

Lycian *statti* ‘stands’

Jay H. Jasanoff

The verb *stta-* occurs six times in the Lycian corpus, both in the pres. 3 sg. (*sttati*) and 3 pl. (*sttãti*). The meaning, which was once thought transitive (‘erect, establish’), is now known to be intransitive ‘stand, be set up’. MELCHERT (1993: 32–3) discusses an unambiguous passage from the Xanthos Stele in which the verb appears twice, each time with the subject *sttala* ‘stele’:

... *se* | *utãna: sttati: sttala: êti: ...* | ... *se xvide* | *sttati mē: sttala:*
êti: ... (TL 44c, 4–7)

‘Both in Hytenna a stele will be set down ... and in Kaunos as well a stele will be set down ...’

Not all the occurrences of *sttati/sttãti* (two others on the Xanthos Stele, 44c, 9; 44b, 35, one on the Letoon Trilingual, N320, 16–17, and one in a tomb inscription from Myra TL 93, 2) are as clear as the lines just quoted. But there is nothing we know about Lycian that would give us any reason to doubt that *sttati* was the normal (or at least a normal) way to say “stands” in this language.

Very few words in Lycian can be said to have a transparent etymology, and those that do, like *kbatra* ‘daughter’ and *esbe* ‘horse’, are usually appreciated for this quality by students of Anatolian comparative grammar. Lyc. *stta-*, obviously somehow based on the PIE root **steh₂-* ‘stand (up)’, ought by all rights to belong here as well. But there is a problem with this “obvious” etymology: it is very unlikely that PIE initial **st-* would have given *st(t)-* in Lycian. The only uncontroversial case of the etymological cluster **st* in Lycian is in the verb “to be,” where 3 sg. **h₁es-ti* gives *esi* (2x) and the corresponding imperative **h₁es-tu* gives *esu* (2x).¹ This example is word-medial, but it is hard to believe that **st* would have become *s* between vowels and remained intact word-initially.² Actual instances of initial *st(t)-* in Lycian—or indeed, of any initial *s* + stop

1 Note that “iterative” verb forms of the type 3 sg. *qastti* ‘destroys’, 3 sg. pret. *qastte* do not counterexemplify this statement, since the *-s-* here probably corresponds to HLuv. *-z-* (cf. *ta-za-* ‘stand’, etc.).

2 As correctly noted by MORPURGO DAVIES (1987: 221).

cluster—are very rare. For *st(t)-*, the only cases listed by MELCHERT (2004a), other than *stta-* itself, are the Greek loanwords *sttala* ‘stele’ and *sttrat* [‘general’ (: στερατηγός), along with three personal names. Initial *sp(p)-* and *sx(x)-* ([sk-]) are likewise confined to names, partly of Greek origin. Interestingly, pre-Lyc. **sk* (< **sh₂*) is represented word-internally by *s* (cf. *wasaza* ‘kind of priest’ = CLuv. *wašhazza-*), exactly paralleling the development of medial **st* to *s* in *esi*, *esu*.³

It can be our unmarked assumption, then, that initial **st-*, and probably **sk-* (< **sh₂*-) as well, regularly gave *s-* in Lycian. Two other possibilities discussed in the literature—that **st-* gave **ht(t)-* and that it gave **t-*—are much less attractive. The idea that initial **s-* might have gone to **h-* before stops as well as vowels, liquids, and nasals is cautiously entertained by MELCHERT (1994: 304f.), who weighs a development **stV- > *sət.tV- > *hət.tV-* (htt-), with an early (and subphonemic?) epenthesis conditioning the antevocalic behavior of the initial **s-*. Actual examples of this treatment, however, are lacking. The noun *hppñterus*, possibly denoting a body of priests, may or may not contain the root **spend-* ‘libate’, but if it does, the starting point could have been the irregular but independently documented Anatolian root variant **sipend-* (cf. Hitt. *ši-(ip-)pa-*^o; FORSSMAN 1994), rather than the normal form in **sp-* (Hitt. *iš-pa-*^o).⁴ There is little reason to believe that *httēme/i-* ‘angry’ is a reflex of PIE **steh₂-* in the sense of German “(sich) empören” (MELCHERT 2004b: 26).

