The Hittite 2pl.-ending -šten(i)

Alwin Kloekhorst

Leiden

It is well known that in Hittite besides the normal 2pl.-ending $-tten(i)^1$ sometimes the variant $-\check{s}ten(i)^2$ is found. It is generally thought that this $-\check{s}ten(i)$ must be of secondary origin. For instance, Oettinger³ states: "Die Endung $-\check{s}ten(i)$ ist durch Falschabtrennung von auf $\circ \check{s}$ auslautenden Stämmen entstanden". This explanation seems rather ad hoc to me. Following the same line of thought, one would also expect, for instance, a variant **- $\check{s}mi$ besides -mi or **- $\check{s}\bar{e}r$ besides $-\bar{e}r$. Jasanoff⁴ connects the ending $-\check{s}ten(i)$ with the rise of the 2sg.pret.-ending $-\check{s}ta$ besides older -tta. As this ending $-\check{s}ta$ is found in NH and NS texts only⁵, we would expect that $-\check{s}ten(i)$, too, is only found in NH or NS texts. This is not the case however: compare the OS attestations $da-i\check{s}-te-en$ (KBo 8.42, Rs. 2, 3), $u\check{s}-t[e-e]-ni$ (KBo 7.14 + KUB 36.100, Vs. 23), $[p]i-i-i\check{s}-te-en$ (StBoT 25.7, IV 10)). This means that Jasanoff's explanation is incorrect as well. Therefore, the ending $-\check{s}ten(i)$ requires an extensive treatment.

In order to do so, I have collected all cases known to me in which a 2pl.-ending -šteni, -štani or -šten is attested. The verbs with which this ending appears can be divided into two categories.

The first category consists of verbs in which the endings -tten(i) and -sten(i) would merge phonetically, either because the verb stem ends in -s-6 or because the verb stem ends in a dental consonant $(*-T-T->-TsT-)^7$. These verbs are irrelevant to our research as we cannot distinguish between the endings -tten(i) and -sten(i).

The second category consists of verbs where there is no phonetic reason to expect that between the verb stem and the ending -tten(i) an extra $-\check{s}$ - would appear. In these verbs the $-\check{s}$ - seems to be unmotivated, and these cases are therefore the ones that have to be

¹ Next to -ttani.

² Next to -*štani*.

Oettinger, Stammbildung, p. 71.

⁴ J.H. Jasanoff, *Hittite and the Indo-European Verb*. Oxford 2003, p. 184.

⁵ a-uš[-ta] (KBo 5.3, III 56 (NH)), me-mi-iš-ta (KUB 15.5, III 11 (NH)), pí-eš-ta (KBo 11.1, Rs. 12 (NH)), ši-iš-ta (KBo 3.34, I 23 (OH/NS)), da-iš-ta (KUB 21.27+, I 4, 6 (NH)), up-pí-eš-ta (KBo 8.76, Rs. 4 (NS)), wa-ar-ri-iš-ši-iš-ta (KUB 31.47, Vs. 13 (NH)).

