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The personal endings of the Hieroglyphic Luwian verb

The work of the last thirty years has shown that Hieroglyphic Luwian, in spite of its awkward writing system, has as great—if not greater—a contribution to make to the historical morphology of Anatolian as Cuneiform Luwian with its more legible but definitely scanty evidence. Both Indo European and Anatolian studies would gain if we could establish the exact morphology of the verbal inflection in the Luwian group but Cuneiform Luwian and Lycian offer only incomplete data. We need to reconsider the Hieroglyphic evidence; the last full statement about it is that by Meriggi in *Manuale I*, 63ff. (1966) and new data are now available.

The "standard" endings

As the other Anatolian languages Hieroglyphic Luwian distinguishes a present and a past tense and an indicative and an imperative mood in the finite verb; we are not yet in a position to make any useful statement about voice distinctions.

At present there is agreement about a limited set of endings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sing.</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Proterite</th>
<th>Imperative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>-us²</td>
<td>-us</td>
<td>-us</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>-us²</td>
<td>-is</td>
<td>-is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>-is</td>
<td>-ia</td>
<td>-ia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plur.</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Proterite</th>
<th>Imperative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>-ug⁵</td>
<td>-iug⁵</td>
<td>-iug⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>-ug⁵</td>
<td>-iu⁵</td>
<td>-iu⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>-ug⁵</td>
<td>-ia⁵</td>
<td>-ia⁵</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The gaps in the table indicate endings for which there is no clear-cut evidence available. Some of these slots can probably be filled, as we shall see below, but one ending must first be added to the table. This is an alternative form for the third person sing. present, and is written either -i or -ia. The evidence was discussed in detail in an earlier article, where no definitive conclusion was reached about the relationship between -i and -ia. It is likely that -ia is an alternative spelling for -i after vowel (all instances of -i and -ia, with one possible exception, seem to belong to -a-stems), but this cannot be proved. At any rate there is little doubt that -i and -ia correspond to the -i third person sing. pres. ending of the Hittite distinguish ideas and suggestions which originated from one rather than the other of us; in this occasion the attempt seemed futile and we did not make it: at the moment we both agree on the views expressed below.


³ In Hier. Luwian preconsonantal v is never written so that the third persons singular and plural (present, past and imperative) are always written in the same manner. A pronoun variation [niti], [nté] and [ntu] for the plural endings, though generally accepted, cannot be demonstrated. It is possible that in future a thorough study of root-cases may provide some evidence on this point.

The personal pronouns

As we have seen, the correct interpretation of the endings depends, in the first instance, on a correct analysis of the context in which they occur; in its turn this is often dependent on the correct identification of the pronouns present in the text. Since this is so, it seems advantageous to print here a table which summarizes our present state of knowledge about the personal pronouns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orthotonic</th>
<th>Enlictit</th>
<th>Possessive Adjectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>annu, mu</td>
<td>mu, mi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>tu, ti</td>
<td>tu, ti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. (Nom. (a)pus)</td>
<td>Nom. as, ata</td>
<td>(a)pasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Dat. tu)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflexive ti</td>
<td></td>
<td>tiis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plur.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>s-zu-za</td>
<td>(an)za</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>w-zu, w-zu</td>
<td>wa(za)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. (Nom. (a)panis)</td>
<td>Nom. ata</td>
<td>(a)pasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Dat. mat(za))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some of these forms are straightforward and are listed in Meriggi, Manuale I, 45f. It now seems clear that Hieroglyphic Luwian tends to use in connection with an orthotonic pronoun an enlitical form

6) The value zu of HH, no. 462 is established for the Empire period not only because of the evidence offered in Laroche, HH 24, 3, but also because of a new unpublished seal from Mekone (information by courtesy of Professor Laroche). For the later period we simply have no evidence for the value of this sign which regularly occurs in pronouns and appears only very rarely in geographical names. Our zu transliteration is only provisional.  

7) Since this form is always enlitical and regularly follows signs with a vocalism it is impossible to know if it must be read -aza or -ana, -na or -naz.

8) In the pronoun of second person plural Can. Luwian oscillates between nasalized and non nasalized forms (cf. Carruba, Die Sprache 14 (1948), 13ff. and especially 32). Hier. Luwian, because of its writing system, cannot provide any evidence for or against nasalization. The same problem exists also for the spelling -zu-za which may correspond to a nasalized -manza or to a non-nasalized -maza.

9) For enlitical ti used as a second person pronoun as well as a third person reflexive cf. Middelberger, Die Sprache, 9 (1963), 95f. For orthotonic ti see assim. 3, 1, 3: tu-ua versus -na "in front of you (sing."); for enlitical ti in the functions of a second person singular pronoun of, e.g. assim. a, 1 (citation (12) (v) below) and assim. c, 2 (citation (14) (ii) below); in the clauses renu-la-wa-ta-ta ... arba pararba "I asked thee"; api-la-wa-ta-ta ni arba manusa parauru "let me not ask thee (again)"; tu is matched by manu(za) of assim. e, 2; renu-la-wa-ma-te(za) ni manula arba pararba "let it not ask you (again)". Cf. also assim. f, 4: u-nu-za-wa/ti-u (ABINUS.ANIMAT) tara/i-la-za-ni-za u-ni-ta ti-za-ta "now if (there) is a mule to thee" (cf. Hawkins below p. 110f.).

---

- Reference is often made to a second person singular ending -a, but we now read -z instead of the present ending and we do not know of another attested -a ending. In assim. g, 3 Meriggi (Manuale II/1, 141) takes the form tu-za-za (t-i-a-sa in our transliteration) as the second person singular of the verb asa (to make). The new readings prevent us from identifying the form with any known verb and at present there is no reason not to take t-i-a-sa as a second person singular imperative. Obviously an -a ending may have existed, and indeed must have existed at some stage, but we have no direct evidence for it. See below note 25.
with the same functions; hence anu ... mi (in the stelae), anu ... mu (in the letters), ḍ-uzu-za ... (an)za, uz-uzu-za ... ma(n)za, etc. It does not seem that in the first and second persons singular and plural a distinction is made between different case forms, though (a) this may depend on the paucity of our evidence, (b) it is probable that the alternation between ti and tu in the second person singular and that between uz-uzu-za and uz-uzu in the second person plural may reflect earlier case distinctions.

