

學人與之

GS Forrer, 2004

Сидетьцев -weni/-wani

## The Morphology of 1 Pl. Pres. and Pret. in Middle Hittite

Andrej V. Sideltsev (Moskau)

The purpose of this paper<sup>1</sup> is to describe (I) the distribution of full and zero grade in 1 pl. pres. and pret.; (II) the distribution of *-u/meni* *-u/mani* endings of 1 pl. pres.

### 0 Idealized descriptive Hittite verb morphology<sup>2</sup>

0. Ablauting verbs possess two stems - strong stem (all sg.<sup>3</sup>, pl. pret., 2 pl. impv.<sup>4</sup>) and weak stem (pl. pres.<sup>5</sup>, 3 pl. impv.). Full grade is stressed<sup>6</sup> vocalism and consonantism of strong stem. *hāš-/heš*-type (for *šākk-/šekk*- see I.2.4) has two strong stems (one for sg., the other - for pl. pret.). Weak stem may be unstressed and zero grade or stressed and full grade (not identical to the full grade of strong stem).

### I. full/zero grade in 1 pl. pres. and pret.

I.0 There are 3 groups of strong/weak-stem distribution in pl. pres. and pret. in MS texts<sup>7</sup>:

I.0.1.a Strong stem throughout the paradigm; 3 pl. pres. (*nē(i)anzi* 9x (1x plene), *nēānzi* 1x, *nēā[(nzi)]*<sup>2</sup> 1x), 3. pl. impv. attest weak-stem full-grade stressed *e*-vocalism<sup>8</sup>:

*nāi*<sup>9</sup>                      *nāiyani*                      *nāiyen*

1 I am grateful to A. Kassian, A. Nikolajev, A. Shatskov and esp. Prof. Dr. C. Melchert. The views expressed in the paper and possible errors are the author's only.

2 This sketch is communis opinio. All author's deviations are explicated in the paper.

3 The surface zero-grade sg. pret. of *memai-* (*halzai*-type) and *uppa*-type is problematic (cf. Melchert, SHHP, 74 fn. 140, 97-8, 149, Oettinger, SHV, 71).

4 In several verb types pl. pret. and 2 pl. impv. are weak stem.

5 *pehute*-type has strong stem in all sg., 1-2 pl. pres. and pret., weak-stem - in 3 pl. pres. and pret.

6 Full grade is unstressed only in the case of former preverbs (*pēda-*, *ānna-*, *ūda-*, *ūppa-*, see fn. 98) and reduplication (*mēmai-*, *mīmma-*, see fn. 42).

7 The grouping was also based on my files for 2 and 3 pl. The classification relies heavily upon that of Oettinger, SHV, passim. The paradigm is represented by 3 sg. pres. (strong stem), 1 pl. pres. and 1 pl. pret. MS forms are not marked.

8 < acrostatic ablaut (Melchert, SHHP, 68; Lehmann, IH Redux, 242-3; cf. Oettinger, SHV, 460, 482).

9 Here and elsewhere length is marked only when it is denoted by plene writings. Thus lack of length indication does not automatically imply short vowel as plene writings are optional.

- (CTH 571) KBo 16.97 +, Vs. 5 *na-i-ya-ni*;  
KuT 50, Vs. 27 *na-i-ú-en*.

### I.0.1.b Strong stem throughout the paradigm (non-ablauting group synchronically<sup>10</sup>):

*pái*                      *páiyani*                      *\*páiyen*

- (CTH 790) KBo 23.27 +, Vs. II 27' *ha-a-nu-mi-e[-ni]*<sup>11</sup>;
- ? • (CTH 752.1) KUB 35.164 +, Vs. I 10' *la-a'-h]u-e-ni*<sup>12</sup>;
- 3+1<sup>2</sup>x (CTH 417.3) KUB 34.75, 6', (CTH 3.1.A) KBo 22.2<sup>13</sup>, Vs. 15 *pa-i-ya-ni*<sup>14</sup>,  
(CTH 199) HBM 24, Vs. 9 *pa-i]-ya-ni* (? - see Alp, HBM, 158 Anm. 75), (CTH 458.1.A) KBo 40.25 +, Vs. I 20' *pa-i-ya-ni-ya-an* „go“;
- 3x (CTH 199) HBM 17, Vs. 20, Rs. 27 *ya-al-hu-u-ya-ni*, (CTH 138.1) KUB 23.77a (+), Rs. 15' *ya-al-hu-ya-ni*,  
(CTH 190) KBo 18.86, Vs. 13' *ya-[al-hu]-ú-en*<sup>15</sup>.

### I.0.2.a Strong stem in sg. pres. and pret., pl. pret.; zero-grade weak stem in pl. pres.<sup>16</sup>:

*dái*                      *duméni*<sup>17</sup>                      *dáyen*

- (CTH 761.1) KUB 35.18, Vs. I 7 *[a]p-pu-ú-e-ni*;
- 2x (CTH 199) HBM 17, Vs. 6 *e-šu-en*, HBM 47, Vs. 8 *e-šu-ú-en* „be“;
- (CTH 268) KUB 21.47 + KUB 23.82 (+), Vs. 18' *ku-ú[a-u]-e-ni*<sup>18</sup>,  
(CTH 28) KBo 16.47, Vs. 15' *ku-e-u-e-en*<sup>19</sup> < *\*kuén-ú-en*;
- (CTH 214) KBo 32.224, Vs. 2' *š[e-e-šu-en]*<sup>20</sup>;

<sup>10</sup> Only athematic verbs that were diachronically ablauting are included (I.2). The rest are omitted.

<sup>11</sup> Half-thematic after *tarna*-type, at the same time shows generalized strong stem of 3 sg. pres. (see also 3 pl. pres. *hānanzi* 3x and *hānjanzi* 2x) Oettinger, SHV, 55!

<sup>12</sup> OS *la-hu-e-ni* 3x in the texts from CTH 752. See Kassian, Glossary, in: Anatolian Languages, 107.

<sup>13</sup> The MS dating follows Košak, electronic Konkordanz sub Bo 70/10.

<sup>14</sup> OS *pa-i-ya-ni*(-) 14+2 frgm. x. See Kassian, Glossary, 112.

<sup>15</sup> On the basis of 3 pl. pret. *išhuuđer* 2x, OS *išhuuáyaní* 1x, *išhuuá-* also belongs to I.0.1.b group (cf. Oettinger, SHV, 61). But (CTH 199) HKM 18, 1k.Rd. 4 *iš-hu-u-it-tin* is not typical for a paradigm with 3 sg. pres. strong-stem generalization. Although it can be analogical only after *halzai*-type (Oettinger, SHV, 62), the only form that could be the starting point is *išpittén* 1x as all the rest of 2 pl. of *halzai*-, *pai-/pi*-, *uppa*-types (42+8<sup>2</sup> x) end in *-i-še(i)*! Cf. Tischler, Handwörterbuch<sup>2</sup>, 64 (two stems: *išhu*- and *išhuuá*-).

