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"To put" and "to stand" in the Luwian languages

1. The starting point for this paper is provided by a series of Anatolian problems. I do not intend to tackle directly the first of these, but I hope that what I have to say about the others may in the end be useful for that problem too.¹

First, Hittite has a number of graphically or phonetically similar roots which have in turn been connected with either IE *dheH₁₂ or IE *steH₁₂. Which Hittite verb belongs with which root? I list here the verbs which have been most frequently mentioned in this connection, though I shall not discuss them any further. For IE *dheH₁₂ - 'to put' Oettinger (Stammbildung des heth. Verbums, 1979, pp. 482, 350, 328) quotes Hitt. dai- (1st. pers. sing. pres. tiēhê, 3rd. pers. sg. pres. dâi) and the iterative zikk- (3rd pers. sg. pres. zikkizzê), so far in agreement with the standard view, as indicated e.g. in Friedrich Wb. s.vv. He also links with these verbs tittiê-, "einsetzen, (Stadt) anlegen" (Friedrich Wb. 3. Ergsheft, s.v.) and tittanu- "einstellen, hinsetzen, einsetzen", again in agreement with Friedrich Wb., s.v., but against Sturtevant (Comp. Grammar of Hitt., 1951, p. 60) and Pedersen (Hitt. u. it., 1938, p. 183), who linked tittanu- with *steH₁₂. Finally, Oettinger (op. cit., pp. 107 ff., 124 ff.) derives from *dheH₁₂ some verbs of the mi-conjugation: the compounds peḫtê-, wapatê-, yertiê-, yeti-, and the simplex iew- "to say" (used in suppletion with iar-). For the latter, he follows in the steps of Pedersen (op. cit., p. 129) in assuming a semantic shift from 'to put' to 'to say with authority'.²

¹ I wish I could have offered to the memory of a close friend who was also a great scholar a different and better paper, but this is the last paper that I can publish in the knowledge that Warren Cowgill saw at least its first version. It was characteristic of him that he accepted some of my conclusions without resenting the fact that they partly contradicted views which he had previously expressed.
² For the earlier references see Kammenhuber, Handbuch der Orientalistik, IV/2, p. 228; cf. also Wackern, Die Grammatik III/1, 1969, p. 69 and Pahwel, Gedenkschrift Eronaus, 1982, p. 183 ff.
For IE *steH₂- 'stand' Oettinger (op. cit., p. 350) quotes only an Hitite verb of the mi-conjugation, *tijaa-, "sich stellen, stehenbleiben" (Friedrich Wb., s.v. "treten, hintreten"), which he derives with Watkins (Ildg. Gramm. III/1, 1969, p. 57) from an earlier *(i)H₁-a-(i)je-, Some reservations about the proposed etymology were raised by Warren Cowgill, both on semantic grounds (for Cowgill the basic meaning of *tijaa- is "to step, walk from one location to another nearby") and on more general morphological and syntactical grounds: In Anatolian, Cowgill argued, telic verbs normally yield presents of the bi-conjugation (cf. dašši, "he puts"), and do not form presents, as the other IE languages do, with other suffixes. Cowgill's problem would not be made any easier, if we followed e.g. Friedrich (Wb., s.v.) and linked *tijaa- with *dheH₁-.

My second question concerns the Luwian languages and can be asked in a number of ways. Starting from Indo-European, what are the Luwian cognates of *dheH₁- and *steH₂-? Starting from the individual languages (Cun. Luwian, Hier. Luwian, and Lycian), what do these languages use for "to put" and "to stand"? How can we best interpret some verbs which look similar to the Hitite verbs mentioned earlier? I shall return to this problem later.

The third question concerns a specific Hier. Luwian word. The Hier. Luwian 3rd pers. sing. present CRUS-ı-ı-ı-ı is differently translated by different scholars.4 Laroche (IH, p. 49) gives it a value "venir" with a question mark. Meriggi (Glossar, p. 115) translates "treten" with the additional gloss "auch 'gehen, kommen, (ver)laufen'", also followed by a question mark. Hawkins and I have normally translated "stand" without any special justification. The problem needs tackling and is obviously connected with the earlier questions.

A fourth question similarly impinges on the previous ones. In an earlier paper (Ps. Susembryia, p. 577 ff.) I studied the i-ending which some Cun. and Hier. Luwian verbs use in contrast with the expected i-ending of 3rd pers. sing. present: the ending obviously matches the -i of the Hitite bi-conjugation. Elsewhere (KZ 96 (1982-83), p. 262 ff.) I also noted that in Cun. Luwian all verbal stems of which we know a 3rd pers. sing. pres. in -ai (attested either in Cuneiform or in Hieroglyphic) have a 3rd pers. sing. pretense which ends in -atta rather than in -ta (cf. pajiai, "he gives" vs. pijattu, "he gave"). In Lycian the i-verbs have been regularly replaced by i-verbs: the cognate of pajiai is pijeei, "he gives"; whenever the evidence is available Lycian shows in these verbs -ti and -te endings and never the alternative -di and -de endings. Yet there is an exception: Lycian has a verb with a 3rd pers. sing. present tado, past. tade, which, formally at least, matches the two Hier. Luwian presents, CRUS-ı-ı-ı-ı-ı-ı, "comes" or "stands" and tado-ı-ı-ı, "takes". What justifies this exception? And is it a real exception? Or is the rule wrong?

My second, third and fourth questions cannot be discussed in isolation from each other; we shall have to consider the data as a whole.

2. We start with the verb "to put". A common feature of the three Luwian languages is the use of a form tiusu-, Lycian tiuswe-, "to put". The evidence is poor for Cun. Luwian, very rich for Hier. Luwian (where the verb is either spelled in full or written with the logogram PONERE, the putting hand, and a phonetic complement) and moderately good for Lycian. The verb has a third person sing. present tiuswuah attested in Hier. Luwian only, and, for the rest the expected Cuneiform and Hieroglyphic forms.5 In Lycian, as expected, -ti endings are attested: tiuswet, tiuswete, etc.*

