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Lycian \textit{statti} ‘stands’

Jay H. Jasanoff

The verb \textit{stta-} occurs six times in the Lycian corpus, both in the pres. 3 sg. (\textit{sttati}) and 3 pl. (\textit{sttāti}). The meaning, which was once thought to be 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 \textit{sttala} ‘stele’:

\begin{verbatim}
... se | utāna: sttati: sttala: ēti: ... | ... se xhide | sttati mē: sttala: ēti: ... (TL 44c, 4–7)
\end{verbatim}

‘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 \textit{sttati}/\textit{sttāti} (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 \textit{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 \textit{kbatra} ‘daughter’ and \textit{esbe} ‘horse’, are usually appreciated for this quality by students of Anatolian comparative grammar. Lyc. \textit{stta-}, obviously somehow based on the PIE root *\textit{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 *\textit{st-} would have given \textit{st(t)-} in Lycian. The only uncontroversial case of the etymological cluster *\textit{st} in Lycian is in the verb “to be,” where 3 sg. \textit{h₁es-ti} gives \textit{esi} (2x) and the corresponding imperative \textit{h₁es-tu} gives \textit{esu} (2x).\textsuperscript{1} This example is word-medial, but it is hard to believe that *\textit{st} would have become \textit{s} between vowels and remained intact word-initially.\textsuperscript{2} Actual instances of initial \textit{st(t)-} in Lycian—or indeed, of

\textsuperscript{1} Note that “iterative” verb forms of the type 3 sg. \textit{qastti} ‘destroys’, 3 sg. pret. \textit{qastte} do not counterexemplify this statement, since the -\textit{s}- here probably corresponds to HUuv. -\textit{z}- (cf. to-\textit{zo} ‘stand’, etc.).

\textsuperscript{2} As correctly noted by Morpurgo Davies (1987: 221).
any initial $s + \text{stop cluster}$—are very rare. For $st(t)$-., the only cases listed by Melchert (2004a), other than $slta$- itself, are the Greek loanwords $sttala$ ‘$ste-$’ and $sttrat$ [‘general’] ($\sigma\tau\rho\tau\tau\gamma\omicron\omicron\omicron\varsigma$), along with three personal names. Initial $sp(p)$- and $sx(x)$- ([sk-]) are likewise confined to names, partly of Greek origin.

Interestingly, pre-Lyc. *$sk$ (< *$sh_2$) is represented word-internally by $s$ (cf. wa-$saza$ ‘kind of priest’ = CLuv. wa$\check{\text{a}}$-$sha$za$-), exactly paralleling the development of medial *$st$ to $s$ in $esi$, $esa$.\(^3\)

It can be our unmarked assumption, then, that initial *$st$-., and probably *$sk$- (< *$sh_2$) 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 *$stV$- > *$s$@t.$tV$- ⟨$htt-$⟩, with an early (and subphonemic?) epenthesis conditioning the antevocalic behavior of the initial *$s$-. Actual examples of this treatment, however, are lacking. The noun $hpp\check{\text{e}}$-$nterus$, 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. $\check{s}$-i-(ip-)pa$^{-}$; Forsssman 1994), rather than the normal form in *$sp$- (Hitt. $i\check{s}$-pa$^{-}$).\(^4\) There is little reason to believe that $htt\check{e}$-$i\check{a}$- ‘angry’ is a reflex of PIE *$steh$-2 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. tātā; cf. Hitt. $tiye/a$- ‘step’)\(^5\) and tumman(t)- ‘ear’ (cf. Hitt. $i\check{s}$tamama$^{-}$). 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 *$steh$- ‘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’ < *$sterh$-3), but the substantive verb (‘be, exist’) is *$t$-, presupposing an $s$-less root form *$teh$-2 (OIr. 3 sg. at-$t\acute{\text{a}}$, MW $taw$ ‘(there) is’ < *$stands$’). Similarly in Tocharian, *$st$- gives Toch. A *$s$- and Toch. B

