]
\]

\[
\text{[ni-xa/i-ta-ta] [DEUS] i-ta[-i] [DEUS] KU[-AVIS-pa-xa-xa-xa-xa][SOLIUM]-MI}
\]

\[
seems to be that –i and –ia are singular endings; the exceedingly few exceptions do not prevent us from making this general statement.

4.4.2. We can now tackle the problem of the alternation between -i / -ia and -ti (or -vi) in the same verb. The evidence is limited and, as we shall see, in no way compelling. pš-iš-/aš-ti 'gives' and ša-ti, ša-ša-ti 'takes' obviously belong to the same verb as pš-ša-ti (KULULU strip 2, rev. 4) and ša-ti (CARCHEMISH A 11 a, 7; A 11 c, 4, 5) but in both verbs the -ti forms are plural: 'they give', 'they take'. Near es-sašra/i-la-ti and tu-ša-aš-ti /PONEER-ša-ti we also have LIBARE(-)šašra/i-la-ti and PONEER-ša-ša-ti, both in ANKORZ, 1. The subject is missing but in the context a plural would probably make better sense than a singular. LIBARE(-)šašra/i-la-ti also occurs in CEKKE, C 3, where the number is not clear. SOLUUM-ME-ša-ti of CARCHEMISH A 3, 2 has a plural subject (see 4.4.1. for SOLUUM-ME-aš-ti). Meriggı (loc. cit.) also quotes a form mu-ša-ša-ti besides mu-ša-aš-ti, but this belongs to an Empire text (KÖLITZ), which is almost entirely illegible; Meriggı himself (1966, 11/2, 265) now reads y-mu-ša-ša-ti and does not try to make sense of the text (for Pes,PES(-)ša-ša-ti see note 18).

Two more instances of possible coexistence of -i and -ti in the singular of the same verb need consideration.

KARATEPE, LXVI, 355 has a singular form AEDIFICARE-ME-ša-ti, which is matched in parallel contexts by two occurrences of a singular AEDI-FICARE-ME-ša-ša-ti(-i) (KARATEPE, LXVI, 373 and LXII, 379; cf. Hawkins, Morpurgo Davies 1976, 125 and the note on p. 128). The alternation at such a short distance is odd; the verb is well attested (cf. Hawkins 1971, 116 ff.) but nowhere else any -i or -ia form is found. It seems likely that in KARATEPE, LXVI -i is the phonetic complement of an understood *šamart or *šamare, rather than of an otherwise unattested *šamari.

The evidence for the verb Pes,wa/-ša or wa/BUS 'to come' is collected by Hawkins 1971. The past is well attested but there are also 5 instances of a third person sing. present Pes,wa/-ša or Pes,wa/-sra/-ša (CARCHEMISH A 11 c, 2; Aleppo 2, 4; Gaziantep 1, 2; Sultanhan, 4 and base, b). In addition Hawkins lists two occurrences of Pes,wa/-ša,-i. Yet one of the two texts (ALEPPO 2, 6) has Pes,wa/-ša,-i which is better restored as Pes,wa/-ša,-ša,-i (Hawkins 1975, 146 and fig. 4).

On the other hand in BOLKAMADEH, 5 the reading is clear:

[wa/-ša,-ša,-i] |mu-ti-ta-ša/-ša,-ša,-i |DEUS--ša,-ša /wa/-ša,-ša,-i

"For him the gods of Mutis shall come well".

PES,wa/-ša,-i is anomalous in at least three ways: a) the supposed -ša form belongs to an -ša-stem verb, since the interpretation anša- (rather than anša-) of Pes,wa/-ša,-i is now certain. We have seen above that -i normally follows an -a- vowel. b) the subject is plural (but there are parallels for this). c) the verb normally has a -ti form for the third pers. sing. present. Moreover, the formula itself is anomalously used. The phrase wašša anša- is frequently found in connection with the gods. Yet, either it refers to the past (and the verb is in the preterite) or belongs to contexts of the type: "if anyone does ..., then let the gods come well for him". In this case the verb is in the imperative; cf. KULULU 1, 5 (quoted in 4.4.1.) and GİFTİLK, rev. 6:

|wa/-ša,-ša,wa/-ša,-ša|-ša,-ša,-i |DEUS--ša,-ša,-i |wa/-ša,-ša,-i
|PES,-wa/-ša,-ša,-i

"May those gods come well for Tuwas".

The reverse formula wishing harm onto the evil-doer also has an imperative. Cf. CEKKE, 11:

ša-pa-ti-ša,-i (CELlius DEUS) TORNIUS (DEUS) karra/-ša,-i-hu-ša,-i (DEUS) tu-AVIS-ša,-i (DEUS) BONUS (DEUS)-ša,-i-ša,-i (DEUS) LUNA-ša,-i (DEUS) SOL CRUX-ša,-i-ša,-i (PES)-wa/-ša,-i

"For him may Tarhunzas, Karhuhas, and Kupapas, the god Good and Ea, the Moon (and) Sun come ..."