5 For Cun. Luwian Lareche DLL, p. 100 lists a 3rd sing. pret. du-ı-ı-ı-ı-ı-ı-ı-ı-ı-ı (KB XIV 114, 112), a 3rd plu. pret. du-ı-ı-ı-ı-ı-ı-ı-ı-ı-ı-ı-ı-ı-ı-ı (KB XIV 114, 112 also mentioned in Lareche, is now differently restored by Starke StBoT 30, p. 120). Most of the texts are obscure and/or broken, except for those with inewuwa. In Hier. Luwian the verb is mostly written logographically with phonetic complements (PONERE-umu-ı-ı-ı-ı-ı-ı-ı; the stem is inewu-ıı-ı-ı; but the historical writing may conceal the difference. I have treated all forms as if they belonged to tiusu, unless the spelling showed unambiguously that they are built on tu-. We have evidence for: Present 3rd pers. sing. tuuswi (BOYBEYPINARİ 2, III A 2 + IV D 2 § 14; SULTANHAN base C § 31; KASYERLI § 2 § 3) or tuuswa (KARKAMIŞ A 13 c + a + b, a § 3, A 25b [11]; 1st pers. plur. tuuswaan (CEKEKE, 10 § 19; 3rd pers. plur. tuusun(w)i (ANCOZ, 1 § 1). Preterite 1st pers. sing. tuuswa (ALEPPO 2, [3] § 10; BOYBEYPINARİ 1, 1 B § 1, 1 § 3; DARENDE, 6 § 3; HAMA 4, A § 57; HAMA 5, 3 § 4 [2]; KARATEPE XXI Hu. and Ho.; ibid., XXXIX Hu.; KARKAMIŞ A 4 A 6 § 3 § 15 and 17; A 13 § 12, A 13 § 2; MARAS § 4; TELL AHMAR 2 § 3; TUPADA, 2 § 10) or tuuswa (PONERE-umu-ı-ı-ı-ı-ı-ı-ı; 3rd pers. sing. tuuswa (BABYLON cap 2 [Hawkins'sollection]); BOYBEYPINARİ 2, III C § 6; KULUHU 4 (= Kocal; Anadolu Arastirmaları 9 (1983), pp. 167-72, pl.1) top § 15; SULTANHAN, 3 § 9) or tuuwa.
The agreement between the three languages is not only formal but also functional. Hier. Luwian, with its greater number of attestations, provides the link between Cun. Luwian and Lycian. In the two clear contexts which we have in Cuneiform Luwian (KUB XXXV 102 (+) 103, vs. iii 6; KUB IX 6 + XXYV 39, vs. iii 29) the meaning is generically "put, place". The first passage has pa-ya-an-tar a-an-ni ti-i-ta-ni di-i-ya-an-du, "let them put him (viz. the child) to the breast of the mother". The second passage belongs to one of the usual curses. "Who does harm to the lord of the sacrifice, let the gods bring him leeks and reeds..."; after a clause the text continues: a-du-y[a a] a-na-an-an-pa-ta-an-zu du-ti-go-an-du, "and let (them) put him under his (scl. of the lord of the sacrifice) feet". The Luwian passage is followed by a Hittite sentence: nun SALSUGI A.NA EN SISKUR, SISKUR ŠA-PAL GIRMESUŠU da-ši-la, and the Old Woman puts the reeds under the feet of the lord of the sacrifice; here Hitt. dai- is construed in exactly the same manner as the Luw. tua-ša. A parallel is provided by two Hieroglyphic sentences:

SULTANHAN, 3 § 9

| sa-te-tu | d-ra-ni-i-zi | la-pa-si-i-zì | ("PES") la-ta-ra | SUB-na-nu | (PONE) re-si-ta |

"to him (scil. the local king; he [scil. the god] put his enemies under (his) feet".

(PONE) re-si-ta BOR, 10 § 9; tua-ERKLET 2,1 § 1; 3rd pers. plur. tua-te-i (PONE) re-si-ta SHEZAR, 3 § 5 or tua-gen (PONE) re-si-ta KULULU 4,1 § 4. Imperative 3rd pers. sing. tu- (PONE) re-si-ta ASSUR, 3 § 22; ALESSI re-si-ta (KULULU) 2, C 2 § 7; 3rd pers. sing. pl. or pl. in obscure contexts PONE re-si-ta IVRIS, A 2 § 2; (PONE) re-si-ta MARASH 8,6; participle tua-išu KARKAMIŠ A 15b, § 12; KULULU 4, 3 § 9. The form PONE re-si-na (or PONE re-si-na) of ALEPPO 3, 2 § 3 is obscure; BOYBEYEPAR 2, IV A 3 § 22 has an unclear (PONE) re-si-na which must be 3rd pers. plural imperfect or imperative.

The Lycian forms are: Present 3rd pers. sing. tua-te (TL 88, 4), 3rd pers. plur. tua-te (N 326, 33); preterite 3rd pers. sing. tua-tu (POME re-si-tu) (context often broken or uncertain, final letters often restored; TL 25,2, 27,2 [28,1], 44,9, 19,20, 44,4 § 51, § 1, 45,3, § 72; N 313); imperative tua-te (TL 88, 4; [93,3]; in spite of the spelling with -e instead of the expected -i both contexts call for a plural rather than a singular form.

I follow the translation by Starke KZ 94 (1980), p. 80; cf. also Beckman SBGIT 28 (1983), p. 228 ff. For Hittite dai- used in a similar context, when the child is put on the knees of one of the parents, see KB XVII 61, obv. 22 (= SBGIT 29, p. 42); [nu-ni-de]-i-an DUMU-an gi-na-si-si-la-di ti-šu-šu "I place the child on her (?) knees."

The word di-i-zi-el is translated 'enemies' because of the context. Cf. perhaps KARKAMIŠ A 23, § 4–5 (t-a-ta, ni-zì) (Norm. Acc. plural) and (t-a-ta, na-zì) (Dat. plur.) to which a meaning 'enemy' can also be attributed from the context (Hawkins, An. St. 25 (1975), 132).

"To put" and "to stand" in the Luwian languages

KARATEPE, XXII Iko.

{i-nu-pa-zi-li-na-za} (LITUUS) i-za-ti-zi-ta-sa (LITUUS) pa-za-ra (SUB-na-na) "PONE-RE-ŠE-NA"

(And I built fortresses[... ] where there were bad men, robbers, who did not live/dwell under M ukas's house)

"and I, Azatwalas, put them under my feet."

In most Lycian contexts the verb tua- means "to erect" or "to dedicate". The object is normally a statue (tukerdii-) or a sarcophagus (rezi) or presumably the stele itself; in two instances (TL 88, 4; 93, 2) it is a klimmi, i.e. an illegal addition, though we do not know the exact meaning of the word. These phrases too have a parallel in Hier. Luwian where the object of tua- may be a table or a throne dedicated in a temple or a stele. In the Xancho stele (TL 44b, 51) the object is kume-zi, "sacrifices" or "altars, sanctuaries".10 The Lycian Trilingual now offers an abstract use of epi-tua- with the object mara ebeija (N 320, 33). We must translate "establish these laws" vel sim. simm.

The Hier. Luwian meanings not only offer the necessary parallels for Cun. Luwian and Lycian; they also give us further evidence for the parallelism with Hittite dai-. They range from "erec" or "dedicate" (tables, thrones, stelae, bread) to "establish" (periodical offerings), to a generic "place, put" (fortresses on the frontier, a body on the funerary pyre, objects on a table, toys (? ) in the hands of children, the god's seal.

---

1 A similar passage, but broken, is found in BOR, 9–10 § 9:


(The year in which I became king)

["in that year"] Tarkanas put [the enemies] beneath my feet"

(Hawkins' readings and interpretation).

10 Cf. Laroche, BSL 62 (1967), 577, but kunezii, plur. kunezi, can no longer be compared with Lyc. kunezi, the new evidence of the Trilingual (N 320, 7) now indicates that Laroche (fourth of Xancho VI, 1979, p. 63) to translate the word as 'sanctuary' or 'altar' (cf. Greek kuneio), but it is possible that in the new text kunezi is only an adjective which determines the noun kune, "sacrifice" (Eichner, Orientalia 52 (1983), p. 59f; cf. MSS 45 (1945), p. 18f. notes 22, 28).