⁶ These are: $a\bar{s}\bar{a}\bar{s}^{-i}/a\bar{s}e\bar{s}^{-i}$ 'to seat', $e\bar{s}^{-\bar{z}i}/a\bar{s}^{-}$ 'to be', $hane\bar{s}\bar{s}^{-\bar{z}i}$ 'to wipe', $ha\bar{s}^{-i}/he\bar{s}^{-\bar{z}i}$ 'to open', $hue\bar{s}^{-\bar{z}i}$ 'to live', $\bar{l}\bar{s}\bar{s}a^{-i}/\bar{l}\bar{s}\bar{s}^{-\bar{z}i}$ 'to make', $i\bar{s}tama\bar{s}\bar{s}^{-\bar{z}i}$ 'to hear', $id\bar{a}law\bar{e}\bar{s}\bar{s}^{-\bar{z}i}$ 'to become evil', $kar\bar{s}^{-\bar{z}i}$ 'to cut', $karu\bar{s}\bar{s}^{-\bar{z}i}$ 'to be silent', $gul\bar{s}^{-\bar{z}i}$ 'to carve', maz^{-i} 'to resist', $nakk\bar{e}\bar{s}\bar{s}^{-\bar{z}i}$ 'to become important', $pah\bar{s}^{-\bar{z}i}$ 'to protect', $parku\bar{e}\bar{s}\bar{s}^{-\bar{z}i}$ 'to become pure', $punu\bar{s}\bar{s}^{-\bar{z}i}$ 'to ask', $\bar{s}e\bar{s}^{-\bar{z}i}/\bar{s}a\bar{s}^{-\bar{z}i}$ 'to sleep', $\bar{s}i\bar{s}^{-\bar{z}i}$ 'to prosper', $tak\bar{s}^{-\bar{z}i}$ 'to unify', $war\bar{s}^{-\bar{z}i}$ 'to buy', and $we\bar{s}\bar{s}^{-\bar{z}i}$ 'to wear'.

Only attested in ed^{-zi}/ad - 'to eat'.

```
investigated in order to explain the occurrence of -šten(i). These verbs are:
au^{-i}/u- 'to see'
                               (u\check{s}t[\bar{e}]ni, au\check{s}teni, au\check{s}ten)
halzai-i/halzi- 'to call'
                                (halzišten)
hanna-i/hann- 'to sue'
                                (hanništen)
išhai- '/išhi- 'to bind'
                                (išhaišten)
išpai-<sup>i</sup>/išpi- 'to be satiated' (išpišten)
mai-i/mi- 'to grow'
                                (maišten)
mēma-i/mēmi- 'to speak'
                                (memišteni, memišten)
nai-i 'to turn'
                               (naišteni, naištani, naišten)
nanna-i/nanni- 'to drive'
                                (nanništen)
pai-'/pi- 'to give'
                               (pišteni, pišten)
parai-'/pari- 'to blow'
                                (paraišteni)
peda-i/ped- 'to bring'
                                (petišten)
penna-i/penni- 'to drive'
                                (penništen)
šai-i/ši- 'to seal'
                                (šāišten)
šunna-'/šunn- 'to fill'
                                (šūništen)
dai-i/ti- 'to put'
                               ([t]išteni, daišten)
dāla-'/dāli- 'to let in peace' (dālešten)
tarna-'/tarn- 'to release'
                                (tarništen)
<u>ūnna-i/ūnni-</u> 'to send here'
                               (ūnništeni, ūnništen)
uppa-'/uppi- 'to send here' (uppešten)
zai-i/zi- 'to cross'
                                (zi\check{s}t\bar{e}n[i])
```

Of these verbs, pai^{-i}/pi - 'to give' is remarkable because it **always** uses the ending -sten(i) and **never** -tten(i):

This cannot be due to chance. This verb is well-attested and one of the most common verbs in Hittite.

The other verbs show forms with -šten(i) as well as with -tten(i). Of course, it would be very important to establish a chronological distribution between these forms. If we can find out which ending was used in which period, we are likely to receive a better insight into the origin of -šten(i). The verbs that are attested often enough to give a good picture are the following:

 au^{-i}/u - 'to see':

OH period: *uš-t*[*e-e*]-*ni* (KBo 7.14 + KUB 36.100, Vs. 23 (OS)), *uš-te-ni* (KBo 3.28, II 9 (OH/NS))

MH period: a-uš-te-ni (KUB 13.27, Vs. 26 (MH/MS), KUB 31.105, 12 (MH/MS), a-uš-ten (HKM 86, 13 (MH/MS), KBo 12.58+, II 37 (MH²/NS)), a-uš-te-en (KUB 24.4 + 30.12, II 14 (OH/MS))

NH period: *a-ut-te-ni* (KUB 31.115, 21 (OH/NS), KUB 26.12 + 21.42, I 9, 37, IV 4 (NH, Tudh. IV)).

dai-i/ti- 'to put':

OH period: [t]i-i-iš-te-ni (KBo 8.42, Rs. 1 (OS)), da-iš-te-en (KBo 8.42, Rs. 2, 3 (OS)).