Thus the BOLKAMADEH passage would add to its irregularities the use of a present indicative in an imperative-like formula; we may feel inclined to ask whether it would not be simpler to assume that the scribe forgot the final -tu and read Pes,wa/-ša,-ša,-i, i.e. restore the
imperative cun'iti.

No clear cut demonstration is possible, but after this brief survey we are left with the impression that the evidence for the coexistence of singular -ti and -i forms in the same verb is either non-existent or too scanty to be taken seriously.

4.4.3. There may be two reasons for attributing a modal value to the -i / -it forms. First, the supposed coexistence with -it forms in the same verb and for the same person. We have seen that there is no factual basis for this point. Secondly the fact that -i and -it often occur in subordinate clauses of the relative or indefinite or hypothetical type. The standard context is of the type: "who does X ..., whoever does X ..., if anyone does X ...". The question arises whether this is the only type of context where -i and -it occur. The answer is negative; we find -i and -it in positive statements for which no modal value is called for. Some examples have already been quoted in 4.4.1 (Sultanhani, 4 and 5; Çiflik, 4); others may be added:

**KULULU strip 2, i:**

32 (ORIS) na-wa/i-ta 'nu-wa/i-hi-at 'ni-ta | pi-ta-it

"Muhawis gives 32 sheep to Nis".

**KARATEPE, XLVIII, 262-266 (Hu):**

wa/i-na | i-it-so-ta-na ta-ta (AQUA) la-pa-ra/i-a | ONNI-MI-i-at ... "and every libation begins/began to honour him ..."


**CARCHEMISH, A 15 b, 2:**

wa/i-mu-ta (HEUS) ku-ARIS-li-pa-sa | (PES) pa-tas-i | PONERI-MI-i-na | ta-i

"Kupapas will take me placed at (her) foot".

**CARCHEMISH, A 1 b, 2-6:**

wa/i-ta-i mi-pa-ta VIK-ta-i-sa REL-i-ta REL-i-ta | ta-tas li-pa-ns i-it-so-ta-i

| mu-pa-wa/i-ta' | || BONUS-sa-as/i-ti CUN-MI i-si-t-so-ta-i

"wheresoever my husband honours (his) name for himself (-ti), he also honours it for me ..."

(This translation seems to me preferable to that suggested by Hawkins 1972, 94 "wheresoever one shall honour the name of my husband, one shall honour me too with reverence", which does not consider the -ti- of the first clause).

Just like the -it forms, -i and -it appear after the prohibitive negative: cf. pa-mu-wa/i-ta, pi-ar/i-da-xa/i-ta, pi-ta-it (Babylon stele, 6; Kululu 1, 6), ta-ta (Carchemish, A 6, 8); cf. 4.6.2.

Altogether I have counted slightly more than 70 occurrences of -i/-it forms in subordinate clauses of the "whenever, if" type versus more than 20 occurrences in main clauses. Before we wonder at the preponderance of the -i/-it forms in subordinate clauses, we may remember that some of these verbal forms are repeatedly used in quasi-formulaic sentences. MALLUS-lu-, for instance, accounts for almost 20 occurrences of -i/-it and always appears in the introduction to the final curse of the texts. If we classify in a similar manner the instances of third persons sing. in -ti attested in Hieroglyphic Luwian we find that they are used at least 28 times in subordinate clauses of the "whenever, if" type, and 17 times in main clauses. The comparatively smaller number of 'subordinate' -ti's can be explained when we observe that no -ti form has the stereotype properties of the most frequent -i forms (we quoted MALLUS-ta-i, but one could also mention CRUS-i, ta-ta etc.). sa-nu-ti with its eight occurrences (in subordinate clauses) is unique among the -ti verbs. At any rate, what emerges is that both the -ti and the -i/-it forms are more frequently used in subordinate clauses than in main clauses. At this point it is not surprising to find that -ti and -i/-it appear in perfectly parallel contexts, often in coordinated clauses. An example may suffice.

