INCONTRI LINGUISTICI

45

© COPYRIGHT BY *FABRIZIO SERRA EDITORE*, PISA · ROMA

Per uso strettamente personale dell'autore. È proibita la riproduzione e la pubblicazione in open access.

For author's personal use only. Any copy or publication in open access is forbidden.

A Yearly International Peer-Reviewed Journal

The eContent is Archived with *Clockss* and *Portico*.
The Journal is Indexed and Abstracted in Scopus (Elsevier) and ERIH PLUS. ANVUR: A.

⋆

Rivista fondata da Roberto Gusmani e pubblicata in collaborazione tra

UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI TRIESTE
SEZIONE DI STUDI IN LINGUE MODERNE
PER INTERPRETI E TRADUTTORI
e
UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI UDINE
DIPARTIMENTO DI STUDI UMANISTICI
E DEL PATRIMONIO CULTURALE

⋆

© COPYRIGHT BY *FABRIZIO SERRA EDITORE*, PISA · ROMA

Direzione:
RAFFAELLA BOMBI (Università di Udine, Italia)
raffaella.bombi@uniud.it
FRANCO CREVATIN (Università di Trieste, Italia)
fcrevatin@units.it
VINCENZO ORIOLES (Università di Udine, Italia)
vincenzo.orioles@uniud.it

Comitato scientifico:
IGNASI-XAVIER ADIEGO LAJARA, Institut del Pròxim Orient Antic, Universitat de Barcelona, España · RAFFAELLA BOMBI, Dipartimento di Studi Umanistici e del Patrimonio Culturale, Università di Udine, Italia · FRANCO CREVATIN, Sezione di Studi in Lingue Moderne per Interpreti e Traduttori, Università di Trieste, Italia · RENÉ LEBRUN, Faculté de Philosophie, Arts et Lettres, Université Catholique de Louvain, Belgique · MARCO MANCINI, Dipartimento di Lettere e Culture Moderne, Sapienza Università di Roma, Italia · HAROLD CRAIG MELCHERT, Department of Linguistics, UCLA, United States of America · VINCENZO ORIOLES, Dipartimento di Studi Umanistici e del Patrimonio Culturale, Università di Udine, Italia · PAOLO POCCETTI, Dipartimento di Studi Umanistici, Università di Roma Tor Vergata, Italia · DOMENICO SILVESTRI, Dipartimento di Studi Letterari, Linguistici e Comparati, Università degli Studi di Napoli "L'Orientale", Italia

Comitato editoriale:
FRANCESCO COSTANTINI · TIZIANA QUADRIO

Recapito della redazione:
Dipartimento di Studi Umanistici e del Patrimonio Culturale
Università · 33100 Udine

⋆

Con un contributo finanziario di:
Dipartimento di Studi Umanistici e del Patrimonio Culturale
Università di Udine

Per uso strettamente personale dell'autore. È proibita la riproduzione e la pubblicazione in open access.

For author's personal use only. Any copy or publication in open access is forbidden.

© COPYRIGHT BY *FABRIZIO SERRA EDITORE*, PISA · ROMA

UNIVERSITÀ
DI TRIESTE

UNIVERSITÀ
DI UDINE

INCONTRI LINGUISTICI

45
(2022)



PISA · ROMA
FABRIZIO SERRA · EDITORE
MMXXII

Per uso strettamente personale dell'autore. È proibita la riproduzione e la pubblicazione in open access.

For author's personal use only. Any copy or publication in open access is forbidden.

© COPYRIGHT BY *FABRIZIO SERRA EDITORE*, PISA · ROMA

inc.ling.libraweb.net · www.libraweb.net

⋆

I prezzi ufficiali di abbonamento cartaceo e/o *Online* sono consultabili presso il sito Internet della casa editrice www.libraweb.net

Print and/or Online official subscription rates are available at Publisher's web-site www.libraweb.net

Fabrizio Serra editore

Uffici di Pisa
Via Santa Bibbiana 28, I 56127 Pisa, fse@libraweb.net

Uffici di Roma
Via Carlo Emanuele I 48, I 00185 Roma, fse.roma@libraweb.net

⋆

Proprietà riservata · All rights reserved
Copyright 2022 by *Fabrizio Serra editore*, Pisa · Roma.
Fabrizio Serra editore incorporates the imprints *Accademia editoriale*, *Edizioni dell'Ateneo*, *Fabrizio Serra editore*, *Giardini editori e stampatori in Pisa*, *Gruppo editoriale internazionale* and *Istituti editoriali e poligrafici internazionali*.

A norma del codice civile italiano, è vietata la riproduzione, totale o parziale (compresi estratti, ecc.), di questa pubblicazione in qualsiasi forma e versione (comprese bozze, ecc.), originale o derivata, e con qualsiasi mezzo a stampa o internet (compresi siti web personali e istituzionali, academia.edu, ecc.), elettronico, digitale, meccanico, per mezzo di fotocopie, pdf, microfilm, film, scanner o altro, senza il permesso scritto della casa editrice.

Under Italian civil law this publication cannot be reproduced, wholly or in part (including offprints, etc.), in any form (including proofs, etc.), original or derived, or by any means: print, internet (including personal and institutional web sites, academia.edu, etc.), electronic, digital, mechanical, including photocopy, pdf, microfilm, film, scanner or any other medium, without permission in writing from the publisher.

⋆

ISSN PRINT 0390-2412
E-ISSN 1724-1669

⋆

Direttore responsabile: Fabrizio Serra

Autorizzazione del Tribunale di Pisa n. 10 del 19.4.1984

Per uso strettamente personale dell'autore. È proibita la riproduzione e la pubblicazione in open access.

For author's personal use only. Any copy or publication in open access is forbidden.

SOMMARIO

SAGGI

LINGUISTICA ANATOLICA

HAROLD CRAIG MELCHERT, ILYA YAKUBOVICH, *New Luwian Verbal Endings of the First Person Plural* 11

LINGUISTICA GRECA

SANDRA RODRÍGUEZ-PIEDRABUENA, JOSÉ MIGUEL JIMÉNEZ DELGADO, *On the Meaning of* φορύνω and φορύσσω*: the Expression of Soaking, Smearing and Spreading in Ancient Greek* 33

INTERFERENZA LINGUISTICA

FRANCESCO ZUIN, *L'influenza del friulano nella varietà tedesca di Timau* 51

RASSEGNA CRITICA

Lingue naturali, lingue inventate, a cura di Serenella Baggio, Pietro Taravacci (Ilaria Micheli) 79
MATTHIAS MÜLLER, *Grammatik des Bohairischen* (Paolo Milizia) 82
Les langues dans la vie. Hommage à Tullio De Mauro, coordonné par Marc Arabyan, Jean-Paul Bronckart, Pierre Escudé (Vincenzo Orioles) 95

SCHEDE BIBLIOGRAFICHE

A cura di D. Astori, F. Costantini, A. Del Tomba, R. Gendre, P. Giusteri, P. Milizia, V. Orioles, T. Pontillo, S. C. Sgroi, D. Sidraschi, C. Viti, F. Zuin

"Quale/i lingua/e per l'Europa?" (Davide Astori) 107
Linguistic Categories, Language Description and Linguistic Typology, a cura di Luca Alfieri, Giorgio Francesco Arcodia, Paolo Ramat (Francesco Costantini) 108
THOMAS LINDNER, *Urindogermanische Grammatik* (Alessandro Del Tomba) 114
Lingua, Testi, Storia. Atti della Giornata di studi in ricordo di Aldo Lui-

© COPYRIGHT BY *FABRIZIO SERRA EDITORE*, PISA · ROMA

Per uso strettamente personale dell'autore. È proibita la riproduzione e la pubblicazione in open access.

For author's personal use only. Any copy or publication in open access is forbidden.

gi Prosdocimi (Firenze, 6 giugno 2017), a cura di Luciano Agostiniani, Maria Pia Marchese (Renato Gendre) 117
Bibliografia degli scritti di Giovan Battista Pellegrini (1945-2018), a cura di Enzo Croatto (Renato Gendre) 119
«Studi e Saggi Linguistici», 58, 2, 2020. *In Memoria di Romano Lazzeroni* (Renato Gendre) 120
Patrizia De Bernardo Stempel, *Muttergöttinnen und ihre Votivformulare, Eine sprachhistorische Studie* (Pietro Giusteri) 122
Dérivation nominale et innovations dans les langues indo-européennes anciennes, sous la direction de Alain Blanc, Isabelle Boehm (Paolo Milizia) 125
ὀνόματα διελεῖν. *Studi in onore di John Trumper per il suo 75° genetliaco*, a cura di Leonardo Di Vasto (Vincenzo Orioles) 127
Salvatore C. Trovato, Salvatore Menza, *Vocabolario del dialetto galloitalico di Nicosia e Sperlinga* (Vincenzo Orioles) 131
Duccio Lelli, *Atharvaveda Paippalāda: Kāṇḍa Fifteen. Text, Translation, Commentary* (Tiziana Pontillo) 133
Emiliano Picchiorri, *Giuseppe Rigutini lessicografo e grammatico* (Salvatore C. Sgroi) 135
Lingue e migranti nell'area alpina e subalpina occidentale, a cura di Michela Del Savio, Aline Pons, Matteo Rivoira (Diego Sidraschi) 138
Martina Bellinzona, *Linguistic Landscape. Panorami urbani e scolastici nel xxi secolo* (Diego Sidraschi) 141
Tra semantica e sintassi: il ruolo della linguistica storica, a cura di Paola Cotticelli Kurras, Sabine Ziegler (Carlotta Viti) 145
Lessicalizzazioni "complesse" ricerche e teoresi, a cura di Iride Valenti (Francesco Zuin) 150
Deutsche Sprachminderheiten im östlichen Europa. Sprache, Geschichte, Kultur, a cura di Uršula Krevs Birk, Matjaž Birk (Francesco Zuin) 153

Recapito dei collaboratori 155

Per uso strettamente personale dell'autore. È proibita la riproduzione e la pubblicazione in open access.