The more common claim that PIE and Proto-Anatolian **st-* would have yielded Lyc. **t-* is likewise poorly grounded. The argument for this treatment depends on the supposedly regular change of initial **st-* to **t-* in Luvian, as evidenced by *tā-* ‘step, arrive’, later also ‘stand’ (HLuv. 3 sg. pres. *tai*, CRUS-*i*, CLuv. 3 sg. pret. *tāta*; cf. Hitt. *tiye/a-* ‘step’)⁵ and *tumman(t)-* ‘ear’ (cf. Hitt. *ištamana-*). But even if Luvian were the direct ancestor of Lycian—which it is not—these two words would not establish the purported sound change. The initial **s-* of **steh₂-* ‘stand’ is an *s*-mobile, prone to appear or disappear in the daughter languages under conditions that have thus far resisted exact specification.⁶ In Celtic, e. g., the normal treatment of initial **st-* is **s-* (cf. OIr. *sernaid* ‘strews’ < **sterh₃-*), but the substantive verb (‘be, exist’) is **tā-*, presupposing an *s*-less root form **teh₂-* (OIr. 3 sg. *at·tá*, MW *taw* ‘(there) is’ < **stands*). Similarly in Tocharian, **st-* gives Toch. A *št-* and Toch. B *st-* (cf.

3 Although the character transcribed ⟨x⟩ or ⟨χ⟩ in Lycian normally goes back to PIE **h₂*, it stands synchronically for some kind of velar stop; cf. MELCHERT (1994: 282; 2004a: 594), HAJNAL (1995: 21). The age and origin of the initial cluster in the names *Saxulije* and *Saxutrazi* is unknown; *Saxulije* may be < Gk. Σχόλιος.

4 I am not at all persuaded by Forssman’s derivation of Hitt. *ši-(ip-)pa-* < reduplicated **spepond-*, but I have no better explanation to offer. Arguing against a derivation of *hppñterus* from **sp-* is the name *Sppñtaza*, which MELCHERT (2004b: 104) considers a borrowing.

5 The fundamental discussion of these forms remains MORPURGO DAVIES (1987).

6 A modern overview of the *s*-mobile phenomenon is given by SOUTHERN (1999).

A *štäm-*, B *stäm-* ‘stand’ < **stembh-*), but the non-presential forms of the verb “to be” are built to a stem **ta(ka)-*, with bare **t-* (3 sg. subj. A *tāš*, B *takam*).⁷ Within Anatolian itself, the preserved *st*-cluster of Hitt. *ištantāi-* ‘remain, tarry’ (cf. PUHVEL, *HED* 464f.) shows that the initial *t-* of Hitt. *tiye/a-* is an *s*-mobile effect, thus for all practical purposes assuring an *s*-mobile-based explanation for Luv. *tā-* as well. The case of Luv. *tumman(t)-* beside Hitt. *ištamana-* is equally inconclusive. Here, if we accept the standard comparison with Gk. στόμα ‘mouth’, the underlying root can be reconstructed as **(s)temh₁-* ‘cut’ (cf. MELCHERT (to appear), WENNERBERG 1972: 30f.).⁸

If PIE **steh₂-* would have given Lyc. **sati* (*vel sim.*), and if the *s*-less version of the root would have given **tati*, then what was *sttati*? The usual answer, authoritatively stated by MORPURGO DAVIES (1987: 220f.) and accepted with reservations by MELCHERT (1994: 304; 2004a: 599) and HAJNAL (1995: 87, 112), is that *sttati* is a borrowing from Greek.⁹ But this proposal raises more questions than it answers. The cluster *st-* is indeed characteristic of the Greek forms of “stand” (pres. ἵστᾶμι, fut. στήσω, aor. ἔστᾶν, perf. ἔστᾶκα etc.), but there is no present stem **στᾶ-* from which a Lycian present *stta-* could have been extracted. Formally, an aphaeretized **στᾶ-* < *ἵστᾶ-* could have given the Lycian form, but the semantics are wrong: the active present ἵστᾶμι does not mean ‘stand’ (intransitive) at all, but ‘make stand, set out’ (transitive). Finally and more to the point, it is simply not credible that Lycian, which shows almost no lexical borrowing from Greek other than proper names (e. g., *Perikle*, *Lusñtre*, *Alaxssañtra*) and a very small number of culturally specific terms (*sttala*, *trijere* ‘trireme’), would have employed a Greek loanword to express the basic notion “stand.” Although our knowledge of Lycian is in many ways defective, it is clear that the Lycian lexicon is overwhelmingly Anatolian in character, preserving important items of inherited vocabulary in a characteristic Luvo-Anatolian form (e. g., *esbe* ‘horse’, *xawa* ‘sheep’, *kbatra* ‘daughter’, *wawa* ‘cow’). If *sttati* cannot be derived from a “Luvoid” or pre-Lycian preform **stati* (*vel sim.*), then we should look for a different Anatolian starting point that explains it better.