**CARCHEMISH, A 11 a, 5-6:**

POST-xa/i-da-pa-wa/i-ta | REL-i-ta | PRAH-na CRUS.CRUS-i

wa/i-ta-i | SCRIBA.xa/i-ta | REL-i-ta

| sa-ni-pa-wa/i-ta (SAFL) ku-ta-sa-as/i-zi LOCUS-sa-a (SAFL) mi-nu-ta
NEG₂-pa-wa/i-ta | wa-na DEUS-ni-na LOCUS-xa(-) (RA₁)be-ni-ti

[NEG₂-pa-wa/i-ta á-ner-xa á-tas-mar-na ARRA MALLEUS-ta
wa/s/-ta-ta' (DEUS) TONITRUS-xa (DEUS)kar-ku-ta-wa (DEUS)ku-AVIS-pa-sa-ha IRA/tá-ta-ta]

"If in future it shall pass
(to anyone) who shall...
and remove (?) these orthostats from (their) places
or shall remove this god from (his) place(s)
, or shall erase my name
may Tannuzas, Karhunus and Kupapas be angry against him"

(Cf. Hawkins 1975, 146)

It would be too long to quote in full the second text of 30U3Y-PINAH, but it is worth noticing that there the curse contains in parallel clauses the following verbs: MALLEUS-t (4 times), (occidens-t)-ma-ti-ti, ti-ni-ti, PONERE-wa/i-ta, ta-ta.i.

At this stage it seems impossible to attribute a specific modal value to the -i/-ia forms in contrast with the -ti forms. The general conclusion must be that certain verbs take -i/-ia endings and other -ti endings without any specific syntactical or semantic difference, just as in Hittite some verbs have -i and others -ti.

4.5. In Hittite the -i forms belong to a specific conjugation so that a third person singular can be expressed as manawat calls for a first sing. manatip and a second sing. manattu in contrast with e.g. aṣṣ ś which calls for aṣṣ and aṣṣ. We have seen how scanty is the Cun. Luwan evidence from this point of view, and we must now ask what is the position of Hieroglyphic. Here some more information is available. Together with -i or -ia forms we find in the verb:

a) a -wi first person sing. present (cf. (VAS)marra/i-diwa/i-wa/i, pi-ṣa-wa-wa/i-di, sa-sa-sa-wa/i-la-wa/i vs. (VAS)marra/i-diwa/i-la, pi-ṣa-sa-sa-wa/i-la-i).

b) a -ba third person plural present (cf. pi-la-ta, ta-ta-ta(-i), LIBARE(-)aš-ta-wa/i-la-ta/i, LIBARE(-)aš-ta-wa/i-la-ta, SOLIUM-MI-ta, PONE-RE-wa/i-ta vs. pi-la-ta, ta-ta, aš-aš-ta-wa/i-la-ta, SOLIUM-MI-ta, 3U-wa/i-ta(-i) / PONE-RE-wa/i-la; see 4.4.2).

c) a -wa 1st person sing. preterite [cf. la-ha [BONÇA, 4], (VAS)ma-rra/i-diwa/i-ta, pi-la-ha, ta-ha, PONE-RE-wa/i-ta, u-pa-ha etc. vs. la-ta, (VAS)ma-r-ra/i-diwa/i-ta, pi-la-ta, ta-ta / la-i, tu-wa/i-ta] / PONE-RE-wa/i-ta, u-pa-i).


e) a second person imperative with no personal ending (cf. a-ṣaṣ-as-ma ASBUR a,i; b,i; c,i; d,i; e,i; f,i vs. a-ṣaṣ-as/i / ia).

f) -tu and -tu third persons sing. and plural imperative (cf. pi-la-tu-i, pi-pa-sa-tu, LIRABE(-)aš-ta-tu/i-tu, tu-wa/i-tu vs. pi-la-ta, pi-pa-sa / i-ta, aš-aš-ta-ra/i-ta-i, tu-wa/i-ta(-i)/PONE-RE-

(Unless specifically indicated, the references are easily traceable in Meriggi 1962)."
ticular it is noticeable that the -i and -iₐ forms belong to verbs which also have a first person singular in -ni (which corresponds to Hittite -ni rather than to Hittite -niₐ) and imperatives in -ta. Similarly the -niₐ forms belong to verbs which have a first person sing. preterite in -niₐ and a third person sing. preterite in -ta.

4.6. So far we have treated the -i and -iₐ forms as interchangeable and we have implicitly attributed to them identical semantic and syntactical functions. Yet the very existence of the two types calls for an explanation. First, the basic data. We have seen that we have ca. 28 different verbs with -i forms and 15 with -iₐ forms. Of these, 10 different verbs have both -i and -iₐ endings. If instead of the different verbs we count the number of occurrences of the individual forms the proportion is somewhat different. The -i forms occur some 85 times and the -iₐ forms some 26 times.

So much for the facts; we may add that -i is attested in at least 40 different inscriptions and -iₐ in 16 different inscriptions. Six texts have both -i and -iₐ (BOHRA, CARCHIPHEN A 6, A 31/2, CEKHKE, KARATRPS, SULTANHAN).

Why two forms? I may anticipate here that the question will not receive a firm answer in this paper but we can explore a few avenues.

