ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR VERGLEICHENDE SPRACHFORSCHUNG

BEGRÜNDET VON ADALBERT KUHN

HERAUSGEGEBEN VON

CLAUS HAEBLER

UND GÜNTER NEUMANN

94. BAND
1980

die Annahme, daß das heth. Wort ein *n*-stämmiges Wurzelnomen
*$g^u en$- fortsetzt, wie es bisher nur für das Altirische zu sichern ist[40];
vor allem die oben beschriebene Entwicklung von *ns* spricht da-
gegen[41]. Jungheth. Sg. N. SAL-*naš* [*$guenanzanas$] ist schließlich
als sekundärer Übergang in die *a*-Deklination zu verstehen, der
auch sonst bei den *n*-Stämmen festzustellen ist (vgl. Sg. A. *ḫaran*
gegenüber älterem *ḫaranan*; HW[1] 56).

Institut für Indogermanistik,   F r a n k   S t a r k e
Phonetik und Slavische Philologie
Sektion Idg. Sprachwissenschaft u. Indologie
Georg-Voigt-Str. 8
6000 Frankfurt 1

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 defi-
nitely 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, 63 ff. (1966) and new data are now available[1].

---

[40] W. Meid, KZ 80, 1966, 271 f.; E. P. Hamp, EC 14, 1974, 194; ders.,
BBCS 27, 1978, 214 (Diese Literaturhinweise verdanke ich Herrn Prof.
G. Neumann). Vgl. jetzt noch E. P. Hamp, KZ 93, 1979, 1 ff., wo erstmals
auch das Heth. (S. 2, Anm.) in die Diskussion eingeführt wird.

[41] Der Sg. N. *išpanz* „Nacht" (Obliquusstamm: *išpant°*) statt *$^*išpāš$ <
*$^*ksp\text{-}\acute{e}n\text{-}s$ zeigt mit N. Oettinger (vgl. Anm. 39) eine sekundäre Entwicklung.

[1] This paper was written in close collaboration with Mr. Hawkins and
is the result of many years of common work and discussions. Our views on
the personal endings recently became more definite on the occasion of yet
another joint reading of the ASSUR letters and we felt it was useful to collect
the evidence for them in this form. The paper appears over one signature
only, but in the past it has proved difficult—and often impossible—to

The "standard" endings

As the other Anatolian languages Hieroglyphic Luwian distin-
guishes a present and a past tense and an indicative and an impe-
rative 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:

		Present	Preterite	Imperative
Sing.	1.	-*wi*[2]	-*ha*	
	2.	-*si*[2]		-∅
	3.	-*ti*	-*ta*	-*tu*
Plur.	1.			
	2.			
	3.	-*nti*[3]	-*nta*[3]	-*ntu*[3]

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[4], 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.

For the abbreviations used in what follows see J. D. Hawkins, A. Mor-
purgo Davies, G. Neumann, 'Hittite Hieroglyphs and Luwian: new evidence
for the connection', *Nachr. Ak. Wiss. Göttingen*, Phil.-Hist. Kl. 1973 Nr. 6,
pp. 143–197 [HHL], at p. 145 note. The transliteration follows the values
tabulated in *An. St.* 25 (1975), 53–55.

[2] For the readings -*wi* and -*si* (rather than -*wa* and -*sa*) of the first and
second persons sing. endings cf. Mittelberger, *Die Sprache* 9 (1963), 80 f. and
HHL 165 and 169.

[3] In Hier. Luwian preconsonantal *n* is never written so that the third
persons singular and plural (present, past and imperative) are always
written in the same manner. A pronounciation [nti], [nta] and [ntu] for
the plural endings, though generally accepted, cannot be demonstrated. It
is possible that in future a thorough study of rhotacism may provide some
evidence on this point.

[4] 'The Luwian languages and the Hittite -*ḫi* conjugation', *Festschrift
O. Szemerényi*, Amsterdam 1979, p. 577 ff.

-*ḫi* conjugation. In theory at least this opens the possibility that in the singular present and preterite (if the Hittite conjugation is to be taken as a model) we may find alternative endings for the various verbal forms.

Other verbal terminations have not been included in the table above; they are -*ta-ni*, -*ra/i-nu*, -*mi-na*, -*ha-na*, -*ti-sa*. Also, as we shall see, it is possible that -*ta* is used for other persons than the third person sing. preterite and the third person plur. preterite[5]).

Most of these endings, though not all, occur in texts of difficult interpretation, such as the ASSUR letters. The context is sufficient to justify the fact that we take them as endings of the finite verb but mostly makes it difficult to establish the person, number and tense which they indicate. In finding them a slot in our table a number of criteria, often complementary, must be kept in mind.

First, the interpretation must either be determined by the context or, at the very least, be compatible with it.

Secondly, we ought to try to fill the available slots and not to duplicate endings for one single function.