We differ from Meriggi in recognising both an orthotonic and an enclitic tu as second person singular pronoun, though we have no clear examples of this form used in a nominative function 1). We assume that ḍ-uzu-za and uz-uzu-za (and probably (an)za and ma(n)za) can be used as nominatives because of the passage in ASSUR 1, 7 (see below citation 2) where uz-uzu-za ... ma(n)za seem to agree with a form of the verb ‘to be’ in the second person plural. This seems to imply that in ASSUR all constructions of the type: Orthotonic pronoun ... enclitic pronoun ... ha-tu-ā-ra/ū/ for a nominative pronoun and an understood form of the verb ‘to be’ in agreement with it (see below p. 91). On the other hand (an)za and ma(n)za can certainly be used also as accusatives and as datives.

The -tani ending

The first of the endings which we want to discuss, -tani, can be easily inserted in the slot of the second person plural present. It was first recognized by Mittelberger 19 in the following text:

(1) CARCHHMISH A 6, 7:
(i) | ḍ-uzu-l (LOGOS) ha-ru-ra/i-wa-wa| (DEUS) ku-an-it-pa-pa/ū |
(ii) uz-uzu-za-wa/i-ma-ta/-m(ANTUS) si-ta-ra/i-i/ MAGNUS ni-wa/i-ta-ni-ū/

"Then I shall cause (him) to say to Kubaba ‘you will make them great for me in the hand’.

There are some points of uncertainty in the translation. Kubaba could be in the vocative and the name could be the words quoted in direct speech. mu is identifiable in the particle chain -wa/i-ma-ta of (ii) -wa/mu-ata) and may call for a translation “in my hand”. uz-uzu-za seems to have nominative function and its presence makes it certain that -tani is a second person plural ending; context and morphology (the -t element) speak for a present form.
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A second instance of -tani has already been referred to:

(2) ASSUR 1, 1:
(i) ḍ-uzu-za ha-wa/i-za | ḍ-pi ] ha-tu-ā-ra/ū |
(ii) wa-wa | ha-ku-i-za | ha-tu-ā-ra/ū | ma(h) a | ha-ku-i-za | ha-tu-ā-ra/ū |
(iii) wa-wa | wa-wa | ha-tu-ā-ra/ū | ̄sa-ta-ni |

"We ourselves (are) to write; we (are) to write no letter; you yourselves are to write."

The interpretation of the apparently undeclineable form ha-tu-ā-ra/ū (i.e. hatu(an)u) causes difficulty. In view of (2) (iii) above the solution is that of taking it as a verbal noun (it can have an object: hatu(an)u) which can be construed with the verb ‘to be’, as the Hitite infinitive, with the meaning ‘I, we, you etc. am/are to hat(u), have to hat(u)’. Cf. Hitt. laḫšušmayanzi esem ‘I was to fight’, quoted by Friedrich, Elementarbuch 11, 143. In (iii) -sa-ta-ni must be read as astani “you are” (second person plural present).

In clauses such as (i) the presumption is that we have a nominal sentence and the verb ‘to be’ is understood. The question of the negative sentences such as (ii) then arises. An exact parallel is found in ASSUR d, 2 and another negative clause which can be compared occurs in ASSUR f, 2 (cf. Hawkins in this volume, p. 115f.). The obvious suggestion is that in (ii) and in the parallel passages the writer complains that, though in this occasion he is obliged to write, he has no letter to write or, less ambiguously, it is not his turn to write a letter, since it is the turn of the addressee. If so the meaning of (i), (ii), and (iii) could be: ‘We have to write, but we have no letter to write; it is you who have to write’. The emphasis of (iii) would explain the exceptional presence of the verb ‘to be’.

The existence of a -tani ending of second person plural present is contextually established; morphologically no problem arises from Mittelberger’s identification: -tani matches Hitite -teni 11).

The -ranu ending

To our knowledge this occurs only once in the sentence which immediately follows citation (2) above:

(3) Assur, 1:

[hr-ua/i] ḫ-pš [u-zî-na šurr-i] [ha-tu-ra/i-nu] [audurn-ta-à-ra/i-nu]

"Listen to your letter."

The sentence belongs to the normal repetitive style of letters, where the addressee is constantly reproached for having failed to write or not having listened to the writer’s requests. In this particular instance it probably opens a section where passages of an old letter are quoted; a new set of requests then starts with another frequent formula: “what is it, my letter?” It is not clear whether ṣ(u)nazzin ‘your’ refers to the letter received or written by the addressee; the former interpretation may be preferable.

The verb tuma(n)di- ‘hear, listen’ was identified by Hawkins, An.St. 25 (1975), 151 ff.¹². Here tuma(n)tarantu is likely to be a second person plural form, since the addressees, as we have seen, are referred to in this person (cf. also u(n)azzin ‘your’). The context does not give us any further indication about tense or mood. Yet, if we remember that -ranu may be a rhodatized form of -tanu, the morphology is more informative. It is unlikely that a present or past tense indicative form ends in -u, but in Anatolian, and in Hieroglyphic Luwian in particular, -u is the mark of the imperative. If we compare on the one hand the -tanu ending of the second person plural indicative present and on the other hand the third person singularal pros. -ti vs. the imperative -tu and the third person plural -ntu vs. the imperative -ntu, it seems legitimate to suggest that -ranu (from *-tanu) is an ending of second person plural imperative.

Two objections are possible. First, the sentence contains a relative element rel-i which contrasts with the idea of an imperatival clause; secondly Meriggi has tentatively identified a second person plural imperative ending -tu.