<sup>16</sup> (CTH 788.1.A) KBo 19.145, Rs. III 40' *la-a-u-e-en* (cf. Haas-Thiel, AOAT 31, 302) may be thematic (see Melchert, SHHP, 37-8; Oettinger, StMed 7, 234).

<sup>17</sup> The type is represented in OS also by *ta-ru-e-ni*(-) 2x. See Kassian, Glossary, 128.

<sup>18</sup> See Oettinger, Gs Pedersen, 320 Anm. 64; Košak, Fs Lin, 79, 83.

<sup>19</sup> Eichner, V Fachtagung, 82; Oettinger, SHV, 21-2, 96-7 refer it to I.0.1.a. However, all the NS strong-stem 1, 2 pl. pres. from the stem *kyenna*- (Oettinger, SHV, 117-9; Melchert, SHHP, 26 n. 53) are not probative.

<sup>20</sup> OS *ša-šu-e-ni* 1. See Kassian, Glossary, 121.

- 2x (CTH 443.1) KBo 15.10 +, Vs. II 58' *du-m[e-]e-ni*, (CTH 761.1) KUB 35.18, Vs. I 7 *tum-me-ni*<sup>21</sup>;
- 2x (CTH 443.1) KBo 15.10 +, Vs. II 60', (CTH 573) KBo 24.130 (+), Vs. I 16' *da-a-u-en*.

### I.0.2.b Strong stem in sg. pres. and pret., pl. pret.; usual zero-grade weak stem with occasional (and innovative) strong stem in pl. pres.:

*áušzi*                      *u(m)méni/áumani*<sup>22</sup>                      *áumen*

- 5x (CTH 752.1) KBo 30.39 +, Rs. III 5, (CTH 134.C) KUB 40.28, 4', KuT 50, Rs. 40<sup>23</sup> *ú-me-e-ni*, (CTH 752.1) KUB 35.164 + KBo 25.139 +, Rs. III 6 *um-me-e-ni* (see Groddek, DBH 2, 47), KuT 50, Vs. 28 *ú-mi-ni*<sup>24</sup>;
- 1x (CTH 151) VBoT 1, Vs. 12 *a-ú-ma-ni*,  
9+2<sup>2</sup>x (CTH 199) HBM 47, Vs. 35, Rs. 42, 51, (CTH 573) KBo 24.130 (+), Rs. 4, (CTH 428) KBo 22.129 (+), Vs. 4, 10, (CTH 3.1.A) KBo 22.2, Vs. 10(?), 11(?)<sup>25</sup> *a-ú-me-en*, KuT 49, Vs. 23, KuT 50, Vs. 19, Rs. 42 *a-ú-mi-en*;
- (CTH 396.2) KBo 15.26, 4' *e-d]u-ya-ni*<sup>26</sup>;
- (CTH 396.2) KBo 15.26, 7' *e-ku-ya-ni*<sup>27</sup>;
- ? • (CTH 195) KBo 15.28, Vs. 7 *hu-e-ku-ya-ni* „conjure“<sup>28</sup>;
- 2x KuT 49, Vs. 14, KuT 49, Vs. 24 *na-a-hu-ya-ni*;
- 4x (CTH 139.A) KBo 8.35, Vs. II 9<sup>29</sup>, (CTH 28) KBo 16.47, Vs. 16', (CTH 713/720) KBo 27.165 +, Vs. 13' *da-i-ú-en*, (CTH 443.1) KBo 15.10 +, Vs. I 32 *[d]a-a-i-ú-en*.

### I.0.2c ā-strong stem in sg. pres. and pret., e-strong stem in pl. pret.; ā full-grade weak stem in pl. pres.:

*hāši*                      *hāššuyeni*                      *\*hēšuyen* (only NS)

- (CTH 752.1) KBo 25.139 +, Rs. III 1 *ha-aš-šu-ú-e-ni* „open“<sup>30</sup>.

<sup>21</sup> OS *tu-me-e-ni* 4x, *tu-me-n*[(i 1x, *da-a-u-e-ni* 1x. See Kassian, Glossary, 123.

<sup>22</sup> In OS the type is also represented by *ku-e-ru-e-ni*[(i 1x. See Kassian, Glossary, 106.

<sup>23</sup> ME-E over erasure.

<sup>24</sup> Not HBM 38, Rs. 12 *ú-ya-u-e-ni* contra Alp, HBM, 191. OS *ú-me-ni* 1x Kassian, Glossary, 88.

<sup>25</sup> See Kassian, Glossary, 88. Cf. Otten, StBoT 17, 6.

<sup>26</sup> See for the restoration Hart, Fs Gurney, 53 w. lit. Cf. Carruba, StBoT 2, 46; Melchert, AHP, 138. OS *a-du/tu-e-ni* 4+2 frgm. x. See Kassian, Glossary, 91.

<sup>27</sup> OS *a-ku-e-ni* 6x. See Kassian, Glossary, 89.

<sup>28</sup> Archi, SMEA 16, 1975, 135-6; Haas, AoF 23/1, 1996, 78; Ünal, RHA 31, 1973, 53; cf. Hagenbuchner, THeth 16, 81. OS *hu-e-ik-ku[-e-ni* (?) 1x, *hu-e-[(ik-ku)-e-ni* (?) 1x „slaughter“. See Kassian, Glossary, 96.

<sup>29</sup> Corresponds to (CTH 139.B) KUB 23.78b +, Vs. II 6' *[d]a-i-u-e-en*.

<sup>30</sup> OS *ha-aš-šu-e-ni* (1x) in a text from CTH 752 (Kassian, Glossary, 95).

I.0.3 Strong stem in sg. pres. and pret., zero-grade weak stem in pl. pres. and pret.<sup>31</sup>  
(šipant- (?), tarnā-type<sup>32</sup>; nu-causatives<sup>33</sup> (?), ḫar(k)- „have“ (?); pai-/pī-type):

tarnāi      tarnumēni      tarnumén;

- (CTH 330.3.B) KUB 12.19, Rs. III 21' pí-tum-me-n[ī]<sup>34</sup>,  
(CTH 443.1) KBo 15.10 +, Vs. II 1 [p]i-e-du-me-en<sup>35</sup>;
- ? • (CTH 761.1) KUB 35.18, Vs. I 3 šī-pa-an-du-ya-ni,  
(CTH 573) KBo 24.130 (+), Rs. 3 šī-pa-an-du-en;
- (CTH 789) KBo 32.15, Vs. II 16' šu-un-nu-me-ni „throw“;
- 3x HKM 109, 10, 16 šu-nu-mi-ni, 11 šu-nu-mi<-ni><sup>36</sup> „drop“;
- 3x (CTH 789) KBo 32.15, Vs. II 17' tar-nu-me-ni, 26' tar-nu-[m]e-ni, KuT 50,  
Rs. 39 tar-nu-mi-ni,  
(CTH 788.1.A) KBo 19.145, Rs. III 40' tar-nu-me-en;
- (CTH 443.1) KBo 15.10 +, Vs. II 26 túḫ-šu-me-en<sup>37</sup>;
- 2x (CTH 199) HBM 47, Vs. 10, 12 u-un-nu-me-en<sup>38</sup>;
- 2x (CTH 752.1) KUB 35.164 +, Vs. I 9' ú-du-me-e-ni<sup>39</sup>, (CTH 270) KBo 16.50,  
Vs. 13 ú-du-um-me-ni.