Thirdly, some etymological plausibility is required. Ideally we ought to be able to explain why a given person of the verb is marked by a certain ending. By way of explanation we may produce some comparative evidence (either within the Luwian group or within Anatolian or, more broadly, within Indo-European), or we may offer a plausible account of how an innovation internal to Hieroglyphic Luwian could have arisen.

Needless to say, any suggestion which does not rely entirely on the combinatory method, i.e. on the first criterion, is bound to be somewhat hypothetical; the ideal suggestion, on the other hand, is one which is primarily based on contextual observations, but is also supported by the second and third method.

Keeping these points in mind we can now turn to the actual evidence for the endings.

---

[5]) Reference is often made to a second person singular ending -*s*, but we now read -*si* the present ending and we do not know of another attested -*s* ending. In ASSUR g, 3 Meriggi (*Manuale* II/1, 141) takes the form †*a-ā-sa* (*i-ia-sa* in our transliteration) as the second person singular of the verb *aya-* '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 *i-ia-sa* as a second person singular imperative. Obviously an -*s* ending may have existed, and indeed must have existed at some stage, but we have no direct evidence for it. See below note 25.

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.

		Orthotonic	Enclitic	Possessive Adjectives
Sing.	1.	*amu, mu*	*mu, mi*	*amis, mis*
	2.	*tu, ti*	*tu, ti*	*tuwis*
	3.	(Nom. *(a)pas*)	Nom. *as, ata* (Dat. *tu*) Reflexive *ti*	((a)*pasis*)
Plur.	1.	*á-ZU-za*[6])	(*an*)*za*[7])	*anzis*
	2.	*u-ZU-za, u-ZU-sa*[6])	*ma(n)za*[8])	*u(n)zis*[8])
	3.	(Nom. *(a)panzi*)	Nom. *ata* (Dat. *ma(n)za*)	((a)*pasis*)

Some of these forms are straightforward and are listed in Meriggi, *Manuale* I, 45 ff. It now seems clear that Hieroglyphic Luwian tends to use in connection with an orthotonic pronoun an enclitic 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*. ad locum, but also because of a new unpublished seal from Meskene (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 enclitic and regularly follows signs with *a*-vocalism it is impossible to know if it must be read -*aza* or -*anza*, -*za* or -*nza*.

[8]) In the pronoun of second person plural Cun. Luwian oscillates between nasalized and non nasalized forms (cf. Carruba, *Die Sprache* 14 (1968), 13 ff. and especially 22). Hier. Luwian, because of its writing system, cannot provide any evidence for or against nasalization. The same problem exists also for the spelling -*ma-za*, which may correspond to a nasalized -*manza* or to a non-nasalized -*maza*.

[9]) For enclitic *ti* used as a second person pronoun as well as a third person reflexive cf. Mittelberger, *Die Sprache*, 9 (1963), 93 ff. For orthotonic *tu* see ASSUR f, 3: *tu-u* VERSUS-*na* "in front of you (*sing.*)". For enclitic *tu* in the functions of a second person sing. pronoun cf. e.g. ASSUR a, 1 (citation (13) (v) below) and ASSUR c, 2 (citation (14) (ii) below); in the clauses *unu-ha-wa-tu-ta . . . arha pararaha* "I *asked* thee"; *api-ha-wa-tu-ta ni arha manuha pararawi* "let me not *ask* thee (again)" *tu* is matched by *ma(n)za* of ASSUR c, 2: *unu-ha-wa-ma(n)za-ta ni manuha arha pararaia* "let it not *ask* you (again)". Cf. also ASSUR f. 4: *u-nu-pa-wa/i-tu-u* (ASINUS.ANIMAL) *tara/i-ka-sa-ni-sa* REL-*ri+i á-sa-ti* "now if (there) is a mule to thee" (cf. Hawkins below p. 110f.).

with the same functions; hence *amu . . . mi* (in the stelae), *amu . . . mu* (in the letters), *á-zu-za . . . (an)za*, *u-zu-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 *u-zu-za* and *u-zu-sa* 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[9]). We assume that *á-zu-za* and *u-zu-za* (and probably *(an)za* and *ma(n)za*) can be used as nominatives because of the passage in ASSUR e, 7 (see below citation 2) where *u-zu-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-à+ra/i* call 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[10]) in the following text:

(1) CARCHEMISH A 6, 7:

(i) |*à-wa/i* (LOQUI)*ha+ra/i-nu-wa/i* (DEUS)*ku*-AVIS-*pa-pa-'*

(ii) *u-zu-sa-wa/i-ma-ta-'* (MANUS)*i-sà-tara/i-i*|MAGNUS-*nú-wa/i-ta-ni-i*
     "(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 part of 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". *u-zu-sa* seems to have nominative function and its presence makes it certain that *-tani* is a second person plural ending; context and morphology (the *-i* element) speak for a present form.

10) *Die Sprache* 9 (1963), 80f.