¹² Most of the evidence for this verb gives us a stem tuma(n)ti- which differs from tuma(n)tu- required here. Yet hesitations of this type are not rare in Hier. Luwian and can be compared with the parallel hesitations between -ai- and -a- found in Cun. Luwian (cf. Larochelle, DELL, 133 ff. and 141; the Cun. Luwian forms we have from this verb in tumamatisas, cf. Larochelle ibid., 69). For Hier. Luwian see e.g. pu-pa-la-ma (citation 13 (vii) below) and pu-pa-la-ma (CEKE A, 4; see below); (*224) ha-ta-la-i-ta (KARATEPE XXVI 135, Hu. and Ho.) and (*224) ha-ta-la-i-ta (KARATEPE XXVIII 144, Hu. and Ho.), etc. A possible -a- form of the verb ‘to hear’ is attested in CARIBEHESH A 11: c-a-u-a/i za-a-zu drus-mi-i-ti audurn-ta-à-ta/i-tu, where the two r- syllables of the ending may perhaps point to a middle form; at any rate the stem seems to have an -a- vocalism.

Yet, we pointed out elsewhere (An. St. 28 (1975), 113) that not all instances of rel-i have a subordinating value, as shown by a karatena clause which starts with rel-i but contains an imperative. In this particular instance, rel-i cannot be a relative pronoun in agreement with ‘letter’ (we would expect rel-i-nu) and the word order, with rel-i inserted between the possessive adjective and the noun with which this agrees, scarcely warrants the suggestion that rel-i is a subordinating conjunction. What it remains obscure, but its presence need not prevent us from recognizing an imperative in the verbal form.

As for the second objection mentioned above, Meriggi (Manuale I, 63 ff.) is extremely tentative in giving an imperative value to -ta; we shall see later that presumably -ta is a past tense indicative ending and as such is irrelevant to our interpretation of -ranu.

The conclusion is that -ranu < *-tanu is the ending of the second person plural imperative. For Cum. Luwian it is customary to recognize a -tan imperative ending which matches Hittite -ten¹⁵. It is not surprising that Hieroglyphic Luwian reinterpreted the inherited form with a final -u on the model of -tu and -ntu.

The -mi-na ending

This was identified long ago (see e.g. Meriggi, Manuale I, 64 with the reference to Burnett) and treated as an ending of 1st person plural proterite, mainly because of the similarity with Hit. -men or -men. In Hier. Luwian -mi-na forms occur in CEKE (dara-mi-na in B 11, 5 [twice], 4 [twice], 10; i-zi-la-mi-na in 1. 4; (*31) hi-sihi-mi-na in 1. 5 [twice]; ha-si-mi-na in 1. 5; (MANUS) rel-lä/i-um-mi-na in 1. 10), in Carchemish A 4, 1–2 (i-zi-la-mi-na, DARE-mi-na), in SULTANAHAN, 2 and base 9 (orus-mi-ua/-mi-na, i-zi-la-mi-na), and in the Külêli lead strips (dare-mi-na in strip 1, rev. 4 [3 times], rev. 6; strip 2, obs. 1, 2). Conceivably an example can also be found in ṭūn 2 (CAPUT, SCULPIT[es]-ku-ı-mi-na).¹⁶ There can be little doubt that -mi-na is a plural ending: CEKE where two people are involved in the basic agreement (see Hawkins, An. St. 29 (1979), 160 f.) is the main evidence for it. We reach the conclusion that -mi-na indicates first person plural for a number of reasons, but mainly because the first SULTANAHAN passage points to a first

¹⁵ Cf. Larochelle DELL, 142 and Cardona, Die Sprache 14 (1968), 13 ff.

person and because we can exclude the first person singular present
(for iziyya- 'make' this is izi-ia-na/i) and the first person singular
preterite (for pia/ja- 'give' this is pia/ja-ha). Moreover, since contextually
a singular is excluded and a second person plural is excluded too (by practically all the texts mentioned), there only remains the
possibility of a first or third person plural. Yet we know that for
e.g. pia/ja- the third person plural present and preterite are respectively
piaja/i and piaja/i that excludes piaja/i. From this grammatical
slot.

We have seen that it is normally assumed (on etymological con-
siderations) that -mi-na is a preterite ending. This needs closer
analysis.

In Cebcent B the heading mentions two people, Kamanis the ruler
and Sasturas, his first servant, who bought (?) the city of Kamanis
from the Kamanis people and gave them 600 donkeys. The verbs are
"is 34(4)\text{34}^{-j}-ia-na and daria-na, two third persons plural preterite.
After this we have an abrupt change and all following clauses have
-mi-na verbal forms.

An example follows:

(4) Cebcent B, 2-3:

(i) 3a-crujer-ri pared-ia-ia-inf Анаш of 1 "3257"-ri + 4 scalar 3-0-ma-
na-zi 3257-za 3a/i-ri-pa-ta-ia-ia infáns-0-mi-ia za dar-
i

(ii) is-ia-ia 3a-pa-ri-ia-ia 3a-ia-ia-ia 4 scalar 3-0-ma-zi
3257-za X-nil-he-ia-ia (3258) daremi-na

"(and they gave to them 600 donkeys),
we give to the children of Warpaia . .
. . .
to Labarnas and Zaataba" we give . . . ."

The shift from third to first person reminds us of that which
occurs (in the singular) in the last part of Katarne. There, how-
ever, a verb of saying accounts for it (Katarne LXX ff.; "If anyone
from among the kings . . . proclaims this I shall delete . . .", or
if he is covetous and proclaims thus 'I shall . . .'). In Cebcent there is
no verb which introduces the first person plural forms but it has
been suggested that the heading is followed by the words pro-
nounced by Kananis and Sasturas when ratifying some form of
contractual agreement (cf. Hawkins, loc. cit.). If so, we may a
priori expect either present or past tense and the past tense of
daremi-na 'they gave' cannot help us in our decision. It could be
argued that an agreement is normally made in the present, but
this cannot be proved. Needless to say these considerations also
apply to all other -mi-na verbs used in Cebcent B in parallel clauses.