MH period: da-iš-ten (HKM 60, 15 (MH/MS)),

NH period: da-a-iš-ten (KBo 12.18, I 3 (OH/NS), KBo 4.8, II 17 (NH)), ta-iš-ten (KUB 21.19, III 9 (NH)); da-a-it-te-ni (KUB 13.6, II 5 (NS)).

nai-i 'to turn':

OH period: unattested

MH period: na-iš-te-ni (KUB 23.77, 94 (MH/MS), KUB 23.72, Rs. 62 (MH/MS), na-iš-ta-ni (KUB 23.72, Rs. 58 (MH/MS), na-iš-ten (KUB 15.34, I 50, II 2, III 16 (MH/MS), KUB 13.29, 8 (MH/NS)), na-a-iš-ten (KUB 17.8, IV 6 (MH²/NS)), na-a-eš-ten (ibid. (MH²/NS)), ne-ya-ten (KUB 15.32, I 55 (MH/NS)), ne-ya-at-ten (KUB 15.31, I 53 (MH/NS))

NH period: ne-ya-at-ten (KUB 7.60, II 30 (NS)), [ne-]i-ya-at-ten (KUB 14.14, Rs. 34 (NH, Murs. II))

mēma-i/mēmi- 'to speak'

OH period: me-mi-eš-ten (KUB 43.55, II 1 (OH?/NS))

MH period: me-mi-iš-te-ni (KUB 23.77, 28 (MH/MS)), me-ma-at-te-ni (KUB 23.82, Rs. 25 (MH/MS or NS)), KUB 13.4, IV 15, 19 (pre-NH/NS)), me-mi-iš-ten (KUB 23.72, Rs. 54 (MH/MS), KBo 15. 28, Rs. 11 (MS)), me-mi-iš-te-[en] (KUB 23.77, 37 (MH/MS)), me-mi-eš-ten (KUB 13.4, I 64 (pre-NH/NS))

NH period: me-ma-at-te-ni (KUB 26. 1, I 21, III 52 (NH), KUB 15.1, II 31 (NH)), me-ma-te-ni (KUB 21.42, IV 4 (NH)), me-mi-eš-ten (KUB 14.8, Rs. 36 (NH)).

The case of au^{-i}/u^{-} is especially telling. In the oldest texts, we find the form $u\check{s}t\bar{e}ni$. In MH texts, this form is altered to $au\check{s}teni$ (analogical introduction of the full-grade into the plural stem). A form autteni (with the ending -tteni) is predominantly found in one text, which is attributed to Tudhaliya IV, one of the last Hittite kings. Consequently, in this verb,

the ending -sten(i) is found from the oldest texts onwards, and its replacement by -tten(i) took place in the very latest stage of Hittite only.

Also dai^{-i}/ti - 'to put' shows a clear distribution: - $\check{s}ten(i)$ is found from OS to NH texts, whereas -tten(i) is found only once, in a NS text.

A similar picture is shown by nai^{-i} . The oldest (MH) forms are naišteni, naišteni and naišten, showing the ending -šten(i). The ending -tten(i) is only found in NH copies of MH texts and in NH texts. It is further remarkable that it is only found when the stem of the verb is $neye/a^{-2i}$, which is the secondarily thematicised mi-inflecting variant of the older hi-inflecting stem nai^{-i} .

The same distribution is found in the case of $m\bar{e}ma^{-1}/m\bar{e}mi^{-1}$. The oldest forms, memisteni, memisteni, show the ending -sten(i), whereas the ending -tten(i) is found in younger copies of MH texts and in NH compositions only. The text KUB 23.82, in which the oldest attestation of me-ma-at-te-ni is found, is paleographically to be regarded as a transition between a MS and a NS text and must be dated to the late MH / early NH period.