A second instance of *-tani* has already been referred to:

(2) ASSUR e, 1:

(i) |*à-zu-za-ha-wa/i-za* |*á-pi* |*ha-tu-à+ra/i*
(ii) |*wa/i-za* |NEG₂-' |REL-*i-ha* |*ha-tu+ra/i-na* |*ha-tu-à+ra/i*
(iii) |*wa/i-ma-za* |*u-zu-za* |*ha-tu-à+ra/i* |*à-sa-ta-ni*
      "We ourselves (are) to write;
      we (are) to write no letter;
      you yourselves are to write."

The interpretation of the apparently undeclinable form *ha-tu-à+ra/i* (i.e. *hatu(a)ri*?) causes difficulty. In view of (2) (iii) above the best solution is that of taking it as a verbal noun (it can have an object: *haturin*) which can be construed with the verb 'to be', as the Hittite infinitive, with the meaning "I, we, you etc. am/are to HAT(U), have to HAT(U)". Cf. Hitt. *laḫḫiiayanzi ešun* 'I was to fight', quoted by Friedrich, *Elementarbuch* I², 143. In (iii) *à-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 Hittite *-teni*[11]).

The -ranu ending

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

11) For the Cun. Luwian endings of first and second persons plural (and in particular for present *-tani*, preterite *-tan*), cf. Carruba, *Die Sprache* 14 (1968), 13ff.

(3) ASSUR e, 1:

> |*à-wa/i* |*á-pi* |*u-zi-na* |REL-*i* |*ha-tu+ra/i-na* |AUDIRE-*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 *u(n)zin* 'your' refers to the letter received or written by the addressee; the former interpretation may be preferable.

The verb *tuma(n)ti-* 'hear, listen' was identified by Hawkins, *An. St.* 25 (1975), 151f.[12]). Here *tuma(n)taranu* 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)zin* 'your'). The context does not give us any further indication about tense or mood. Yet, if we remember that *-ranu* may be a rhotacized 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 *-tani* ending of the second person plural indicative present and on the other hand the third person sing. pres. *-ti* vs. the imperative *-tu* and the third person plural *-nti* 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 *-ta*.

---

[12]) Most of the evidence for this verb gives us a stem *tuma(n)ti-* which differs from *tuma(n)ta-* required here. Yet hesitations of this type are not rare in Hier. Luwian and can be compared with the parallel hesitations between *-ai-*, *-i-* and *-a-* found in Cun. Luwian (cf. Laroche, *DLL*, 133f. and 141; the Cun. Luwian form we have from this verb is *tummataimmis*, cf. Laroche ibid., 99). For Hier. Luwian see e.g. *pu-pa-la-ta* (citation (13) (vi) below) and *pu-pa-li-ta* (CEKKE A, 4; see below); (*274) *ha-ta-la-i-ta* (KARATEPE XXVI 135, Hu. and Ho.) and (*274) *ha-ta-li(-i)-ha/há* (KARATEPE XXVIII 144, Hu. and Ho.), etc. A possible *-a-* form of the verb 'to hear' is attested in CARCHEMISH A 11 c: *à-wa/i za-à-zi* DEUS-*ni-i-zi* AUDIRE-*ta+ra/i-ru*, 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 (1978), 113) that not all instances of REL(-*i*) have a subordinating value, as shown by a KARATEPE 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-na*) 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 is 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 Cun. Luwian it is customary to recognize a *-tan* imperative ending which matches Hittite *-ten*[13]). It is not surprising that Hieroglyphic Luwian redetermined 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 Barnett) and treated as an ending of 1st person plural preterite, mainly because of the similarity with Hitt. *-wen* or *-men*. In Hier. Luwian *-mi-na* forms occur in CEKKE (DARE-*mi-na* in B 11. 3 [twice], 4 [twice], 10; *i-zi-ia-mi-na* in 1. 4; (*31) *hi-sà-hi-mi-na* in 1. 5 [twice]; *ha-zi-mi-na* in 1. 5; (MANUS) REL-*lá/i/u-mi-na* in 1. 10), in CARCHEMISH A 4, 1–2 (*i-zi-ia-mi-na*, DARE-*mi-na*), in SULTANHAN, 2 and base 9 (CRUS-*nú-wa/i-mi-na*, *i-zi-ia-mi-na*), and in the KULULU lead strips (DARE-*mi-na* in strip 1, rev. 4 [3 times], rev. 6; strip 2, obv. 1, 2). Conceivably an example can also be found in TÜNP 2 (CAPUT. SCALPRUM(-)*ku-sa-mi-na*[14]). There can be little doubt that *-mi-na* is a plural ending: CEKKE where two people are involved in the basic agreement (see Hawkins, *An. St.* 29 (1979), 160f.) 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 SULTANHAN passage points to a first

---

[13]) Cf. Laroche *DLL*, 142 and Carruba, *Die Sprache* 14 (1968), 13 ff.