-názzi      ? -numēni      ? \*-numén

- 2x (CTH 199) HBM 10, Vs. 12 ar-nu-me-ni, (? - see Alp, HBM, 158, Anm. 76)  
HBM 24, Vs. 10 [ar-n]u-[m]e-ni;
- (CTH 761.1) KUB 35.18, Vs. I 5 aš-nu-me-ni, (CTH 271) KBo 40.16, 9' aš-ša-nu-ma-ni;
- (CTH 789) KBo 32.15, Vs. II 18' ḫu-iš-nu-mi-ni;
- (CTH 375.1.A) KUB 17.21 +, Rs. IV 12 li-in-ga-nu-ma-ni;
- (CTH 199) HBM 47, Vs. 13 uš-ki-nu-mi<-ni>.

31 Pl. strong-stem forms are sporadic: 2 pl. impv. páišten „give“ 3x; 1 pl. pret. úppayēn 1x; 2, 3 pl. pres. mématteni 1+1 frgm. x, mémanzi 1x; ánnanzi 4x, ánn[a]tteni 1x. See I.2.6.

32 See for accentuation Melchert, SHHP, 25; Oettinger, StMed 7, 233, Gs Pedersen, 321.

33 OS forms of the type are ya-aḫ-nu-me-ni 1x and ki-iš-nu-ma-ni 1x (Kassian, Glossary, 105, 131).

34 OS pí-e-tu-me-ni 6+1 frgm.x, pí-e-tu-me-e-ni 1x, pí-du-me-ni 1x, pí-e-tu-mi-ni 1x. See Kassian, Glossary, 117.

35 OS or MS pí[-]e-tu-mi-en 1x. See Kassian, Glossary, 117.

36 HKM is not available. The forms are cited by courtesy of A. Shatskov. Cf. Hoffner, StBoT 45, 204, fn. 21. The form is analogical - see ibid.

37 For other forms analogical to tarnā-type see HEG, T, 412.

38 Analogical after tarnā-type (Oettinger, SHV, 80; Melchert, SHHP, 25, 117 fn. 78).

39 OS ú-t[u]-me-e-ni (?) 1x in a text from CTH 752. See Kassian, Glossary, 131.

? • 2x (CTH 275) KUB 34.58, r.Kol. 2', (CTH 140.1) KUB 26.19, Vs. II 23' ḫar-ú-e-ni „have“, 4x (CTH 275) KUB 34.58, lk.Kol. 7', (CTH 199) ABoT 65, Rs. 13, (CTH 270) KBo 16.50, Vs. 5, (CTH 275) KUB 36.109, 14' ḫar-ya-ni<sup>40</sup>, (CTH 138.1) KUB 23.77 +, u.Rd. 61' ḫar-ru-ya-ni.

pāi-      pīyēni<sup>41</sup>      piyēn

- (CTH 295.6) KBo 16.59, Rs. 4 mi-im-mi-ū-en<sup>42</sup>;
- 12+1<sup>43</sup>x (CTH 461) KBo 21.21, Rs. III 15', (CTH 137) KBo 16.27 +, Vs. I 14' pí-i-ú-e-ni, 15' p]i-i-ú-e-ni, (CTH 789) KBo 32.16, Vs. II 23, KBo 32.15, Vs. II 15', (CTH 138.1) KUB 23.77 +, Rs. 67', (CTH 458) KBo 31.97, 11' pí-i-ú-e-ni, ? (CTH 138.1) KUB 13.27 +, Vs. I 11' pí-i[-ú-e?]-ni, (CTH 190) KBo 18.86, Vs. 2', (CTH 270) KBo 16.50, Vs. 6, (CTH 137) KBo 16.27 +, Rs. III 10', (CTH 375.1.A) KUB 17.21 +, Rs. IV 12 pí-ú-e-ni, (CTH 139.A) KBo 8.35, Rs. III 9 p]i-ú-e-ni „give“, (CTH 433.3) KBo 17.105 +, Rs. III 30 pí-ú-en.

Some verbs of this type have analogical thematic forms in pl.<sup>43</sup>:

ḫalzāi      ḫalziyāni      ḫalziyēn/ḫalziyēn

- (CTH 375.1.A) KUB 17.21 +, Rs. IV 11 ḫal-zi-ya-ni,  
(CTH 215) KBo 32.202, Rs. 8' ḫal-zi-ú-e-n, (CTH 138.1) KUB 23.77a (+), Vs. 11 ḫal-zi-e-u[-en];
- (CTH 199) HBM 47, Vs. 17 me-mi-ja-u-en, (CTH 713/720) KBo 35.229 +, Vs. I 5' me-e-mi-ja-u-en.

úppāi      úppiye<sup>44</sup>      úppiye/úppayēn

- (CTH 375.1.A) KUB 17.21 +, Rs. IV 13 up-pi-ú-e-ni,  
(CTH 385.4) KUB 34.55, lk.Kol. 10' up-pi-ú-en, (CTH 199) HBM 75, Vs. 11' up-pa-u-e-en, ?? (CTH 215) KBo 32.202, Rs. 7' up-pa[-u-en]??.

I.1 The attribution of several verbs in I.0 requires justification.

40 OS ḫar-ya-ni 2x. See Kassian, Glossary, 94.

41 The type is represented in OS by pa-ri-i-ya-ni 1x. See Kassian, Glossary, 114.

42 Analogical (Oettinger, SHV, 497, StMed 7, 223; Melchert, SHHP, 100). See for the accent [mímma-] Melchert, SHHP, 100; Kimball, HHP, 154, 321.

43 See Melchert, SHHP, 100 fn. 52, 128 fn. 94; AHP, 142; Oettinger, SHV, 71. Cf. Eichner, V Fachtagung, 97; HED, H, 63. For sg. pret. of memai- and the next type see fn. 3.

44 The class is represented in OS by pí-en-ni-ú-e-ni 1x. See Kassian, Glossary, 116.

I.1.1 3 pl. pres. *lāḫuayanzi* 7x may indicate strong-stem generalization from 3 sg. pres. to all the paradigm<sup>45</sup>. Lack of plene for 1 pl. pres. may be due to the non-obligatory nature of plene writings and rarity of 1 pl. pres. forms. But OS *lahyeni* may also represent zero-grade weak stem [*lah-ye-ni*].