---

\(^3\) Although the character transcribed ⟨x⟩ or ⟨q⟩ in Lycian normally goes back to PIE *$h_2$, 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 $S\check{z}zu\check{\text{lu}}$je and $S\check{z}zu\check{\text{ra}}$za is unknown; $S\check{z}zu\check{\text{lu}}$je may be < Gk. Σϕιλισσα.\(^4\) I am not at all persuaded by Forsssman’s derivation of Hitt. $si$-(ip-)pa$^{-}$ < reduplicated *$spep$nd$-$, but I have no better explanation to offer. Arguing against a derivation of $hpp\check{\text{e}}$-$nterus$ from *$sp$- is the name $Spp\check{\text{u}}$za$-$, 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).
Lycian *statti ‘stands’

st- (cf. A ἱσταμ-, B ἱστω- ‘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 τάσ, B ῥάταμ).7 Within Anatolian itself, the preserved st-cluster of Hitt. ἵστανται- ‘remain, tarry’ (cf. Puhvel, HED 464f.) shows that the initial t- of Hitt. τίγνα-/ is an s-mobile effect, thus for all practical purposes assuring an s-mobile-based explanation for Luv. τά- as well. The case of Luv. τάμμα- beside Hitt. ἵσταμα- is equally inconclusive. Here, if we accept the standard comparison with Gk. στόμα ‘mouth’, the underlying root can be reconstructed as *στεμβή- ‘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. ἴσταμεν, fut. ἴστατον, perf. ἴστατος etc.), but there is no present stem *στά- from which a Lycian present stta- could have been extracted. Formally, an aphaeretized *στά- < *στά- could have given the Lycian form, but the semantics are wrong: the active present ἴσταμεν 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, Lusitire, Alaxssantra) 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 bi-conjugation i-present 3 sg. *steh3-i-e : 3 pl. *steh3-i-ẹnti, with regular loss of *bh2 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 < *dhēh3-i-e : *dhh3-i-e ; see Jasanoﬀ 2003: 91ff. for full discussion). Outside Anatolian, the stem formative -i- was mostly extended to *-ie/o- by the addition of the thematic vowel; this was the origin of the apparent thematic stem *steh3-ie/ẹ-

---

7 The original *s- survives only in the irregular Toch. A 2 sg. imperative pāstāk ‘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-trimmata.  
9 Morpurgo Davies (loc. cit.) refers the idea to Meriggi (1980: 265) and, earlier, Pedersen (1948: 31f., 52). Hajnal allows for the possibility that the retained cluster was “inspired” by Greek.
‘stand’, with reflexes in at least five branches of the IE family (cf. Toch. A tā- and OIr. -tā, noted above; further Lat. stū, -ās < *stōje/o- or (less likely) *stajē-).10 OHG stān < *stājan, OCS stojp, -iši).11 In Hittite the expected athematic hi-present *tāi : *tiyanzi is no longer extant, but two indirect reflexes testify to its former presence: 1) the thematic stem tiye/a-, etymologically a “tudāti-present,” standing in the same relation to the i-present *(s)t(ē)h₂-i- as the Indo-Iranian tudāti-presents syā- ‘bind’,12 dyā- ‘cut’, dyā- ‘bind’, chyā- ‘cut’ to the i-presents *sh₂(ē)h₁-i-, *d(ē)h₂-i-, *d(ē)h₁-i-, *sk(ē)h₂-i- (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 *steh₂- 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. tisṭhati, YAv. histaite ‘stands’), Greek (ὑστᾰμι etc.: cf. above), Italic (Lat. sistō ‘set out; stand (firm)’, Unbr. 1 sg. sestu ‘set’), and Celtic (OIr. air-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. *sti-steh₂-ti : pl. *sti-sth₂-enti, 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 “h₂e-conjugation” in PIE, with a paradigm of the type 3 sg. *sti-sth₂-h₂e, 2 sg. *sth₂e, 3 sg. *e, 3 pl. *sti-sth₂-ni (the “μήταω-type”; cf. Jasanoff 2003: 128ff.). Under this analysis, the non-Greek thematic forms (tisṭhati, sistō, etc.) were the quasi-regular reflex of the athematic h₂e-conjugation paradigm, while the Greek active forms (ὑστᾰμι etc. for expected *ὑστεω etc.) were created secondarily, probably by backformation from the middle (ὑστᾰμι etc. < *sti-sth₂-). The two theories agree in positing i-reduplication for the present of *steh₂-, thus clearly separating this