[14]) A doubtful instance of LITUUS(+)*na-mi?-na* occurs in IZGIN A 11; cf. Hawkins, *Kadmos*, 19 (1980), 135.

person and because we can exclude the first person singular present
(for *iziya-* 'make' this is *i-zi-ia-wa/i*) and the first person singular
preterite (for *piya-* 'give' this is *pi-ia-ha*). Moreover, since context-
ually 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. *piya-* the third person plural present and preterite are respectively
piyanti and *piyanta*—which excludes *piyamin(a)* from this gram-
matical 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 OEKKE B the heading mentions two people, Kamanis the ruler
and Sasturas, his first servant, who bought (?) the city of Kamana
from the Kanapuweans and gave them 600 donkeys. The verbs are
"*344"(-)*i-sa-ta* and DARE-*ta*, 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) OEKKE B, 2–3:

(i) |*za*-CRUS+*ra/i-pa-wa/i* INFRA-*ni* 1 "*257"-*ri*+*i* 4 SCALPRUM(-)*ma-
na-zi* *257-*za* ¹*wa/i*+*ra/i-pa-tá-sa-za* INFANS(-)*ni-wa/i-za* DARE-
mi-na

(ii) |*há-ia-la* ¹*la-pa*+*ra/i-na-ia* ¹*za-za-ia-ha* 4 SCALPRUM(-)*ma-na-zi*
*257-*za* X-*nú-hu-za-ti*(URBS) DARE-*mi-na*

"(and they gave to them 600 donkeys)
we give to the children of Warpatas ...
... to Labarnas and Zazas[15]) we give ..."

The shift from third to first person reminds us of that which
occurs (in the singular) in the last part of KARATEPE. There, how-
ever, a verb of saying accounts for it (KARATEPE LIX ff.: "If anyone
from among the kings ... proclaims this 'I shall delete ...', or
if he is covetous and proclaims thus 'I shall ...'"). In OEKKE 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 Kamanis 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

---

¹⁵) For the reading of the two names see *HHL*, p. 189, note 165.

DARE-*ta* '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 OEKKE B in parallel clauses.

The text of CARCHEMISH A 4, which has a number of parallel
clauses to OEKKE, is too broken to be much of help, but the two
passages from SULTANHAN deserve quotation.

(5) SULTANHAN, 1–2:

(i) |*à-wa/i* |*za-na* |(DEUS)TONITRUS-*hu-zá-na* |*tu-wa/i*+*ra/i-sà-si-i-na*
|*ta-nu-wa/i-ha*

(ii) |*à-wa/i-sa* |*á-pi-i* |CRUS-*nú-wa/i-mi-i-na* |(ANIMAL) BOS-*ri*+*i*
9 OVIS *à*+*ra/i-ma-sa-ri*+*i-i*

"(I am ...)
I set up this Tarhunzas of the vineyard;
we set (him) up with an ox and 9 AR(A)MA sheep."[16])

The presumption is that the verb *tanuwamin* is in the past be-
cause of the preceding *tanuwaha*[17]), 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[18]).

---

¹⁶) *armasi-* could be a derivative of *arma-* 'month' attested in Cun. Luwian
and in Lycian (*r̃ma*); this was originally suggested by Laroche (*HH*, p. 67;
cf. also Moriggi, *Glossar* 33) but we still cannot prove it.

¹⁷) Meriggi, *Manuale* II/1, 116, prefers to take *tanuwamin* as a participle
accusative in agreement with *Tarhunzan* of the previous clause, but this
obliges him to end the clause with *à-wa/i-na u-pa-ha*, which is best taken
as part of the next clause: *à-wa/i-na u-pa-ha* REL-*i* "and when I *honoured*
him (he came with all goodness)". For us, as for Meriggi, there remains the
problem of the final *-sa* element of *à-wa/i-sa* in (ii).

¹⁸) Notice for instance the contrast between the past tense used in
OEKKE A when describing the setting up of the statue and the present tense
which describes the future sacrifices in OEKKE C (for OEKKE's order of reading,
from A to C, see Hawkins, *An. St.* 22 (1972), 105). A similar shift from past
to present may perhaps occur in KARATEPE, where the clauses from e.g.
XXXVII to XLVII are in the past (this is true even for the broken part
where enough verbal endings are preserved) and refer to the foundation of
the city; on the other hand XLVIII and XLIX, which refer to the rituals
which follow, have a *-ia* verb (*taia*) and an imperative respectively. This may
perhaps explain the puzzle about the tense of *taia* first discussed in *An. St.* 28
(1978), 112 and then in *Festschrift Szemerényi*, p. 577 ff., esp. 597 ff.

(6) SULTANHAN, base 8–9:

  (i) [|*ni*]-*pa-wa/i-ta* |URBS+*MI-ni* |REL-*sa-ha* |*ka-ti-i-'* |CRUS-*i*
  (ii) |*ni-pa-wa/i-ta* |("TERRA")*ta-ka-mi-i* |REL-*sa-ha* |*ka-ti-i* |*ta-i*
  (iii) |*ni-pa-wa/i-ta* |*wa/i-na* |REL-*sa-ha* |*ka-ti-i* |CRUS-*i*
  (iv) |*á-pi-i-wa/i-tà-'* |REX-*ti-ia-ri+i* |LEPUS+*RA/I-ia-ti-i*
       |*i-zi-ia-mi-na-'*
  (v) |*à-wa/i* |*ka-ti-i-sa* |*ni-i* |*á-sa-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*/CRUS-*i* is clearly present tense (cf. *Festschrift 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 *iziyamin*[19]).