11 The double dative construction used for "to put to someone in the hand" is shared by Hier. tua- and Hitt. dai-. Compare KARKAMIŠ A 6, 5 § 15 (also 17) i-za-ta-ra [ra-za] ("3rd") i-za-ta-ri- [MANUS]-i- [بش] ("PONERE") ci-ta-ra-ša, "with honour to them I then put KATUNUS in the hand" (Montporgo Davies, Riches, 1986, p. 130–1) and e.g. Mss 1 64 (SBGIT 24, p. 8) mu-nu-ma KARA ANESEKUR. KARKAMIŠ 8 KUR VVUULU [t-a-ta-la] hna-na-za-an-an [SUB-na-na] i-za-ta-ri, "and to me he put all the army and the charioteer of the land of Haiti in the hand".
on the criminal’s house, a person at the feet of the god.13) The verb can be joined to preverbs: anda, CUM-ni, annan, PRAE-na with various meanings. More abstract values should also be mentioned: most remarkable perhaps is the phrase from Karatepe XXXIX HU:

|wa-tu-ta (LITUUS) u-za-tu-ta/ta-ta-na (URBS) |á-ša, || na-na PONERE-ha |

“and to it [i.e., the city] I ‘put’ the name Azatwata’. Here the verb tuaa- is construed exactly as Hitite dati- in phrases such as nāšhān NIG.SUA-an SUM-an dati, “and he ‘put’ to him the name Just” (cf. CHD, s.v. lama, b.3’c). The parallelism is underlined by the Hier. Luw. particle -ta, the Luwian equivalent of Hitt. -han.

Another passage, so far not understood, which offers a close parallel to an Hitite expression, is KAYSERI, 2, § 3:

[... ] IDOMUS-na-za, | REL-sa ([[“LITUUS”] tu-wa-ta-na |
| PONERE-wa-ti-f |

“He who shall set the eye on the [...] houses” (the reference is to the criminal who will be punished by the gods).14

---

13 I offer here a more detailed listing: a) To set up, to dedicate a throne and a table for a god(s): (BOYEBPINARI 1; II § 5 a); b) to dedicate a stele (DARENDE; KULULU 4, top); c) an á-ša (URKILET 2) ii) To dedicate bread to a god (KARKAMIS A 11 a); iii) To dedicate/establish a) periodic offerings and libations (HAMA 4, A § 13); b) a vineyard (BOR, § 3.4a); c) To place a) a name or names on a monument (HAMA 4, A § 7; HAMA 5); b) a body on a pyre (SHEIZAR); c) frontiers or fortresses or frontiers (CEKKE, TOPADA); d) pure X on a table (ANCOZ); e) the god’s seal on the criminal’s house (KULULU 2); f) objects (!) in the hand of children (KARKAMIS A 6); g) someone at the feet of the goddess (KARKAMIS A 15 b); h) enemies under one’s feet (see above). For “giving (‘putting’) a name” and “setting the eye” see below. Other objects of tuaa- such as nāšhān (BOYEBPINARI 2, III A 2 IV D § 14; KARKAMIS A 13 c 4 a 4 b, a § 3 14); hā-ta ου-ου ｘ (BOYEBPINARI 2, IV A 3 § 22), and LNGUNS (tuaa- tu-sa) (VRIZ) remain obscure.

14 Anda tuaa- is used of putting the evil-doer onto/ onto the Moon God’s KIPUTA (SULTANHAN, base C § 31); of the god who put an anjā-ni to a man and then take it away (KULULU 4, 13 § 4 9); CUM-ni tuaa- refers to putting a name with a god (ALEPPO 2, § 10) but putting X with the gods (TELL AHMAR 2, § 7) or collecting everything together (ASSUR, e § 22). For SUB-na-na (annah) tuaa- see above. PRAE-na tuaa- is used in BABYLON cup 2 of putting a stone cup before the god (i.e. of dedicating it to him). PRAE-i tuaa- in MARAS § 4 belongs to a broken text.

Readings by Hawkins; cf. also Hawkins, KADISH 19 (1980), p. 124, where, however tuaa- is treated as another form of tuaa-, “towards”. Clearly we have here the accusative singular of the word for ‘eye’ of which we knew already the nominative-accusative plural tuaa (KARABURUN, 2, 3; cf. AKST 30 (1980), p. 127); the pattern

We may compare the clause twice repeated in the first Military Oath (StBoT 22, i 23 f., 42 f.):

nu-zu-an A-NA KUR URA-ENAT; 77 KUR-li IGHHA-sa da-a-i “und auf das Land Hatti feindlich den Blick richtet”

and the even closer passage (615f iv) quoted by Oettinger ibid., p. 25:


An examination of the texts where tuaa- or tuaa- occur makes it clear that in spite of some variations there is formal and semantic continuity in all Luwian languages; etymologically we are dealing with one verb and one verb only. Another conclusion is that semantically and syntactically tuaa-/tuaa- matches Hitite dati- in addition to the obvious links quoted, others might be mentioned. That dati- itself is to be connected with IE *dhehi- can hardly be doubted and the name-giving construction I quoted above offers one bit of evidence for it (cf. Gr. ἄποψις ἄποψις, Lat. nomen dare, Skt. nama ḍhā-, etc.). Obviously we cannot demonstrate that Luwian tuaa- is etymologically related to Hitt. dati-, since conceivable a different verb could have replaced the expected form and acquired all its range of meanings and constructions (as well as its membership of the bi-conjugation). Yet a connection is not impossible, and it is reasonable to accept the view of those who recognize both an etymological and a semantic link between tuaa- and dati- and derive tuaa- from dhehi-.

3. So much for “to put”, though I shall return to it. What is the evidence, if any, for “to stand”? Cuneiform Luwian and Lycian have little to offer, at this stage at least, so that we must concentrate on Hier. Luwian. Here we must distinguish two ta- roots. The first means “to take” (cf. Hitite da-) and is always written with the ta sign for the “taking hand” (Laroche HH, no. 41); this verb does not concern us here.15

15 Oettinger StBoT 22 (1976), 25 attributes the da-a-i form of his text to dati- ‘to put’, but with considerable hesitations; the Hier. Luwian parallel supports the identification.

16 Cf. § 4.4 below for some suggestions.

17 Some forms of the verb 'to give', though they are normally so interpreted: cf. below note 56. For the verb 'give' we know both ta-forms and da-forms which are sometimes written with the CAPERE logogram (cf. Hawkins and
The other root is normally written with the 'leg' sign (Laroche HH, no. 82) which could be transliterated ta₄, but is best taken as a logogram, CRUS (Hawkins, An. St. 30 (1980), p. 149). The third person sing. present of this verb, CRUS-i, once alternates in the same text (SULTANHAN, see below) with ta-i, so that the reading is not in doubt. Also, the two versions of KARATEPE XVIII write ta-i₄ (Hu) and CRUS-i₄ (Ho) respectively for the same word. In addition to CRUS-i₄ we know an 'iterative' written ('CRUS') ta-za₄ (KARATEPE, LXXIV) and a causative written in various manners: CRUS-nu₄, ta-nu₄, ('CRUS') ta-nu₄. The presence of CRUS is important because this is a logogram which clearly characterizes a closely knit verbal group and distinguishes it from the normal verbs of coming and going, marked by the 'foot' (PES) and the 'reversed foot' (PES₂) respectively; from the verb "to put", characterized as we have seen, by the PONERE logogram (the 'putting hand', Laroche HH, no. 65); and from the verb "to take" marked by the CAPERE logogram (the 'taking hand').

3.1 What do ta₄, taza₄- and tanu₄- mean? It may be easier to start from the causative, all the more so because in Hier. Luwian the -nu₄-formation, which is highly productive, has a well defined value: "to cause/allow X to do what is indicated by the root". The verb tanu₄-occurs in at least 16 clear passages as well as in some less clear ones.