For author's personal use only. Any copy or publication in open access is forbidden.

© COPYRIGHT BY *FABRIZIO SERRA EDITORE*, PISA · ROMA

NEW LUWIAN VERBAL ENDINGS OF THE FIRST PERSON PLURAL

Harold Craig Melchert · Ilya Yakubovich

Abstract · The Luwian 1pl.prs. /-unni/ is identified beyond a reasonable doubt, but the matching 1pl. endings have not been attested thus far within the preterit and imperative paradigm of Luwian verbs. We submit that the Luwian 1pl. pret. ending was /-unta/ and provide combinatorial evidence for our hypothesis, which involves forms in both cuneiform and hieroglyphic transmission. Furthermore, we identify 1pl.impv. ending /-untu/ in Luwian cuneiform texts. With regard to the historical origin of the new Luwian endings, we suggest the spread of the final /-ta/ in the preterit paradigm represents a product of analogical leveling, while the imperative ending /-untu/ arose as a result of proportional analogy.

Keywords · Anatolian, Luwian, Decipherment, Verbal Inflection, Analogy, Verbal Derivation.

1. State of the Art

One of the unsolved problems of Luwian morphology is the interpretation of the Luwian segment /-unta/ found at the end of verbal forms.[1] Laroche (1959) analyzed several Luwian verbal forms ending in *-un-ta* in cuneiform transmission, while additional items belonging to this group are listed in Melchert 1993. According to our present statistics, we have 20 assured verbal forms in /-unta/, which belong at least to nine lexemes and are scattered through nine different fragments, although in several cases the signs corresponding to the segment /-unta/ are fully or partially restored based on the parallel passages.[2] In many

melchert@humnet.ucla.edu, Carrboro nc, United States of America.
sogdiana783@gmail.com, Philipps-Universität Marburg, Deutschland.

[1] Ilya Yakubovich and Harold Craig Melchert are primarily responsible for the synchronic and diachronic conclusions of this paper respectively. We thank an anonymous reviewer for constructive criticism and comments, but we remain solely responsible for the contents. Its preliminary version was presented at the 32nd Annual ucla Indo-European Conference (ucla, November 2021). Ilya Yakubovich conducted research on the topic of this paper under the auspices of the project "LuwGramm: A Grammar of the Luwian Language", co-directed by Elisabeth Rieken and Ilya Yakubovich and funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (RI 1730/11-1 and YA 472/3-1).

[2] These are KBo 9.141 iv 14' *wa-ar-*[*ma-a-ú-un-ta*], KBo 9.141 iv 17' *na-ak-ku-u*[*š-ša-a-ú-un-ta*], KBo 9.143 ii[!] 9' [*wa-a-ar-ma*]*-a-un-ta*, KBo 22.254 iii 6' [...-]*un-ta*, KUB 6.15 ii 8 *:tar-ra-wa-*

https://doi.org/10.19272/202200801001 · «incontri linguistici», 45, 2022

received: 24.9.2021 · revised: 10.3.2022 · accepted: 12.3.2022

Per uso strettamente personale dell'autore. È proibita la riproduzione e la pubblicazione in open access.

For author's personal use only. Any copy or publication in open access is forbidden.

instances this segment follows the suffix vowel *-ă̄-* (phonetically usually [ā]), therefore the items of our dossier can be collectively called forms in /-(ā)unta/.[1] Furthermore, Hawkins (1980: 118) suggested that Iron Age Luwian *wa/i-la-u-ta* attested in hieroglyphic transmission (ASSUR letter f+g § 7) represents a counterpart of the forms ending in *-a-un-ta* in cuneiform orthography, while Iron Age Luwian *i-sa-u-ta* (ASSUR letter f+g § 28) was compared with *wa/i-la-u-ta* in Hawkins 2000: 552. Since the Anatolian hieroglyphic orthography never reflects /n/ before plosives, this identification does not require special pleading.

According to the majority view that is dominant nowadays, the forms under discussion represent a variant of the 3pl.pret. ending /-(a)nta/. This analysis, already found in Laroche 1959 (see under *ikkunau-*, *tarawi-* and *warmau-*), was upheld in Melchert 1993, and extended to the hieroglyphic forms by J. David Hawkins in his above-mentioned publications. It is found in the most recent reference sources (Giusfredi 2020a: 44, Melchert 2020a: 252), where the relevant endings are listed as /-aunta/ and /-awnta/ respectively. At the same time, there is no consensus regarding the way this alleged allomorph came into being: Melchert (2003: 193) indicates that its origin and distribution remain obscure, and a standard introduction to Indo-European Studies likewise calls it unexplained (Fortson 2010: 188).

To be sure, there were several attempts to trace the origins of the verbal forms under discussion. Thus, their phonetic explanation was ventured in Hawkins 2000, where the hieroglyphic forms *wa/i-la-u-ta* and *i-sa-u-ta* are attributed to the stem *wala-* 'to die' and *i(ya)sa-* 'to buy' respectively under the same 3pl.pret. analysis,[2] while a late phonetic de-

un-ta, KUB 35.15 iii 1 ⌜*wa-ar*⌝-[*ma-a-ú-un-ta*], KUB 35.15 iii 4 *na-ak-ku-uš-ša-a-ú-un-ta*, KUB 35.16 (+) i 5' [*wa-ar-ma-a-un-t*]*a*, KUB 35.16 (+) i 6' *i-ik-ku-na-a-ú-un-ta*, KUB 35.16 (+) i 20'' *wa-a-ar-ma-a-ú-u*[*n-ta*], KUB 35.16 (+) i 21'' [*na*]-*ak-ku-uš-ša-a-ú-un-t*[*a*], KUB 35.16 (+) iv 1'' *wa-a*[*r-ma-a-ú-un-ta*], KUB 35.68:9' [*za-ap*]-*pu-un-da*!, KUB 35.68:10' *za-ap-pu-un-*[*ta*], KUB 35.68:11' *za-ap-pu-un-ta*, KUB 35.124 ii 2 *lu-*⌜*ú*⌝*-un-ta*, KUB 35.124 ii 5 *lu-ú-un-ta*, KUB 35.124 ii 6 *ya-ru-un-ta*, KUB 35.124 ii 7 *pí-un-ta*, and KBo 13.263:3 ⌜x⌝-*i-pu-un-ta*.

[1] The phonological status of vowel length in various dialects of the Luwian language represents a matter of debate. For a recent assessment of stress-driven restructuring of syllable weight in Luwian see Vertegaal 2020, who concludes, however, that the full dephonologization of vowel length was probably never reached in the history of this language (p. 228).

[2] Contrast the analysis of Sasseville 2020: 193, according to which *i-sa-u-ta* means 'are ruined'. The apparent rational for such an interpretation is the perceived clash between the availability of the already purchased *kamara*-commodities and the following request to procure an additional one. In our view, the request for a new commodity is prompted by the failed delivery of those already purchased (cf. the discussion in Section Three).

© COPYRIGHT BY *FABRIZIO SERRA EDITORE*, PISA · ROMA

Per uso strettamente personale dell'autore. È proibita la riproduzione e la pubblicazione in open access.

For author's personal use only. Any copy or publication in open access is forbidden.

velopment **-ant- > -aut-* is hesitantly invoked in order to account for the unexpected *-u-*. Yet the adduced typological parallel with the development of the accusative singular ending **-an > -u* in the history of Lycian (Hawkins 2000: 550) is rather imprecise, since the ASSUR letter f+g, featuring both problematic forms, does not show any trace of a parallel sound change in e.g. acc.sg. *ka-mara/i-ra+a-na* /kamaran/ (§ 31) or nom.pl. ASINUS.ANIMA-*na-zi* /tarkasnantsi/ (§ 21). What is even more important, the late character of the alleged sound change would disconnect *wa/i-la-u-ta* and *i-sa-u-ta* from their counterparts in /-(ā)unta/ in Luwian cuneiform texts, which constituted the primary basis for the elucidation of *wa/i-la-u-ta* in Hawkins 1980.