The absence of a laryngeal reflex in the Luvian forms of “stand” points to a *hi*-conjugation *i*-present 3 sg. **stéh₂-i-e* : 3 pl. **sth₂-i-énti*, with regular loss of **h₂* before **i*. Such presents are a well-attested formal type in Hittite, where the *Musterbeispiel* is the verb “to put” (3 sg. *dāi* : pl. *tiyanzi*, as if < **dhéh₁-i-* : **dhh₁-i-*’; see JASANOFF 2003: 91ff. for full discussion). Outside Anatolian, the stem formative **-i-* was mostly extended to **-je/o-* by the addition of the thematic vowel; this was the origin of the apparent the-

7 The original **s-* survives only in the irregular Toch. A 2 sg. imperative *pāštāk* ‘be!’.

8 The argument would thus not be affected if NEUMANN (1983: 146f.) is correct in seeing a Lycian cognate of Luv. *tumman(t)-* in the name(?) *esi-tñmata*.

9 MORPURGO DAVIES (*loc. cit.*) refers the idea to MERIGGI (1980: 265) and, earlier, PEDERSEN (1949: 31f., 52). Hajnal allows for the possibility that the retained cluster was “inspired” by Greek.

matic stem $*sth_2\text{-}\acute{i}\acute{e}/\acute{o}$ - ‘stand’, with reflexes in at least five branches of the IE family (cf. Toch. A $t\bar{a}$ - and OIr. $\cdot t\acute{a}$, noted above; further Lat. $st\bar{o}$, $-\bar{a}s < *stai\acute{e}/o$ - or (less likely) $*stai\acute{e}\bar{-}$,¹⁰ OHG $st\bar{a}n < *st\acute{a}jan$, OCS $stoj\acute{o}$, $-i\acute{s}i$).¹¹ In Hittite the expected athematic hi -present $*t\bar{a}i : *tiyanzi$ is no longer extant, but two indirect reflexes testify to its former presence: 1) the thematic stem $tiye/a$ -, etymologically a “ $tud\acute{a}ti$ -present,” standing in the same relation to the i -present $*(s)t(\acute{e})h_2\text{-}i\text{-}’$ as the Indo-Iranian $tud\acute{a}ti$ -presents $sy\acute{a}$ - ‘bind’,¹² $dy\acute{a}$ - ‘cut’, $dy\acute{a}$ - ‘bind’, $chy\acute{a}$ - ‘cut’ to the i -presents $*sh_2(\acute{e})h_1\text{-}i\text{-}’$, $*d(\acute{e})h_2\text{-}i\text{-}’$, $*d(\acute{e})h_1\text{-}i\text{-}’$, $*sk(\acute{e})h_2\text{-}i\text{-}’$ (JASANOFF 2003: 105-7); and 2) the unique 3 sg. mid. $tiyari$ ‘arrives (at)’ (*vel sim.*), unambiguously athematic and hence (*pace* KLOEKHORST 2008: 879) not assignable to the paradigm of $tiye/a$ -.¹³