In all clear contexts a value such as "set up, erect, establish" is appropriate. Kings and other individuals erect (tanu₄-) stelae and statues (7 times) or set up (tanu₄-) a god or gods (8 times) or set up (tanu₄-) an individual. A translation "cause to stand" is possible in all instances; "cause to come" or "cause to step in" would not be appropriate for the sentences which have stelae or statues as the grammatical object.

As examples one may quote RESTAN, 2 § 3:

za-pa-wal₄ ("STELE") wa-wa-na (DEUS) pa-ha-la-ti-i₄ CRUS-nu₄-ha.

"and this stele I set up to Bahalatis",

or SULTANHAN, 1 § 2:

l₄-za₄-wa₄ wa₄-wa₄ (DEUS) TONITRUS-hu₄-s₄-na tu-wa₄ + n-li-s₄-si₄-i₄ na l₄-za₄-wa₄-ha

"I set up this Tarhunzas of the Vineyard".

3.2 The iterative-intensive ta₄-za₄- occurs only once in one of the last two clauses of KARATEPE (LXXXIV-LXXXV Hu) and is picked up in a subordinate clause by the simple CRUS-i₄. The text reads:

POST-na-wa₄-i₄ ARHA ("CRUS") ta₄-za₄-tu₄ l₄-ra-li₄-zi₄ OMNIS-MI₄-zi₄ (OCULUS) za-wa₄-wa₄-ta₄-wa₄ s₄₄-i₄-

§ 6; or tannu₄ (CRUS-nu₄-hat₂) in KARKAMISH A 31/2, § 4; QAL'AT EL MUDIQ, 2 § 3; RESTAN, 2 § 3; 3rd pers. plural CRUS-nu₄-ta₄-wa₄ (KULULU, § 4, § 5) or CRUS-nu₄-ta₄, TILSENET, 2 § 5. The forms ("CRUS") ta₄-za₄-wa₄-wa₄ (KARKAMISH A 15b) and CRUS-nu₄-ta₄-wa₄ (KARKAMISH A 19b) are not clear.

Erecting or "setting up" of stelae and statues: KARKAMISH 3, QAL'AT EL MUDIQ, RESTAN, TILSENET, KARKAMISH A 25₄₄, A 31/2, A 18₄₄ (?); setting up of a god or gods: KARKAMISH A 1₄₄, A 4₄₄, § 2₄₄, 2₄₄, KAYSERI, KULULU I, SULTANHAN, 1, 2₄₄, TELL AHMAR 2. Different contexts: KARKAMISH A 6₄₄, setting the young prince high up, A 1₄₄, A 2₄₄, setting (probably prompting an infitive), A 15b (incomplete and obscure). I am not certain if the form ta₄-za₄ of TILSENET, 1 § 1 belongs here. The semantic range of tanu₄- partly overlaps with that of (SOLHUM)tu₄-wa₄, the causative of (SOLHUM)tu₄-wa₄, 'set'. The forms attested are as follows: present 1st sing. tanu₄-wa₄ ("CRUS") tanu₄-wa₄-wa₄, 1st pers. plural tanu₄-wa₄- (CRUS-nu₄-wa₄-ta₄-s₄₄-ni₄ SULTANHAN, 2 § 3). Preterite 1st pers. sing, tanu₄-wa₄-wa₄ (written in full in KULULU 1, 2 § 5 and SULTANHAN, 1 § 2 and 3 § 16; otherwise written semilogographically in KARKAMISH A 1₄₄, §§ 2₄₄, 2₄₄, 2₄₄, [2₄₄, 4₄₄, § 7]; KAYSERI, 2; TELL AHMAR 2, 5.

(DEUS) LUNA + MI-sa-te-wi (DEUS) SOL-ha REL-ri + i å-ta-ma za "CRUS"-i

"Hereafter may Azatwatis' name continue to stand for all ages, as the Moon's and the Sun's name stands."

The Phoenician version offers a simpler sentence: "But the name of 'ETWĐ shall be for eternity, like the name of the Sun and Moon', with Phoenician ū-ni 1m corresponding to ta-za-tu araî-zî OMNIS-MI-zi. Both the Phoenician parallel and the general context call for a translation of tua- as "remain, continue to stand", and of "CRUS"-i (i.e. tâti) as "stands". That the two verbs share the same root is not in doubt; -za- is a well attested suffix. Merigg's translation (Manmade III 1, p. 99) "may the name reach all descendants" is based on a wrong semantic and grammatical interpretation of the verb and of ati-zi as a dative plural instead of a nom.-acc. plural. We should notice that both ta- and tua- are intransitive, while, as expected, the causative tamu- is transitive.

3.3 In addition to the KARATEPE passage just quoted the simple verb CRUS- or tua- occurs in some fixed locations discussed below and in several other passages (cf. below and note 25), where it is mostly accompanied by preverbs. The clearest text is perhaps IZGIN, 3 § 3:

wali-mul (DEUS) TONITRUS CUM-ni CRUS-tn (When I sat myself on my paternal throne)
"Tarihunzas stood with me".

We may compare Hitt. tija- in expressions like Hatt. ii 66 (StBoT 24, p. 15) ms-mi 5iSTAR GASAN-JA GAM-an ti-ja-at "and Istar, my Lady, stood with me".

The comparison is strengthened by the remaining KARATEPE passage (XLVIII Hu):

---

22 Forms attested: present 3rd pers. sing. CRUS-(-i)l/a/i (ALEPPO 2, 6 § 23; BABYLON, 5 § 10; HISSARCIK, 2 § 3; KARATEPE, LXXV Hu. ["CRUS"-i]; KARKAMIŞ A 3, 2 § 18 A 2 + 2; A 18, 4; SULTANHAN, 3 § 21 [phr. subject 'the gods']; ibid. base, F-G §§ 38, 39, 40; TILSEVET, 3 § 6 or CRUS-ta-ha-la (CEKKE, 11 § 22; KARATEPE, XLVIII Hu and Ho). Present, 3rd pers. sing. CRUS-lat (EGRIKÖY, 2 § 3 ["CRUS"-la]; IZGIN B/C/A, 3 § 3); 3rd pers. plur. CRUS-in KARKAMIŞ A 5 n. 4 § 5. Imperative, 3rd pers. plur. "CRUS"-tu KULULU 2, 3 § 6; cf. also CRUS in KARKAMIŞ A 3 n. 4 § 13.


---

to ì-wa-[i]-sa-tu-na ta-il-a [CRUS-ii in Ho.] ("FLUMEN") hâ-pa + râtâ-sâ /OMNIS-MI-î-sâ "and every river land will begin to honour him (viz. the god)".24

The construction of taïa (a byform or 'bygraph' of tâi) with the infinitive matches that of Hittite tija- with the supine in the sense of "to start to do something, to be prepared to do something". A further example of functional equivalence between ta- and Hitt. tija- will be discussed below in § 3.5.

Elsewhere anda- tu- or POST-ni anda- tu- obviously indicate some form of contact with persons or objects in the dative; meanings such as "come to stand in, or close to" or "attach oneself to" are all possible; whenever the context is not too obscure a comparison with Hitt. tija- is possible.25

Finally another set of passages shows a different construction. The verb tu- is used with a preceding dative in an intransitive phrase; we have three such phrases: ka-ti tu-, taraî-pi or taraî-pâ tu-, and the more obscure taraî-pâ(-na)-na-hi-ri+i tu-.