A different account emerged in connection with studying cuneiform texts. Sasseville 2020, a recent monograph encompassing the analysis of verbal derivation in the Luwic languages, follows the train of thought that had already been implicit in the stem assignment of Laroche 1959 and was explicated in Weitenberg 1984: 295 and Starke 1990: 537-538. He attributes the phoneme *u* in /-(ā)unta/ not to the 3pl.pret. ending /-(a)nta/ but to the preceding derivational suffix. The forms under discussion represent one instance where the author does not attribute a probative character to his analysis, as is clear from the following quotation: "The constitution of a paradigm of Luwian stems in /-au-/ or /-u-/ is not possible based on the current state of the data. Most of the lexemes falling into this category are not well attested and do not show a unitary picture" (Sasseville 2020: 190). And indeed, none of the verbs treated in our paper show the alleged derivational suffix /-au-/ or /-u-/ in their attested finite forms outside the element /-unta/, which makes such an analysis inevitably circular.[1] As mentioned above, the hypothesis that *u* in *wa/i-la-u-ta* and *i-sa-u-ta* belongs to the ending dominated in Hieroglyphic Luwian Studies (cf. also Melchert 1993: v).

An attempt to cut through the Gordian knot by rejecting the grammatical analysis of the forms in /-(ā)unta/ as 3pl.pret. is undertaken in Oreshko 2020 (in contrast to Oreshko 2019: 238, where the conventional morphological assignment is still accepted). His starting point here does not concern the formal difficulties: his analysis of ASSUR letter f+g mi-

[1] The status of KUB 35.111 ii 4' ˹*wa*˺-*lu-u-ta* as a verbal form is not assured, as is also acknowledged in Sasseville 2020: 196. The same goes for KUB 35.155 obv. 4' *i-šu-um-ma* (Sasseville 2020: 194). As for the infinitive **i-ik-ku-ú-na-ú-na*, reconstructed on the basis of KUB 9.6 iv 13', 22', 24', this form can be analyzed as /ikkuna-una/, where /-una/ is the infinitive suffix.

© COPYRIGHT BY *FABRIZIO SERRA EDITORE*, PISA · ROMA

Per uso strettamente personale dell'autore. È proibita la riproduzione e la pubblicazione in open access.

For author's personal use only. Any copy or publication in open access is forbidden.

litates against the assumption that *wa/i-la-u-ta* and *i-sa-u-ta* refer to past events. His alternative is to treat both forms as gerundives ('are to die', 'are to be bought') and analyze them as cognates with the Hittite infinitive in *-wanzi* (Oreshko 2020: 345-347). It is, however, to be noted that the gerundive slot in Iron Age Luwian is already taken by the formations in *-mi-na*, on which see Melchert 2004a. While the coexistence of two finite forms with a modal function cannot be *a priori* ruled out, no account of the distribution between forms in *-mi-na* and *-u-ta* in the hieroglyphic texts is found in Oreshko 2020. On the formal side, Oreshko acknowledges that his analysis requires the attribution of infinitives in *-wanzi* to a different stem than the verbal substantive in *-war*, which obviously represents a less economical solution from the perspective of Hittite historical morphology. Finally, Oreshko's hypothesis is not illuminating for the function of Luw. /-(a)unta/ in the second millennium BCE: none of the interpretations of cuneiform passages listed in Oreshko 2020: 346 fn. 7 is backed up by combinatorial arguments or discussed in a broader context (cf. Section Two below).[1]

Notwithstanding these shortcomings, we still subscribe to Oreshko's negative conclusions: the forms in /-(ā)unta/ are indeed unlikely to have anything to do with the 3pl.pret. In what follows we are going to argue that they contain verbal endings of first person plural and must be considered together with the Luwian forms in /-(ā)unni/, which are commonly acknowledged to contain the endings of 1pl.pres. since Carruba 1968. The similarity of the two segments is an intuitive argument in itself: if the element /-un-/ marked in some way the first person plural in the verbal paradigm, one no longer needs either to attribute the emergence of *-u-* to a recent sound change or to relegate it to a dubious derivational suffix. The same can, of course, be said about the gains of Oreshko's hypothesis, but the additional advantage of our solution is that we have enough empty spots in the paradigm of 1pl. for the new ending. In Luwian cuneiform passages, only the present tense active ending /-unni/ is attested for the first person plural, while the matching endings have not been attested thus far within the preterit and imperative paradigm of Luwian verbs (Melchert 2020: 251-252). As for the hie-

[1] Going somewhat ahead, an additional argument against Oreshko's hypothesis is derived from the forms in /-(ā)untu/, which coexist with those in /-(ā)unta/ in cuneiform texts. The juxtaposition of these two endings, resembling the contrast between 3pl.pret. /-(a)nta/ vs. 3pl.impv. /-(a)ntu/, arguably represents the strongest evidence that they both belong to finite forms. Cf. the discussion in Section Two in connection with example (3).

© COPYRIGHT BY *FABRIZIO SERRA EDITORE*, PISA · ROMA

Per uso strettamente personale dell'autore. È proibita la riproduzione e la pubblicazione in open access.

For author's personal use only. Any copy or publication in open access is forbidden.

roglyphic corpus, here the 1pl. verbal endings have lacked a plausible identification until now.[1]

Naturally, these preliminary considerations do not constitute in themselves a proof that /-unta/ represents a first person plural ending, but they are sufficient as an incentive to test such a hypothesis. In Sections Two and Three we are going to examine its compatibility with the Luwian data in cuneiform and hieroglyphic transmission respectively. We shall see that all the forms in /-(ā)unta/ at our disposal are compatible with the proposed interpretation, while several of them offer combinatorial confirmation for their agreement with underlying first plural subjects. In the concluding Section 4, we are going to examine the Luwian ending /-unta/ from the comparative perspective. While there is no doubt that it constitutes an innovation vis-á-vis the set of 1pl. endings attested in Hittite, we shall argue that its derivation is historically unsurprising.

2. Data in cuneiform transmission

The essential combinatorial evidence for the ending /-unta/ comes from fragmentary contexts, which are frequently neglected in secondary literature. Thus, lines 5, 6, and 7 in KUB 35.124 ii contain the verbal forms *lu-ú-un-ta*, *ya-ru-un-ta*, and *pí-un-ta* respectively; the first and last among those can be analyzed as the well-known Luwian stems /la-/ 'to take' and /pija-/ 'to give' combined with the ending /-unta/. It is crucial that the labial element does not appear in the regular 3pl. endings of the respective verbs: one can contrast *lu-ú-un-ta* with 3pl.impv. *la-a-an-du* (KUB 29.34+ i 10') and *pí-un-ta* with *pí-ya-an-du* (KBo 13.260 ii 25, 26, 28). The shape of the ending points in a different direction: *lu-ú-un-ta* can be compared with 1pl.pres. *lu^{i}-ú-un-ni* (KUB 29.34+ i 16') and *lu-un-ni* (KUB 35.128 iii$^{?}$ 9'), while *pí-un-ta* can be compared with 1pl.pres. *pí-u-un-ni* (KBo 4.11 obv. 27). It is easy to see that these data falsify both the assumption of a

[1] It was previously believed that the hieroglyphic texts contain the 1pl.pres. ending *-mi-na* (Morpurgo-Davies 1980: 93-97), but Melchert (2004a) demonstrated to everyone's satisfaction that the formations in *-min(a)* function as modal forms (predicative gerundives). It was likewise claimed that the hieroglyphic texts contain the 1pl.pret. ending *-ha-na* (Morpurgo-Davies 1980: 97-101), but this hypothesis was quickly doubted in Carruba 1984. According to the etymologically informed hypothesis briefly mentioned in Melchert 1992: 196-197, *-ha-na* may reflect a 1sg.pret.med. ending. This remains *sub judice*, but a mere glance at the contexts is sufficient to assert that three of the four occurrences of *-ha-na* (ASSUR letter a §8, ASSUR letter b §5, and ASSUR letter f+g § 37) favor its 1sg. interpretation, and only in one case (ASSUR letter f+g § 18) the 1pl. interpretation is preferable.

© COPYRIGHT BY *FABRIZIO SERRA EDITORE*, PISA · ROMA

Per uso strettamente personale dell'autore. È proibita la riproduzione e la pubblicazione in open access.

For author's personal use only. Any copy or publication in open access is forbidden.

late dialectal change **a>u* before the nasal and the claim that only the stems ending in *-u* contain the final element *-un-ta*.

Since the fragment KUB 35.124 ii contains only the final part of the column, one cannot deploy the broader context to falsify the hypothesis that in this case we are dealing with a chain of gerundives. More promising for such a purpose are those passages where the 1pl.pres. ending /-unni/ appears in the immediate vicinity of the forms in /-unta/. Thus, the fragmentary 1pl.prs. form [... -]*ru-un-ni* in KUB 35.68:7' is juxtaposed with *za-ap-pu-un*[*-ta*] in KUB 35.68:10' and *za-ap-pu-un-ta* in KUB 35.68:11', while the fragmentary form [... -]*un-ta* in KBo 22.254 iii 6' is juxtaposed with *du-un-ni* 'we place' in KBo 22.254 iii 8'. It is important to keep in mind that the 1pl.pres. forms in /-unni/ are even less frequent that those in /-unta/ in the Luwian corpus, and therefore the juxtaposition of these two endings in the same incantation can hardly be attributed to chance.