Accordingly, the chronological distribution for these four verbs is the following: the oldest (OH and MH) forms show the ending -sten(i), whereas the ending -tten(i) is only found in texts (copies as well as original compositions) from the late MH / early NH period onwards. In my view, these facts can only be explained by assuming that in these verbs the ending -sten(i) is **not** a secondary ending that replaces original -tten(i), but must have been the **original** one, which in younger times is replaced by the ending -tten(i).

The next question is: what are the common features of verbs that show an original ending $-\check{s}ten(i)$? When we look at the 21 verbs for which an ending $-\check{s}ten(i)$ is attested (see the list above), we immediately see that they are **all** hi-inflected verbs. There is not a single mi-inflected verb that shows the ending $-\check{s}ten(i)^8$. This cannot be coincidental: statistics show that the chance that a random collection of 21 Hittite verbs consists of hi-verbs only, is 1 in 1.2 trillion⁹.

Our conclusion therefore should be that the ending $-\dot{s}ten(i)$ is the original hi-ending that contrasts with the mi-ending -tten(i). This distribution is nicely corroborated by the fact that in the paradigm of nai^{-i} as cited above, all forms that show the hi-inflected stem nai-take $-\dot{s}ten(i)$, whereas the forms that show the secondarily thematicised mi-inflected stem $neye/a^{-2i}$ take the ending $-tten(i)^{10}$.

-

⁸ Note that, as stated above, mi-verbs in which the ending -tten(i) would phonetically merge with $-\check{s}ten(i)$ (e.g. $e\check{s}^{-\check{z}i}/a\check{s}$ - 'to be': $a\check{s}teni$; $ed^{-\check{z}i}/ad$ - 'to eat': azteni) cannot be used as an argument and must be left out of consideration.

⁹ To my knowledge, we find about 210 hi-verbs and 580 mi-verbs in Hittite. The ratio hi-verbs: total number of verbs therefore is 210: 790 = 1: 3.76. The chance that a random list of 21 Hittite verbs consists of hi-verbs only then is $1: 3.76^{21} = 1: 1,212,170,547,718$.

¹⁰ The old paradigm nehhi, naitti, nāi, naiwani, naišteni / naištani, nēanzi is replaced by NH neyami, neyasi, neyazzi, neyaweni, neyatteni, neyanzi. Similarly e.g. halzišten of hi-inflecting halzai-'/halzi-'to scream' besides NS halziyatteni of thematicised halziye/a-zi.

Nevertheless, not all hi-inflected verbs show the ending -sten(i). When a hi-verb is attested in NS and NH texts only, it is possible that this is due to the replacement of -sten(i) by -sten(i) in younger times as we have established for au-i/u-, dai-i/ti-, nai-i and $m\bar{e}ma$ -i/ $m\bar{e}mi$ -. However, there are hi-verbs attested in OS and MS texts that use -sten(i) instead:

```
\bar{a}k^{-i}/akk- 'to die': a-ak-te-en (KUB 14.1 + KBo 19.38, Vs. 12 (MH/MS)).

\bar{a}r^{-i}/ar- 'to arrive': ar-te-ni (KUB 31.101, 31 (MS)), a-ar-ten (KUB 23.72+ 40.10, Rs. 28 (MH/MS)).
```

 $l\bar{a}$ - i /l- 'to release': la-a-at-te-en (KUB 24.4, Rs. 24 (MH/MS)). $s\bar{a}kk$ - i / $s\bar{a}kk$ - 'to know': $s\bar{a}$ -ak-te-e-ni (KBo 22.1, Vs. 5 (OS)).

dā-ⁱ/d- 'to take': da-at-te-e-ni (KUB 36.106, Vs. 8 (OS)), da-a-at-te-en (StBoT 25, 7 IV 9 (OS)), da-at-te-en (KUB 31.105, 16 (MH/MS)), da-at-ten (HKM 17, l.edge 4 (MH/MS), HKM 41, 12 (MH/MS), HKM 45, 16 (MH/MS)).