Finally we come to the KULULU strips; a few examples from these extremely formulaic texts will suffice[20]):

(7) KULULU strip 1, rev. 4:

  (i) *200* "*179" ¹*ha-ha-ia-'* DARE-*mi-na*
  (ii) *200* "*179" ¹TONITRUS-*hu-na-za-ia* DARE-*mi-na*
  (iii) *10* "*179"-*za* ¹*pu-la-i-ia* |CUM-*ni tu-na-sá-'* (URBS)
       "we give 200 ... to Hahas,
       we give 200 ... to Tarhunazas,
       10 ... for/with Pulas of the city Tunas."

(8) KULULU strip 2, 1:

  (i) *32* (OVIS)*ha-wa/i-na* ¹*mu-wa/i-hi-sá* ¹*ni-ia pi-ia-i*
  (ii) *68* OVIS-*na* ¹*la-li-sá* ¹*pá?-ra/i-sà-ta-ia* |*pi-ia-i* |*ku-ki-sà-ta-za*
       |REL-*za* |*wa/i-si-i*

---

[19]) Nor does it seem possible to follow Meriggi (*Manuale* II/1, 120) who tentatively translates *katis* with 'tribute' comparing (SCALPRUM) *ka-ti-na* (which we prefer to take as a neuter plural *katina*, since it agrees with *zaia*) 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.

[20]) For the KULULU lead strips, which have not yet been fully published, see T. Özgüç, *Kültepe and its Vicinity in the Iron Age*, Ankara 1971, 111ff. and Laroche, ibid., 114–116. For KULULU fragm. 1, see Özgüç, *Anadolu* 17 (1973), 1–30.

  (iii) *140* OVIS *7 ta-ru-ti* |DARE-*mi-na* |*á-sà-ha-ia-la+ra/i-ti*(URBS)
  (iv) *40* OVIS-*sá* ¹*nu-nu-ia* |MAGNUS+*RA/I-ia-li*
      "Muwahis gives 32 sheep to Nis.
      Lalis gives 68 sheep to Pa?rsatas because/so that to the KUKISATI's . . .
      We give 140 sheep to the 7 statues from the City Ashaialari-.
      40 sheep for Nunus the URIYALIS."

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 postposition CUM-*ni* (cf. (7) (iii)). In strip 2 we have a) simple datives (cf. (8) (iv)); b) formulae with *piyai* "will give, gives" as in (8) (i); c) formulae with *piyanti* "they(will) give" or *usanti* "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 than 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 -*i* form for the present. However, -*min* causes philological difficulties in any case (why the -*i*- vocalism?) and, as we shall see, in Hier. 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[21]).

The -ha-na ending

There are four occurrences of -*ha-na* verbal forms, all in the ASSUR letters ("*69"(-)*sa-ha-na* in ASSUR b, 2, g, 4; "*69"(-)*wa/i-zi-ha-na* in f, 3, and MORI-*ha-na* in a, 3).

---

[21]) Carruba, loc. cit., argues for a Cun. Luwian first person plural present -*un(n)i* and for a first person plural preterite -*man*; the latter ending is attested, according to him, in the form *ḫu-u-i-na-i-ma-an*. This seems plausible, but I wonder whether the context necessarily calls for a past rather than a present verb.

The passages need to be discussed in full:

(9) ASSUR b, 1–2:

(i) |u-nu-ⁱ-pa-wa/i-mu |1-ti-na |za-na |("LOQUI")ma-à+ra/i-ti-na
    |CUM-ni |i-zi-ia-'

(ii) |à-wa/i |á-pi |ku-ru-pi |REL-ia |("*286.*317"-')wa/i-à-ra/i-ma
     |LEPUS-pa-sà-la-ia |ARHA-' |"*69"(-)sa-ha-na

(iii) |wa/i-à+ra/i |("*69")ha+ra/i-za

(iv) |wa/i-ma-à+ra/i |ARHA-ⁱ |VIA-wa/i-ni
     "Now do for me this one bidding:
     what WARAMA TAPASALAIA we *missed* for the KURUPI,
     get them,
     send them out to me."

(10) ASSUR g, 4:

(i) |á-pi-ha-wa/i-' |("LEPUS")ta-pa-sà-la-ia |("*286.*317")
    wa/i-ara/i-ma-' |ku-ru-pi |á-mi-i |à-ta-ti |ARHA-' "*69"(-)sa-
    ha-na

(ii) á-pa-ⁱ-ia-pa-wa/i |DOMUS-ni-i |à-ta-ti ARHA-' |("*69"(-)sa-ha-'

(iii) |wa/i-à+ra/i-ⁱ |("*69")ha+ra/i-za

(iv) |wa/i-ma-à+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-
tu-ⁱ* in ASSUR e, 2; second pers. sing. present ""*69"(-)sa-si* 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. 115f., 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, Taksalas, 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-la-ri+i |-ha-wa/i-tu-u |("*78")á-tu-na-ri+i |REL-na-'
    |"*69"(-)wa/i-za-na |"*69"(-)wa/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 (*tani-
manza*); it would be possible to read OMNIS-*mi-za* and take the word
as a dative plural in agreement with *-(an)za* 'to us', but cf. ASSUR
e, 3: *à-wa/i* OMNIS-MI-*za* CUM-*ni* PONERE-*u* "put everything to-
gether".