Quite aside from the combinatorial arguments, it is important to understand the function of the forms in /-unni/ and /-unta/ in those contexts that are amenable to pragmatic interpretation. The majority of Luwian cuneiform fragments at our disposal represent incantations embedded in Hittite-Luwian rituals (CTH 757-763).[1] Their purpose is to interpret manipulations performed by the patron of the ritual with the assistance of the ritual specialist and/or to communicate requests to the gods. The Hittite narrative preceding the incantation normally contains the description of the respective ritual manipulations, which ensures the cohesion between the Hittite and Luwian parts of the same rite. The interpretative part of the Luwian incantations is normally expressed in the indicative (present or past), while the imperative mood is normally used for the requests. The most common subject of the indicative clauses is the ritual patron (EN SISKUR), since he is performing most of the manipulations in the course of the ritual. It is, however, the ritual specialist (such as, for instance, the Old Woman) who utters the incantations, therefore the sentences referring to the ritual patron are usually in the third person, and the subject, as a rule, is overtly present.

Now the peculiarity of the clauses featuring the forms in /-unta/ (and /-unni/) is the consistent absence of overt subjects, at least in so far as the restoration allows us to judge. The most reliable example is (1), the Luwian incantation that follows the description of manipulations

[1] For the classification of Luwian texts in cuneiform transmission, see Mouton, Yakubovich 2021.

© COPYRIGHT BY *FABRIZIO SERRA EDITORE*, PISA · ROMA

Per uso strettamente personale dell'autore. È proibita la riproduzione e la pubblicazione in open access.

For author's personal use only. Any copy or publication in open access is forbidden.

involving a scapegoat and precedes a concise reference to the release of the same animal. The interpretation of *na-ak-ku-uš-ša-a-ú-un-ta* as 3pl. pret. would naturally beg the question about the identity of multiple actors performing the scapegoat rite. Although the Kuwattalla tradition, which includes CTH 761, features variants mentioning multiple ritual patrons, the relevant texts do not contain the forms in /-unta/, whereas KUB 35.15 explicitly mentions a sole ritual patron. The analysis of the same form as a gerundive is likewise suboptimal, because the gerundives normally require overt subjects in both Hittite and Luwian and because the incantations embedded in Hittite-Luwian rituals normally do not refer to future events. In contrast, the interpretation of *na-ak-ku-uš-ša-a-ú-un-ta*, and by extension ˹*wa-ar*˺-[*ma-a-ú-un-ta*], as 1pl.pret. automatically solves the problem of subject marking.[1] Whether the ritual specialist refers to a joint effort involving the ritual patron and herself, or the passage implies the involvement of two ritual specialists (e.g. temple attendant Kuwattalla and Old Woman Šilalluhi, who frequently act as a tandem), what one might expect in the subject position is the personal pronoun 'we', which, however, lacks overt expression in verbal clauses in Luwian or the other languages of the Anatolian group.

(1)	KUB 35.15 iii 1-5, CTH 761, MS, restored after KBo 9.141 iv 14'-18'
	1 [a-a-ri-in] ˹wa-ar˺-[ma-a-ú-un-ta ta-pa-a-ru-wa]
	2 ˹ta-ta-ar˺-ri-ya-a-am-[(m)a ḫi-i-ru-ú]-˹ta˺ [pu-u-wa-ti-la]
	3 na-a-nu-um-ta-ri-ya-˹la˺ [wa-la-an]-˹ti-e˺-ya [ḫu-it-wa-li-e-ya]
	4 na-a-nu-um-pa na-ak-ku-uš-ša-a-ú-un-ta pa-˹a˺ n[(a-ak-ku-uš-ša-a-ḫi-t)i]
	5 ku-wa-an-zu-ni-im-ma-an a-aš-du
	'[For a while we have been performing] conju[rations (on account of) *tabaru*-s], curse[s, perjuri]es, [past] (or) present, [of the de]ad [(or) the living]. Now we have performed the scapegoat rite. May (those) be affected [by] the sc[(apegoat rite)]!"

The pragmatic interpretation of (1) is consistent with the morphological analysis of the relevant verbal forms as factitives. We submit that that the forms in /-ā-unta/, such as *na-ak-ku-uš-ša-a-ú-un-ta*, represent the combination of the derivational suffix /-ā(i)-$^{(di)}$/ (PIE **-eh$_2$-i̯e/o-*) and

[1] For the restoration ˹*wa-ar*˺-[*ma-a-ú-un-ta*], cf. example (3) below. The spelling with the seemingly redundant *-ú-* in *na-ak-ku-uš-ša-a-ú-un-ta* and parallel cases may serve disambiguation purposes, underscoring the diphthong /āu/ (as opposed to /āo/). For the status of /o/ in Luwian, see Melchert 2020b: 248.

© COPYRIGHT BY *FABRIZIO SERRA EDITORE*, PISA · ROMA

Per uso strettamente personale dell'autore. È proibita la riproduzione e la pubblicazione in open access.

For author's personal use only. Any copy or publication in open access is forbidden.

the ending /-unta/.[1] The etymological analysis of the relevant forms suggests that we are dealing with agent-oriented denominatives (e.g. /warm-ā(i)-$^{(di)}$/ 'to perform conjurations', /nakkuss-ā(i)-$^{(di)}$/ 'to perform the scapegoat rite'), where the factitive suffix **-eh$_2$-i̯e/o-* is expected on independent grounds.[2] As an additional example featuring the demonstrable pro-drop construction with /-unta/ and the same derivational pattern one can consider (2), where 1pl.pret. *i-ik-ku-na-a-ú-un-ta* is apparently derived from the stem /ikkunā(i)-$^{(di)}$/ 'to perform the *ikkunatt*-sacrifice'.[3]

(2)	KUB 35.16(+) i 5'-6', CTH 760, NS
	5' [a-ri-in wa-ar-ma-a-un-t]a ḫa-a-ra-tar-ša wa-aš-ku-wa-al-li-ma-an-za 6' [... n]a-a-nu-ú-un-pa i-ik-ku-na-a-ú-un-ta
	'[For a while we] have been [performing conjurations] (on account of) offense (and) fault… N]ow, we have performed the *ikkunatt*-sacrifice'.

An additional stem endowed with the same suffix occurs in a fragmentary passage, which nonetheless offers decisive evidence against the gerundive interpretation of the forms in /-unta/. It is easy to see that the first two lines of (3) feature a construction that is parallel to those attested in (1-2). Its last line, however, contains the new form [*šar-l*]*a-a-u-un-du*, which cannot be separated from Iron Age Luwian /sarl(a)i-$^{(di)}$/ 'to exalt' (Sasseville 2020: 229-230). The attested second-millennium forms of the same verb are, however, all compatible with the different stem assignment /sarlā(i)-$^{(di)}$/, which derives independent support from the factitive character of this verbal stem (cf. /sarl(a/i)-/ 'supreme'). What is crucial for the topic of this paper is that [*šar-l*]*a-a-u-un-du* reflects a

[1] The same stem is transliterated as /-a(i)-/ in Sasseville 2020: 78-127, where it was first systematically described. The uniform phonological transcription /-āi-/ fits the majority of examples cited in this paper. It remains, however, to be tested whether this suffix always attracted stress in Luwian and thus preserved its long *ā*, which goes beyond the scope of this paper.

[2] The Luwian denominative verb /warmā(i)-$^{(di)}$/ 'to perform conjurations' is presumably derived from **warm(a)-* (or perhaps **warman-*) 'spell, conjuration' and is ultimately cognate with /warannāγid-/ 'speech' (for a slightly different analysis cf. Sasseville 2020: 198). Luw. /nakkuss-ā(i)-$^{(di)}$/ 'to perform the scapegoat rite' can be compared with /nakkussāγid-/ 'scapegoat rite' attested in the same corpus, for example, in line 4 of (1).

[3] Sasseville (2020: 562-563) offers a convincing translation of Luw. /ikkuwar/ as 'liver', thus supplying the first Anatolian cognate of Gk. ἧπαρ, Ved. *yákṛt* and Lat. *iecur* 'liver'. The verb /ikkunā(i)-$^{(di)}$/ 'to treat with liver, to perform a liver-rite' presumably represents a denominative based on */ikkun-/, the oblique stem of /ikkuwar/.

© COPYRIGHT BY *FABRIZIO SERRA EDITORE*, PISA · ROMA

Per uso strettamente personale dell'autore. È proibita la riproduzione e la pubblicazione in open access.

For author's personal use only. Any copy or publication in open access is forbidden.

different finite form derived from the same stem type as *na-ak-ku-uš-ša-a-ú-un-ta* and *i-ik-ku-na-a-ú-un-ta*. Both the shape of the endings /-unta/ and /-untu/ and their sequence of the verbal forms in (3) support the hypothesis of the matching preterit and imperative endings (cf. 3pl.pret. /-(a)nta/ vs. 3pl.impv. /-(a)ntu/).[1] Both /-unta/ and /-untu/ share the first syllable with 1pl.prs. /-unni/. If the analysis of *na-ak-ku-uš-ša-a-ú-un-ta* as 'we performed the scapegoat rite' (1pl.pret.) is accepted, this prompts the translation of [*šar-l*]*a-a-u-un-du* as 'let us praise' (1pl.impv.).

(3)	KUB 35.16(+) i 20''-22'', CTH 760, NS
	20'' [a-ri]-in wa-a-ar-ma-a-ú-u[n-ta ... na-a-nu-ú-un-pa] 21'' [na]-ak-ku-uš-ša-a-ú-un-t[a ...] 22'' [šar-l]a-a-u-un-du šar-l[i-in ^{d}UTU-an ...]
	'[For a whi]le, [we have been] performing conjurations [… . Now, we have pe]rformed the scapegoat rite […]. Let us [pr]aise the Sup[reme Sun-god …]!