---

10 The possibility that the Latin forms go back to a stem in *-ē- is suggested above all by Sabelic forms like Osc. 3 pl. stahkd, which, as shown by Cowgill (1973), presuppose a present *stak-. Cowgill reconstructs such a stem for Italic, positing a contraction of *stak- (< *steh₂(ē)h₁- ) to stā- in Latin. In my view, the Proto-Italic starting point was a post-PIE *stāre/o-, which gave Lat. stē- directly and was secondarily “stativized” to *staj(ē)- in Sabelic.


12 Or perhaps, following Kümmler (LIV 518), better glossed ‘release’ and taken from PIE *sth₁-. If so, the corresponding i-present would be *(s)ēh₁-i- ( : Hitt. ʂṭē- ‘shout, press’ ) and the tudāti-present would form an exact word equation with Hitt. šṭye/o- ’id.’.

13 Only athematic i-verbs have 3 sg. middles in -iyari (cf., e.g., hātiyari ‘is called’ ( : 3 sg. act. hālsū, pl. -iyanzi), mgyari ‘is born’ ( : māi, -yanzi, etc.); bona fide stems in -se-/yα- form their 3 sg. middle in -tet(a)(ri) and -iyatta(ri). The middle of tiye/o- would have to have been tietta(ri) or tiyatta(ri).

14 Pace LIV, where all the relevant forms are characterized as post-IE creations.
verb and its congeners from the type represented by \( *dheh₁₋\) ‘put’ and \( *dheh₃₋\) ‘give’, where the reduplication vowel was \( *e₋\) (cf. Ved. \( dād(h)āti\), Lith. \( dedū ‘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. \( *sti-stēh₂₋ti\) and \( *sti-sth₂₋e\), 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. \( *sastarₒ \) (: \( sō-tₒ\), Gk. \( ἕστακα \) 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 \( *sTᵢ/e-sT₋\) by \( *Tᵢ/e-sT₋\), thus generating the reduplication type seen in Ved. \( tōṣthat₁ \) (+ perf. \( tāṣthāu \), etc.) and Toch. B \( spārtt₋\) ‘turn’, ptcp. \( pāspārttau₋\).

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 \( stām₋ ‘stand’, ptcp. (caus.) \( šešc(a)nu ‘halted’\). 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. \( stetᵢ₋\) (: \( sistᵢ₋\) (\( : sistᵢ₀ ‘stand’), OE \( spēft₋\) ‘spat’ < \( *spe-p₋\), pret. to \( spētan ‘spit’) and the less common \( *sTᵢ/e-s₋\) (cf. OHG \( steroz < *stezaut, pret. to \( stōzan ‘hit’ < *stautan\).)

We can now return to Anatolian. In Jasanoff (2003: 131), I called attention to the fact that a virtual Hittite cognate of Lat. \( sistₒ\) and Ved. \( tōṣthati₋\) probably underlies the common verb \( tīttnu₋\) (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’, \( wahnu₋ ‘turn (tr.)’ beside \( wēh₋/wah₋ ‘turn (intr.)’); or transitive, with the same meaning as \( tīttnu₋\) (cf., e.g., \( laknu₋ ‘make fall’ beside \( lāk₋ ‘id.’, \( ašēšanu₋ ‘settle’ beside \( ašās₋/ašē₋ ‘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 [\ldots] (12) GIS-ru ti-it-ta-i, which he renders ‘when [\ldots] he installs’ 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 *GIS*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<sup>LIM</sup> GIBIL *GIS*ḫa-at-tal-wa-aš GIS-ru
(38) ti-it-ta-na-wa-an-zi Û LÚ zi-li-pu-ri-ya-tal-la-aš
(39) r’aˇ-pí-ya-ak-ku a-ni-ya-zi ta ki-e INIM<sup>MES</sup> 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 (*GIS*h˘attalu or *GIS*h˘attalwaš t˘aru) 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 l˘ak- to laknu- or ašš- to ašš- to aššanu-.