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-mu-u |u-za+ra/i-ⁱ |"*476.*311"(-)à-li-ia-ta
     "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. 109ff. 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 *-wi* 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 rebuilt 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 innovation may perhaps be found in the present. The first person sing. present ending was *-wi* 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 *-wi* 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. *-ha* : 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 ne-

cessary to attribute to *-han* past value and to *-min* present value rather than vice-versa[22]).

The -ta ending

The spelling *-ta* indicates the third person singular or third person plural preterite endings: *-ta* and *-nta* respectively. However in the ASSUR 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) |*á-sa₅-za* |REL-*pa-ti-wa/i+ra/i-ia*
  (ii) |*ta-ka-sa-la-sa-wa/i-i* |("LOQUI")*ha-ri+i-ti-i*
  (iii) |*sa-na-wa/i+ra/i* |PUGNUS.PUGNUS-*si*
  (iv) |*à-zu-za-ha-wa/i-za* |*á-pi* |*ha-tu-à+ra/i*
  (v) |*u-nu-ha-wa/i-tu-u-ta* |*u-za-ri+i* |ARHA-' |*pa+ra/i-à+ra/i-ha*
  (vi) |*wa/i-mu-i* |*ha-tu+ra/i-na* |NEG₂-' |*ma-nu-ha* |("LOQUI"·')*pu-pa-la-ta*
  (vii) |NEG₂-'-*wa/i* |*tara/i-pa-i-mi-i-sa* |*za-na* |*à-pa-ha* "PES₂"(-)*à+ra/i-ta* |*kara/i-mi-sà*(URBS)
  (viii) (*78)*á-tu-ni-na-wa/i-mu-u* |REL-*za* |NEG₂-' |*ma-nu-ha* |VIA-*wa/i-ni-ta*
  (ix) |ARHA-*ha-wa/i-mu-u* |REL-*ri+i* |MORI-*ha-na*
  (x) |*wa/i-mu-u* |*u-za+ra/i-i* |"*476.*311"(-)*à-li-ia-ta*
  (i) "Speak to Kwipatiwara.
  (ii) Taksalas 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 TARPAMIS *move* this and that to Carchemish?
  (viii) Why did you not send to me the ATUNI?
  (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 . . .".

---

[22]) 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 PUGNUS.PUGNUS-*si* is based on that of the PUGNUS.-PUGNUS- verb of KARATEPE XXI, where, on the basis of the Phoenician '*bd*, we had previously translated SUB-*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 -*ri*, i.e. the reflexive -*ti*, which would impress a medial value to the verb.

sanawa, the neuter plural Nom.-Acc. of *sanawi-* 'good', could come to mean 'well', but if so we miss the needed -*wa*- 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 (c, 2 and e, 3); its meaning is guessed from these contexts. *u-za-ri+i* in the same clause looks like the ablative of the possessive adjective *u-zi-* '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 usage.

In (vi) it would come natural to translate ("LOQUI")*pu-pa-la-ta* with 'answer' or the like, but the verb also occurs in OEKKE A, 4 (Hawkins' collation) which reads:

za-ha-wa/i STELE-*z⟨a⟩ á-pa-sá pu-pa-li-ta*
"he *wrote* this stele himself."

An attempt at finding a meaning suitable both for OEKKE (where the author of the inscription reports about his deeds) and for ASSUR yields something like 'write', 'compose', 'dictate'[23]).

In the clause that follows (vii) *tarpamis* must be the subject; it may be a proper name but need not (cf. *An. St.* 25 (1975), 136). The verb "PES₂"(-)*à+ra/i-ta* must be compared with "PES₂"(-)*à+ra/i-wa/i* of ASSUR f, 4, which is intransitive: *à-wa/i-wa/i* ("PES")*pa+ra/i-ri+i* ARHA-' "PES₂"(-)*à+ra/i-wa/i* "shall I move around on foot?" or "I am moving around on foot". Here it is possible that we have

---

[23]) If the meaning 'write' is correct, it is tempting to connect the verb with the root *pu-* 'write' now attested in Lycian (*ppuweti, pude*; cf. Laroche, *Fouilles de Xanthos* VI, Paris 1979, 71). *pupla-* could have arisen through syncope from **pupula-* or **pupuwala-*; in its turn this form could be a denominative from a reduplicated root followed by the -*ala/i*-suffix. At the moment the suggestion cannot be proved.