The i -present of $*steh_2$ - was inherited from PIE,¹⁴ but it is not the only present reconstructible for this root. A reduplicated present must be set up as well, with obvious reflexes in Indo-Iranian (cf. Ved. $tis\acute{t}hati$, YAv. $hi\acute{s}taite$ ‘stands’), Greek ($\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\mu\iota$ etc.; cf. above), Italic (Lat. $sist\bar{o}$ ‘set out; stand (firm)’), Umbr. 1 sg. $sestu$ ‘set’), and Celtic (OIr. $air\text{-}sissedar$ ‘leans’). The detailed prehistory of these forms is contested. The parent language clearly had at least two types of reduplicated presents, one with $*-e-$ and the other with $*-i-$ as the reduplication vowel. For “stand,” LIV sets up an athematic paradigm 3 sg. $*st\acute{i}\text{-}st\acute{e}h_2\text{-}ti$: pl. $*st\acute{i}\text{-}sth_2\text{-}\acute{e}nti$, implicitly treating the thematic inflection of the Indo-Iranian, Italic, and (indirectly) Celtic forms as an innovation vis-à-vis the Greek forms. My own view, based on a different reading of the Anatolian evidence, is that i -reduplicated presents inflected according to the “ h_2e -conjugation” in PIE, with a paradigm of the type 3 sg. $*st\acute{i}\text{-}sth_2\text{-}h_2e$, 2 sg. $*\text{-}th_2e$, 3 sg. $*-e$, 3 pl. $*st\acute{i}\text{-}sth_2\text{-}nti$ (= the “ $\mu\acute{\iota}\mu\omega$ -type”; cf. JASANOFF 2003: 128ff.). Under this analysis, the non-Greek thematic forms ($tis\acute{t}hati$, $sist\bar{o}$, etc.) were the quasi-regular reflex of the athematic h_2e -conjugation paradigm, while the Greek active forms ($\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\mu\iota$ etc. for expected $*\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\omega$ etc.) were created secondarily, probably by back-formation from the middle ($\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\mu\iota$ etc. $< *st\acute{i}\text{-}sth_2\text{-}$). The two theories agree in positing i -reduplication for the present of $*steh_2$ -

10 The possibility that the Latin forms go back to a stem in $*-\bar{e}$ - is suggested above all by Sabellic forms like Osc. 3 pl. $stah\acute{i}nt$, which, as shown by Cowgill (1973), presuppose a present $*sta\bar{e}$ -. Cowgill reconstructs such a stem for Italic, positing a contraction of $*sta\bar{e}$ - ($< *sth_2\text{-}(e)h_1\text{-}$) to $st\bar{a}$ - in Latin. In my view, the Proto-Italic starting point was a post-PIE $*st\acute{a}\acute{i}\acute{e}/o$ -, which gave Lat. $st\bar{a}$ - directly and was secondarily “stativized” to $*sta(\acute{i})\bar{e}$ - in Sabellic.

11 On the form of the stem in Slavic cf. JASANOFF (2003: 115, note 59).

12 Or perhaps, following KÜMMEL (LIV 518), better glossed ‘release’ and taken from PIE $*seh_1$ -. If so, the corresponding i -present would be $*s(\acute{e})h_1\text{-}i\text{-}’$ (: Hitt. $\acute{s}ai$ - ‘shoot, press’) and the $tud\acute{a}ti$ -present would form an exact word equation with Hitt. $\acute{s}iye/a$ - ‘id.’.

13 Only athematic i -verbs have 3 sg. middles in $-iyari$ (cf., e.g., $halziyari$ ‘is called’ (: 3 sg. act. $halz\acute{a}i$, pl. $-iyanzi$), $miyari$ ‘is born’ (: $m\acute{a}i$, $-iyanzi$), etc.); bona fide stems in $-ie$ -/ $-iya$ - form their 3 sg. middle in $-ietta(ri)$ and $-iyatta(ri)$. The middle of $tiye/a$ - would have to have been $tietta(ri)$ or $tiyatta(ri)$.

14 *Pace* LIV, where all the relevant forms are characterized as post-IE creations.

thus clearly separating this verb and its congeners from the type represented by **dheh₁-* ‘put’ and **deh₃-* ‘give’, where the reduplication vowel was **-e-* (cf. Ved. *dád(h)āti*, Lith. *dedù* ‘I put’, etc.).