Scholarly opinion has long been divided over whether to refer *tittanu-* (and hence also *titta-*) to *steh<sub>2</sub>* ‘stand’ or *dheh<sub>1</sub>* ‘put’. Puhvel (HED, 465), following (*inter alios*) STURTEVANT (1933: 78 and passim) and PEDERSEN (1938: 183), favors a derivation from *steh<sub>2</sub>-*: KLOEKHORST (2008: 884) and OETTINGER (1979: 350), following FRIEDRICH (1952: 225), prefer *dheh<sub>1</sub>-*. Semantically, *steh<sub>2</sub>* is the better choice. *tittanu-* (glossed ‘make stand’ in HOFFNER-MELCHERT 181) basically means ‘set up’, literally and metaphorically, as opposed to dai-/tiya- (<*dheh<sub>1</sub>-*), which means ‘lay down’; significantly, the passive of dai- is supplied by ki- ‘lie’. Like Gk. ἵστημι and Lat. statu¯o (constitu¯o), *tittanu-* is the verb for appointing people to ranks and offices (kingship, priesthood, etc.). The compound *parà tittanu-* ‘present’ functions as the causative of *parà tiya-* ‘step forward’ (CHD s. v. parà); another compound, *šarà 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 *dheh<sub>1</sub>-* over *steh<sub>2</sub>-* as the etymological source of *titta(nu)-* is phonological: *titt(a)-* can be taken directly from *dhidh(h<sub>1</sub>-*) - but not from *stist(h<sub>2</sub>-*).20 But *titt(a)-* need not have come from *stist(h<sub>2</sub>-*) 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(h<sub>2</sub>-*) morphologically. This would in fact have been possible in a number of ways. Under one

---

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(h<sub>1</sub>-*) is a pure abstraction; the present of *dheh<sub>1</sub>-* had c-reduplication in PIE.
imaginable scenario, PIE (ideal) *stist(h₂)- would first have been remodeled to *stit(h₂)- (cf. Ved. *tīṣṭhati), 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-ié/-ó ⇒ tiye/-, etc.). Alternatively, the initial remodeling could have been to *stit(h₂)- (cf. Ved. t´ıst.hati), 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-e/-ó ⇒ t*e/-, etc.).

21 Alternatively, the initial remodeling could have been to *stit(h₂)- (cf. Lat. stet¯ı); 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-/*tii- should have looked like, and speakers would one way or another have found a way to generate it.

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 h₂e-conjugation counterpart to the apparent thematic present *stist(h₂)-e/o-. The significance of all this for the problem of Lyc. statti is obvious. stta-ti cannot be taken from any form of the i-present *stéh₂-i>-i- (cf. Ved. *stāti), or its associated tudāti-present *stθ₂-i-é/-ó (- = Hitt. *tētzi); 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 *stístθ₂- —specifically, from *stístθ₂-, the variant with the reduplication pattern of Lat. steti. In Lycian, initial *st- would have given *s-, and the hī-conjugation ending -*ai (as in Hitt. *tītai) would have been remade to the “unlenited” ending -ati.23 The expected outcome of a pre-Lycian 3 sg. *stitai would thus have be-

---

21 The synchronic isolation of Hitt. iˇstant¯ai- ‘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. *ādihit = Gk. ἔποιησα ‘stepped into place’, etc.).

23 To the extent etymological hī-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.
en *sitati, which with syncope (as in other reduplicated presents; cf. Hajnal 1995: 184) would have given the attested stati /stati/.Appearances notwithstanding, the Lycian present thus turns out to form a word equation not with Gk. στ-, but with the Hittite reduplicated hi-verb titta- and its better-known derivative tittanu-.
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