I.1.2.1 Group I.0.3 The suggested paradigm of *nu*-causatives has good IE background (< sg. *\*-néu-*, pl. *\*-nu-*<sup>46</sup>). However, inner-Hittite evidence in favour of it is scanty: OS *ya-aḫ-nu-ú-mi* 1x<sup>47</sup>; NS/NH (CTH 293) KUB 13.35 +, Rs. IV 1, 7 *ya-aḫ-nu-um-me-e-ni(-)*<sup>48</sup> and NS/MH (CTH 260.1) KUB 31.44, Vs. II 5 *ti-ik-ku-uš-nu-um-me-e-ni*<sup>49</sup>; NS/NH (CTH 294.1) KUB 40.88 +, Rs. IV 10' *li-in-qa-nu-e-ir* (see CHD, L-N, 69). Even these data are controversial: for 1, 3 pl. analogical introduction of stressed *-mēni*, *-ēr* into the unaccented position is conceivable. KUB 31.44 displays it clearly as the ending of preverb-accented *uqate-* is also spelled plene: Vs. II 12 *u-ya-tum<sup>um</sup>-me-e-ni*<sup>50</sup>. Thus generalization of strong-grade 3 sg. (cf. Hoffner, JNES 31/1, 1972, 31) cannot be totally excluded.

I.1.2.2 Similarly, for *ḫar(k)-* „have“ full and zero grades merged due to phonetic developments. Mobile accent can be assumed on the basis of *ḫar-te-e-ni* (Oettinger, Kratylos 43, 1998, 100), but to my knowledge the form is attested only in NS/NH (CTH 378.III) KUB 14.12, Rs. 11' (see HED, H, 150). The text also attests *analogical* expansion of *-tēni*: Rs. 10' *u-ya-at-te-e-ni* (preverb accented!).

I.1.2.3 *šipant-* had original *o*-grade in sg. (Melchert, StMed 7, 186; AHP, 105, 146; cf. Oettinger, StMed. 7, 231). Pl. vocalism is ambiguous – it may be zero (< *\*ṇ*)<sup>51</sup> or go back to [é]<sup>52</sup> in an acrostatic paradigm. Lack of plene spellings (*šipandanzi* 21+4 frgm. x) may be interpreted in two ways: a) [*an < éN*] is not lengthened following Melchert, AHP, 135;

b) [*an < éN*] is lengthened following Kimball, HHP, 163-5, 244-5, but plene spellings for [*an < éN*] are so rare that their lack in this case is just incidental.

I.1.2.4 *pai-/pī-* type demonstrates plene spelling of weak-stem 1 pl. pres. (*pīyēni* 7x, OS *pariyāni* 1x). Lack of such spellings in *ḫalzai-*, *uppa-* types is presumably incidental. It is interpreted as accented weak stem [*ī*]<sup>53</sup>. However, this hypothesis does not tackle the origin of this paradigm which at face value does not fit into standard Hittite ablaut patterns.

I suggest the following explanation. Some of the verbs of these types are enlargements of roots in final *-h<sub>1</sub>* – e.g. *išpai-* < *\*speh<sub>1</sub>i-*<sup>54</sup>, *šai-*, *memai-* < *\*mé-mh<sub>1</sub>i-*<sup>55</sup>. In the position before a consonant (i.e., in 1 and 2 pl.)<sup>56</sup> *\*-h<sub>1</sub>i-* led through laryngeal-sonorant metathesis to *\*-ih<sub>1</sub>-* (see Melchert, SHHP, 101; AHP, 78; Kimball, HHP, 282-3 w. ref.)<sup>57</sup>. This was in its turn realized as long [*ī*] even in the unstressed position in historical Hittite. Then it spread among the type: *pariyani* is analogical as it does not meet the conditions for laryngeal metathesis because it may go back only to *\*prh<sub>1</sub>-i-ye-ni* even if the inflection was athematic! Like other verbs with the same preverb, *pai-* „give“ has to be preverb stressed, then *\*pé-ai-* > *pái-*<sup>58</sup>, the attested weak stem *pi-* is analogical after other verbs of the class.

Alternatively, one may suppose an accent retraction to explain [*ī*]<sup>59</sup>. The only motivation for the change of accent position may be *pīyēni* in case it retained its primary preverb accent. But, as was indicated above, the form itself has been influenced by *ḫalzai-* type. Generally, there are no parallels for accent retraction in ablauting verbs as they consistently show zero-grade weak stem in pl. pres.

I.2 Historically, I.0 groups are explained as follows:

45 Cf. Oettinger, SHV, 47; Kimball, HHP, 377; Schulze-Thulin, Anatolisch und Indogermanisch, 386.

46 Kronasser, EHS, 440; Oettinger, SHV, 566 Anm. 12, Gs Kronasser, 166, StMed 7, 219; Melchert, SHHP, 59, 107. Cf. Tremblay, AfO 46/47m 1999/2000, 220 fn. 13, Kimball, HHP, 222-3.

47 See Kassian, Glossary, 131; Melchert, StMed 7, 187 with more post OS forms.

48 See Kimball, HHP, 98, 374; Kronasser, EHS, 439, 449.

49 Corresponding to *te-ik-ku-uš-nu-ma-ni* in a similar text NS (CTH 260.2) KUB 31.42, Vs. II 8.

50 Corresponding to KUB 31.42, Vs. II 14 *u-ya-te-ya-ni*. For 3 pl. pret. see, e.g. Kimball, HHP, 129.

51 See Kimball, HHP, 108, 314; LIV<sub>1</sub> s.v. Kümmel attempted to demonstrate in his report „Zur o-Stufe im idg. Verbal-system“ (Albert-Ludwigs-Universität, Sprachwissenschaftliches Seminar) that roots of the shape *\*CōRC-/\*(C)RōR-* had weak stem of the shape *\*CōRC-/\*(C)RōR-*. However, there are too many counterexamples to this hypothesis. Cf. Forsmann, Gs Pedersen, esp. 102-104, Schulze-Thulin, Anatolisch und Indogermanisch, 384.

52 Jasanoff, Hul, 87; Melchert, AHP, 31, 92, 94, 98, 121; cf. Kimball, HHP, 429-30.

53 See Oettinger, SHV, 463; StMed 7, 234. Cf. Kimball, HHP, 204, 217; Melchert, SHHP, 65, 118.

54 See Melchert, SHHP, 101; AHP, 78; Oettinger, HS 114/1, 82. Cf. Jasanoff, IX Fachtagung, 160.

55 See Melchert, SHHP, 74 fn. 140; Oettinger, HS 114/1, 82. It cannot go back to anything like *\*mēm-* (no geminate *-mm-*). 1 sg. is an unlikely start for analogy. Cf. HEG, L-M, 186f, LIV<sub>1</sub> s.v.

56 Whatever primary paradigms were, athematic inflection is clearly a starting point for historical Hittite.

57 There is no unmetathesized zero-grade in forms like *mīa-* „flourish“ contra Kimball, HHP, 383 as these forms are analogical after *-je*-class (see fn. 43 for ref.).