5.6.1 While -i seems to match -i of Cuneiform Luwian, Hittite and Palaic, -iₐ, if read as [ya], has no parallel outside Hieroglyphic. This makes it an obvious candidate for a morphological innovation (the alternative hypothesis, viz. that it is an archaic feature preserved here only, seems unlikely), and obliges us to explore usage and meaning of -iₐ to see how the innovation may have arisen.

Obviously the first task is to see if, and how, -i and -iₐ differ in usage. Yet both forms occur in parallel contexts, sometimes in coordinated sentences. CEKHKE, 10 f. may serve as an example (cf. Hawkins 1975, 146 f. in addition to Mariggl 1966, II/1, III):

\[\text{ni-pa-va/i URBS+HI-ni REL-va MALUS-hi-bi-ri+ii VERSUS (PRS₄) i+ra/i}\]

"He who approaches this city with malice, or ... (-i- verb) (its) frontiers, or he stands (-iₐ verb) ... from (?) this stele, (and) erases these words (-i verb) ..."

There is little doubt that the -i and -iₐ forms fulfill exactly the same syntactical function: a difference in grammatical person or modal value must be excluded.

4.6.2. We may wonder whether -i and -iₐ could differ in tense. The question is important since, if this were so, it would also be possible to explain how the innovation came about. If -iₐ were a past marker we could think of an analogical proportion of the type:

\[-ti : -ta = -i \text{ (or } -yi \text{) : } X\]

which would trigger off the creation of a new third person singular preterite in -ta. The fact that one and the same verb can have both -ta and -iₐ forms would not count as an objection since this could reflect the initial period of confusion before the analogical innovation became fully established. However, the hypothesis is acceptable only if -iₐ occurs in contexts which call for a past, in contrast with -i which clearly appears in contexts which require a present or a future. There are, interestingly enough, a few clauses where -iₐ could be taken as a past marker. The first two occur in KARATEPE.

(1) KARATEPE, XXXIII-XXXV, 171-187:

\[\text{t-pa-va-sa-pa-sa-i-ta } \text{ 'TERRA'-ta-ta-sa } \text{ (ha-pa-xa/i) REL-iₐ REL-ya-ta mi-wa/ni-na } \text{ (i-sa-ta) CAPUT-ti-sa-sa-va } \text{ REL-i-ta-na REL-sa-i-i } \text{ 'VIA'-wa/ni-na 'PRS₂'(-)i-wa-na REL-pa-wa/da-mi-ta-na ('DISS') K-ll-ta-na } \text{ MULIER-i-i-ha 'SRS+SEG' i-ta-ta}\]

"and in those places which were formerly feared (?),"
where a man fears/fear to walk the road,
in my days even women walked with spindles.

₇-nu₂-ta and PES₂, PES₂-ta are undoubtedly preterites; the context seems to call for a past value of REL₇-s₂-ta, a form of the verb 'to fear' (cf. Hawkins, Morpurgo Davies 1976, 111 f.).

(2) KARATEPE, XLVIII, 262-265, was quoted above in 4.4.3. The verb ta₂-ta (H) ḪVUS₂-ta (H) occurs after a number of missing sentences but it is noticeable that all the miserable traces of verbal endings which we have before it point to preterite endings. The Phoenician text, which is preserved, also calls for a translation with a past tense both in this very passage and in the preceding clauses.

A third passage belongs to an inscription where the problem of extricating tenses is far from easy.

(3) BÜNDNIS, 1 f.f. (for the text see Morpurgo Davies, Hawkins 1979):

(i) EGnv-ést \ ?Hau/n-t-ṭs₂-ah ...
(ii) | ḪVUS₂-ta | (DEUS) ḪVUS₂-ta \ | ḪVUS₂-ta | (BONUS) ḪVUS₂-ta \ |
(iii) | ḪVUS₂-ta \ | TERRA-REL₇-s₂-ta \ | SUPER₁-v₂-ta \ | "CASPÉB" \ | ḪVUS₂-ta \ | pi-pa-qa-ṭa
(iv) | (DEUS) ḪVUS₂-ta \ | (BONUS) ḪVUS₂-ta \ |
(v) | ḪVUS₂-ta \ | (ANIMAL) \ | (BONUS) ḪVUS₂-ta \ |
(vi) | ḪVUS₂-ta \ | TERRA-REL₇-s₂-ta \ | AVUS₂-ta \ | REL₇-s₂-ta \ |
(vii) | REL₇-s₂-ta \ | (DEUS) ḪVUS₂-ta \ |
(viii) | REL₇-s₂-ta \ | (ANIMAL) \ |
(ix) | REL₇-s₂-ta \ | (ANIMAL) \ |
(x) | REL₇-s₂-ta \ | (ANIMAL) \ |
(xi) | REL₇-s₂-ta \ | (ANIMAL) \ |

The sense would run perfectly if all the -ta forms were translated as preterites — except for two problems: why should we have a present in (iii) and a past in (v), the parallel clause? why should we have a -a form in (vii) but the expected -ta form in (vi)? It seems that if we stress the parallelism of (iii) and (v) we may be pushed to take -a in (v) as a present marker; on the other hand, if we stress the parallelism of (vii) and (x) the presence of a clear past in (x) ought to induce us to take -a in (vii) as a past marker, though the morphological contrast between -a and -ta in the same verb would remain unexplained.