More immediately relevant for our present purposes is the question of how the reduplication process would have treated consonant clusters, especially groups of the form **sT-* (T = any voiceless stop). Reconstructions of the type 3 sg. **sti-stéh₂-ti* and **stí-sth₂-e*, with complete reduplication of the cluster, are only formulaic; underlying sequences of the type **sTi/e-sT-* (i/e = any reduplication vowel) were in fact probably realized as **si/e-sT-* in late PIE. **si/e-sT-* is by far the most common treatment in the individual languages, not only in reduplicated presents, but also in the perfect (cf. YAv. 3 pl. perf. *°šastarə* (: *stā-*), Gk. *ἔστᾱρα* etc.). Departures from the **si/e-sT-* pattern, which are not infrequent, can be seen as innovations arising from the language acquisition process. Some new speakers, wrongly concluding from cases like **smer-* : **sesmor-* (‘obtain by lot’), **pleh₁-* : **peploh₁-* (‘fill’), etc. that reduplication intrinsically favored the less sonorous of the two consonants in a cluster, replaced **si/e-sT-* by **Ti/e-sT-*, thus generating the reduplication type seen in Ved. *tīṣṭhati* (+ perf. *tastháu*, etc.) and Toch. B *spārtt-* ‘turn’, ptcp. *paspārttau*.¹⁵ Other speakers, overriding the evidence for *sT*-cluster simplification altogether, re-generated the theoretically “original” pattern **sTi/e-sT-* (cf. Go. *af-skaidan* ‘cut off’, pret. *af-skaiskaid*, Toch. B *stäm-* ‘stand’, ptcp. (caus.) *šcešc(a)mu* ‘halted’).¹⁶ Yet other speakers maintained the integrity of *sT*-clusters in word-initial position but simplified them medially, giving the pattern **sTi/e-T-* (cf. Lat. perf. *stetī* (: *sistō* and *stō* ‘stand’), OE *speoft* ‘spat’ < **spe-p-*, pret. to *spātan* ‘spit’) and the less common **sTi/e-s-* (cf. OHG *steroz* < **stezaut*, pret. to *stōzan* ‘hit’ < **stautan*).¹⁷

We can now return to Anatolian. In JASANOFF (2003: 131), I called attention to the fact that a virtual Hittite cognate of Lat. *sistō* and Ved. *tīṣṭhati* probably underlies the common verb *tittanu-* (also *titnu-*) ‘install’, formally the causative of a simplex **titt(a)-*. Given the semantics of such pairs generally, the theoretically expected **titt(a)-* could in principle have been either intransitive, with a meaning like ‘move into position’ (*vel sim.*; cf. *arnu-* ‘bring’ beside *ār-* ‘arrive’, *waḥnu-* ‘turn (tr.)’ beside *weḥ-/waḥ-* ‘turn (intr.)’); or transitive, with the same meaning as *tittanu-* (cf., e. g., *laknu-* ‘make fall’ beside *lāk-* ‘id.’, *ašešanu-* ‘settle’ beside *ašāš-/ašeš-* ‘id.’). In fact, a transitive 3 sg. *tittai* is cited by KLOEKHORST (2008: 881f.) in the broken passage KBo 19.162 iv (11) *ma-a-an* [...] (12) *GIŠ-ru ti-it-ta-i*, which he renders ‘when [...] he installs⁷ the wood’. Kloekhorst takes this form to be the 3 sg. corresponding to the

¹⁵ But in Tocharian A the corresponding root (*spārtw-*) has the participle *sāspārtwu*, with **si/e-sT-*.

¹⁶ Based, like other reduplicated causative (class II) preterites, on the PIE reduplicated aorist.

¹⁷ See JASANOFF (2007: 262). Germanic, it will be noted, is particularly rich in innovative reduplication patterns.

participle *tittiyant-*, used in the Hittite Laws to describe a LÚ *ILKI* (‘man owing *ILKU* services’) who has been “installed” in the place of a missing LÚ ^{GIŠ}TUKUL (‘man having TUKUL obligation?’).¹⁸ Far more striking, however, is the parallelism of *tittai* with 3 pl. *tittanuwanzi* in KUB 2.2 ii 38:

(37) *ma-a-an I-NA É.GAL^{LIM} GIBIL^{GIŠ} ha-at-tal-wa-aš GIŠ-ru*

(38) *ti-it-ta-nu-wa-an-zi Û^{LÚ} zi-li-pu-ri-ya-tal-la-aš*

(39) *ᵛa^ᵛ-pí-ya-ak-ku a-ni-ya-zi ta ki-e INIM^{MEŠ} me-ma-i*

‘Wenn man in einem neuen Palast das Riegelholz einsetzt, so führt eben dort der *zilipuriyatalla*-(Priester) (das Ritual) aus und spricht (dabei) folgende Worte ...’ (SCHUSTER 1974: 65)