---

a transitive usage (without ARHA) and that *zan apan-ha* 'this and that' (common gender) serve as objects. For a comparison with Hittite *ar-* cf. Hawkins, *An. St.* loc. cit.; see also Hawkins below p. 111.

The first word of (viii) offers an almost unique example of word-final -*n* written before an enclitic particle.

For (ix) and (x) see above citation (12) and Hawkins below p. 114.

In (vi), (viii), and (ix) it seems impossible to translate the -*ta* verbs as third persons sing. preterite. In (vi) there is no stated subject, and an impersonal "they did not *write*" is out of place in this style where the reproaches to the defaulting correspondents are extremely pointed. We could think of a second person singular or plural preterite. In view of -*tu*- in (v) it seems simpler to think of a second person singular.

In (viii) it could be possible to take *tarpamis* of (vii) as the subject of *harwanita* (the full reading of VIA-*wa/i-ni-ta*) but a plausible meaning would be difficult to establish. *harwani-* means 'to send' and 'to send' is what the addressee normally is supposed to do in these letters. All that we know of *tarpamis* is that he came to Carchemish; in his case there would be no question of sending but only of bringing or taking. It is much more likely that the subject is Kwipatiwara. If so, here too a second person singular or a second person plural are possible; for the same reasons as above, it seems easier to think of a second person singular preterite. Finally the same analysis must be applied to (x); Meriggi's tentative suggestion (*Glossar*, 226; *Manuale* II/1, 136) that the form is an imperative second person plural is now less likely since we know what the meaning of the verb in the previous clause is (cf. Hawkins below, p. 109ff.). Here a second person plural rather than singular could be argued for on the basis of the previous word *u-za+ra/i*, but we should not forget the hesitations between singular and plural which frequently occur in these letters (cf. here (iv) "we are to write", though the writer is only Taksalas; (v) "I asked thee with/in your (letter?)", etc.); the point cannot be decisive.

In ASSUR a we find evidence which points to the existence of an indicative -*ta* ending which differs from -*ta* of the third person singular preterite and -*nta* of the third person plural preterite. The obvious suggestion is that this ending fills the slot of the second person singular preterite (though a second person plural preterite cannot be entirely excluded). If so, we gain besides a first person singular -*ha* and a third person singular -*ta* a second person singular

-ta which matches the attested -ta ending of the second person singular preterite in the Hittite -ḫi 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 LITUUS (+)na-ti-sa in BOYBEYPINARI 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 LITUUS(+)na-ti-sa (ASSUR c, 4 and g, 1) and two of *77+RA/I-ti-sa (ASSUR e, 4 and g, 2). Finally ASSUR e, 1 has a form u-sa-ta-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-zu-za-wa/i-ma-za |ha-tu-à+ra/i

(ii) á-pi-ha-wa/i-tu-u-ta |ni-i-' |ARHA-' |ma-nu-ha |pa+ra/i-à+ra/i-wa/i

(iii) |á-pi-ha-wa/i-mu-ta NEG₂-' REL-ha-na |u-si-ti-sa

(iv) |wa/i-mu-ta |*187(-)tu-wa/i-i-za |REL-za |u-si-ti-sà

(v) |wa/i-mu-u |10 ha-sà-pi-na |100-ha-wa/i-mu |*187(-)sù-mi-la-'-na |VIA-wa/i-ni

(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 TUWIZA?

(v) Send to me 10 HASPI 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 usi- is difficult to establish: cf. Hawkins, An. St. 25 (1975), 140.

From the context usitis 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) |("LEPUS")ta-pa-sà-la-ia-ha-wa/i |(*286.*317)wa/i-à+ra/i-ma-i |REL-ta-ha |LITUUS(+)na-ti-sà 4-zi |ni-pa-wa/i |5-na-' |("*78")à-ru-ti-na

(ii) |wa/i-mu-u |VIA-wa/i-ni

(iii) |ha-la+ra/i-la-ha-wa/i-mu-u |sa-na-wa/i-ia |VIA-wa/i-ni
"And wherever you see TAPASALAYA 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 LITUUS(+)na- 'see', cf. Hawkins, "The logogram 'Lituus' and the verbs 'to see' in Hieroglyphic Luwian", Kadmos 19 (1980), 109ff., esp. p. 133.

(16) ASSUR g, 1:

(i) |á-pi-wa/i-à+ra/i-i |11 ("*78")à-ru-ti-sá

(ii) |ni-pa-wa/i+ra/i-i |NEG₂-' |wa/i-mi-LITUUS-si

(iii) |à-wa/i-i |LITUUS(+)na-ti-sa |REL-ta-ha |10 ("*78")à-ru-ti-na

(iv) |wa/i-mu-u |VIA-wa/i-ni-i
"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."

For (ii) see Hawkins, An. St. 25 (1975), 135; for (iii) Hawkins op. cit., Kadmos 19 (1980), 132f.