58 See Melchert, SHHP, 32, 73, 162-3; HS 102, 1989, 44-5; cf. Eichner, V Fachtagung, 92.

59 See Melchert, AHP, 89, 102. For *kīnu-* see rather Kimball, HHP, 383; *ā(i)-* verbs may also be explained differently – see Kimball, HHP, 129 366. Luwian data are not probative – see Melchert, AHP, 279.

I.2.1 Group I.0.1.b shows complete 3 sg. pres. strong-stem generalization. The tendency to generalize strong stem from 3 sg. pres. onto the whole paradigm is strong in Hittite, it is not limited to levelling irregular paradigms<sup>60</sup>.

I.2.2 Group I.0.2.c is a phonetic transformation of acrostatic ablaut (strong stem \**ó* - full-grade weak stem \**é*) > *āC-* - pl. pres. *āCC-*, pl. pret. *ēC*<sup>61</sup>.

I.2.3 The pres. of I.0.2.a-b, I.0.3<sup>62</sup> groups goes back to IE holokinetic ablaut (strong stem in sg. - zero-grade weak stem in pl.). Strong stem was secondarily generalized onto pl. pret. starting from 2 pl. impv.<sup>63</sup> that was strong stem in IE (it coincided with 2 pl. pret. in Hittite). This starting point was characteristic in IE only of root present, root aorist and *n*-infix present (see fn. 63). MS phonetically regular continuants of the primary distribution<sup>64</sup> are *ēšten* „be“ 19+2 frgm. x and *ēpten* 6+1 frgm. x. Then strong stem spread onto pl. pret. of *-hi*-conjugation verbs<sup>65</sup> (mostly < perfects) by the proportion *ēpzi* - *ēpten* : *āki* - x. Among *-hi*-conj. verbs *pai-/pī-*, *halzai-* and *tarna*-types<sup>66</sup> (I.0.3) attest strong stem in pl. pret. only sporadically.

*tarna*-type is actually expected to demonstrate strong stem as it is historically *n*-infix pres. But its strong stem is secondarily thematized zero grade (see Melchert, SHHP, 25, 29 fn. 61; 1 sg. is an unlikely start for analogy contra Oettinger, StMed 7, 233 w. ref.; Eichner, V Fachtagung, 97). Whatever the primary paradigm of *pai-/pī-* was, its current inflection is analogical after former perfects.

I.2.4 Several primarily acrostatic verbs joined the new ablaut system analogically acquiring zero-grade weak stem in pl. pres., - namely *šakk-/šekk*-type and *ed-/ad-*, (?)

60 Like *galh-*. See Kimball, HHP, 165-6; Melchert, AHP, 82, 136, 169. For *pai-* „go“ see Kimball, HHP, 108, 231, 365; Melchert, SHHP, 75 w. fn. 142.

61 See Melchert, AHP, 80-1; SHHP, 139 fn. 108; cf. Oettinger, SHV, 48-50, 55, 112, 440; HED, H, 221; Kimball, HHP, 280, 441-2.

62 Contra Hart, Fs Gurney, 57, because not just *pai-* „give“ has zero-grade in pl. pret., but several types.

63 See Oettinger, SHV, 67, 97, 141, 406; Gs Pedersen, 320 Anm. 64. Cf. Hart, Fs Gurney, 59-60; (?) Rosenkranz, HuI, 220; Justus, Mat. heth. Thes., Lf. 10, Nr. 7, 14-15. Cf. Oettinger, SHV, 113.

64 2 pl. is a convenient IE starting point for strong-stem expansion. Its primary connection with strong stem does not follow from synchronic Hittite data as the difference between strong-stem 1 and 2 pl. is not statistically relevant: *āšten* 2x, OS *ušt[ē]ni* 1x vs *āumani* 1x, *u(m)mēni* 5x; *pāšten* 3x (alongside *pāšten* 11+3 frgm. x) vs *piyēn* 1x; (?) *ēpt[eni]* 1x and *ēpt[an]* 1x (alongside *āptēni* 1x) vs *appūēni* 1x. Strong-stem 2 pl. pres. is attested 6x (above mentioned + *dāit[teni]* 1x), strong-stem 1 pl. pres. - 6x.

65 Besides 1 pl. forms from section I.0, there are the following 2 pl. pret./impv. forms: *ākten* 1x, *ārten* „come“ 1x, *āšten* 8x, *ēšten* „sit“ 1x, *halāitten* 1x, *dāitten* 11x (7x plene, OS 1x plene), *dāišten* 2+1 frgm. x (OS 2x), *uāšten* „buy“ 1x.

66 Lack of strong stem in pl. pret. of *šipant-* may be due to chance as the forms are graphically long and this normally precludes plene spellings.

*ekū-/akū-* (2 pl. pret./imper. *ēkuten* 6x, *ēzten* 7x). In this case all pl. pret. originally was (and remained in MH) strong stem<sup>67</sup>. Pl. pres. became zero-grade weak stem both on the proportion *app-ānzi* - *ēpp-er* : x - *šékk-er*<sup>68</sup> and due to analogical pressure from a more common *ā* - *ā-* ablaut type as there is no other class with the same ablaut type (strong stem *ā* - weak stem *é*) for pres. *ed-/ad-*, (?) *ekū-/akū-* are analogical after other pres. types with *e* - *a* ablaut. The analogy is complete for *ed-/ad-*, (?) *ekū-/akū-* which are synchronically I.0.2.b (see fn. 82-83) and sporadic for *šakk-/šekk*-type which forms a separate group (I.0.4).

*šakk-/šekk*-type has often enough been assessed as possessing one strong stem (*šakk-* in sg.) and one weak stem (*šékk-* in pl.), i.e. as belonging to group I.0.3<sup>69</sup>. However, it is still sometimes described as displaying in OH *ā*-strong stem in sg., *a*-weak stem in pl. pres., *e*-strong stem in pl. pret., i.e. as having two strong stems<sup>70</sup>. This point of view has to be discarded because as different from verbs of groups I.0.2.a-b, 3 pl. pres. of *šakk-/šekk*-type has the same vocalism as *e*-grade 3 pl. pret.: *šékkānzi* 4x, *ašēšānzi* 12x, *tamēššānzi* 2x alongside *tamaššānzi*<sup>71</sup> 1x; ? OS *k]arēpanzi* 1x (see Kassian, Glossary, 104)<sup>72</sup>. As 3 pl. pres. is not normally influenced by 3 pl. pret. (see I.2.6.1), *e*-vocalism has to be original in pl. of both pres. and pret. As OS *šaktēni* 1x (MS *šaktēni* 1x vs expected *šékteni* 2x) does not fit into this ablaut type, it has to be analogical (cf. LIV<sub>1</sub>, s.v.) like OS *dāūeni*.