The contexts of *tittai* and *tittanuwanzi* are exactly the same—a Hittite-Hattic ritual procedure accompanying the installation of the door bolt (^{GIŠ}*hattalu* or ^{GIŠ}*hattalwaš tāru*) in a new structure.¹⁹ *titta-* is the hitherto unrecognized simplex corresponding to *tittanu-*; the formal and derivational relationship between the two is the same as that of *lāk-* to *laknu-* or *ašāš-/ašeš-* to *ašešanu-*.

Scholarly opinion has long been divided over whether to refer *tittanu-* (and hence also *titta-*) to **steh₂-* ‘stand’ or **dheh₁-* ‘put’. PUHVEL (*HED*, 465), following (*inter alios*) STURTEVANT (1933: 78 and *passim*) and PEDERSEN (1938: 183), favors a derivation from **steh₂-*; KLOEKHORST (2008: 884) and OETTINGER (1979: 350), following FRIEDRICH (1952: 225), prefer **dheh₁-*. Semantically, **steh₂-* is the better choice. *tittanu-* (glossed ‘make stand’ in HOFFNER-MELCHERT 181) basically means ‘set up’, literally and metaphorically, as opposed to *dai-/tiya-* (< **dheh₁-*), which means ‘lay down’; significantly, the passive of *dai-* is supplied by *ki-* ‘lie’. Like Gk. ἵστημι and Lat. *statuō* (*constituō*), *tittanu-* is the verb for appointing people to ranks and offices (kingship, priesthood, etc.). The compound *parā tittanu-* ‘present’ functions as the causative of *parā tiya-* ‘step forward’ (*CHD* s. v. *parā*); another compound, *šarā tittanu-*, is the verb of choice for erecting a stele. Where *tittanu-* and *dai-* contrast, their meanings are often dramatically different, as, e. g., in *peran tittanu-* ‘erect, station’ vs. *peran dai-* ‘place before the statue of a deity’. The only reason to favor **dheh₁-* over **steh₂-* as the etymological source of *titta(nu)-* is phonological: *titt(a)-* can be taken directly from **dhidh(h₁)-* but not from **stist(h₂)-*.²⁰ But *titt(a)-* need not have come from **stist(h₂)-* by sound change; all that is needed is a plausible scenario by which pre-Hittite speakers, for whom reduplication was a synchronic process, could have created *titt(a)-* (or **tit(h₂)-*) *morphologically*. This would in fact have been possible in a number of ways. Under one

¹⁸ Glosses of the legal terms taken from Hoffner (1997: 332).

¹⁹ I am indebted to Elisabeth Rieken for help with questions of Hittite usage, and especially with the interpretation of KBo 19.162 iv 11–12.

²⁰ It should be borne in mind, however, that the stem **dhi-dh(h₁)-* is a pure abstraction; the present of **dheh₁-* had *e*-reduplication in PIE.

imaginable scenario, PIE (ideal) **stist(h₂)-* would first have been remodeled to **tist(h₂)-* (cf. Ved. *tíṣṭhati*), which would then have given **tit(h₂)-* (*titt(a)-*) as part of the general replacement of **st* by **t* in the forms of the verb “to stand” (cf. **sth₂-i-é/ó-* ⇒ *tiye/a-*, etc.).²¹ Alternatively, the initial remodeling could have been to **stit(h₂)-* (cf. Lat. *stetī*); this too would eventually have been simplified to **tit(h₂)-* (*titt(a)-*). In the last analysis, *titt(a)-* is exactly what the reduplicated stem corresponding to a “root” **tā-/*tai-/*ti-* should have looked like, and speakers would one way or another have found a way to generate it.