Yet another relevant group of forms in /-untu/ has never been treated thus far in connection with those in /-unta/. The three occurrences of *du-ú-un-du* in (4) contrast with 3pl.impv. *du-ú-wa-an-du* 'may they place' (e.g. KUB 9.6 iii 29') derived from the stem /tūwa-$^{(i)}$/ 'to place'. While the historical contraction **wa* > *u* is attested in Luwian, notably in the 1pl.pres. ending /-unni/ < **wanni* (Melchert 1994: 237), it is not otherwise to be observed in third plural forms, even if the plene spelling of the first syllable in the stem /tūwa-$^{(i)}$/ suggests that it carries the accent. In view of the attested 1pl.pres. *du-un-ni* 'we place' (KBo 22.254 iii 8'), the interpretation of *du-ú-un-du* as a 1pl.impv. form emerges as far more probable.[2] On the pragmatic level, the third plural agreement of the verbs in incantation (4) would contradict the references to a single ritual patron in the relevant manuscript, while the translation given below can again be taken as an utterance of the two ritual practitioners,

[1] The paradigmatic connection between the verbal form restored here as [*šar-l*]*a-a-u-un-du* and those in /-ā-unta/ has already been stressed in Sasseville 2020: 190, albeit without providing the interpretation of the relevant form, which is cited there as [*x-*]*x-a-u-un-du*. The restoration proposed here takes into consideration the fact that the incantation cited in (3) accompanies the *šarlatt*-sacrifice.

[2] The formal relationship between 1pl.impv. *du-ú-un-du*, 3pl.impv. *du-ú-wa-an-du*, and 3sg. pret. *du-ú-wa-at-ta* (e.g. KUB 14.114:11') matches that between 1pl.pret. *pí-un-ta* (*KUB* 35.124 ii 7), 3pl.impv. *pí-ya-an-du* (*KBo* 13.260 ii 25, 26, 28), and 3sg.pret. *pí-i-ya-at-ta* (*KUB* 35.101 Vo? 7'), to /pi:ja-$^{(i)}$/ 'to give', another *ḫi*-verb with generalized stem apparently accented on the first syllable. See further section 5 below.

© COPYRIGHT BY *FABRIZIO SERRA EDITORE*, PISA · ROMA

Per uso strettamente personale dell'autore. È proibita la riproduzione e la pubblicazione in open access.

For author's personal use only. Any copy or publication in open access is forbidden.

Kuwattalla and Šilalluhi, perhaps with the "empathic" inclusion of the ritual patron.

(4)	KUB 35.70(+) ii 15-16, CTH 762, NS
	15' [d]a-a-ni-ta du-ú-un-du ⌜na⌝-x(-)[...] 16' [d]u-ú-un-du ḫu-u-wa-al-la-ri-in ⌜du-ú-un⌝-[du ...]
	'Let us place the *tanid*-stones [...]! Let us place [...]! Let us place *huwallar(i)*-[...]!

The final example that is potentially relevant to interpreting the function of /-unta/ in cuneiform texts is KUB 6.15 ii 8 :*tar-ra-wa-un-ta*.[1] This form does not belong to a Hittite-Luwian ritual but occurs in a fragmentary account of a Hattusa queen's dream (Mouton 2007: 231). It is logical to assume that the queen narrated her dream in the first person, but the protagonists of the dream are rendered as ^{d}UTU-*ŠI* … MUNUS.LUGAL-*ya* 'My Majesty and the Queen' in KUB 6.15 ii 5, which implies that that the dream was later retold by the king, or the scribes assumed his perspective. It is hard to say whether the Luwian word :*tar-ra-wa-un-ta*, embedded in the Hittite context and accompanied by a *Glossenkeil*, belongs to the original narrative of the queen or its later adaptation. In either case, however, the first plural preterit verb appears quite appropriate with reference to the royal couple.

Summing up, a combination of formal and contextual clues suggests that the forms in /-unta/ and /-untu/ in Luwian cuneiform texts can be treated as 1pl.pret. and 1pl.impv. respectively. This analysis is demonstrably superior to both their treatment as third plural forms and the reconstruction of the Luwian gerundive in /-unta/. The forms in /-ā-unta/ and /-ā-untu/ turn out to represents combinations of a stem-forming suffix going back to PIE **-eh*$_2$*-i̯e/o-* and the same endings /-unta/ and /-untu/. The final vowel of the other attested vocalic stems (e.g. /tuwa-$^{(i)}$/ 'put' or /pija-$^{(i)}$/ 'give') disappears before these endings.

3. Data in hieroglyphic transmission

As already mentioned in Section One, there are only two Iron Age Luwian forms in /-unta/ attested in one hieroglyphic document, namely the ASSUR letter f+g, the longest among the Luwian letters on lead strips found in Aššur. The contextual analysis of both forms is com-

[1] Although the meaning of the verbal stem cannot be determined on contextual grounds, see Melchert 2020b: 547 for a likely etymology constraining its semantic range.

© COPYRIGHT BY *FABRIZIO SERRA EDITORE*, PISA · ROMA

Per uso strettamente personale dell'autore. È proibita la riproduzione e la pubblicazione in open access.

For author's personal use only. Any copy or publication in open access is forbidden.

plicated by a large number of obscure forms in this text. Its genre differs from the bulk of Luwian hieroglyphic documents: the authors complain about their pitiful conditions and make repeated requests for various goods. Passage (5) addresses the situation with the *kamara*-commodities, tentatively identified with camels.[1] The authors of the letter appear to assert that they bought four *kamara*-s in § 28, but adverse circumstances are reported in §§ 29-30, and then a frantic request for 'any *kamara*-' follows in § 31, which forces the atelic interpretation for |*i-sa-u-ta*.[2] The etymological imperfective suffix /-ssa-/ that is present in this stem (Melchert 1989: 42) offers a potential way of solving the problem: |*i-sa-u-ta* can be taken as imperfect with the backgrounding function 'were in a process of buying' (cf. Hoffner and Melchert 2002: 379). At the same time, one has to keep in mind that this is not a lexical interpretation: the stem in /-ssa-/ was apparently generalized in Iron Age Luwian and may have accordingly inherited a broad range of aspectual meanings.

(5)	ASSUR letter f+g, §§ 27-31
	§ 27 |á-pi-ha-wa/i-za |(L420)wa/i-sa-ha-sa |kwa/i-za |VIA-wa/i-ni-ta § 28 |wa/i-za |á-pi 4-zi-i |ka-mara/i-zi |i-sa-u-ta § 29 |wa/i-za-ta |"COR"-ta-ni |POST-na-´ L480-ia § 30 |PRAE-pa-wa/i-za-ta || |NEG_2-a |kwa/i-sà-ha |("PES_2")wa/i-a-za-sa-ti § 31 |wa/i-za |ka-mara/i-ra+a-na |kwa/i-i-ha |VIA-wa/i-ni^{-i}
	'Furthermore, what you sent us for the transaction, (with it) we were in a process of buying four *camels* for ourselves. We are concerned (about it): no one (ever) brings them forth to us. Send us any (available) *camel*'!

Passage (6) comes earlier than (5) in the text of the ASSUR letter f+g but is discussed second because it is arguably a more difficult one to inter-

[1] This identification was in Yakubovich 2016: 87, fn. 30 and endorsed with much further elaboration in Giusfredi 2020b. Rostislav Oreshko (pers.comm.) objects to it on the grounds that the determinative for camel is never found next to the *kamara*-commodities. This may, however, be due to the fact that camels were not sufficiently common in the urban environment of Anatolia and northern Syria to expect the creation of a specific determinative for the word.

[2] For the interpretation of L480-*ia* as a verb of negative semantics, see Sasseville 2020: 193. We cannot, however, accept the attempt to separate |*i-sa-u-ta* in ASSUR letter f+g, § 28 from |*i-ia-sa* ASSUR letter f+g, § 34. We interpret § 29, lit. "It L480-s on our soul" as a statement of emotional impact, cf. German *Es liegt uns am Herzen* 'we are concerned about it'. For the interpretation of § 30 and § 31, see Yakubovich 2016: 83 and Sideltsev, Yakubovich 2016: 90 respectively.

© COPYRIGHT BY *FABRIZIO SERRA EDITORE*, PISA · ROMA

Per uso strettamente personale dell'autore. È proibita la riproduzione e la pubblicazione in open access.

For author's personal use only. Any copy or publication in open access is forbidden.

pret. Besides § 4, which may contain a request for axes,[1] all the clauses of this passage appear to feature hyperbolic statements describing or implying the sufferings of the senders.[2] §§ 6-7, both referring to 'dying', are obviously tightly linked with one another and can also be compared with ASSUR e § 10, where certain children are said to be 'dying', in part due to the same negative factors, *sutiri-* and 'offenses' that are to be removed in ASSUR f+g § 8. The implication of §6 is that the bodies and arms of the senders (interpreted as such based on their determinatives) are "dying" of an exhausting physical activity, perhaps due to the lack of (proper) axes.[3] The following clause apparently conveys additional details of how the senders are "dying", even though these details defy unambiguous interpretation at the present state of our knowledge.[4] It is, however, clear that "dying" is introduced here as something relevant to the present situation of the senders, not an event that took place in the past (cf. Oreshko 2020: 345).