tarna-ⁱ/tarn- 'to allow': tar-na-at-te-ni (KUB 23.77+, Vs. 101, 102 (MH/MS), KUB 31.105, 14 (MH/MS)), tar-na-at-ten (HKM 41, 14 (MH/MS)).

```
uda-<sup>i</sup>/ud- 'to bring here': ú-da-at-te-[en] (KUB 13.27, Vs. 17 (MH/MS)). wašta-<sup>i</sup>/wašt- 'to sin': wa-aš-ta-at-te-ni (KBo 16.27, I 23 (MH/MS)). watarnaḥḥ-<sup>i</sup> 'to order': wa-tar-na-aḥ-ten (HKM 44, 8 (MH/MS)). wiwakk-<sup>i</sup> 'to demand': ú-i-wa-ak-<<te->>-ten (KUB 15.34, III 40 (MH/MS)).
```

We see that this group consists of verbs that end in a consonant $(\bar{a}k^{-i}/akk^{-})$ 'to die', $\bar{a}r^{-i}/ar^{-}$ 'to arrive', $\bar{s}\bar{a}kk^{-i}/sakk^{-}$ 'to know', $watarnahh^{-i}$ 'to order' and $wiwakk^{-i}$ 'to demand') and verbs that belong to the 'half-consonantal' class, i.e. verbs that originally ended in a laryngeal $(l\bar{a}^{-i}/l^{-})$ 'to release', $d\bar{a}^{-i}/d^{-}$ 'to take', $tarna^{-i}/tarn^{-}$ 'to allow', uda^{-i}/ud^{-} 'to bring here' and $wašta^{-i}/wašt^{-}$ 'to sin'). How do these verbs fit into the picture?

On the basis of all the philological facts gathered up till now, I would like to propose the following scenario.

Originally, all hi-verbs showed a 2pl.-ending -sten(i) that contrasted with the mi-ending -tten(i). In the course of the development of Hittite, the ending -steni is gradually being replaced by the ending -tteni. A possible triggering for the replacement could be the fact that -sten(i) and -tten(i) merged phonetically if the verb stem ended in -steni or a dental consonant.

For verbs of which the root ends in a consonant, this replacement took place in pre-Hittite times already, probably for phonotactic reasons: the Hittites could not easily cope with consonant clusters containing an interconsonantal $-\dot{s}$ -. The replacement in these verbs had ended by the time the first Hittite texts were written, with the result that the original ending $-\dot{s}ten(i)$ is not attested in $\dot{h}i$ -verbs that end in a consonant¹¹.

For verbs of which the root ended in a laryngeal, the replacement started in pre-Hittite times, too. For a few verbs of this class the replacement was fully completed by the time

¹¹ Except - \dot{s} -, of course, but here we cannot distinguish between -tten(i) and - $\dot{s}ten(i)$.

that the first Hittite texts are written (cf. $d\bar{a}^{-i}/d$ - 'to take' that has datteni and datten in OS texts already). For other verbs the replacement is still visible in the oldest texts (cf. OH petišten 'you must bring away' besides younger pedatteni; MH hanništen 'you must judge' besides hannatten)¹².

For the *hi*-verbs that end in a vowel (the *dāi/tiyanzi*-class, *mēma/i*-class and *au-/u*- 'to see') no replacement took place in the pre-Hittite or OH period. The first signs of replacement in these verbs are visible in the late MH period only (e.g. *zaitten* 'you must cross' (KUB 31.101, 7 (MS)) beside older *zištēni* (KUB 26.87, 11 (OH/NS)), *mematteni* 'you speak' (MH/MS or NS) beside older *memišteni*), but the bulk of the replacement took place in the NH period. The very frequent verb *pai-'/pi-* 'to give' never fell victim to the replacement, however, and retained the ending *-šten(i)* up to the last Hittite texts.