We can take it as given, then, that alongside the *i*-present **(s)t(é)h₂-i-*, Proto-Anatolian inherited a reduplicated present **stist(h₂)-* (*vel sim.*), the cognate of Ved. *tíṣṭhati*, Lat. *sistō*, etc. It is hard to be sure how the reduplication of the *st*-cluster would have been realized at the moment of the breakup of Proto-Anatolian; **sist(h₂)-* (the probable PIE surface form), **tist(h₂)-*, and **stit(h₂)-* (both convenient pre-Hittite forms) would all have been plausible candidates. In Hittite, as we have seen, the reduplicated stem was ultimately remade to *titt(a)-*; the fact that this is a *hi*-verb (3 sg. *tittai*) points to an origin in the PIE *h₂e*-conjugation $\mu\acute{\iota}\mu\omega$ -type (3 sg. **stí-sth₂-e* : pl. **stí-sth₂-nti*; cf. Hitt. *mimmai*, *-anzi* ‘refuse’ < *‘stand firm’), rather than in the putative “**sti-stéh₂-ti*-type,” which would have given a *mi*-verb in Hittite. Note that the hypothesis of a *h₂e*-conjugation present helps explain the frequent syntactic bivalency of the forms in the daughter languages, which may be transitive, intransitive, or both. Under the *h₂e*-conjugation theory, the intransitive value would have been primary, reflecting the origin of the *h₂e*-inflection as a secondarily activated outgrowth of the pre-PIE “protomiddle,” or—as Erich Neu would have called it—*Urmedium*.²² As an early student of the complex of problems surrounding the perfect, middle, and thematic endings in PIE, Neu would have been intrigued by the discovery of a *hi*-conjugation counterpart to the apparent thematic present **stí-sth₂-e/o-*.

The significance of all this for the problem of Lyc. *sttati* is obvious. *sttati* cannot be taken from any form of the *i*-present **stéh₂-i-e* : 3 pl. **sth₂-i-énti* (= Luv. *tai*) or its associated *tudáti*-present **sth₂-i-é/ó-* (= Hitt. *tiezzi*); nor can it plausibly be explained as a Greek loanword. But it *can* be taken from one of the post-PIE realizations of the ideal reduplicated stem **stísth₂-*—specifically, from **stíth₂-*, the variant with the reduplication pattern of Lat. *stetī*. In Lycian, initial **st-* would have given *s-*, and the *hi*-conjugation ending **-ai* (as in Hitt. *tittai*) would have been remade to the “unlenited” ending *-ati*.²³ The expected outcome of a pre-Lycian 3 sg. **stitai* would thus have been

²¹ The synchronic isolation of Hitt. *ištantāi-* ‘remain, tarry’ (cf. above) enabled it to escape this process.

²² Otherwise KÜMMEL (*LIV* 591, note 6), who takes the transitive meaning to be primary and attributes the intransitive reading to the intransitivity of the active root aorist (cf. Ved. *ásthāt* = Gk. *ἔστῆ* ‘stepped into place’, etc.).

²³ To the extent etymological *hi*-conjugation verbs adopted dental endings in the 3 sg. in Luvian and Lycian, these always appear in their tense or voiceless alternants: 3 sg. pret.

**sitati*, which with syncope (as in other reduplicated presents; cf. HAJNAL 1995: 184) would have given the attested *sttati* /*stati*/. Appearances notwithstanding, the Lycian present thus turns out to form a word equation not with Gk. $\sigma\tau\alpha$ -, but with the Hittite reduplicated *hi*-verb *titta*- and its better-known derivative *tittanu*-.