The text of Cebcent A 4, which has a number of parallel
classes to Cebcent, is too broken to be much of help, but the two
passages from Sultanah deserve quotation.

Sultanah, 1-2:

(i) 3a-pa-ia-ia (32) tonitrus-hu-xa-ia | 3a-ia-ia-ia 3a/i-ri 3a-ia-ia-ia
3a-ia-ia-ia (32) daremi-na

(ii) 3a-ia-ia 3a-ia-ia 3a-ia-ia 4 scalar 3-0-ma-ia-ia-ia
3257-za (32) onu-ia-ia (32) daremi-na

"(I am . . .)
I set up this Tarhunzas of the vineyard;
we set (him) up with an ox and 9 Ar<Base>ma sheep."

The presumption is that the verb tanuwa/min is in the past be-
cause of the preceding tanuwa/a(7), but we ought to remember
that while the first clause records the (past) establishment of a cult,
the second states (or may state) what the ritual is going to be and
what sacrifices are in order; in other words, it may refer to the
future too(19).

---

18) arma-j could be a derivative of arma- 'month' attested in Ceb. Luwyn
and in Lyceon (röm); this was originally suggested by Larocque (HHH, p.67;
cf. also Morrigi, Glossor 33) but we still cannot prove it.

19) Morrigi, Manusale 11/1, 116, prefers to take tanuma/n as a partitive
accusative in agreement with Tanumam of the previous clause, but this
obliges him to end the clause with 3-a/a-ia-ia 3a-ia-ia-ia-ia, which is best taken
as part of the next clause: 3-a/a-ia-ia 3a-ia-ia-ia 3a-ia-ia-ia 4 scalar 3-0-ma-ia-
aia, which is the nomial term of the ritual which follows, has a -ia verb (tata) and an imperative respectively. This may perhaps explain the puzzle about the tense of tata first discussed in An.St. 28
(1978), 112 and then in Postscripts, Stromberg, p. 577ff., esp. 597ff.
(6) SULTANHAN, base 8-9:

(i) [mi]-pa-wa/i-ta | urbs + mi-ni | rel-sa ha | ka-ti-i | grus-i
(ii) ni-pa-wa/i-ta | ("terra") la-ka-mi | rel-sa ha | ka-ti-i | la-i
(iii) mi-pa-wa/i-ta lewa/na | rel-sa ha | ka-ti-i | grus-i
(iv) [api]-wa/i-ta - (rel-ti-ta i) | neptis + ra/i-ta i | tzi-la-mi-ni
(v) a-wa/i | ka-ti-i-sa | ni-i | asa-tu-u
"or whoever stands for/in katis to the city,
or whoever stands for/in katis to the land,
or whoever stands for/in katis to the stele,
(then) we shall act by royal authority;
let there be no katis."

This is part of the curse, where, as normal, 'if' clauses and 'whoever' clauses are mixed. ta-i/grus-i is clearly present tense (cf. Festeschrift Szemerényi, p. 584ff), katis must be a nefarious action and (iv) and (v) must refer to the consequences which will follow the action of the evil-doer. A past translation does not seem possible for itiyanum."

Finally we come to the KULULU strips; a few examples from these extremely formulaic texts will suffice:

(7) KULULU strip 1, rev. 4:

(i) 200 "*170" : ha-ha-la 'dare-mi-na
(ii) 200 "*170" : toniteus : ha-na-za-ia dare-mi-na
(iii) 10 "*170" : pu-la-i-ia | sum-mi tu-na-sa | (urbs)
"we give 200 . . . to Hahas,
we give 200 . . . to Tarhunazas,
10 . . . for/with Pulas of the city Tunam."

(8) KULULU strip 2, 1:

(i) 32 (obis) ha-wa/i-na | mu-wa/i-bi-sa | ni-ia pi/ta-i
(ii) 68 obis-na | ha-li-sa | bu-di-ra/i-sa-ta-i | pi-i-ta | ku-li-sa-la-za
| rel-za | wa/i-si-i

Nor does it seem possible to follow Meriggi (Manuale II/1, 120) who tentatively translates katis with 'tribute' comparing (escalpum) ka-ti-na (which we prefer to take as a neuter plural katina, since it agrees with sumu) and renders (v) with: "(saying): 'thus we have done for royal command'."
The shift to a pluralis maiestatis seems as natural here as in citation (5) above.

9) For the KULULU lead strips, which have not yet been fully published, see T. Oşgüç, Külçepe and Its Vicinity in the Iron Age, Ankara 1971, 111ff. and Laroche, ibid., 114-118. For KULULU fragm. 1, see Oşgüç, Anadolu 17 (1973), 1-30.
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(iii) 140 obis 7 la-ru-i | dare-mi-na | d-saḫ-ia-ia-la-ra/i-ti (urbs)
(iv) 40 obis-sa | mu-nu-i-ia | magnum + ra/i-ti-ia-li
"Mawahis gives 32 sheep to Nis.
Lalis gives 68 sheep to Pašisasas because/so that to the
KUKISAT's . . .
We give 140 sheep to the 7 statues from the City Ashaialari-
40 sheep for Nunus the Uriyalu."

The formulae are very repetitive. In strip 1 the few dare-mi-na clauses alternate with non verbal clauses which contain the name of the recipient in the dative (possibly with a patronymic and/or an ethnic adjective) and the preposition cum-ni (cf. (7) (iii)). In strip 2 we have a) simple datives (cf. (8) (iv)); b) formulae with piyanti "will give, gives" as in (8) (i); c) formulae with piyan "they (will) give" or askanti "they (will) bring (?)' and no subject (as in strip 2, 4); d) formulae with dare-mi-na as in (8) (iii). The texts obviously indicate simple economic transactions, but all the non ambiguous verbs are always in the present, which would make it very difficult to take dare-mi-na as a preterite. This evidence agrees with that of citation (6) above.