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) |INFANS-ni-ha-wa/i-mu |tu-wa/i-na |CUM-ni *77+RA/I-ti-sa

(ii) |PRAE-wa/i |á-mu |na-wa/i-' |REL-na |REL-sà-ha-' |LITUUS(+)u-ni-ti
"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 tuwin 'thy'. It is easy to imagine a clause such as "thou didst promise your 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-ha-wa/i-za* |*tu-wa/i-na* |INFANS-*ni-na* |CUM-*ni* *77+RA/I-*ti-sa*
(ii) *wa/i-za* LITUUS(+)*na-ri+i*

  "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.* 25 (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 *tuwin* 'thy'. A past
is in theory possible but a present is at least as possible and prob-
ably more likely.

The BOYBEYPINARI 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-sa* 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-sa* (or- *tis*) as a second person singular present
ending [24]). From a grammatical point of view, however, we must
notice that the slot is already filled by *-si*, an ending whose etymo-
logy presents no difficulty. We then have to face the possibility that
both *-tis* and *-si* 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 Hittite *-zi*
and *-i*, i.e. with the third person present singular endings of the
Hittite *-mi* and *-hi* conjugations. Hier. Luwian *-si* obviously
matches the Hittite second person singular ending of the *-mi* con-
jugation; *-tis* has no exact parallel, but can be explained if we as-
sume that a *-ti* ending (which matched the second person singular
present ending of the Hittite *-hi* conjugation) was redetermined with
an *-s* element characteristic of the second person singular. *-tis* (pre-

---

[24]) It seems possible that Cun. Luwian too had an ending *-tis* attested in
KUB XXXV 133 II 25: *az-za-aš-ti-iš ya-a-šu ú-ut-ti-iš ya-a-šu*, 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, but emend the tense). This translation is not
compatible with taking the form *wattanei* of the previous clause as a second
person plural, as suggested by Carruba, *Die Sprache* 14 (1968), 16.

sumably from *-*tai+s*) would then correspond to the preterite
second person singular ending *-ta* discussed above [25]).

We could have hoped that, just as the *-si* second person sing.
forms correspond to *-ti* third persons, the *-tis* 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 *-tis* forms belong,
with one exception, to verbs which are rarely attested [26]). However,
for one verb (LITUUS(+)*na-* 'see'), we have besides a *-tis* form (cf.
citations (15) and (16)), a third person sing. present LITUUS(+)*na-ti-i*
(or *-na-ri+i*), a first person sing. preterite LITUUS(+)*na-ha* and a
third person sing. preterite LITUUS(+)-*na-ta* (for the data see Haw-
kins, *Kadmos* 19, 109f.). 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. Hittite verbs with
a mixed conjugation are frequent; it is probable that a later Ana-
tolian 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 LITUUS.-
LITUUS(+)*na-i* of SULTANHAN 5:

  |*wa/i-ta* |*á-pa-sa-ha* |*á-pa-sa-za* |*sa-na-wa/i-ia-za* |*za-ri+i* |*à-ta*
  |LITUUS.LITUUS(+)*na-i*
  "he too shall look upon his good here".

It seems plausible that the verb is built on the same root as
LITUUS(+)*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.

---

[25]) 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 Laroche, *DLL*, 142.

[26]) The other two verbs, *usi-* and *77+RA/I , are not very well attested.
For *usi-* the problem is whether it is the same verb as *usa-*. If this is the
case, we have from *usa-* a first person sing. present (PES)*u-sa-wa/i* (ANDAVAL,
2), a first person sing. preterite ("PES")*u-sa-ha* (KARATEPE, XXIX 146) and
probably a third person plural present *u-sa-ti* (KULULU strip 2, rev. 4). Of
the verb *77+RA/I- we only know the forms *77+RA/I-*ti-sa* and *77+RA/I
-*ha* (ASSUR f, 3).

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:

			Present	Preterite	Imperative
Sing.	1.		*-wi*	*-ha*	
	2.	*-si*	*-tis*	*-ta*	*-∅*
	3.	*-ti*	*-i (-ia)*	*-ta*	*-tu*
Plur.	1.		*-min*	*-han*	
	2.		*-tani*		*-ranu*
	3.		*-nti*	*-nta*	*-ntu*

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 *-tis* endings for the second person present singular partially contradicts what was stated in *Festschrift Szemerényi* (p. 605ff.) about the way in which the *-ti/-i* (*-ia*) pair offered the only productive parallel to the Hittite contrast between *-mi* and *-ḫi* conjugations. However, before reaching any further conclusion, we need much more evidence for the productivity of the *-tis* ending and for the inflectional type to which *-tis* belongs.

The second person singular preterite *-ta* may offer another example (besides *-ha*) of the generalization of an ending which, in Hittite terms, belongs to the *-ḫi* conjugation, but here too we need more evidence and above all more instances of second person singular preterite forms. If confirmed, the existence of a second person singular *-ta* may also help to account for the form of the *-ta* and *-nta* endings of third person singular and plural[27].

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

Somerville College, Oxford   Anna Morpurgo Davies

---

[27] 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 preterite verb.