In all other contexts the -a forms seem to have present/future value and often alternate in identical constructs with -t or -ṭi presents (as in the passage from KÝNŸE quoted in 4.6.1).

Three times we find -a forms after a prohibitive negative: ...
... | NEG -i CUN-ni ARSHA | te-la and ... | NEG, CUN-ni ARSHA | te-la both in GARKUMISH A 6, 8. Once a -ta form appears after an adverbial formation which means 'in future' or the like; cf. SULTANAH, 6:

| \( wa/i-tu-u \) 9 | (ANIMAL)ROS-\( sa \) CENTUM-\( ha \) me-tu-md |
| POST\( ra/i-ta-pa-wa/i \) \( a-ta \) | \( as\( ra/i-wa/i-ta \) |
| \( wa/i-ta-u-ta \) | \( ti-na-ta-ra \) | POST\( ra/i-ta \)
| \( wa-as-li-pa-wa/i-tu-u \) | 11 (ANIMAL)OVIS-ni |

"to him (there will be) 9 oxen and 100 ..., and in future he will an\( ta \) as\( ra, \) for him in future (there will be) a ti\( na-ta-ra, \) and for him, yearly, 11 sheep"

The reading is based on Mr. Hawkins' collation. The text is far from clear but the adverb ought to point to a present/future value of an\( ra, \) rather than to a past. An attempt at translating POST\( ra/i-ta \) as 'afterwards' or the like, which would allow the introduction of a past verb to follow it, cannot be supported by any relevant evidence.

Altogether the bulk of the evidence favours for -\( ta \) the same functions as for -\( i, \) though the KARATEPE and BONGA passages remain mysterious. On the other hand we ought not to forget the frequent instances of Hittite present forms where we would expect a preterite. Given this, the analogical hypothesis made above about the origin of -\( ta \) has to be dropped.

4.6.3. Other morphological explanations do not seem more plausible. -\( i \) and -\( ta \) cannot beconjugalional allomorphs since both endings can occur in the same verb. Nor does it seem likely that we have two endings in free variation or dialectically differentiated. In the latter case we would not expect to find both forms in the same text; in the former it would be very difficult to explain how -\( ta \) came to exist, if it is indeed an innovation, but has no morphological raison d'être and no obvious analogical origin.

Since no other explanation is available we may now ask whether both -\( i \) and -\( ta \) could be different spellings for an [-i] morph (an

hypothesis first suggested in Hawkins, Morpurgo Davies, Neumann 1973, 180). If this were so, our problem would be solved.

That in a syllabic script the syllabogram -\( a \) can indicate a post-
vocalic -\( i \) (perhaps only in final position) is not implausible, but is there any positive evidence for this suggestion?

In final position spellings of the -\( CV-i-a \) type mostly belong to two grammatical categories: neuter plurals Nom.-Acc. of the ha-ni-la-
\( ta-ta \) type and datives singular of the kar-\( ha-ka-ta \) type.

The neuter plurals in -\( ta \) alternate with -\( a \) forms (cf. ha-ni-la-
\( ta-ta \) and ha-ni-la-ta in KARATEPE, XII, 60 Ho and Hu, and OMNIS-MI-ma-
\( ta \) / OMNIS-MI-\( ra \) ibid., XV, 77, Ho and Hu); see Hawkins, Morpurgo
Davies 1978, 107. The comparison with Hittite neuters such as Ā\( s \)āla (from Ā\( s \)āla-) and m\( a \)g\( a \)ya (from m\( a \)k\( k \)ti-) speaks for a phonetic contrast between [-\( a \)] and [-\( ay \)a]. In the neuter plural of pronouns we regularly find R\( a \)l-\( i-a, \) (\( -a \))p\( a-\( a \)t\( a, \) sa-a, and there is no trace of simple -\( a \) forms. Here Lycian ā\( w \)i\( ja \)a provides a perfect model for ā\( p \)a-\( a \) (if we allow for the Lycian change of a to e). Once again this speaks for a full [ya] reading of -\( a \)t\( a \) rather than for an [i] value.