The first phrase is attested three times in the same text: SULTANHAN, base F-G §§ 38–42:

(i) 'ni-pa-wa-ti/-tu | URBS+MI-ni | REL₂-sa-ha/ | ka-ti-i | CRUS-i
(ii) [ni-pa-wa-ti/-tu | ("TERRA") tu-ka-mi-i | REL₂-sa-ha | ka-ti-i | [tu-]]


25 KARATEPE, LXXV and XLVIII have been discussed above and so has IZGIN; HISSARCIK will be discussed below. anda-tu occurs intransitively in BABYLON perhaps with reference to coming to stand into a precipice or a built up area. In KULULU 1 the verb (tâni) refers to the action of the god who will punish the evil doer and anda tu- for him the (orto the) tâ-sî-zi. The noun may be acc. neuter sing or dative plural; other attestations of this word which may mean "suite, memorial" or the like speak for a singular but if so this would be the only instance of tu- with or without preverb used transitively— which makes one pause. In KARKAMIŞ A 3 POST-ni ili-tâ CRUS-i is used intransitively in the curse part of the text: "Kutuwass gave masters of the sepant to this Tarihunzas of Karkamiš... in future whoever append (i) anda tui to them and takes them away from this Tarihunzas of Karkamiš, him may this Tarihunzas of Karkamiš curse!". In Hittite appenda tija—(with appenda tija) means "to attach oneself to someone" e.g. in KUB XXXIII 1 +, evh, 1, 33–4 = STBoT 16, p. 6: na-at-kün A-NA LUGAL KUR (URU-MI-za-tu-i) EGR-PÁ-an-du (wuü-râ)-sw, and they attached themselves to the King of Egypt) and a similar meaning is suitable here. The context of EGRIKÖY, 2 is too broken to allow an analysis.
e-verb *tar(a)pi-, which is frequently attested.28 Similarly in Hittite beside the phrase *kari*iija- we also find a verb *karijaa-.

Finally in the difficult text KARKAMIŠ A 5a, 2 § 5 Hawkins now reads the following sentence:

**seologi** · [x]-na- · si-'x' · dami- · sa · tari-ri · i-sa · MATER-ti-sa · tari-pa-nada · la-hi-ri · i · CRUS-ta

"and for me ... my father (and) mother stood for t."

The dative this time is that of an -ahi- abstract, but the meaning of the phrase is not clear.

3.4 What can we now say about the Hieroglyphic root *ta- and its meaning? To translate "come" or "go" seems impossible, a) because of the logogram CRUS instead of PES or PES2, b) because of the meaning of the causative *tanar-, c) because of KARATEPE LXXIV-LXXV where "stand, remain" are the most likely values both for *tazara- and *ta-.

In all other passages some notion of movement may seem implicit as is in Hitt. *teja-; on the other hand, a value such as "come to stand", i.e. an eventive rather than a stative "stand" fits most contexts. The distinction between eventive and stative values may be neutralized in the causative. Admittedly in KARATEPE a stative rather than an eventive value may seem appropriate, but we should not forget that of all our texts KARATEPE is one of the most recent and that conceivably this CRUS-i of KARATEPE may be a semantic back formation from the causative. A further problem is that we are still uncertain about the value of the *tara-iteratives such as *taza-.

The Hieroglyphic Luwian evidence then speaks for a *hi-conjugation verb *ta-, which means "to stand" or "to come to stand" (in an eventive sense) and which matches Hittite *teja-. The next question is whether this is merely a Hieroglyphic Luwian verb or a Common Luwian verb.

3.5 I now turn to Cuneiform Luwian. The evidence is very limited but Laroche, D.L. S.v. lists a verb *ta-, though he does not offer any interpretation. In fact in two passages at least the verb can be translated without excessive difficulties.

28 In addition to the form TARAPI- of the verb there is also a form TARAPA-, which may conceivably be athematic, cf. for the full data the article quoted in note 26.
According to Starke, the text is part of a ritual organized over a number of days. In the first sentence, if we compare ta- with Hier. Luw. ta- and with Hitt. tiya-, we can think of the technical value of tiya- in temporal statements and translate: "your day has come/stepped in". We compare phrases like Hitt. ny m-a-â-ha-an n-e-kw-uz me-jur ti-ja-az-zi, "and sobald die Zeit des Abends (cin)(trit)" (KUB XLI 17 118; cf. Neu, Studien zum Endungslosen "Lokativ", p. 14) or ma-a-an (URU-A-rı-in-na XI ITU-âš ti-iz-zi, "when the eleventh month comes in in Arinna" (KBO VI ii 61), cf. Oettinger, Bibliogr. 39 (1982), col. 365). Hier. Luwian too offers an example of the ta-verb in this technical use; cf. HIRARCIIK 12 § 3:

NOVEM-ti-sa-ha-wal-ti-ti-[i?] ANNUS-saq-si-sa-i [REL-ti] itu-i
"and when the year's ninth (sic! month?) comes." 32

In Cun. Luwian the -ta ending of tatta, third pers. sing. preterite, is the expected form for a verb which appears in Hier. Luwian with an -i third pers. sing. present.

Other Cun. Luwian passages are too broken or too obscure to be much of use, but the two texts quoted establish that in Cun. Luwian too there is a verb ta- which corresponds to Hittite tiya-.

3.6 It has now emerged that both Cuneiform and Hieroglyphic Luwian had (and probably inherited from Common Luwian) a ta-verb, which meant "to come to stand", i.e. was an eventive "to stand", but also had or acquired a stative value in Hier. Luwian. Functionally the verb corresponds to Hittite tiya-. Given meaning and form it is difficult to translate is based on a distinction between the adjective ara, 'long' and the noun ara-, 'time, generation', which are both listed under ara, ara(-) and ara- 'long' in Laroche DIL, p. 36. Of the adjective, which normally precedes a noun (most often 'years'), we know the nom. plur. ara(a)ni, the abl.-instr. ara(y)i (once ara(a)-a-ti in KUB 16 i 11) extended by Starke StBoT 30, p. 93 into ara(-)s-a(-a)-ti and the dat. plur. ara-ra-sa-an-a (KBO XXIX 17, v. 7). For the noun we have the acc. sing. ara and the abl.-instr. ara(-)s-a(t) (and the dat. ara(-a)ti). The adjective matches the Hier. Luw. nom.-acc. neuter plural "LONGUS"s-ti-ra(-a) (KARATEPE, LXXIV Hu, Ho; KARKAMIŠ A 5 a, 2 § 7; A 18b, 1 § 2; TILSETEK, 1 § 2) and the dat. plur. ara(a)ni (HAMA 4, B 2 § 10, A 4 § 12).

32 For the passage cf. Hawkins and Morpurgo Davies, Hethitica, forthcoming, § 3 d.)
not to connect this verb with IE *steh₂*-, but, if so, we ought to notice that in Luwian we have, in contrast with Hittite, the expected *i*-type for the telic root *steh₂*-4. Obviously this does not explain the form of Hitt. *tija*- but adds plausibility to the view that *tija-* too is related to *steh₂*-.

4. So far I have neglected Lycian mainly because it offers different complications from those we have been discussing. Yet one of my original questions (§ 1) concerned the Lycian 3rd pers. sing. *tadi* which, with its -di ending, conflicts with the *tati* we expect as the replacement for an *-i* form of Cuneiform or Hieroglyptic Luwian.