This means that the original Hittite verbal endings of the active were as follows:

		mi-endings		<i>ḫi</i> -e	ndings	
	pres.	pret.	PIE	pres.	pret.	PIE
1sg.	-mi	-(n)un	<*-m(i)	-hhe, -hhi	-ḫḫun	$<*-h_2e(i)$
2sg.	-ši	-š	< *-s(i)	-tti	-tta	$<*-th_2e(i)$
3sg.	-za, -zi	-t(ta)	<*-t(i)	-e, -i	-\$	<*-e(i)/*-s
1pl.	-weni	-wen	</td <td>-weni</td> <td>-wen</td> <td><?</td></td>	-weni	-wen	</td
2pl.	-tteni	-tten	< *-th ₁ e	-šteni	-šten	</td
3pl.	-anzi	-er	<*-enti	-anzi	-er	$<*-\bar{e}r$

What is the origin of this newly discovered ending $-\check{s}ten(i)$? In my view, the most important element of this ending is $-\check{s}$ -, as the element -ten(i) can easily have been adopted from the mi-ending -tten(i).

It is in my view quite likely that the Hittite *hi*-endings in one way or another go back to or are cognate with the PIE perfect. Usually, these endings are reconstructed as follows, primarily on the basis of Greek and especially Sanskrit evidence, of which I have given the paradigm as well:

1sg. *
$$C \circ C - h_2 e$$
 1pl. * $C C - m \acute{e}$ cf. Skt. 1sg. $cak \acute{a}r - a$ 1pl. $cak \r{r} - m \acute{a}$ 2sg. * $C \circ C - th_2 e$ 2pl. * $C C - \acute{e}$ 2sg. $cak \acute{a}r - tha$ 2pl. $cak \r{r} - \acute{a}$ 3sg. * $C \circ C - e$ 3pl. * $C \circ C - e$ 3sg. $cak \acute{a}r - a$ 3pl. $cak \r{r} - \acute{a}r$

We see that for the 2pl. an ending *-e is reconstructed. This ending is based on the Sanskrit paradigm only, however, as in the other IE languages, the plural endings of

¹² As this class, which consists of verbs that have a root-final laryngeal (*CoH- / *CH-), in this case behaves similar to the verbs that end in a consonant (for which, too, the replacement of -šten(i) by -tten(i) starts in the pre-Hittite period), and not similar to the verbs that end in a vowel (for which the replacement only starts in the late MH period, and largely takes places in the NH period), we might have to assume that at the (pre-Hittite) time of the commencing of the replacement, the root-final laryngeals were still consonantal.

the perfect have not well been preserved. The only other IE language group in which the plural perfect endings seem to have been preserved is Tocharian, namely in its preterite (class I-V, example 'to be'):

	TochB	TochA	PToch.	
1sg.	takāwa	tākā	< *taka-wa	< *-w-h ₂ e
2sg.	takāsta	tākast	< *taka-sta	$<*-s-th_2e$
3sg.	tāka, takā+	tāk, tāka+	$<*taka-\emptyset$	< *- <i>e</i>
1pl.	takām*	tākmäs	< *taka-mə	< *-me
2pl.	takās	tākas*	< *taka-sə	$<*-su^?$
3pl.	takāre	tākar	< *taka-re	< *-ro

We see that here in the 2pl. an element -s- is found as well, which is difficult to explain as a secondary creation. It might therefore be attractive to connect this -s- with the $-\check{s}$ - found in Hitt. $-\check{s}ten(i)$. I must admit, however, that it remains difficult to reconcile this *-s- with the Skt. ending -a, which seems to point to *-e.

For the time being, my conclusions are the following: The Hittite mi- and hi-verbs did not only have different endings in the singular, but in the 2pl. as well, which was -tten(i) in the mi-inflection, reflecting the PIE primary ending $*-th_1e$, and -šten(i) in the hi-inflection. The hi-ending -šten(i) is gradually being replaced by the mi-ending -tten(i) from pre-Hittite times onwards, first in verbs with a root-final consonant or laryngeal, and later on in verbs that end in a vowel. At the end of the Hittite period almost all hi-verbs use the ending -tten(i), except for the frequent verb pai-i-pi-i-to give.