(6)	ASSUR letter f+g, §§ 4-8
	§ 4 |a-wa/i |("COR")na-hi-zi ("COR")la+ra/i-hi-ri+i-ia-zi-ha |PRAE^{-i} |(PONERE)sà-ti-nu^{-i}
	§ 5 |wa/i-za-´ |na-a-pa |a-su-nu
	§ 6 |"CORPUS"-hi-sà-wa/i |(BRACCHIUM)hu-mi+ra/i-ha |zi-ku-na-ti |*ARHA* |wa/i-la-mi-na-´ |PUGNUS.PUGNUS-nu
	§ 7 |"L476"-wa/i-pa-wa/i (L476.L311)hi-ru-ra+a-ti^{-i} |*ARHA* |wa/i-la-u-ta
	§ 8 |su-ti-ri+i-na-wa/i-´ |ha+ra/i-ta-ha |PRAE-i (PONERE)sà-ti-nu^{-i}

[1] The noun *na-a-pa* can be tentatively compared with \|(ASCIA)*na-pa-*[*ri*+]*i* 'with an axe' in KAYSERİ § 7 (Hawkins 2000: 473).

[2] § 4 and § 8 feature identical predicates and clearly refer to malign phenomena as direct objects. For the interpretation of § 4 see Oreshko 2020: 249-250 and Bauer *et alii* 2021. The stem \|*ha+ra/i-ta-* in § 8 cannot be separated from Luw. /χarattar/n-/ 'offense', attested many times in cuneiform transmission and possibly represents its later development.

[3] For the interpretation of *ʒi-ku-na-* as a hard physical labor, see Oreshko 2020: 349. The translation given in (6) implies the interpretation of \|*ARHA* \|*wa/i-la-mi-na-´* as a depictive participial phrase agreeing with (BRACCHIUM)*hu-mi+ra/i-*. Alternatively, one can interpret \|*wa/i-la-mi-na-´* as a gerundive, in which case the translation of § 6 would be: 'Hold the body and arm from dying of the *ʒikuna*-labor!'

[4] The ablative (L476.L311)*hi-ru-ra+a-ti^{-i}* may either literally imply that the senders are dying because of a broken promise or contain yet another hyperbolic claim that they are dying in a cursed (wretched, outcast) state. The meaning of \|"L476"-*wa/i-* eludes our comprehension. We can only acknowledge, following Oreshko 2020, that this form is probably to be read /tawa/ or /tawi/ and tentatively assume that it is related to the negative notion \|("COR")*ta-wa/i-sà-ta-ti* in the parallel passage ASSUR letter e, § 10.

© COPYRIGHT BY *FABRIZIO SERRA EDITORE*, PISA · ROMA

Per uso strettamente personale dell'autore. È proibita la riproduzione e la pubblicazione in open access.

For author's personal use only. Any copy or publication in open access is forbidden.

> 'Remove fears and anxieties! *Asunu* the *axes* for us! Uphold the *body* and *arm* (as it is) dying of the *zikuna*-labor! We have died of curse/perjury in the *tawa*-condition! Remove *sutiri*- and offenses'!

The two examples quoted above supply strong combinatorial evidence for the interpretation of /-unta/ as an Iron Age Luwian first plural ending. The ASSUR letter f+g represents a missive by a certain Taksala and his associate(s) to Iyami and his associate(s). Accordingly, both the first person and second person plural pronouns are common in this letter, and therefore the presence of some verbal endings of the first-person plural also conforms to our general expectations. But there is more to say: the form analyzed as /walāunta/ in (6) occurs in the vicinity of the reflexive particle /=tsa/ '(for/to) us' (ASSUR letter f+g § 5), while the form analyzed as /isāunta/ in (5) shares the clause with the 1pl. reflexive particle /=tsa/. Furthermore, the hieroglyphic texts feature a minimal pair between CEKKE § 6b ("CONTRACTUS")*i-sa-ta* 'they bought' and ASSUR letter f+g § 28 |*i-sa-u-ta* 'we bought'.

At the same time, the forms under discussion offer unexpected complications, which could not be predicted on the basis of the cuneiform data. First, in both instances we find verbs in /-ā-unta/ with no traces of denominative derivation: the Luwian stem *wa-la-* 'to die' is cognate with the root *wäl* 'to die' in Tocharian A (Malzahn 2016: 285-286 with ref.), while the Luwian stem *i-(ia)-sa-* 'to buy' represents a *-ssa-* derivative of the verbal stem **iya-*, cf. Lycian A *ije-* 'to buy' (Melchert 1989: 42 and 2004b: 28). These facts, however, appear less surprising if we keep in mind that the ASSUR letters postdate the cuneiform fragments tackled in the previous section by some five centuries. On the one hand, it is certainly possible that the denominative suffix /-ā(i)-/ spread to the primary verbal derivation over this period, on the other hand, one cannot rule out that /walāunta/ and /isāunta/ were derived via some unattested nominal formation.[1] Whichever explanation one chooses, the Luwian stems /walā(i)-$^{(di)}$/ and /isā(i-)$^{(di)}$/ are no more outlandish than, say, /ilχā(i)-$^{(di)}$/ 'to wash' (Sasseville 2020: 87) or /tamā(i)-$^{(di)}$/ 'to build' (Sasseville 2020: 92-93), for which primary verbal derivation was likewise suggested in the past.

[1] In the instance of /walāunta/ one can actually argue that the adverb (CRUX)*wa/i-la* 'fatally' represents a vestige of a nominal derivative. For more details on a small class of Luwian predicative modifiers derived from verbal roots (quasi-converbs), see Yakubovich 2020: 477-480. Note also that Lyc. A *la-*$^{(ti)}$ 'to be dead' also most likely reflects a derived stem with **-eh*$_2$- extension, for which a denominative origin can be surmised.

© COPYRIGHT BY *FABRIZIO SERRA EDITORE*, PISA · ROMA

Per uso strettamente personale dell'autore. È proibita la riproduzione e la pubblicazione in open access.

For author's personal use only. Any copy or publication in open access is forbidden.

Second, we have seen that at least in the instance of /walāunta/, the present or future tense interpretation emerges as pragmatically more likely than the preterit one, as properly stressed in Oreshko 2020. This result is certainly unexpected but hardly fatal for our hypothesis, since the parallel passage ASSUR e § 10 uses 3pl.pres.med. |(MORI)*wa/i-wa/i-ri+i-ta-ti* 'they are dying' with reference to the children's condition. Regardless of the tense used, the reference to death apparently serves the same rhetorical purpose in both instances, representing an ultimate argument for obtaining the necessary commodities.[1] Accordingly, one can interpret 'we have died' in § 7 as yet another hyperbolic statement. The situation is further confounded by the absence of the 1pl.pres. ending /-unni/ in the attested Iron Age Luwian corpus.[2] It is, however, obvious, that none of the complications listed in the last two paragraphs represents an argument against the 1pl. interpretation: both concern other grammatical features of the forms under discussion and thus need not affect the main claim of the present paper.

4. Historical considerations

Accounting for the Luwian 1st.pl.pret. ending /-unta/ must begin with the evidence we have for the Proto-Anatolian first plural active indicative endings. Hittite attests *-weni* (with a variant *-wani*) for the present and *-wen* for the preterit. Palaic almost certainly has matching *-wini* and *-wani*: see likely KUB 35.63 iii$^{!}$ 11 *i-ú-i-ni* 'we go', *ibid*. iii$^{!}$ 13 *ḫa-pa-ri-wa-ni* 'we sell (?)' (contrasting with 2sg.pres. *ḫa-pa-ri-i-ši* 'you sell (?)' in *ibid*. iii$^{!}$ 15), and *ibid*. iii$^{!}$ 13 *ti-wa-ni* 'we __' *ibid*. iii$^{!}$ 13. As noted in note 2, pp. 11-12, Lydian *-wv* definitely marks 1pl.pret. and likely the matching present. Without contradictory evidence we may reconstruct present active indicative **-weni* and preterite **-wen*.

The combined vocalism and consonantism of Luwian 1pl.pres. /-unni/ argue for a two-stage development. Given the geminate /-nn-/, it can hardly represent anything other than **-wéni*, matching the Hittite ending. By "Čop's Law" (Čop 1970) it would have become regularly

[1] In typological terms, cf. colloquial Russian *Мы тут уже все сдохли пока тебя ждали*, lit. "We have all died here while waiting for you" as a rebuke for late arrival.

[2] Since one can argue on independent grounds that the Lydian ending *-wv* probably came to combine the functions of 1pl.pres. and 1pl.pret. (Yakubovich 2017: 281), it is conceivable that the Luwian ending /-unta/ was extended to both functions in the 1st millennium BCE. Yet the merger of the two endings in Lydian is presumably mediated by a phonologically regular apocope in the present, whereas the parallel merger in Iron Age Luwian would lack an obvious motivation.

© COPYRIGHT BY *FABRIZIO SERRA EDITORE*, PISA · ROMA

Per uso strettamente personale dell'autore. È proibita la riproduzione e la pubblicazione in open access.

For author's personal use only. Any copy or publication in open access is forbidden.