In the case of the -\( ta \) datives of the kar-\( ha-ka-ta, \) ka-ni-ni-ta-
\( ta \) type, the comparison with Cun. Luwian -\( y \)a and Lycian -\( e \)a speaks in favour of a full phonetic value of -\( ta \) (cf. Hawkins, Morpurgo Davies, Neumann 1973, 170). However, we may well wonder how to interpret the contrast between the dative PR\( a \)TER-la-\( i \) which occurs twice in KU\( n \)L\( U \) strip 1, rev. 4 and the dative 1REL-\( a \)-PR\( a \)TER-la-\( a \) (a personal name) found ibid., obv. 2. It is possible that in the word for 'brother' either -\( i \) stands for [ya] or we have an almost unique example in Hieroglyptic of dative in -\( Ca-ta \) rather than -\( Ca-ta \) or -\( Ga \).

Leaving aside this last problem what emerges is that the spelling -\( Ca-ta \) can indicate [Ca\( y \)a]. This does not prove or disprove that -\( Ca-
ta \) can also indicate [Ca].

Elsewhere it is not difficult to quote instances of -\( i \)/-\( ia \) al-
ternations: cf. e.g. i-ni-i-wa/i/-\( i \) (TIL B\( A \)R\( S \)I\( P \)I, 1, KARATEPE, LXIX, 365) and i-ni-i-wa/i (ASSUR, e, 2), i-ni-i-ta (e.g. KARATEPE, III,
verbs which have -ti counterparts in Hieroglyphic (or vice-versa). On
the other hand there are at least three instances of -ti forms in Cu-
meiform which match -ti forms in Hieroglyphic: Cum. aya-ti, Hier. a-la-
ti (Sultaniyan, 6); Cum. a-mi-ti, Hier. p-us-a-si-ti (Carchemish A 11
c, 2 etc.); Cum. turs-tti, Hier. tu-pa-ti-ti (Kasser, 3). The evidence is
scanty but the two languages agree.

We mentioned above that Lycian has no -a forms. More important is
that even where Hieroglyphic has -a, Lycian has -ai; compare Hier.
pi-la-i and Lycian piji-ti; Hier. pone-tri-si-ta-li bu-wa-ti-it and Lycian
uwa-ti-si; Hier. tu-ti / curab-ti (or tu-i ?) and Lycian tu-di. When the
evidence is available the -ai forms of Cum. and Hier. Luvian correspond
to -ti forms of Lycian (cf. Lycian adi 'he makes', Lycian uwa-ti-si 'he
hits', etc.). All works as if the two older members of the Luvian
group preserved two different morphs for the third person sing. pres-
pent, but the youngest member, Lycian, generalized one of the two.

5.1. How much overlap is there between Cuneiform and Hieroglyphic
Luvian and Hittite? Among the -a forms of Cuneiform there is no cer-
tain match with Hittite. Possible candidates are (1) la-la-a-ti, if
(a) it is not an imperative, and (b) can be compared with the non-redu-
plicated Hittite tat 'he takes'; (2) pa-ap-pa-a-ti, if (a) it is not
an imperative, and (b) can be compared with Hittite pa-at (but pa-at
is also attested); (3) ta-par-ti-yu-ti, if (a) it is a third person
singular, and (b) Hittite paratsgi all really exists, i.e. it is not a
Luvian form in Hittite. The -ti verbs of Cuneiform Luvian often cor-
respond to -ai verbs of Hittite (aya-ti : aya-at; a-mi-ti : amikarsi,
iti : (pa-)kar; kalisati : kalitisni; kantatis : kangatisi; par-
bat : par tatsi; puati : puunatsi, and perhaps a few others). The
exception is Cum. Luvian is-ta-ta-ti, if it corresponds to Hittite hal-
atsi (but in Hittite the verb also has -ati-type forms).

Hieroglyphic offers a somewhat different picture. There is one
absolutely clear instance of overlap with Hittite: tu-ta / tu-ta 'he
takes' and Hittite da-it. The semantics are less clear in the case
Hier. u-pa-ti and Hittite upa-at but the morphological overlap is complete.
Together with *ad-î 'takes', we can also consider *la-î 'takes', if the two forms have a common origin. *pi-la-î is etymologically related to Hitt. pač 'gives', but the Luwian group seems to have remodelled the whole conjugation of the verb.

In a few other cases we may think that *-î forms of Hier. Luwian correspond to *-aî forms of Hittite, but in no instance are we certain about the validity of the comparison. If our interpretation is correct, SOLIUM-MR-qa-î may correspond to Hittite esâ or esâraî, but the normal form is middle: esâ, esâraî. For pa-aa-REI-î, G.R. Hart (apud Hawkins 1975, 119 note 9) has suggested a connection with Hittite paahxal-, which seems to be a *-mî verb: *aa-aaštâ/la-î 'offers' may be compared with the non-replicaded Hittite ūnlaâ-î, which has a third person sng. present ahrâtanî (but also a form ahrâtî); wa/írra/î-îla-î 'helps' ought to match Hittite wârâtaâ-î.