This newly discovered 2pl-ending -sten(i) (of which the element -tten(i) might have been adopted from the mi-ending -tten(i) at an earlier period, which would only leave the element -s- as the last trace of the original ending) resembles the PToch. 2pl. preterite-ending *-s- regarding the element -s-, which is difficult to explain as a secondary innovation. How this element *-s- can be linked to the Skt. perfect-ending 2pl. -a (which seems to reflect *-e) remains unclear.

Appendix

All attestations of -šten(i) that are known to me: au^{-i}/u^{-} 'to see': $u\bar{s}$ -t[e-e]-ni (KBo 7.14 + KUB 36.100, Vs. 23 (OS)), $u\bar{s}$ -te-ni (KBo 3.28, II 9 (OH/NS)), a- $u\bar{s}$ -te-ni (KUB 13.27, Vs. 26 (MH/MS), KUB 31.105, 12 (MH/MS)), a- $u\bar{s}$ -te-en (KUB 24.4 + 30.12, II 14 (OH/MS)), a- $u\bar{s}$ -ten (HKM 86, 13 (MH/MS), KBo 12.58+, II 37 (MH?/NS)); $halzai^{-i}/halzi^{-i}$ to cry, to call': $halzi^{-i}$ -i \bar{s} -ten (KBo 3.1, II 51 (OH/NS), KUB 28.82, I 18 (OH/NS), VBoT 58, I 27, 29, 32 (OH/NS), KUB 9.11 + 28.82 + IBoT 3.98, I 18 (OH/NS), KBo 13.98 Rs. 7 (fr.) (OH/NS)), $halzi^{-i}$ -i \bar{s} -te-en (IBoT 3.89, Vs. 6 (OH/NS)), $halzi^{-i}$ -e \bar{s} -ten (KBo 13.106, I 18 (OH/NS)); $hana^{-i}/hann^{-i}$ 'to sue': ha-an-ni- $i\bar{s}$ -ten (HKM 60, 9 (MH/MS)), ha-an-ni- $e\bar{s}$ -ten (KUB 54.1, II 43 (NS)); $halzi^{-i}$ -i $halzi^{-i}$ -i