The conclusion is that the contextual evidence for -mi-na, or -min (as we can read this ending), favours a first person plural and that a present fits better some of the passages quoted as a preterite. This may seem to conflict with the comparative evidence, since, on the model of Hittite (though not of other Indo-European languages), we would expect an -s form for the present. However, -min causes philological difficulties in any case (why the -i- vocalism?) and, as we shall see, in Hior. Luwian the slot of the 1st person plural preterite must be filled by a different form. Quite obviously the comparison with Hittite cannot be taken too far and some restructuring has taken place in the system of personal endings."

The -ha-na ending

There are four occurrences of -ha-na verbal forms, all in the ASUR letters (**69**) - ha-na-ia in ASUR b, 2, g, 4; **69** - wa/ i-si-ha-na in f, 3, and MORI-ha-na in s, 3.

9) Carrube, loc. cit., argues for a Cum. Luwian first person plural present -un(s) and for a first person plural preterite -man; the latter ending is attested, according to him, in the form ba-u-na-i-sa-na-an. This seems plausible, but I wonder whether the context necessarily calls for a past rather than a present verb.

7 Zeitschr. f. vgl. Sprachf., Bd. 94, Heft 1/2
The personal endings of the Hieroglyphic Luwian verb

The passages need to be discussed in full:

(9) ASSUR b, 1-2:
  (i) [u-nu-¼-pa-wa/i-mu |t:i-na |sa-na |("LOQU")ma-á-ra/i-ti-na
      [cux-ni |i-¼-ia-]
  (ii) [à-pa/i |p:i |ku-ru-pi |REL-iA |("*286:*317")wa/i-á-ra/i-ma
      [LEPUS-qua-¼-da-la-ia |ARHA- |("*69")-wa-ha-na
  (iii) wa[i-á-ra/i |("*69")ha-ra/i-xa
  (iv) wa[i-¼-ma-á-ra/i |ARHA- |VIA-wa/i-ni
      "Now do for me this one bidding:
      what WARAMA TAPASALATA we missed for the KURUPI, 
      get them, 
      send them out to me."

(10) ASSUR g, 4:
  (i) [à-pa/ha-wa/i- |("LEPUS")la-qua-¼-da-la-ia |("*286:*317")
      wa[i-ar[i-¼-ma- |ku-ru-pi |á-¼-mi- |á-¼-ta-ia |ARHA- |("*69")-sa-ha-na
  (ii) [á-¼-pa/-i-qua-wa/i |POXUS-ni- |á-¼-da-la ARHA- |("*69")-sa-ha-
  (iii) wa[i-á-ra/i- |("*69")ha-ra/i-xa
  (iv) wa[i-¼-ma-á-ra/i ARHA- |VIA-wa/i-ni
      "and we missed TAPASALAYA WARAMA for my KURUPI 
      and I missed them for the house (palace?) . . . 
      get them, 
      send them out to me."

The two passages are obviously parallel. As usual in these letters our knowledge of the vocabulary is not sufficient to give a full translation. The verb "*69"-sa- occurs in two other passages, but always in the letters (imperative third pers. singular "*69"-sa-" in ASSUR o, 2; second pers. sing. present "*69"-sa-" in ASSUR f, 2). It seems that the meaning 'miss' fits all contexts; for the reading san-, further discussion, and a very tentative comparison with Hittite šanḫ-, cf. Hawkins in this periodical p. 116 f., citations (5) and (6).

In citation (9) the letter is sent by one writer only; in citation (10) by two writers (or by one plus one or more members of his family or group). However, the letters continuously oscillate between 'I' and 'we', 'thou' and 'you'. In ASSUR a, Talsalas, the same writer as of citation (9), speaks of 'our writing' and of 'you', though he addresses one person only; in f and g the addressee(s) is/are alternatively asked to do things for 'us' and for 'me'; whatever the value of -ha-na we notice in citation (10) (i ii) that a -ha-na verb is coordinated with a first person sing. preterite of the same verb. Since there is no subject stated for "*69"-sa-ha-na the most likely hypothesis is that we are dealing with a first person; the verb which follows speaks for a preterite but excludes the 1st person sing. preterite (which ends in -ha) so that -han(a) seems to be a first person plural preterite ending.

(11) ASSUR f, 3:
  (i) [pa-ra[i-¼-la-ri-i [ha-wa/i-tu-u |("*78")á-tu-na-ri:i |REL-iA-
      |("*69")-jea/i-za-na |"*69"-[jea/i-zi-ha-na
  (ii) wa[i-za |OMNIS-MI-za |"VIA"-wa/i-ni
      "And which WAZA we WAZI ed to you (sing.) from/with the 
      PARALI ATUNI, 
      send all to us."

In (ii) OMNIS-MI-za is taken as a Nom.-Acc. sing. neuter (tananimaza); it would be possible to read OMNIS-MI-za and take the word as a dative plural in agreement with -anaz to 'us', but cf. ASSUR e, 3: á-wa/i OMNIS-MI-za SUM-ni POKER-ur "put everything together".

In (i) the verb seems to have an internal accusative (conceivably "we requested a request" or the like). The interpretation of the sentence and of the -han(a) ending depends on the meaning of the verb and its object. If the meaning suggested were correct, a first person plural would be possible.

(12) ASSUR a, 3:
  (i) [ARHA-ha-wa[i-mu-u |REL-ri:i |MORI-ha-na
  (ii) wa[i-¼-mu-u |wa-ra/i-¼- |("*476:*311")-á-ti-la-ia
      "As for me, as if we had died, 
      you Aliya' ed me with/in your (letter?) ."