Of the Hieroglyphic forms a number end in -sa- or -aa-. It seems that Hieroglyphic has an iterative suffix -sa-, which (perhaps) alternated with -aa-, but it is also likely that -sa- verbs arose from stems ending in stop followed by a -sa- suffix (see Hawkins, Morpurgo Davies, Neumann 1973, 184 ff., Hawkins, Morpurgo Davies 1975, 133). Whatever their origin, all -sa- verbs for which we have evidence have third persons sing. present in -î rather than -î (i-xî-la-î is not relevant here because, even if it is built with a -sa- suffix must have been redetermined with a -sa- suffix). A number of -aa- verbs also have -î or -ia forms: the obvious examples are *pi-pa-aa-î, REL-aa-î. Two possible instances of -sa- 'iterative' with -î forms are quoted in the literature, but are both extremely uncertain and have to be dismissed. *la-la-aa-î of CARCHEMISH A 3, 3, if it were a verb, would be in the singular, but Meriggi (1966, II/1, 57) has argued that it must be the dative-locative of a noun. *la-la-la-aa-î of CARCHEMISH A 3/2, 4 has traditionally been taken as a verb derived from Hittite lamen 'name' (though the Hieroglyphic word is *atamunu). Yet, (a) this is implausible, (b) the context is obscure, (c) if the form were a verb, the chances are that it would be in the plural.

The conclusion is that both -sa- and -aa- verbs have -î third persons singular; this may be relevant for the complex question of the relationship of the -sa- and -aa- verbs with the -ak- and -e(a)- iteratives of Hittite, which are *-mî and *-hî verbs respectively.

In Hittite the *-mî causatives belong to the *-mî conjugation. Hieroglyphic Luwian has a possible example of *-mî verb with an -î ending, pa-aa-la-î, but, given the obscurity of the context, it is not absolutely certain that the verb is a causative (though Hawkins 1979 discusses a possible simplex pa-). It is interesting to contrast with this form, the causative (SOLIUM) i-âdâ-mî-sâ-î-î of KARATEPA, XIV, 313 (Ho). It belongs to a sentence syntactically obscure, but may well be a third person singular. If so, we may have some oscillation between -î and -î forms in the case of the *-mî verbs but the evidence is far too small.

It remains to add that in Hieroglyphic, as in Cun. Luwian, we find -î forms which overlap with Hittite *-mî forms, though the evidence is scanty; cf. *ia-ia-î-î 'makes' (SULTANHANIAN, 6) and Hittite iyansî; (PBS) íra-ír 'comes' (i.e. rî < *rî (kkkk, rev. 10, see Hawkins 1975, 146 f.) and Hittite (pa)iuâni.

6. It is now time to summarize some of our findings. Both Cuneiform and Hieroglyphic Luwian have -î and -î third persons singular present. The contrast is morphologically conditioned, i.e. some verbs have -î, others have -î. The scarcity of our evidence does not allow us to formulate rules which predict for certain verbal types the appearance of either -î or -î (though we can say, for Hieroglyphic, that the *aa- and -sa- verbs have -î and not -î). It is remarkable that, both in Cuneiform and Hieroglyphic, -î always follows an -î vowel; with the reservations formulated in 3. and 4.3, we may venture the suggestion that *aa- is a thematic vowel and that -î is frequent in thematic verbs.12 There is evidence in Hieroglyphic, and to a lesser extent in Cuneiform, that in other forms of the conjugation the -î verbs have the same ending as the -î verbs. The third member of the Luwian group, Lycian, ignores the -î forms and in some instances we have
definite evidence for -ā forms of Hieroglyphic (and, presumably, of Cuneiform) which correspond to -tā forms of Lycian.

From a historical point of view the evidence now allows us to attribute to Common Luwian both a -tā and an -ā ending for the third person singular present (obviously -ā may represent an earlier diphthong). Common Luwian -ā must be compared with Hittite -ā, just as Common Luwian -tā must be compared with Hittite -tā (< -tā). It follows that -ā (or its phonetic antecedent) also belonged to Common Anatolian. This is not a new conclusion, but some of the data are new.

New data also confirm the old view that the -ā forms of Luwian belong to verbs which, except for the third person singular present, have the same personal endings as the -tā verbs. If we were to proceed in complete innocence of all that has been written about the origin of the -ā conjugation this ought to mean one of two things: either the Luwian languages inherited from Common Anatolian a contrast between two verbal conjugations and then lost it, except for the -tā / -ā contrast in the third person singular present, or Hittite inherited from Common Anatolian a -tā / -ā contrast which formed the starting point for the creation of two conjugations (these, in their turn, may have exploited inherited morphological material). To make sense of this statement, I should add perhaps that I want to speak of a contrast in conjugation, whenever this can be defined by a contrast in the endings of two or more verbal persons.