/-wanni/. Such an ending is indeed attested once in the Ritual of Zarpiya, a male practitioner (^{LÚ}A.ZU) of Kizzuwatna, which contains parallel versions of the invocation of the god Sanda and his attendant deities in Luwian and Hittite. The Hittite version of the invocation is directly followed by passage (7). The rest of the paragraph and the following §§9-11 describe slaughtering a male goat, smearing a drinking straw with its blood and offering the raw heart and liver to the deities. The ritual client takes a bite of the raw liver, drinks of the blood, and declares: 'Look, Sanda and Innarawantes-deities, we have sworn an oath! We have taken a bit of the raw liver, and we have drunk from a single straw!' Even though Hittite is the matrix language of the whole passage, the ending /-wanni/ is surely Luwian, whether the stem *li(n)k-* is genuine Luwian or Hittite. Nowhere is the Hittite variant *-wani* spelled with a geminate.

(7)	HT 1 i 34 and duplicate KUB 9.31 i 34', CTH 757, MH/NS
	nu ú-wa-at-ten nu e-ez-za-at-ten nu li-ku-wa-an-ni
	'Come and eat! We shall swear an oath.'[1]

However, in Luwian cuneiform texts the first plural active present ending appears only as *-unni*. We must assume that at some point before attested Luwian the ending *-wanni* was generalized to all verbal classes and then the unaccented and hence syncopated variant was generalized. Neither of these steps is implausible or even unexpected. The distribution of the Hittite variant *-wani* argues that it is the regular result of unaccented **-weni* (Melchert 1994: 137-138), but it eventually is totally ousted by *-weni*, including in verbs accented on the stem. We may assume the same for Luwian, with the difference that unaccented *-wanni* was syncopated to *-unni*. The latter was then in turn generalized to all stem classes. This last step is hardly shocking, given that root *mi*-verbs with potentially mobile accent (and thus accented plural endings) are limited in Luwian (see Sasseville 2020: Chapters 8 and 9).[2] If we assume a parallel development for the inherited preterite ending **-wén*, we predict a result **-un*.

[1] Likewise Oettinger (1979: 13, note 10) and Görke (2014: § 8). The alternative of a dat.-loc. singular of a Hittite noun *li(n)kuwātar* 'oath taking' is extremely unlikely in a one-word clause and contradicted by the following context.

[2] Evidence for mobile accent in this class is limited, but note frequent 3sg.impv. *a-aš-du* vs. 3pl.impv. *a-ša-a-an-du* (KUB 32.7 RC 6'). As per Sasseville (2020: Chapter 11), all *ḫi*-verbs in Luwian are "thematized" as stems in *-a-*, and the plene spellings in the stems *tu-u-wa-* 'to put, place' and *pí-i-ya-* suggest that by whatever motivation they were in fact accented throughout on the first syllable (cf. note 2 p. 19).

© COPYRIGHT BY *FABRIZIO SERRA EDITORE*, PISA · ROMA

Per uso strettamente personale dell'autore. È proibita la riproduzione e la pubblicazione in open access.

For author's personal use only. Any copy or publication in open access is forbidden.

A standard proportional analogy based on 1pl.pres. /-unni/ cannot account for /-unta/ as the matching preterit ending. A proportion 3pl.pres. /-anti/ : 3pl.pret. /-anta/ = 1pl.pres. /-unni/ : x would predict †-*unna*. However, a look at the entire set of Luwian preterit active endings does suggest a motivation:

Singular		Plural
1	/**-χa**/, (/-χan/)	**-un*
2	/**-t(t)a**/	**-t*/*dan*
3	/**-t(t)a**/	/**-anta**/

Strictly speaking, we have no evidence for the 2pl.pret.act. ending in any form of Luwian, but one expects it to match the 2pl.act.impv. It is important to emphasize that the alternate first singular ending /-χan/ is quite rare.[1] The result is that not only do the "founding" forms of the third person active forms end in *-Ca*, but also for the most part so do the other forms of the singular.[2] It therefore seems reasonable that speakers might reshape the ending **-un* to /-unta/ to match three of the five other members of the paradigm, thereby also enhancing its similarity to 1sg.pret.act /-χa/. Once the 1pl.pret. ending was /-unta/, a proportional analogy may account for the imperative: /-anta/ : /-antu/ = /-unta/ : x (⟶ x = /-untu/). We have no means of determining whether the second plural was also altered to **-t*/*danta*. The preexisting homophony with the imperative may well have preserved **-t*/*dan* in the preterit.

The final point to be addressed is here the fact that the stem-final vowel of *ʒa-ap-pa-* 'to offer sacrificially' (2sg.pres. *ʒa-ap-pa-aš-ši* in KUB 35.15 ii 6', 3sg.pret. *ʒa-ap-pa-at-ta* in e.g. KBo 22.137 iii 9'') disappears in 1pl. pret. *ʒa-ap-pu-un-ta* in e.g. KUB 35.68.11.[3] As shown in Sasseville 2020: 16-

[1] As per note 1, p. 13, we are persuaded that /-χan/ marks first *singular* preterit, not first plural, but what if any synchronic functional difference exists between this ending and the regular /-χa/ is far from obvious. We cannot pursue the issue here. The preterit middle endings of Iron Age Luwian, described in Rieken 2004, are not included in this table in view of their patently innovative character. Bringing to its logical end the tendency that is also observed in the history of Hittite, second singular **-s* was entirely replaced even in *mi*-conjugation vocalic stems: note 2sg.pret. *kulānitta* (KUB 6.45 iii 52) and VIA-*wa*/*i-ni-ta* = /χarwannita/ (ASSUR letter a, § 7).

[2] We follow the view that the third person endings represent the co-opted mediopassive endings **-to* and **-onto* (Melchert 1994: 293 with refs.). Lycian *-te* and *-ṼTe* assure that this is a Proto-Luwic development.

[3] The semantics of the verb under discussion will not be discussed in the present paper. We insist, however, that it cannot be separated from HLuw. *ʒa-pa-*, attested in the ŞARAGA inscription (see Poetto 2010, Sasseville, Yakubovich 2016).

© COPYRIGHT BY *FABRIZIO SERRA EDITORE*, PISA · ROMA

Per uso strettamente personale dell'autore. È proibita la riproduzione e la pubblicazione in open access.

For author's personal use only. Any copy or publication in open access is forbidden.

77, the Luwian *ti*-conjugation verbs with the ending /-atta/ in 3sg.pret. match the Hittite factitives in *-aḫḫ-*. Hittite shows that these originally inflected as *ḫi*-verbs, and it is due to the secondary nature of the *mi*-inflection that the Luwic endings are unlenited (Sasseville 2020: 67-73 with references to prior scholarship). Nevertheless, one would expect the result of tautosyllabic **-éh₂* to be a long /ā/, and there is evidence for this in a few stems. We would thus predict that the addition of the endings in *-u+* would yield a long diphthong /a:u/, just as in the extended factitive stems in **-éh₂-ye/o-*, which with deletion of the yod and syncope do show the expected result, as seen above in *na-ak-ku-uš-ša-a-ú-un-ta* etc.

We must acknowledge that we have no ready solution for the contraction in *za-ap-pu-un-ta*. The scenarios presented in Sasseville 2020: 71-73 (one by Sasseville and one by Melchert) are sufficiently complex to justify seeking a possible alternative. We would like, however, to stress that this sound change is by no means isolated, but finds parallels in other verbs belonging to the same stem type. On the one hand, 3sg.pret. *mar-ša-at-ta* in KBo 29.43 r. col. 7' cannot be separated from 1pl.pres. *mar-šu-<un>-ni* in KUB 35.133(+) iv 11'. The attribution of this verb to the factitive class is supported by its Hittite cognate *maršaḫḫ-* 'to desecrate' (Sasseville 2020: 28-29). On the other hand, the participle *pal-ḫa-a-<am>-ma-an-za* (KUB 35.145 iii 7) cannot be separated from the infinitive *:pal-ḫu-na* (KUB 44.4 Vo 22). The meaning 'to flatten, spread out' is both contextually and etymologically plausible for this verb (cf. Hitt. *palḫi-* 'wide'), while the plene spelling in *pal-ḫa-a-<am>-ma-an-za* offers an independent confirmation that we are dealing with a factitive in **-éh₂-*. Thus, the shape of the contracted 1pl.pret. /-unta/ in (certain) factitives matches that of the 1pl.pres. /-unni/ and infinitive /-una/.[1]

Bibliography

Bauer *et alii* 2021 = A. H. Bauer, D. Sasseville, I. Yakubovich, *Hieroglyphic Luwian /lalhiliya-/*, la+ra/i-hi-ri+i-ia- *'anxiety (?)'*, in *eDiAna*, 959, 2021: http://www.dwaks.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dev/dictionary.php?lemma=959, accessed 03.09.2021.

Carruba 1968 = O. Carruba, *Die I. und II. Pers. Plur. im Luwischen und im Lykischen*, «Die Sprache», 14, 1968, pp. 13-23.

[1] Likewise, *i*-conjugation verbs with stems ending in /-a-/ show first plurals in /-unni/ and /-unta/. For example, 1pl.pret. *pí-un-ta* 'we gave' (KUB 35.124 ii 7, stem /pija-$^{(i)}$/) can be compared with 1pl.pres. *ḫu-u-i-un-ni* 'we run' (KUB 35.133(+) iv 14', stem /χ^{w}ija-$^{(i)}$/. In this case, however, the contraction is easier to explain, since the stem-final vowel is presumed to be short.