4.1 Before we discuss *tadi* we should consider another relevant verb, Lyc. *stati* (3rd pers. sing.), *stati* (3rd pers. plur.). The evidence is limited—six passages in all, none of which is absolutely clear. The traditional translation “puts, locates” has recently been challenged—no doubt correctly.13 In the Xanthos stele (T 44 c 5,7,9) *stati* is accompanied twice by the nominative *stala,* ‘stele,’ and once by *urubilijé,* which can also be a nominative neuter. T 44 b 35 (*stati*) is too broken and too difficult to be of use and T 93,2 (*stati*) does not help to establish the construction or meaning of the verb. The one occasion on which *stati* occurs in the trilingual (N 320,16–17) is perhaps parallel to the passages first mentioned and some light comes from Eichner’s suggestion14 that *tānā,* which precedes the verb, is a neuter noun (< *tāsian*) which means ‘monument’ or the like. There are two possibilities; either *stati* is intransitive, with *stele* and ‘monument’ as subjects, and means ‘stands’,15 or is transitive, as suggested by Guasmani loc.cit., and means ‘establishes’ or the like. According to either interpretation a link with the IE verb for ‘stand’ is likely. It does not follow, however, that *stati* is the Lycian equivalent of Hier. Luwian *tāi*; it is far more likely that *stati* is simply a borrowing from Greek.16 Lycian has practically no

4.2 I can now return to Lycian *ta-* . The verb is well attested with a present *tadi* (3rd pers. sing.) and *tāti*tą* (3rd pers. plur.), a preterite *tādē* (3rd pers. sing.) and *tātē* (3rd pers. plur.), an imperative 3rd pers. plur. *tātē* (for *tātē*), and an infinitive (possibly with reduplication) *tāmēlē* (see § 18). It is always transitive and always occurs with preverbs which define its meaning: *nī* ‘in’ (< *nānda*), *nēhē* ‘against’, on *(< *nānda + epί * < *epī*)*, *hippē* ‘upon’ (< *sār epī*), etc. The attested phrases are as follows:

*nī* *ta-* ‘impose, establish’ (??) (T 4,5; 5,7; 51,3; 36,3; 38,7; 39,7; 41,4; 42,2; 47,3). The object may be fines which the council imposes on the transgressors of the law or payments to be made for particular

---

13 Cf. e.g. Guasmani, *Studia Meriggii,* 1979, p. 227 ff.
15 Cf. e.g. Laroche, *Fossiles de Xantos VI,* p. 68 and Eichner op.cit. in note 34.
16 Cf. Meriggii, *Studios grammaticali dell’anonimo* (Roma 1980, 115, p. 245), who also assumes that Lycian *tē* is somehow related to our verb. Pedersen, *Lykisch and Hittitisch* (Copenhagen 1949), p. 317, § 52, and p. 52 § 90 also suggests that *stati* is a borrowing, but this is in the context of an attempt to prove that *tānā* derives from *tānā*.
18 Note also that it would be extraordinary to find a *-tē* -form in Lycian when no *-tē* -form appears either in Hittite or in the other two Luwian languages.
19 Pret. 3rd pers. sing. *tadi* in TL 5,2; 6,2–3; 75,4; 83,10–11; 84,3; 88,5; 94,2; 101,3; 102,2; 109,3; 110,2; 125,2; 131,2; 149; 7; pers. plur. *tātē* in TL 57,6 (J. 7); 58,4; 75,2; 84,2; 88,3; 90,2; 93,2; 94,1; 101,2; 109,2; 110,2; 112,2; 131,1; 134,1; 149,3; 150,5,6; N 306,3; 309,2; 317,2; *tē* TL 102,1. Pret. 3rd pers. sing. *tādē* TL 4,5; 36,3; 41,4; 42,2; 47,3; 3rd pers. plur. *tādē* TL 31,3; 39,7; 50,1; N 320,13; *wē* 38,7. Imperative 3rd pers. plur. *tātē* TL 5,10; 75,3; 90,2; 98,3; 91,2; 109,3; 154,2; *tē* (with omission of the nasal vowels) TL 118,2, N 317,3. Infinitive *tē* TL 39,6, *tē* (90,3; *tē* 49; 149,15; *tē* 34,1 (for the forms with initial *-tē* cf. Hudeck, *KZ* 98 [1985], p. 41 ff.). "Inferior" 3rd pers. plur. pres. *tātē* TL *83,6* (restored by Laroche, *Fossiles de Xantos VI,* p. 71); 89,2; [118,4]. For the absence of some expected nasalized vowels in the plural cf. Morpurgo Davies, KZ 96 (1982/83), p. 253 note 22 with other references. An apparent third person sing. pres. *epōsēti* is found in Lycian B, TL 44 c 55.
purposes. On rare occasions (TL 75, 2; 84, 2) the phrase is used in the same way as "n̄iēpi tā-

*n̄iēpi tā- 'bury, lay in' (TL 39, 6; 57, 6; 80, 2; 83, 6, 10, 11; 88, 3, 5; 89, 2; 90, 2; [93, 2]; 94, 1; 101, 2, 3; 102, 1; 110, 2; 112, 2, 3; [118, 4]; 131, 1; N 306; 319a; 317). The verb is used of people who are going to be buried in their own graves or of people who after death are illegally introduced into the grave of someone else.

hṛppa tā- 'bury, lay on top' (TL 5, 10; 49; 58, 4; 75, 3, 4; 84, 3; 91, 2; 94, 2; 109, 3, 5; 110, 2; [111, 2]; 118, 2; 128, 2; 134, 1; 149, 5, 7; 150, 5, 6). The verb is used for people who after death are illegally buried in the graves of other people.

*n̄e hṛppa tā- (TL 102, 2; 134, 2; N 317). Apparently equivalent to hṛppa tā-

The meaning of two other phrases, *n̄eēre tā- (TL 109, 2–3) and esērē tā- (TL 6, 2–3; 131, 2) is not entirely clear, partly because we are uncertain about the meaning of the preverbs but the basic value of the verb seems to be the same. Finally, *n̄e tā is used once in the trilingual (N 320, 13: 9tādi) where it is likely to have a more abstract meaning than "put", but the context is not clear.12

4.3 The basic sense of Lycian tā- is 'lay, put' as we established long ago. The real problem arises when we try to decide whether the Lycian verb is linked with any other Luwian verb. It seems unlikely that Lyc. tā- is related to Hier. Luw. ta-, 'take' (3rd pers. sing. ta-i; cf. note 17). First, this would call for a drastic semantic shift, which would be difficult to parallel; secondly, we would have to explain the -di-, -de endings used in the singular instead of the expected -ti-, -te endings (cf. § 1). Similar, and possibly worse, problems would arise if we tried to link Lycian ta- and Hier. Luw. ta-, 'stand, come to stand' (3rd pers. sing. ta-i, CRUS-i), Gk. Luw. ta-, 'come to stand'. Here we would have to postulate a semantic change (from 'stand' or 'come to stand' to 'put'), a syntactical change (from intransitive to transitive), and we would again be confronted by the question of the -di-, -de endings.