We may now shed our assumed ignorance. No doubt the communis opinio, which (in spite of numerous syntactical and semantic problems) sees a clear morphological connection between the endings of the Indo-European perfect (and perhaps middle) and those of the -ā conjugation, will reject the second hypothesis. I do not want to dispute this view. However, it is not easy to see why Luwian should have retained only the morphological contrast between -ā and -tā — all the more so since, to judge from Hieroglyphic, the -tā forms are not limited to a few residual verbs. In particular, if Luwian ever had an equivalent of *-tā (*-tā or the like) why should this form have been replaced by -tā (or -mtā) when the first person singular preterite was *-mtā? On the other hand, if we prefer to assume that the creation of the present forms, as contrasted with the inherited *-tā, *-tā, *-a, (Luwian -tā, *-mtā, *-a) does not go back to Common Anatolian, why should Luwian have created a new -ā (*-mā?) ending for the third person singular present and no new endings for the other persons of the present?

New data may indeed lead to salvation but the journey is long and tiring. The traveller must negotiate more obstacles than he expected, and there is no royal road to the kingdom of heaven. In my view whoever tries to explain the origin of the -ā conjugation must also explain why the Luwian conjugation came to have the form it had.

NOTES


2 The basic facts about the Luwian conjugation are stated in Neumann 1959, 388 ff. For the form of the *-tā type cf. Karruba 1968, 19 ff. The new trilingual does not seem to have altered our view of the conjugation (see Laroche 1974a and 1974b).

3 The Cuneiform Luwian texts are quoted from Otten 1953a. As mentioned above the new texts are not very helpful. KBo XIII, 260 offers a number of instances of the imperative la-a-la-ad-du, and KBo IX, 145.7 has the imperative la-a-la-na-du.

4 If *-u-i-ns-ē of KUB IX 31, obv. ii, 30 were a full verbal form it ought to be a third person singular rather than a second person singular imperative, since it occurs in a subordinate clause. Yet Karruba 1968, 13 ff. makes a good case for reading *y-a-i-ns-i-ns-an (rather than *y-a-i-ns-ē ns-an) and for taking the verb as a first person plural.

5 The texts are quoted according to Laroche 1960 and Laroche 1969. Implicit reference is always made to Meriggi 1966 for the edition of the texts and to Meriggi 1962a for the lexicon.

6 For the KULLU lead strips see Ösgår 1971, 111 ff. and Laroche ibid., 116-116. For KULLU fragm. I see Ösgår 1973, pl. XII-XIII, figs. 5-6.

7 Square brackets round a reference indicate that in that text the verb is partially restored.

8 CARCHEMISH A 6, 9 has a form 'MALLESS'-iz which is unique and presumably ought to be read 'MALLESS'-iz-ē (ē) or 'MALLESS'-iz-ē (ē).

9
An alternative translation is "for me Kupapas will take (it) (viz. the azur-mentioned previously) placed at (her) foot".

I have not discussed above the evidence for the verb PES₁(-)t̥d̥- or PES₂(-)t̥d̥-, because it is too uncertain, though it may be very relevant. CARCHMISH A 1, I has the first person sing. present PES₁(-)t̥d̥-wetš'-t̥- (cf. Hawkins 1972, 88 but correct ibid., 109 the note on para. 5); the third person sing. present 'PES₁(-)t̥d̥-i and 'PES₂-PES₂(-)t̥-t̥-i of SULTANHAN and DOH were listed in A.2.1. A third person plural present PES₁-PES₂(-)t̥-t̥-i is attested in ALEPPO 2,2 (cf. Morpurgo Davies, Hawkins 1979). A three person plural pretense 'PES₁-PES₂(-)t̥-t̥-i is found in BORÇA, 4' (Morpurgo Davies, Hawkins 1979). If all these forms belong to the same verb of movement, which seems likely, we have a good example of a conjugation with t̥d̥- or t̥-, and -t̥- endings in the present, and -t̥- in the pretense.

We should also mention the unique spelling PRAE-t̥-a of CARCHMISH A 6, 1 in lieu of the frequently attested PRAE-t̥; unfortunately here too the data are ambiguous. Houwink ten Kate 1961, 82 and 1965, 22 ff. has made a good case for two Luwian forms *p'ri and *p'riya continued by Lycian pr' and pr'يا pr'uya.

It seems to me unlikely that -ac continues *-a'̄-; i.e. the old 'perfect' ending + the -a element of the present; the odds are that the contraction is much earlier than the date of our texts.

The problems posed by Luwian have often been ignored; for a recent exception see Riehner 1975, but obviously he could not consider the Hieroglyphic data discussed above.
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