For the full context and a more detailed analysis of it see below citation (13); for the verb 'to die' see the article by Hawkins in this periodical, p. 109 ff. The presence of both -mu- and -ha-na in (i) ought to induce us to take -ha-na as a singular ending, but for the verb 'to die' we have elsewhere (KULULU 2, B 2) a -ha 1st person sing. preterite (cf. Hawkins below p. 113). A first person singular
present does not seem likely in this context (and in any case we would expect a -we ending) so that we are induced to take -ha-na as a marker of first person plural; a preterite seems preferable to a present. In view of the hesitations mentioned above between 'I' and 'we', 'thou' and 'you' the sequence -mu ... -ha-na need not surprise us.

The final verb of (ii) is a hapax; meanings such as "you took notice", "you treated" or even "you neglected" would be possible. For the translation as a second person sing, preterite see below citation (13).

None of the passages where -ha-na occurs is entirely clear, but a first person plural seems likely in all instances and contextually a preterite seems to be preferable to a present. The ending, which presumably is to be read -han, has no parallel in other Anatolian languages, but an innovation is not difficult to explain. It can be treated as an analogical formation built on the first person sing. preterite -ha to which a pluralizing -n was added. If we are right in interpreting -mi-na, i.e. -min, as an ending of first person singular present, a model for the evolution may perhaps be found in the present. The first person sing, present ending was -we and we know that in Cun. Luwian this alternated with -mi due to dissimilation; we also know that the early Anatolian languages show frequent hesitations between -w- and -m-. It is conceivable that this led to a neutralization of the -w-/m- contrast in some positions. If so, -min may have been felt as differing from -we only or mainly because of the final -n; the creation of -han alongside -ha would have introduced into the preterite a contrast parallel to that between the first person singular and the first person plural of the present.

A pluralizing -n may also have been segmented in the second person plural preterite ending. We have no direct evidence for it in Hier. Luwian, but we know that the Cun. Luwian form was -tan and, in view of the Hier. present -tani, we may suspect that -tan was the form of the Hieroglyphic preterite too. Below I shall argue that Hieroglyphic Luwian had a second person sing. preterite ending -ta; if so, -han could have arisen from an analogical proportion such as 2nd pers. sing. pret. -ta; 2nd pers. plur. pret. -tan = 1st pers. sing. pret. -he; 1st pers. plur. pret. X, where X = -han.

We do not need to elaborate on this point, but whatever the exact explanation of -han, there is little doubt that this form is much easier to understand as a past than as a present. In other words, even on merely morphological grounds, it would seem necessary to attribute to -han past value and to -min present value rather than vice-versa.23)

The -ta ending

The spelling -ta indicates the third person singular or third person plural preterite endings: -ta and -tona respectively. However in the assum letters we have at least three examples—and possibly more—of -ta verbal forms which contextually seem to indicate a second person singular preterite.

(13) ASSUR A, 1–3:

(i) *[ba-zu-za] in Rel-Pa-ti-ua/-ra/-ia  
(ii) *[mu]-ha-za-ya-za-wa/-ra/i/-ia *"(LOGIC)"ha-ri-i-ia-i  
(iii) *[sa-na-wo]/ra/-i  
(iv) *[da]-zu-za-za-wa/-ia  
(v) *[n]-na-wo/-ia-ia *"ARIA"  
(vi) *[wu]/ru/-ia-ia-ia  
(vii) *[ne]-wo/-ia/"ar/"-zi-ia  
(viii) *(78)*da-za-za-za-za-wa/-ia  
(ix) *[ko]-ha-za-wa/-ia  
(x) *[mu]-wia/-ia  

(1) "Speak to Kwiapitwara.

(ii) Takalsas says:

(iii) you (sing.) will live well.

(iv) We ourselves (are) to write.

(v) Now I asked you (sing.) with/in your (plur.) (letter?)

(vi) you did not write a letter to me.

(vii) Did not Tarpams move this and that to Carchemish?

(viii) Why did you not send to me the AUN?

(ix) As for me, as if we had died,

(x) you Aliya' ed me/with/in your (letter?)."

The text continues with three clauses of the type; "but now send (2nd pers. sing. imperative) to me . . . "

---

23) The position of Cun. Luwian is not yet certain (see note 21), but it would seem that Hier. Luwian here differs from the earlier language. The assumption is that the later language has reorganized the system and created a new ending for the first person plural preterite.
The translation has a number of hypothetical points. In (iii) the meaning of magnum_pugnus-si is based on that of the pugnus-pugnus-verb of kariqer XXI, where, on the basis of the Phoenician ‘bd, we had previously translated sur-na-na pugnus-pugnus-as ‘serve’; however ‘live under’ would be equally suitable there and would provide an acceptable formula here. If so, in (iii) the final particle could be -ni, i.e. the reflexive -ni, which would impress a mediaval value to the verb.

saneva, the neuter plural Nom.-Acc. of sana-w ‘good’, could come to mean ‘well’, but if so we miss the needed -sea- particle. Alternatively we could recognize in the first word an adverbial sana with a similar value.

In (v) we find a verb parara- which occurs in two other passages of the assur letters (e, 2 and e, 3); its meaning is guessed from these contexts. u-zu-ra-i-i in the same clause looks like the ablative of the possessive adjective u-zii ‘your’, but could conceivably be a form of the personal pronoun ‘you’. If it means ‘your’ or ‘yours’ it can refer to a letter or a dispatch, but there may be ambiguity between the letter written and that received by the addressee. The assur letters do not seem to be always consistent in their use.

In (vi) it would come natural to translate (“loquor”) pu-pa-la-ta with ‘answer’ or the like, but the verb also occurs in CHAIFA, 4 (Hawkings’ collation) which reads:

za-ha-wa-i stel-n-z(a) da-pa-sa pu-pa-la-ta

“he wrote this stèle himself.”

An attempt at finding a meaning suitable both for CHAIFA (where the author of the inscription reports about his deeds) and for assur yields something like ‘write’, ‘compose’, ‘dictate’.