As early as 1945 Pedersen (Lykisch u. Hittitisch, p. 31 § 50) compared Lycian tādi with Hittite dâ, 'he puts', but then proceeded, implausibly, to segment tādi as tā-di-i, arguing that we were dealing with a reduplicated root and an -i ending as in Hittite. This is patently wrong and calls for no further discussion (we have no evidence for an -i ending in Lycian), but we may still retain the main point. Given the basic meaning 'to put' of Lyc. tā- it is difficult to dissociate this verb from Hittite tāi, IE *dheh₁-i-. If we were not for the fact that we also want to connect with these forms Luw. tuwē-, Lyc. tuwē-, we would probably not hesitate to accept the connection. Admittedly, the fact that the Hittite verb belongs to the -i-conjugation raises the usual problem: why -dā and not *-ti in Lycian? Yet, we could observe by way of defense that the rule has only been formulated for the Luwian languages; we simply cannot know whether all verbs of the Hitt. -i-conjugation had Luwian equivalents with -ti and not -di- endings. The question then becomes: did Lycian have two verbs, tuwe- and ta-, derived from the same *dheh₁-i- root?

There is no definite answer. All that can be done is to show that a derivation of both tuwe- and ta- from the same root is not impossible, i.e. plausible semantic and morphological processes can be reconstructed to account for the differences between the two roots. If the reconstruction leads to the explanation of other problems, this will add plausibility to the hypothesis, but speculation is bound to play a considerable part in the argument.

4.4 The two verbs do not wholly overlap in use; tuwe- is specialized in the sense of erecting or setting up monuments, but in compo-
tion (epitwēti masa in N 320, 32) can also be used for establishing or setting up laws; ta-, always with preverbs, is used with the specialized meaning of laying or burying bodies but can also be used with more abstract values (cf. the phrase ἱτε τα-). Both the partial overlap and the partial differences could be explained if we started from one and the same root. It is worth observing that Greek θρήνος, often in composition, has all the range of uses which we have attributed to tuwe- and ia.-

Morphologically things are far more complicated. We have seen that strictly speaking we are not committed to explaining the -di ending of ta-, but on the theory of a common origin we must still explain why we have both tuweei with -ti and iadi with -di; we ought also to explain why the *dheH₁ root did not yield in Luvian the expected tai form, which in its turn would have called for a tais replacement in Lycian.

It is a plausible assumption that for the three roots *dheH₁, *steH₁ and *deH₁, Anatolian inherited both the formal equivalents of root aorists or intransitives (3rd pers. sing. *dheH₁-t(i), etc.) and the equivalents of hi-conjugation forms (whether these were in fact perfects or some nominal verb formation is irrelevant for our purposes). The latter forms certainly had endings of their own in the singular; if such endings also existed for the plural they were soon replaced by endings which were not differentiated from those of the other type.

An attempt at reconstructing exact forms is fraught with difficulties—all the more so since we aim at reconstructing Common Luvian rather than Common Anatolian—but a few points can be established. After the merger of initial *d and *deH₁ the simplification of the laryngeals in various positions, and the merger of e, a, and i in most positions, the so-called hi-forms of 'put' and 'take' (IE 'give') must have been very similar in Common Luvian. A rough reconstruction follows; I have based it on forms which do not include the -i element of the present but I do not necessarily imply that such a type can be attributed to Common Luvian. 45

45 For the use of ōn in the sense of burying in the Greek inscriptions of Lycia see Bryce op. cit. (in note 40), p. 188 note 96.

46 If Cop, IF 75 (1971), pp. 85–96 is correct in assuming that Cun. Lw. writes as ð in certain positions but the same rule does not apply to inherited i and d, Common Luvian must still have distinguished the aspirate stops from other stops in intervocalic position but there is no evidence that this applies to initial position.

47 I have reconstructed the relevant forms with *e, *i, and *a, but from a Luvian point of view *e, *i, *a would lead to the same results.

It is possible that the similarity of the two inflectional patterns was the cause, or one of the causes, which prompted the remodelling of 'put' and the creation of a new regular stem tuwea-. How the -i- was introduced in the stem does not matter much for our purposes; it has often been suggested that it was introduced from the first person plural where the laryngeal was lost before i. At present what matters most is that the remodelled tuwea-, 'put' followed the same conjugational pattern as the verb it replaced (hence tuwea- 3rd pers. sing.).

The Luvian equivalents of the root aorist or intransitive at some stage must have had plural forms similar to the ones I reconstructed above. The singular was different; tentatively it may be reconstructed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>'put'</th>
<th>'take'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1sg.</td>
<td>(*dheH₁-t(i) &gt;) *dēn</td>
<td>*dēn (&lt; *deH₁-t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2sg.</td>
<td>(*dheH₁ &gt;) *dis</td>
<td>*dis (&lt; *deH₁-i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sg.</td>
<td>(*dheH₁ &gt;) *dāt(a)</td>
<td>*dāt(a) (&lt; *deH₁-t)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

46 Here it is difficult to know whether the -i- was introduced into the stem or not. In theory Luvian forms of the dui type (3rd pers. sing. present) may be explained as derived directly from *dheH₁-t(i) with *e > i) or as derived from *deH₁-a with a further *i-element added.

47 Even without particular composition though the concrete evidence for it is not plentiful (the exact vocalism is irrelevant for my purposes); in Can. Luvian we may probably appeal to the -m(i)- forms discussed by Carruba, Die Sprache 14 (1968), p. 171f.

48 Cf. e.g. Oesinger, Stammbildung p. 482f. In the table above I have tentatively assumed that H₁ and H₂ vocalize into a between stops, this is not in contradiction with the assumption that H₁ and H₂ are lost after stop and before i.

49 The reconstruction here is particularly arbitrary: In final position a stop should have been lost in Common Luvian, but we may have here a supporting vowel, the point I am trying to make is that, if when either the -i element or the -a supporting vowel were present, the dental which preceded them would have been voiced because it followed a long stressed vowel (see below, with notes 52 and 53).
I assume that *eH1C > *eC and that in Common Luwian *e > *i.49 I also assume that after a long accented vowel i is voiced/lenited, as it is e.g. in Cun. Luwian i-r-'i, 'goes', Hier. Luw. i-r-'i (< *eiri) and perhaps in Cun. Luw. ma-na-a-ti (- *mneH1ti).50 For the verb 'to take' the two inflectional patterns (hi-type and injunctive type) differed only because of the singular endings; the stem was basically the same in both. After the predictable levelling occurred only one inflectional type was left with a third pers. sing. diai. For 'to put' the position was different: if the chronology I postulated is correct, the 'hi-type' endings belonged to a new stem inwa- which was formally very different from the *di-/ida-stem to which the 'normal' non -hi endings were added. This may explain why a full simplification did not take place and both stems survived, in contrast with the simplification undergone by the stems of 'take' and, one may add, 'stand'. Yet in Luwian terms a conjugation in which the singular has an -i-vocalism (*di- in this case) and the plural an -a-vocalism (da-) is impossible; we have no evidence for qualitative Ablaut in the Luwian verbal inflection. Some levelling was called for and the plural stem was generalized.51 If so, Common Luwian could have created a new third person singular *deki or *deki, which is the direct antecedent of Lycian tadi; the same process would have led to a present deka or dadi which yielded Lycian tadi.24