I.2.5 IE aorist with strong stem<sup>73</sup> in 1, 2 pl. is an unlikely starting point for strong-stem pl. pret.<sup>74</sup> as it is strong-stem 2 pl. both pres. and pret.<sup>75</sup> of *pehute*-type that directly continue aoristic ablaut<sup>76</sup>. Analogical explanation which is suggested for strong-stem 1, 2 pl. pres. of *nai-* (I.2.6.1) does not work for *pehute*-type as 3 pl. pret. *pēhu-ter*

67 It could have stimulated strong stem generalization onto all pl. pret. of *eš-* „be“, *epp-*, *šeš-*, *kūen-*, *hūek-*.

68 See Jasanoff, TSLM, 137 who, however, reconstructs the analogy of *apūēni/ēpūen* type.

69 See Beekes, ZVS 88/2, 1974, 181 w. ref.; Jasanoff, HuI, 86; Melchert, SHHP, 68.

70 Oettinger, SHV, 54, Oettinger, Kratylus 43, 1998, 105.

71 The only verb that contrasts 3 pl. pres. and pret. is *dar-ānzi* 4x (OS 3x), *tēr-er* 2+1 frgm. x (1x plene). 3 pl. pret. *e*-vocalism is here analogical after the suppletive form of 2 pl. pret./impv. OS *tē-tten* 1x, MS *tē-tte[n]* 1x.

72 There are even analogical forms: *ērtēni* „come“ 1x vs. regular *artēni* 1x. See Oettinger, SHV, 48 Anm. 36, 403-4.

73 See Oettinger, SHV, 105, 107-110, 126-7; Jasanoff, MSS 52, 1991; TSLM, 149-150; all w. ref.

74 Contra Eichner, V Fachtagung, 82; Hart, Fs Gurney, 58-9. Cf. Kimball, HHP, 375.

75 No MS or OS 1 pl forms. 2 pl.: *pēhutetēni* 1x; *ūyate/itten* 5x; *ūyate(t)eni* 1+1<sup>2</sup> x; *ūyate(t)eni* 2x.

76 See Eichner, V Fachtagung, 82, 88; Oettinger, SHV, 107-110; StMed 7, 225

6x (plene 3x), OS 1x, *úya-ter* 4x, OS 2x may represent only zero-grade *'-t-er* (\**péhute-er* would have been contracted into \**péhutēr*<sup>77</sup>). On the contrary, \**nā(i)-er* (only NS) is a clear strong stem. Thus aoristic ablaut was lexicalized for *pehute*-type and does not function as a productive functionally loaded phenomenon. The only influence it could exercise was to *stimulate* strong-stem 1, 2 pl. pres. vs weak-stem 3 pl. pres., not strong-stem 3 pl. pret.!

I.2.6 As strong stem of pl. pret. and that of sg. are always identical, it is conceivable to suppose 3 sg. pres. as the starting point for both. However, 3 sg. pres. strong-stem generalization onto all paradigm (I.0.1.b) and 2 pl. impv. strong-stem generalization onto pl. pret. (I.0.1.a, I.0.2.a-b) are more likely to work independently (cf. Melchert, SHHP, 25, 73-5). 2 pl. impv. strong-stem generalization onto pl. pret. in MH functions as pl. pret. marker (most consistently for 3 pl.<sup>78</sup> - see I.2.6.1). On the contrary, even if strong-stem generalization from 3 sg. pres. is incomplete (*úppayēn*; *mématteni*, *mémanzi*; *únnanzi*, *únn[a]tteni*<sup>79</sup>), it is different from the strong stem arising from 2 pl. impv. as: a) strong-stem forms are sporadic; b) there is no special connection of strong stem and pl. pret. - strong stem is used both in pl. pret. and pl. pres.

I.2.6.1 However, 2 pl. impv. strong-stem generalization may spread onto all the paradigm except 3 pl. pres. This is the case with *nai-* (I.0.1.a). 2 pl. impv. as the starting point is assumed because of the contrast between 3 pl. pres. (weak stem) and 3 pl. pret. (strong stem). This *nai*-type generalization tendency at an earlier stage is represented by *sporadic* spread of strong stem onto pl. pres. of I.0.2.b<sup>80</sup>. Sporadic synchronic status (cf. Hart, Fs Gurney, 52f) is clear in the only statistically significant case: *áumani* 1x vs. *u(m)mēni*<sup>81</sup> 5x. For all the other (clearly secondary) forms it has to be assumed as they

are too rarely attested: *éd]uani*<sup>82</sup> and *ékūani*<sup>83</sup> vs OS *aduēni* 4+2 frgm. x, *akuuēni* 6x<sup>84</sup>; *nāhūani* vs regular *hāšš(u)uēni*<sup>85</sup>. *huékūani* „conjure“ is unclear (cf. Oettinger, SHV, 103, 110) in view of lack of relevant forms.

The fact that 3 pl. pres. of I.0.2.a-b verbs resists strong stem generalization is due to *pehute*-type analogy (see I.2.5; cf. Hart, Fs Gurney, 52). The verbs that generalize 3 sg. pres. strong stem do not display this „conservatism“ of 3 pl. pres. (see I.1.1, I.2.6); one can add *hāššanzi* 1x „open“ (*hāššanzi* 9x, OS 5x) and *uāhanzi* 7x (OS 13x), *uāhānzi* 1x showing 3 sg. pres. influence in consonantism (Oettinger, SHV, 99).

I.2.6.2 In OS texts there is one clear case which proves that the tendency to introduce strong stem into pl. pres. operated as sporadically as in MS, and its results were not retained in MS: OS *dāyeni* 1x vs regular OS and MS *tumēni*.

There are no MS 1, 2 pl. pres. forms for OS *huēkkū[eni]*, *huē[(kkū)eni]* „slaughter“ (? - see I.2.6.1); or for OS *kuérūen[i]* (MS 3 pl. pres. *kurānzi* 1x - MS 3 pl. pret. *[k]uérér* 1x).

## II. -u/meni vs. -u/mani

II.1.1 -u/meni is used 88x (67%), while -u/mani 42x (33%), i.e. -u/meni is about twice as common as -u/mani and is an unmarked variant. Lexically, the forms with -u/meni and -u/mani endings are mostly in complementary distribution<sup>86</sup>. The only verbs with both endings are *aššnu-*, *au(š)-u-*, *har(k)-* „have“. Among ablaut-accentual groups the only types which are never attested with -u/mani are thematic verbs (I.0.1.b, except *ske*-forms) - 25x -u/meni. The only type showing clear preference for -uani is *-ske*-forms<sup>87</sup>. Although -u/meni is almost twice as common generally as -u/mani, the situation for *-ske*-forms is nearly the opposite: -uani (16x - 57%) is more common here than

77 (CTH 147) KUB 14.1 +, Vs. 71 *ú-te*?-[e-i]r is too fragmentary and unclear.