In the clause that follows (vii) tarpamis must be the subject; it may be a proper name but need not (cf. An. Sl. 25 (1975), 136). The verb “tesis”(-a)-ra-si-ta must be compared with “tesis”(-a)-ra-si-wa-si of assur f, 4, which is intransitive: a-wa-sa-wa-si (“tesis”) pa ra/si-ta, i-ri-i arba’a, “tesis”(-a)-ra-si-ta “shall I move around on foot?” or “I am moving around on foot”. Here it is possible that we have

38 If the meaning ‘write’ is correct, it is tempting to connect the verb with the root pu_‘write’ now attest in Lydian (pupwa, puds; cf. Laroche, Poulilles de Xanthos VI, Paris 1976, 71). pupwa could have arisen through syncope from *pupwala or *pupicola; in this form this could be a denominative from a reduplicated root followed by the -ala/suffix. At the moment the suggestion cannot be proved.
-ta which matches the attested -ta ending of the second person singular preterite in the Hittite -bi conjugation. From a comparative point of view this finding, if correct, is welcome.

The -ti-sa ending

With one possible exception in an obscure passage LTTUS (+)ma-
ti-sa in BOYDEYMAR Text 2, IV D 1) this ending too is not attested outside the Assur letters. Here we have two occurrences of u-si-ti-sa (both in Assur c, 3), two of LTTUS(+)+na-ti-sa (Assur c, 4 and g, 1) and two of *77+raži-ti-sa (Assur c, 4 and g, 2). Finally Assur e, 1 has a form u-sa-la-mu-ti-sa in an obscure context, but this may well be a noun rather than a verb.

(14) ASSUR c, 1–3:
(i) u-u-la-ma-za | ha-tu-à-rafì
(ii) ď-pi-ha-wa/i-tu-u-la | ni-i’ | arha’a | ma-nu-la | pa-rai-â-rafì-wa/i
(iii) ď-pi-ha-wa/i-mu-la | nga’ì’ | rel-ha-na | u-si-ti-sa
(iv) wa/i-mu-la | *187(-)tu-wa/i-i-za | rel-sa | u-si-ti-sa
(v) wa/i-mu-la | 10 ha-sà-pi-na | 100 ha-wa/i-mu | *187(-)sà-mi-la’-na | via-wa/i-nì

(i) “You (plur.) yourselves (are) to write.
(ii) And let me not (again) ask you (sing.),
(iii) and you do not bring anything to me.
(iv) Why do you bring to me tuwia?
(v) Send to me 10 hasi and 100 sumila to me.”

For the verb parara- of (ii) see above citation 13. In (iii) and (iv) the exact meaning of the verb u-sì- is difficult to establish: cf. Hawkins, An. St. 25 (1975), 140.

From the context wisiu seems to be a second person either present or past. Here it is not easy to establish whether it is singular or plural, but the tu ‘thee’ of (ii) may speak for a singular.

(15) ASSUR c, 3–4:
(i) (LTTUS)‘ma-pa-sà-la-ia-ha-wa/i | (*286.217)wa/i-à-rafì-ma’ì
| rel-ta-ha | LTTUS(+)+na-ti-sa | 4-si | ni-pa-wa/i | bà-nà’ì | (*78”)d–ru-ti-nì
(ii) wa/i-mu-u | via-wa/i-nì

(iii) ha-la-ra/i-la-ha-wa/i-mu-u | sa-na-wa/i-ia | via-wa/i-nì
“And wherever you see tapalaya warama, 4 or 5 aruti, send (them) to me.
And send to me good halarla.”

The passage continues directly from citation (14) above. Cf. also citations (9) and (10). For the verb LTTUS(+)+na- ‘see’, cf. Hawkins, “The logogram LTTus and the verbs ‘to see’ in Hieroglyphic Luwian”. Kadmos 19 (1980), 109ff., esp. p. 133.

(16) ASSUR g, 1:
(i) ď-pi-wa/i-à-rafì-i | 11 | (“*78”)d–ru-ti-sa
(ii) ni-pa-wa/i-à-rafì | nga’ì’ | wa/i-mi-LTTUS-sì
(iii) ď-wa/i-ì | LTTUS(+)+na-ti-sa | rel-la-ha | 10 | (“*78”)d–ru-ti-na
(iv) wa/i-mu-u | via-wa/i-nì

“To you (sing.) (there are) 11 aruti’s—
or do you (sing.) not find them?
Wherever you see 10 aruti’s send (them) to me.”


In (15) (i) we need a second person verb; the imperative second person singular which follows speaks for a singular and the context for a present. In (16) (iii) too a second person singular present is needed; the singular is required because of the indicative singular which precedes (ending -si) and the imperative singular which follows; a present fits the context much better than a past.

(17) ASSUR e, 4:
(i) [NSHAN-ni-ha-wa/i-mu | tu-wa/i-nà | oum-nì | *77+raži-ti-sa
(ii) [TRAM-wa/i] [đ-mu | na-wa/i-ì | rel-sa | rel-sà-ha’ì | LTTUS(+)+u-
ni-tì

“And to me you will promise your (sing.) child,
whom never before me shall anyone know.”

For the translation see Hawkins, An. St. 25 (1975), 131. In (i) the context would allow a present or past tense, but a second person singular seems very likely in view of the possessive lusin ‘thy’. It is easy to imagine a clause such as ‘thou didst promise thy child
to me", but very difficult to suppose to suppose the existence of e.g. "you did promise thy child to me". See citation (18) below.

(18) ASSUR G, 2:

(i) [ti-va-zi-xa |tu-u-zi-na |fnans-zi-na |cum-mu **77+rāği-ti-va
(ii) wa-zi-xa LIITU(+)na-ti-va

"you (sing.) will promise your (sing.) child to us.

Will he/she see us?" (or "He/she will see us.")

This is the last paragraph of ASSUR G (for the order of reading in ASSUR F and G see Hawkins, An. St. 26 (1975), 141) and contains the writer's final request. The passage is obviously parallel to that of citation (17). In (i) a second person singular seems guaranteed by the presence of orthotonic ti 'thou' and of tuvin 'thy'. A past is in theory possible but a present is at least as possible and probably more likely.