© COPYRIGHT BY *FABRIZIO SERRA EDITORE*, PISA · ROMA

Per uso strettamente personale dell'autore. È proibita la riproduzione e la pubblicazione in open access.

For author's personal use only. Any copy or publication in open access is forbidden.

Carruba 1984 = O. Carruba, *Nasalisation im Anatolischen*, «Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici», 24, 1984, pp. 57-69.

Čop 1970 = B. Čop, *Eine luwische orthographisch-phonetische Regel*, «Indogermanische Forschungen», 75, 1970, pp. 85-96.

Fortson 2010 = B. W. Fortson, *Indo-European Language and Culture: An Introduction*, 2nd ed., Oxford, Blackwell, 2010 («Blackwell textbooks in linguistics», 19).

Giusfredi 2020a = F. Giusfredi, *A Study in the Syntax of the Luwian Language*, Heidelberg, Winter, 2020 («Texte der Hethiter», 30).

Giusfredi 2020b = F. Giusfredi, *Assyrian Camels and Luwian Officials*, «Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires», 1, 2020, pp. 53-56.

Görke 2014 = S. Görke, *Das Ritual des Zarpiya aus Kizzuwatna gegen Seuche im Land*, hethiter.net/: CTH 757 (TX 05.06.2014, TRde 05.06.2014).

Hawkins 1980 = J. D. Hawkins, *The Hieroglyphic Luwian Word "to die"*, «Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung», 94, 1980, pp. 109-119.

Hawkins 2000 = J. D. Hawkins, *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions*, Vol. II, *Inscriptions of the Iron Age*, Berlin, de Gruyter, 2000.

Hoffner, Melchert 2002 = H. Hoffner, H. C. Melchert, *A Practical Approach to Verbal Aspect in Hittite*, in *Anatolia Antica, Studi in Memoria di Fiorella Imparati*, a cura di S. de Martino, F. P. Daddi, Firenze, Lo Gisma, 2002, pp. 377-390.

Laroche 1959 = E. Laroche, *Dictionnaire de la langue louvite*, Paris, Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1959.

Malzahn 2016 = M. Malzahn, *The second one to branch off? The Tocharian lexicon revisited*, in *Etymology and the European Lexicon: Proceedings of the 14th Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, 17-22 September 2012, Copenhagen*, hrsg. von B. S. S. Hansen *et alii*, Wiesbaden, Reichert, 2016, pp. 281-292.

Melchert 1989 = H. C. Melchert, *New Luvo-Lycian Isoglosses*, «Historische Sprachforschung», 102, 1989, pp. 23-45.

Melchert 1992 = H. C. Melchert, *The Middle Voice in Lycia*, «Historische Sprachforschung», 105, 2, 1992, pp. 190-199.

Melchert 1993 = H. C. Melchert, *Cuneiform Luvian Lexicon*, Chapel Hill, Self-Published, 1993.

Melchert 1994 = H. C. Melchert, *Anatolian historical phonology*, Amsterdam, Rodopi, 2003.

Melchert 2003 = H. C. Melchert, *Language*, in *Handbuch der Orientalistik I 68*, hrsg. von H. Craig Melchert, Leiden, Brill, 2003 («The Luwians»), pp. 170-210.

Melchert 2004a = H. C. Melchert, *Hieroglyphic Luvian Verbs in* -min(a), in *Per Aspera ad Asteriscos: Studia Indogermanica in honorem Jens Elmegård Rasmussen sexagenarii Idibus Martiis anno MMIV*, ed. A. Hyllested *et alii*, Innsbruck, Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck, 2004, pp. 355-362.

Melchert 2004b = H. C. Melchert, *A Dictionary of the Lycian Language*, Ann Arbor, Beech Stave, 2004.

Melchert 2020a = H. C. Melchert, *Luwian*, in *A companion to Ancient Near East-*

© COPYRIGHT BY *FABRIZIO SERRA EDITORE*, PISA · ROMA

Per uso strettamente personale dell'autore. È proibita la riproduzione e la pubblicazione in open access.

For author's personal use only. Any copy or publication in open access is forbidden.

ern Languages, edited by R. Hasselbach-Andee, Hoboken, NJ, Wiley Blackwell, 2020, pp. 239-256.

Melchert 2020b = H. C. Melchert, *Hittite* tarru- *'firm, secure' and Luvian cognates*, in Ὀνομάτων ἴστωρ, *Mélanges offerts à Charles de Lamberterie*, édité par C. le Feuvre and D. Petit, Leuven, Peeters, 2020, pp. 541-553.

Morpurgo-Davies 1980 = A. Morpurgo-Davies, *The personal endings of the Hieroglyphic Luwian verb*, «Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung», 94, 1980, pp. 86-108.

Mouton 2007 = A. Mouton, *Rêves hittites: Contribution à une histoire et une anthropologie du rêve en Anatolie ancienne*, Leiden, Brill, 2007 («Culture and History of the Ancient Near East», 28).

Mouton, Yakubovich 2021 = A. Mouton, I. Yakubovich, *Where did one speak* luwili*? Geographic and Linguistic Diversity of Luwian Cuneiform Texts*, «Journal of Language Relationship», 19, 1, 2021, pp. 25-53.

Oettinger 1979 = N. Oettinger, *Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbums*, Nürnberg, Carl, 1979.

Oreshko 2019 = R. Oreshko, *Phonetic value of Lydian letter <d> revisited and the development of PIE dentals in Lydian*, «Wékwos», 4, 2019, pp. 191-262.

Oreshko 2020 = R. Oreshko, *'Tears', 'Blood' and 'Eyes' in Hieroglyphic Luwian: Observations on HLuw. sign *311 = <ASḪA> and Related Problems*, «Wékwos», 5, 2020, pp. 341-368.

Poetto 2010 = M. Poetto, *Un nuovo verbo luvio-geroglifico*: zapa- *e la sua correlazione al luvio cuneiforme* zapp(a)-, in *Ex Anatolia Lux: Anatolian and Indo-European studies in honor of H. Craig Melchert on the occasion of his sixty-fifth birthday*, edited by R. I. Kim *et alii*, Ann Arbor, Beech Stave Press, 2010, pp. 296-302.

Rieken 2004 = E. Rieken, *Das Präteritum des Medio-Passivs im Hieroglyphen-Luwischen*, «Historische Sprachforschung», 117, 2, 2004, pp. 179-188.

Sasseville 2020 = D. Sasseville, *Anatolian Verbal Stem Formation: Luwian, Lycian, and Lydian*. Leiden, Brill, 2020.

Sasseville, Yakubovich 2016 = D. Sasseville, I. Yakubovich, *The Luwian inscription ŞARAGA: an improved edition*, «Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires», 1, 2016, pp. 32-35.

Sideltsev, Yakubovich 2016 = A. Sideltsev, I. Yakubovich, *The Origin of Lycian Indefinite Pronouns and its Phonological Implications*, «Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft», 70, 1, 2016, pp. 75-124.

Starke 1990 = F. Starke, *Untersuchung zur Stammbildung der keilschrift-luwischen Nomens*, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 1990 («Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten», 31).

Vertegaal 2020 = X. Vertegaal, *Syllable Weight Gradation in the Luwic Languages*, «Transactions of the Philological Society», 118, 2, 2020, pp. 211-236.

Weitenberg 1984 = J. Weitenberg, *Die hethitischen u-Stämme*, Amsterdam, Rodopi, 1984.

Yakubovich 2016 = I. Yakubovich, *Some transitive motion verbs and related lexemes in Late Luwian*, «Indogermanische Forschungen», 121, 2016, pp. 69-92.

© COPYRIGHT BY *FABRIZIO SERRA EDITORE*, PISA · ROMA

Per uso strettamente personale dell'autore. È proibita la riproduzione e la pubblicazione in open access.

For author's personal use only. Any copy or publication in open access is forbidden.

Yakubovich 2017 = I. Yakubovich, *An agreement between the Sardians and the Mermnads in the Lydian language?*, «Indogermanische Forschungen», 122, 2017, pp. 265-293.

Yakubovich 2020 = I. Yakubovich, *Doing things reverently among the Luwians*, «Études Classiques», 55, 2020, pp. 465-489.

© COPYRIGHT BY *FABRIZIO SERRA EDITORE*, PISA · ROMA

Per uso strettamente personale dell'autore. È proibita la riproduzione e la pubblicazione in open access.

For author's personal use only. Any copy or publication in open access is forbidden.

COMPOSTO IN CARATTERE DANTE MONOTYPE DALLA
ACCADEMIA EDITORIALE, PISA · ROMA.
STAMPATO E RILEGATO NELLA
TIPOGRAFIA DI AGNANO, AGNANO PISANO (PISA).

⋆

Luglio 2022
(CZ 2 · FG 3)



© COPYRIGHT BY *FABRIZIO SERRA EDITORE*, PISA · ROMA

Per uso strettamente personale dell'autore. È proibita la riproduzione e la pubblicazione in open access.

For author's personal use only. Any copy or publication in open access is forbidden.