78 Only the verbs with both 3 pl. pres. and pret. attested: *akū-ānzi* 103x (OS 25+7 frgm. x) - *ékū-ēr-* 1x; *app-ānzi* 64x (OS 15+3 frgm. x), *app-ānzi* 2x - *épp-er* 3+1 frgm. x (OS 2x); OS *ašānzi* „be“ 5+1 frgm. x (no unambiguous MS forms!) - *éš-er* 4+1 frgm. x (OS 3+1 frgm. x); *ad-ānzi* 39x (OS 7x) - *ét-er* 1x; *uū-ānzi* 2+1<sup>2</sup> x (OS 1x) - *āy-ēr* 2x; *hu(i)ānzi* 30x (OS 13x), ? *hu(i)-ān[zi]*<sup>2</sup> 1x - *h[uu]ā-ēr* 1x, *huūd-er* 2x (1x plene); *kun-ānzi* 7x (OS 3x) - *kuén-er* 8x; *kur-ānzi* 1x - *[k]uér-er* 1x; *d-ānzi* 131x (OS 28x), *d-ānzi* 3+1<sup>2</sup> x - *dā-er* 8x (OS 2x), *dā-ēr* 1x; *ti(i)-ānzi* 221x (OS 46x, *tiānti* 1x) - *dāi-ēr* 3+1 frgm. x, *dā-er* 5x, *dāy-er* 6x. *dā(i)er* 2x, *dā(i)ēr* 2x are in frgm. contexts and can belong to both *da-* and *dai-*. However, there are no clear *dāier* forms from *da-* contra Oettinger, SHV, 75 Anm. 59 w. ref.

79 All the forms represent the same tendency. However, analogy from other types cannot be totally excluded (see Oettinger, SHV, 61, 80). Cf. Oettinger, StMed 7, 232; Eichner, V Fachtagung, 94. For some forms textual analogy might also have been at work: e.g., for *úppayēn* which is preceded by *i-ja-u-e-en* (see II.2.2).

80 2 pl. pres. and OS 1 pl. pres. reveal the same tendency for I.0.2.a verbs (see I.2.6.2, fn. 64).

81 See Oettinger, SHV, 83, Melchert, AHP, 138 and Hart, Fs Gurney, 55.

82 *édūani* (attested also in OH/NS) does not directly represent the IE acrostatic present *ēd-/ed-* (see LIV<sub>1</sub> s.v.) contra Melchert, AHP, 138, also 71. NS/OH *édūani* is not probative for OH data as there is always the possibility with copies that it is a scribe's incorrect transformation of the original. Moreover, OS *aduēni* as different from hapax OS *dāyeni* is attested many times (4+2 frgm. x) and has to be considered the normal/standard OS form. There are no OS strong-stem 2 and 3 pl. pres. for the word, either.

83 Contra Melchert, AHP, 138, it has nothing to do with the reconstructed acrostatic or reduplicated form (for which see Eichner, MSS 31, 1973, 82; Oettinger, SHV, 87-8, 90; LIV<sub>1</sub> s.v.).

84 Oettinger, StMed 7, 216, Hart, Fs Gurney, 53.

85 See Melchert, AHP, 147. For regular forms see Oettinger, SHV, 43f.

86 See already Otten-Souček, StBoT 8, 78, Hart, Fs Gurney, 54-55. However, the number of attestations of concrete forms is very small.

87 See already Güterbock, *Orientalia* 25, fs. 2, 1956, 118.

-*u*eni (12x - 43%). All the rest of statistically significant types are used both with -*u*/meni and -*u*/mani<sup>88</sup>:

generalized strong stem:	
1x <i>hānumēni</i> ;	1x <i>nāiūani</i> ;
1x <i>lāh]uēni/lāh]uēni</i> ;	3x <i>uālhuani</i> ; 3+1 frgm. x <i>pāiūani</i> ;
ablauting root vocalism, mobile accent:	
12x <i>pīuēni</i> ; 1x <i>ūppiūeni</i> ;	1x <i>halziūāni</i> ;
5x <i>-nu-mēni</i> ;	? 2x <i>-nu-māni</i> ;
? 2x <i>haruēni</i> „have“;	? 5x <i>haruāni</i> „have“;
2x <i>tu(m)mēni</i> ; 1x <i>ku[au]ēni</i> ;	
10x <i>tarna</i> -type (e.g. <i>tarnummēni</i> );	? 1x <i>šipant(u)uāni/šipant(u)uani</i> ;
5x <i>u(m)mēni</i> ;	1x <i>āumani</i> ;
1x <i>hāššūeni</i> „open“;	2x <i>nāhuani</i> ;
	1x <i>éd]uani</i> ; 1x <i>ēkuani</i> ;
1x <i>[a]puēni</i> ;	? 1x <i>huékūani</i> (see I.2.6.1);
no ablaut, impossible synchronically to define the position of accent:	
1x (?) <i>mazzue[ni</i> ; 2x <i>harkuēni</i> „perish“;	2x <i>ištamaššūani</i> .
3x <i>šanhuēni</i> <sup>89</sup> ; 1x <i>uarsūeni</i> .	

II.1.2 It is clear from the table that -*u*/mani is unstressed (a) in ablauting verbs where the forms with -*m*/uani are secondary/innovative and sporadic; (b) in verbs that completely generalized strong stem<sup>90</sup>; in productive -*ske*-forms<sup>91</sup>. -*u*/mani is stressed in

<sup>88</sup> For OS -*u*ani forms see fn. 89-92. The common belief (see Houwink ten Cate, Records, 8 w. ref., Otten - Souček, StBoT 8, 79) that OS -*u*ani ending is much less common than the MS one, has to be abandoned as OS corpus itself is much smaller, thus only relative counts are probative. The MS correlation (67% -*u*/meni vs 33% -*u*/mani) is the same as the OS one (24x -*u*ani (33%) vs 48x -*u*/meni (67%)). So there was no expansion of -*u*/mani in MS.

<sup>89</sup> OS *hatkuēni* 1x; OS *paršūani* 1+1<sup>2</sup> x are also ambiguous. See Kassian, Glossary, s.v.

<sup>90</sup> For OS these are *išhuuāuāni*, *pāiūani*, (?) OS or MS *dašuy]á?hhuuani* 1x. See Kassian, Glossary, s.v.

<sup>91</sup> For OS this is *akkuškéuani* 1x. See Kassian, Glossary, 89.

the types that do not have secondary strong stem in pl. pres.<sup>92</sup> - most probative are *halzai-* and *pai-/pī*-types. I cannot explain this latter pattern as secondary.

The fact that *ái-* *i-*’ ablaut and *hi*-conj. may be secondary for *halzai-*, *parai-* (see fn. 43, I.1.2.4) as well as for quite a few other verbs of *halzai-*, *pai-* and *uppa*-types does not mean that the ablaut itself (with safe IE parallels) is secondary.

Thus MS and OS distribution makes it evident that the connection between lack of ending stress and the use of -*u*/mani is not primary<sup>93</sup>. Due to the productive nature of Hittite ablaut *e/a*, the variants -*u*/meni and -*u*/mani<sup>94</sup> came to be productively and secondarily used as correspondingly unmarked and marked (unaccented) allomorphs of the same morpheme.