(MH/MS)), me-mi-iš-te-[en] (KUB 23.77, 37 (MH/MS)), me-mi-iš-ten (KUB 23.72, Rs. 54 (MH/MS), KBo 15.28, Rs. 11 (MS), KUB 36.97, IV (7), 9 (NS), KUB 6.45, I 19 (NH)), me-mi-eš-ten (KUB 43.55, II 1 (OH?/NS), KUB 13.4, I 64 (pre-NH/NS), KUB 14.8, Rs. 36 (NH)); nai-i 'to turn': na-iš-ta-ni (KUB 23.72, Rs. 58 (MH/MS)), na-iš-te-ni (KUB 23.77, 94 (MH/MS), KUB 23.72, Rs. 62 (MH/MS)), na-iš-ten (KUB 15.34, I 50, II 2, III 16 (MH/MS), KUB 13.29, 8 (MH/NS)), na-a-iš-ten (KUB 17.8, IV 6 (MH?/NS)), na-a-eš-ten (KUB 17.8, IV 6 (MH?/NS)); nanna-'/nanni- 'to lead': na-an-ni-iš-ten (KUB 31.101, 22 (NH)); pai-ⁱ/pi- 'to give': pí-iš-te-ni (KUB 12.63, Rs. 33 (OH/MS), HKM 58, Rs. 22, 23 (MH/MS), KUB 13.27 + 23.77, Vs. 10, 31, 51, 61, 100 (MH/MS), KUB 15.34, III 38, KUB 26.19, II 28 (MH/NS)), pí-eš-te-e-ni (KUB 14.15+, I 15 (NH)), pí-eš-te-ni (KUB 13.4, I 55, 57 (MH/NS), KUB 15.33b, III 3 (MH/NS), KBo 19.44, Rs. 55 (NH), KUB 22.70, Vs. 43 (NH), KUB 5.17, II 9 (NH)), pí-e-eš-te-e-ni (KBo 5.13, I 8 (NH)), [p]í-i-iš-te-en (IBoT 3.135, Rs. 10 (OS)), pí-iš-te-en (KUB 23.77, Vs. 58 (MH/MS), KUB 31.105, 17 (MH/MS), KBo 16.27 + 40.330, I 9 (MH/MS)), pí-iš-ten (KUB 23.77, 14 (MH/MS), KUB 23.72+40.10, Vs. 61 (MH/MS), KBo 17.105, II (33) (MH/MS), KUB 15.34, II 49 (MH/MS), KUB 31.119, r.col. 4 (MS?), KUB 15.32, I 55 (MH/NS), KBo 15.34, II 6 (MH/NS), KUB 26.19, I 17 (MH/NS), KUB 25.31, Vs. 52 (NS)), [p]i-iš<-te>-en (KUB 30.12, Rs. 15 (NH)), pa-iš-te-en (KUB 23.77, Vs. 31 (MH/MS), KUB 31.105, 10 (MH/MS)), [p]a-iš-ten (KUB 12.56, IV 7 (MH/NS)), pí-eš-ten (KBo 10.37, II 33 (MH/NS), KUB 41.8, III 10 (MH/NS), KBo 10.45, II 32 (MH/NS), KUB 26.29, Vs. 15 (MH/NS), KUB 36.89, Rs. 40 (NH), KUB 24.12, III 7 (NH), KBo 5.13, I 7 (NH)), pí-eš-te-[en] (KBo 11.14, III 17 (MH/NS)); parai-ⁱ/pari- 'to blow': pa-ra-is-te-ni (KBo 3.27, Vs. (24), 26 (OH/NS)); penna-i/penni- 'to drive away': pé-en-ni-iš-ten (KUB 26.19, II 34 (MH/NS)); $peda^{-i}/ped^{-i}$ to take': $p\acute{e}-ti-i \acute{s}-te-en$ (KBo 17.14 + KUB 36.100, Rs. 9 (OS)); $\check{s}ai^{-i}/\check{s}i^{-i}$ to press, to seal': ša-a-iš-ten (KUB 26.82, 9 (NS)), še-iš-te-en (KUB 31.74, II 9 (OH/NS)); *šunna-'/šunn-* 'to fill': *šu-u-ni-iš-ten* (KUB 13.3, II 17 (OH/NS)); dai^{-1}/ti - 'to put': $[t]i-i^2$ iš-te-ni (KBo 8.42, Rs. 1 (OS)), da-iš-te-en (KBo 8.42, Rs. 2, 3 (OS)), da-iš-ten (HKM 60, 15 (MH/MS)), da-a-iš-ten (KBo 12.18, I 3 (OH/NS), KBo 4.8, II 17 (NH)), ta-iš-ten (Bo 4222 (KUB 21.19), III 9 (NH)); dāla-i/dāli- 'to let in peace': da-a-li-eš-ten (KBo 32.14, II 23, 39, III 6, 20, 34, 54 (MS)); tarna-ⁱ/tarn- 'to release': tar-ni-iš-ten (KUB 6.45+, I 32 (NH), KUB 6.46, I 33 (NH)); $\bar{u}nna^{-1}/\bar{u}nni$ 'to send here': $u^{2}-[u]n-ni-i\bar{s}-te-ni$ (KUB 23.77+, Vs. 104 (MH/MS)), u-un-ni-iš-ten (HKM 16, 10 (MH/MS)); uppa-i/uppi- 'to send here': up $pi-e\check{s}$ -ten (KBo 18.2, Rs 5 (NH)); zai-i/zi- 'to cross': $zi-i\check{s}$ -te-e-n[i] (KUB 26.87, 11 (OH/NS)).