The MÖKHAYNAKI passage is too obscure to be discussed here (cf. Hawkins, An. St. 20 (1970), 92 and Hawkins, Kadmos 19 (1980), p. 134. The interpretation of the -ti-va ending must rest on the passages quoted above. If so, it seems that we ought to accept Meriggi's opinion (implicit in Manuale I 68 and in Glossar, passim) and treat -ti-va (or -ti-a) as a second person singular present ending. From a grammatical point of view, however, we must notice that the slot is already filled by -si, an ending whose etymology presents no difficulty. We then have to face the possibility that both -si and -ti are second person singular present endings, just as both -ti and -i (-ia) are third person singular present endings.

We have seen that -ti and -i can be compared with Hitittite -ti and -i, i.e. with the third person present singular endings of the Hitittite -mi and -hi conjugations. Hier. Luwian -si obviously matches the Hitittite second person singular ending of the -mi conjugation; -ti has no exact parallel, but can be explained if we assume that a -ti ending (which matched the second person singular present ending of the Hitittite -hi conjugation) was redefined with an -s element characteristic of the second person singular. -si (presumably from *-tai-s) would then correspond to the preterite second person singular ending -to discussed above.22)

We could have hoped that, just as the -si second person singular forms correspond to -ti third persons, the -ti second persons would have corresponded to -i or -ia third persons. Unfortunately the evidence is very scanty. Admittedly we have no -si forms for the verbs which yield -i or -ia third persons and the -ti forms belong, with one exception, to verbs which are rarely attested.23) However, for one verb (LIITU(+)na- 'see'), we have besides a -tis form (cf. citations (16) and (17)), a third person sing. present LIITU(+)na-ti-va (or -na-ti-i, a first person sing. preterite LIITU(+)na-ta and a third person sing. preterite LIITU(+)na-ta (for the data see Hawkins, Kadmos 19, 190 f.). In other words it looks as if, in this instance at least, the same verb had both a -ti third person singular and a -tis second person singular. This is surprising in view of the etymological suggestions made above, but not unduly so. Hitittite verbs with a mixed conjugation are frequent; it is probable that a later Anatolian language, in which the two conjugations did not exist as such, i.e. were not productive as separate categories, showed a higher level of mixture.

That this may be the right explanation in the case of the verb 'to see' is also suggested by the third person singular LIITU(+)na-i of SULTANHAN 5:

[wa]-la[i] |da-pa-sa-ha |da-pa-sa-xa |sa-na-wa[i]-ia-xa |za-ri+i |la-[la [-LIITU, LIITU(+)na-i]

"he too shall look upon his good hero".

It seems plausible that the verb is built on the same root as LIITU(+)na-?, perhaps with a reduplication. If so, in contrast with the simplex, the reduplicated root would have an -i ending for the third person singular.

22) An -s ending is not attested in Hier. Luwian (see note 5) but there is little doubt that at some stage such an ending must have existed in Indo-European and in Anatolian. For Cun. Luwian see Laroöe, DLL, 142.

23) The other two verbs, wa- and **77+rāği, are not very well attested. For wa- the problem is whether it is the same verb as uwa. If this is the case, we have from uwa- a first person sing. present (PŠUL-[a]-a-wa[i] (ANDAYAL, 2), a first person sing. preterite ("swa")su-[a]-ha (XARRATHES, XXIX 148) and probably a third person plural present u-[a]-tis (XUROUL strip 2, rev. 4). Of the verb **77+rāği we only know the forms **77+rāği-tis and **77+rāği-ta (ASSUR F, 3).

24) It seems possible that Cun. Luwian too had an ending -tis attested in KUB XXXV 139 12 2a: za-su-[a]-ti-ba | a-[a]-ti-ba | ya-[a]-ti-ba, which may mean "you (sing.) will eat well, you will drink well" (cf. also Hawkins in Papers of the XXVI Rencontre Assyriologique, Copenhagen 1980, p. 221, with reference to Neumann, and emend the text). This translation is not compatible with taking the form wattani of the previous clause as a second person plural, as suggested by Carruba, Die Sprache 14 (1988), 16.
The personal endings: a more complete table

If the conclusions reached above are correct, a table of the personal endings of the Hieroglyphic Luwian verb may look as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Pret.</th>
<th>Imperative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>-wí</td>
<td>-há</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>-si</td>
<td>-ís</td>
<td>-iá</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>-sí</td>
<td>-sí</td>
<td>-sí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plur.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>-mín</td>
<td>-han</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>-sóni</td>
<td>-són</td>
<td>-rámnu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>-wí</td>
<td>-nsá</td>
<td>-ntá</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is not the place in which to discuss the linguistic implications of these results, beyond the few hints given above, or in which to attempt a full etymological analysis of the endings.

It will be sufficient to notice that the existence of a -ísis endings for the second person present singular partially contradicts what was stated in Festskrift Szemerényi (p. 605ff.) about the way in which the -i/-i (-iá) pair offered the only productive parallel to the Hittite contrast between -mi and -bi conjugations. However, before reaching any further conclusion, we need much more evidence for the productivity of the -ísis ending and for the inflectional type to which -ísis belongs.

The second person singular pretérite -tá may offer another example (besides -há) of the generalization of an ending which, in Hittite terms, belongs to the -hi conjugation, but here too we need more evidence and above all more instances of second person singular pretérite forms. If confirmed, the existence of a second person singular -tá may also help to account for the form of the -tá and -nts endings of third person singular and plural.

We argued above that the -han ending of first person plural pretérite is easily explained as an innovation based on the first person singular -há; we must also acknowledge that it is less easy to account for the present tense value of -mín and for its i-vocalism.

Somerville College, Oxford

Anna Morpurgo Davies

---

1) It is noticeable that, if we are correct, Hier. Luwian would not make any distinction between the second and third persons singular of the pronouns and between the second and third persons singular of the pretérite verb.