Works cited

- COWGILL, Warren. 1973. The source of Latin *stāre*, with notes on comparable forms elsewhere in Indo-European. *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 1, 271–303.
- FORSSMAN, Bernhard. 1994. Zu hethitisch *šipand*- und *išpand*-. In *honorem Holger Pedersen. Kolloquium der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 26. bis 28. März 1993 in Kopenhagen*, ed. J. E. Rasmussen, 93–106. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- FRIEDRICH, Johannes. 1952. *Hethitisches Wörterbuch. Kurzgefasste kritische Sammlung der Deutungen hethitischer Wörter*. 1st ed. Heidelberg: Winter.
- HAJNAL, Ivo. 1995. *Der lykische Vokalismus*. Graz: Leykam.
- HOFFNER, Harry A., Jr. 1997. *The Laws of the Hittites: A Critical Edition (Documenta et Monumenta Orientis Antiqui 23)*. Leiden/New York/Köln: Brill.
- HOFFNER-MELCHERT = Hoffner, Harry A., Jr., and H. Craig Melchert. 2008. *A Grammar of the Hittite Language. Part 1. Reference Grammar*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns.
- JASANOFF, Jay H. 2003. *Hittite and the Indo-European Verb*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- . 2007. From reduplication to ablaut: the class VII strong verbs of Northwest Germanic. *Historische Sprachforschung* 120, 241–284.
- KLOEKHORST, Alwin. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon (Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series 5)*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- LIV. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben. Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstamm-bildungen*. Zweite, erweiterte und verbesserte Auflage bearbeitet von Martin Kümmel und Helmut Rix. Wiesbaden: Reichert. 2001.
- MELCHERT, H. Craig. 1993. A new interpretation of lines c 3–9 of the Xanthos Stele. *Akten des II. internationalen Lykien-Symposions, Wien, 6.–12. Mai 1990*. Herausgegeben von Jürgen Borchardt und Gerhard Dobesch. Band I (*Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse. Denkschriften, 231. Band*), 31–34. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- . 1994. *Anatolian Historical Phonology (Leiden Studies in Indo-European 3)*. Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi.
- . 2004a. Lycian. *Cambridge Encyclopedia of the World's Ancient Languages*, ed. R. D. Woodard, 591–600.

CLuv. *-tta* (not *-ta*), HLuv. *-ta* (not *-ra*), Lyc. *-te* (not *-de*), 3 sg. pres. Lyc. *-ti* (not *-di*) (MORPURGO DAVIES 1983: 263f.). Since many original *mi*-verbs take the unlenited endings as well, a Lycian 3 sg. in *-ti* allows for the possibility of earlier *hi*-inflection but does not prove it. A 3 sg. in *-di* excludes the possibility of a *hi*-verb altogether.

- . 2004b. *A Dictionary of the Lycian Language*. Ann Arbor/New York: Beech Stave Press.
- . (to appear). Neuter stems with suffix **(e)n-* in Anatolian and PIE.
- MERIGGI, Piero. 1980. *Schizzo grammaticale dell’Anatolico (Accademia nazionale dei Lincei. Memorie. Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche, serie 8, 24/3)*. Roma: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei.
- MORPURGO DAVIES, Anna. 1983. Dentals, rhotacism and verbal endings in the Luwian languages. *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung* 96, 245–70.
- . 1987. ‘To put’ and ‘to stand’ in the Luwian languages. *Studies in Memory of Warren Cowgill. Papers of the Fourth East Coast Indo-European Conference, Cornell University 1985*, ed. C. Watkins, 205–228. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- NEUMANN, Günter. 1983. Zur Erschließung des Lykischen. *Le lingue indoeuropee di frammentaria attestazione*, ed. E. Vineis, 135–151. Pisa: Giardini.
- OETTINGER, Norbert. 1979. *Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbuns*. Nürnberg: Hans Carl.
- PEDERSEN, Holger. 1938. *Hittitisch und die anderen indo-europäischen Sprachen (Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, historisk-filologiske Meddelelser 25/2)*. Copenhagen: Munksgaard.
- . 1949. *Lykisch und Hittitisch (Kongelige Videnskabernes Selskab, historisk-filologiske Meddelelser 30/4)*. Copenhagen: Munksgaard.
- PUHVEL, Jaan. *HED: Hittite Etymological Dictionary*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 1984–.
- SCHUSTER, Hans-Siegfried. 1974. *Die hattisch-hethitischen Bilinguen. I. Einleitung, Texte und Kommentar (Documenta et Monumenta Orientis Antiqui 17)*. Leiden: Brill.
- SOUTHERN, Mark V. 1999. *Sub-Grammatical Survival: Indo-European s-Mobile and its Regeneration in Germanic (Journal of Indo-European Studies Monograph 34)*. Washington: Institute for the Study of Man.
- STURTEVANT, Edgar H. 1933. *A Comparative Grammar of the Hittite Language*. Philadelphia: Linguistic Society of America.
- WENNERBERG, Claes. 1972. Indogermanisch **stomen-* ‘Mund’. *Die Sprache* 18, 24–33.