What emerges from this reconstruction, however imperfect, is that both a 'hi-conjugation' tuwa- and a 'mi-conjugation' taa- may have arisen from the inherited *dheH1- at a Common Luwian stage. If Hittite nus-tezzi etc. (Oettinger, Stammbildung, p. 125 f.) and Hitt. tezzi 'says' are also formed on this root, we could argue that Lycian tadi formally corresponds to Hitt. tezzi, with the difference that while Hittite generalized the vocalism of the singular stem, Luwian generalized the vocalism of the plural stem. It is not superfluous to ask why we do not have more substantial traces of ta-, 'to put' in Cuneiform and Hieroglyphic Luwian, but the fact that we cannot answer the question cannot be used as a serious objection. The Cuneiform Luwian evidence is too scanty to allow us to make much of an argumentum ex silentiis. Here too, however, we have a form a-ga-ta-a[n-]da, 'let them fetch', in a miraculously clear context.25 The absence of ta- 'to put' from the Hier. Luwian texts may also be ascribed to lack of evidence, though we cannot exclude that one or two examples of ta- 'put' are attested.6

51 Cf. e.g. Oettinger, Stammbildung, p. 535 f. and HHI. (quoted in note 4), p. 166. To the examples quoted there we may now add Hier. Luw. tamitka, 'prosperity' (Hitt. tamta(n)TEM(R)); cf. Hawkins and Morpurgo Davies, Hittitica, forthcoming.
53 It is otiose to speculate why the plural rather than the singular stem was preferred, but we may also note that presumably Luwian also had the continuation of *a-ti, *a-thi- stem, which formally overlapped with *a-di from *dheH1- (cf. Cun. Luw. ta-tim(w); Lyc. tedeimi, 'son'). The process which led to the creation of Lycian dadi can be explained in at least two ways which need not be mutually exclusive. Conceivably a third pers. sing. pres. *deki with voiced or voiced dental after a long accented vowel was analogically replaced by dadi which avoided the contrast in the vocalism of the singular and the plural, but preserved the original ending. Alternatively, when the inherited 3rd sing. ending -t was replaced by -ta, the dental of this form was voiced or lenited before the introduction of the vowel of the plural in the singular and the present followed suit.
54 Eichner, MSS 31 (1973), 50 also derives Lyc. tedi from 'urantia, *deH1ti and compares Hitt. tezzi, 'says' but he does not state whether he thinks that Lyc. a is the direct continuation of *eH1 or not.

KUB XXXV 102 (1-4) 103, obv. ii 14', v. 4 v; cf. Starke, KZ 94 (1980), p. 80 f.; StBoT 30, pp. 205 f., 222 f.
54 I am not clear what Oettinger (Stammbildung, p. 183) has in mind when he refers to the fact that Hier. Luwian has preserved together with Lycian the form *deH1, 'br. set'. It is possible, however, that we have an example of the root for 'to put' written with the same ta sign which is normally used for 'to take'.
KARKAMIS A 11 b 4-c, b 4-5 §§ 26'-29' contains one of the usual curses against the evil doer:
(i) was-ta-i-'IR-si-ta-as-sa-1a-un '(CULTEUR)'pa + wsi-ta-ti-ti-ti
(ii) FEMINA-ti-ia-ti-as-as-ha-tos-ti-ti-un '(CULTEUR)'pa + ha-ta-ha-ti-ti-ti
(iii) waH1-ti-ti-1 VEN-si-ia-ti-at-sa-(H1)neR-sa-1a-ta
(iv) FEMINA-ti-ia-ti-as-ha-ta-i-ta-(FEMINA) + 'etc. at ta-ta-ti
"From him may they not be unmannerly,
and from her may they never insinuate,
To him may they not be masculine potency/seed,
To her (?) may they not be feminine fertility/seed."
The passage was explained by Hawkins (AnSt 25 (1975), p. 143 f.) who discussed the meaning of ta- in (iii) and (iv) and concluded that the verb meant 'convey, bring' and ta was a dative of advantage. Obviously what the gods deny to the evil doer is the capacity to have children (though it is not clear whether the reference is to male and female descendants or to male potency and female fertility). However, we have no other example of a similar use of ta, 'to take', and the 'give' meaning of the root, which we know from the other Indo-European languages, can hardly be appealed to here. If we had a verb ta- 'to put', the passage could refer to male and female fertility which the gods put into those they love. Why should the verb be written with the 'taking' hand? Carnuba, Gedenkschrift Kromayer, p. 6 note 8, reaches similar conclusions; however, the other example he offers of ta- 'put' (KARKAMIS A 11 b 6, 7-7) can be differently explained and is in all probability simply a form of ta-, 'to take' (cf. Hawkins and
5. If both the hard data from which I started and the speculations with which I continued are correct, some conclusions may now be stated. The Luwian equivalent of Hittite *tija* is a ta-verb attested both in Cuneiform and in Hieroglyphic Luwian. Lycian *stati* may be ultimately related but is likely to be a borrowing from Greek. The ta-verb has ‘hi-conjugation’ forms (Hier. Luw. *tai*) and an evventive meaning ‘to come to stand’, though in Hier. Luwian we also have one instance of the verb with a stative value in KARATEPE, a late text. In all likelihood the contrast between evventive and stative values was neutralized in the causative Hier. Luw. *tanu* ‘to cause to stand’. On grounds of both meaning and form ta- must be connected with *tshuH₂*; it remains to be seen whether these data contribute to our understanding of Hitt.

tija-.

Hittite *dai-*, ‘to put’ must be compared with the verb *tura-*, known from all Luwian languages. The verb is best attested in Hier. Luwian where it has a wide range of meanings; in some phrases its use matches exactly that of Hitt. *dai-*. In Lycian *tura-* seems to have a more limited range of meanings though this may well be due to the paucity of our evidence. From Hier. Luwian we learn that the verb was of the ‘hi-conjugation type’ (3rd pers. sing. *turaat*) and the expected forms with -ti- and -te- endings are attested in Cuneiform, Luwian and Lycian respectively.

In Lycian we also find, in composition with preverbs, a ta-verb (3rd pers. sing. *tade*, pret. *tade*) with a basic meaning ‘put’, which we cannot link either with Luwian *ta-*, ‘stand’ or with Luwian *ta-*, ‘take’. We may argue that *ta-* derives from *thuH₂* ‘put’ (like *tura*), if we assume that *tade, tade*, etc. continue a ‘mi-conjugation’ form based on the Anatolian equivalent of the IE root *acor* or intransitive. This conclusion is relevant to the Hittite compounds of the type *ugetre, pēkute*, etc., and to the Hittite verb *te-, ‘say*, all of which belong to the mi-conjugation.

Somerville College, Oxford

---

Morphurgo Davies, Kansu, 34, 1936, p. 77 f.). Another possible occurrence of ta, ‘to put’ is in TILSEVET, T § 1: *za-tawá/ti STELE* ta- *tawá/ti ta-ta*. The obvious interpretation is “Uwawis put (erected/dedicated) this stèle”, but § 5 states “my children erected (CRUS-ta-ta) this stèle in goodness”; if the person (Uwawis) in whose honour the stèle is erected is dead, as we may guess from the context, there may be objections against the interpretation of § 5 suggested above.

97 It may be relevant to note that recently E. Campanile (Studi C. Montefell, Pisa 1985, pp. 101–103, Studi R. Andorni, Pisa 1985, pp. 65–77) has argued, against the common opinion, for an IE present *thuH₂* and for an IE present *stati*; this is hardly the place to explore the consequences of this view.

---
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