Naturally, there is nothing strange in a redistribution of originally unaccented allomorph onto accented positions<sup>95</sup>. NS *akuuani* and *aduani* (see Otten-Souček, StBoT 8, 78; Hart, Fs Gurney, 53 fn. 11) seem to be the cases. If analyzed as [*áduani*], the forms violate the normal ablauting patterns of the type (*a*-grade of the root is an unstressed zero-grade weak stem). If analyzed as [*aduāni*], they violate the productive connection between -*u*ani and the unstressed position. Actually, the forms seem to be a contamination between attested *ēkuuani*, *ēduani* and *akuuēni*, *aduēni*. On the contrary, there is no basis like this for the appearance of *halziūāni*, *pariūāni*, probably -*nu-māni*, *haruāni*, *šipantuūāni*. Note that *halzai*-type is conservative and resistant to innovations.

II.2.1 MS data in favour of -*uāni* are complemented by OS *išhuuāuāni*. The long unstressed vowel in the ending has to be analogical from the stressed -*u*ani.

Similar forms are attested in NS/OH (CTH 414.A) KUB 29.1, Vs. I 15 *e-du-ua-a-ni*<sup>96</sup>, ibid. 14 *pa-a-i-ua-a-ni*; NS/late MH (CTH 42.A) KBo 5.3 +, Rs. IV 13’ *pa-a-i-ua-a-ni*<sup>97</sup>.

<sup>92</sup> OS forms are (?) *kišnumāni*, *pariūāni*, (?) *haruāni*.

<sup>93</sup> Cf. Melchert, AHP, 138; StMed 7, 191 n. 4; Rosenkranz, Vergleichende Untersuchungen ..., 80; Hoffner, JNES 31/1, 1972; probably also Hart, Fs Gurney, 53-55. The syncopated forms -*uni* (see Otten, StBoT 11, 26) are not relevant as they may have arisen both from -*u*ani and -*u*eni (see Melchert, SHHP, 53).

<sup>94</sup> The origin of -*u*/mani remains a mystery. Existing theories (Luwian or dialectal Hittite influence; umlaut) are implausible. See Houwink ten Cate, Records, 7-8; Kronasser, EHS, 379-380; Hart, Fs Gurney, passim. Analogy after 2 pl. pres. -*tani* < \*-*th<sub>2</sub>ene+i* (Eichner, MSS 31, 1973, 78; V Fachtagung, 79) is unlikely as -*tani* (20x (11%) vs -*teni* 141x (89%)) is attested three times as rarely as -*u*/mani, their lexical and accentual distribution being much the same. Thus synchronically -*u*/mani is clearly the starting point.

<sup>95</sup> 3 pl. pret. -*ar* is not comparable contra Melchert, AHP, 143, 180. See rather Oettinger, Kratylus 43, 1998, 107-8. Cf. Neu, HS 102, 19.

<sup>96</sup> See already Otten-Souček, StBoT 8, 78; Houwink ten Cate, Records, 16.

<sup>97</sup> A parallel 2 pl. pres. is attested in NS/MH (CTH 134.1) KBo 8.37 (+), Rs. 6’ *pa-it-ta-a-ni* vs. NS/MH (CTH 134.2) KUB 23.7, Rs. 1’ *pa-it-te-e-n[i]*.

The forms are rather common to be just mistakes contra Hart, Fs Gurney, 53 and Melchert, AHP, 138.

II.2.2 Although none of the forms in II.2.1 is actually ending accented, they exactly parallel the distribution of plene in *-uēn*. The introduction of strong stem into 1 pl. pret. led to the situation when *-uēn* was stressed only in the verbs of I.0.3<sup>98</sup>. These forms never show plene spellings. Plene spellings of 1 pl. pret. ending occur only in the unstressed position<sup>99</sup>: accented stem: *ku-e-u-e-en*, *la-a-u-e-en*, *[d]a-i-u-e-en*; *up-pa-u-e-en*; (CTH 199) HBM 76, Vs. 10' *i-ia-u-e-en*; KuT 49, Vs. 11 *ú-ua-u-e-en*; (CTH 138.1) KUB 23.77 +, Vs. 41' *[i]-ši-ia-aḥ-ḥu-e-en*<sup>100</sup>. Thus, in both *-ua-a-ni* and *-u-e-en* we deal with generalization of the accented allomorph into the unaccented position<sup>101</sup>.

II.2.3 It is important to note that the phonetically regular<sup>102</sup> 1 pl. pret. ending should be *\*-uan*. As it is not attested, one has to suppose a factor that blocked the phonetic development - a tendency to keep vocalism identical in pres. and pret. with the orientation at the most common variant *-uēni*. Consequently lack of *a* vocalism in pl. pret. is in any case secondary and analogical<sup>103</sup>.

#### Korrekturnachträge

Ad I.0.1.b: for *ḥānumēni* cf. Ūnal, Ortaköy, 90 w. fn. 41.

Ad I.0.2.b: (CTH 573) KUB 18.5 +, Vs. I 28, 33, 46 *a-ú-me-en*, 23 *a-ú-m[e<sup>2</sup>-e]n*, 35 *a-ú-me-en*;  
(CTH 790) KBo 9.137 +, Rs. III 19' *da-i-ú-en*;  
(CTH 581) KUB 31.101, Vs. 11' *za-i-u-en*.

Ad I.0.3: (CTH 39) KUB 26.39, Rs. IV 5' *ḥal-zi-ú[-en]*.

Ad I.2.3 fn. 64: *ākteni* 1x;

fn. 65: *zāitten* 1x.

Ad I.2.4 fn. 72: *érer* 1x vs regular *arér* 1+2<sup>2</sup>x. But HKM 113, Rs. 15 *a-ša-še-er* is analogical after sg.!

Ad I.0.3: HKM 110, Vs. 5 *šu-nu-mi-ni*.

98 Even here *pédumen* and *únnumen* are preverb stressed (Oettinger, SHV, 501, StMed 7, 225; Melchert, SHHP, 91, 128, 141; Kimball, HHP, 150-1. Cf. Melchert, SHHP, 91; Oettinger, Gs Kronasser, 166-7).

99 Thus already (?) Melchert, SHHP, 128. See generally Kimball, HHP, 62. 1 pl. pres. is different: ending accented *ú/um-me-e-ni*, *du-m[e]-e-ni* vs root accented *ḥa-a-nu-mi-e-ni* and preverb accented *ú-du-me-e-ni*.

100 Following Melchert, SHHP, 128.

101 See generally Kimball, HHP, 129; Melchert, SHHP, 108.

102 See Kimball, HHP, 164, but her explanation of 1 pl. is incredible.

103 Cf. Eichner, V Fachtagung, 79; Melchert, AHP, 138; StMed 7, 191 n. 4.