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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. (sttâti). 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 sttala ‘stele’:

\[\ldots \text{se} | \text{utâna: sttati: sttala: čiː; } \ldots \mid \ldots \text{se x̱bide} | \text{sttati méː sttala: čiː; } \ldots\]

\[\text{(TL 44c, 4–7)}\]

‘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/sttâti (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. *h₂es-ti gives esi (2x) and the corresponding imperative *h₂es-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

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. to-zu ‘stand’, etc.).

² As correctly noted by Morpurgo Davies (1987: 221).
any initial s + stop cluster—are very rare. For *st(t)-, the only cases listed by Melchert (2004a), other than *situ- itself, are the Greek loanwords *sttala ‘stele’ and *strat- ‘general’ (: στρατηγός), 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. wa-saza ‘kind of priest’ = CLuv. wašhaṣṣa-), 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- > *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 *ppn̄trerus, 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. ˇsi-(ip-)pa-); Forssman 1994), rather than the normal form in *sp- (Hitt. iš-pa-).4 There is little reason to believe that *ttême/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. tātta; 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’ < *steh2-), but the substantive verb (‘be, exist’) is *tā-, presupposing an s-less root form *teh2- (OIr. 3 sg. at-tā, MW taw ‘(there) is’ < *teh2-). Similarly in Tocharian, *st- gives Toch. A s.t- and Toch. B

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 *Szuxāje and *Szuxrata is unknown; Szuxāje may be < Gk. Σύξατας. 4 I am not at all persuaded by Forssman’s derivation of Hitt. ˇsi-(ip-)pa- < reduplicated *spepond-, but I have no better explanation to offer. Arguing against a derivation of *hppn̄trerus from *sp- is the name *Sppūlaza, 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).
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*st- (cf. A stäm-, 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 tás, B tākaṃ).7 Within Anatolian itself, the preserved st-cluster of Hitt. ištanti- ‘remain, tarry’ (cf. Pühvel, HED 46ff.) 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. tummana- 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: 30ff.).

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 statti? The usual answer, authoritatively stated by Morpurgo Davies (1987: 220ff.) and accepted with reservations by Melchert (1994: 304; 2004a: 599) and Hajnal (1995: 87, 112), is that statti 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. ἱσταμένω, fut. ἱστάνω, aor. ἤστο, perf. ἔστα); but there is no present stem *stā- from which a Lycian present stta- could have been extracted. Formally, an aphaeretized *στά- < ἱστά- could have given the Lycian form, but the semantics are wrong: the active present ἱσταμένω 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, Lusītre, Alaxssaītra) 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 statti cannot be derived from a “Luvoird” 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. *stēh2-i-ē : 3 pl. *stēh2-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 < *dhēh1-i- : *dhh1-i- ; see Jasanoff 2003: 91ff. for full discussion). Outside Anatolian, the stem formative *-i- was mostly extended to *-i:e/o- by the addition of the thematic vowel; this was the origin of the apparent thematic stem *stēh2-i:e/é-

7 The original *s- survives only in the irregular Toch. A 2 sg. imperative pāstā ‘be!’.
8 The argument would thus not be affected if Neumann (1983: 146ff.) 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 (1949: 31ff., 52). Hajnal allows for the possibility that the retained cluster was “inspired” by Greek.
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pl. *(h)reflex of the athematic with a paradigm of the type 3 sg. *st`ı-sth ı-* as the Indo-Iranian tud`ati-presents sy`a- ‘bind’,12 dy`a- ‘cut’, dy`a- ‘bind’, chy`a- ‘cut’ to the i-presents *sh`ı2(é)h1-ı-*, *d(é)h2-ı-*, *d(é)h1-ı-*, *sk(é)h2-ı-*. (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-.

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. tıisth, YAv. hiṣtaite ‘stands’), Greek (ḥṣṭāμ, etc.; cf. above), Italic (Lat. sistō ‘set out; stand (firm)’, Unbr. 1 sg. sexta ‘set’), and Celtic (OIr. aissedard ‘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 reduplicative vowel. For “stand,” LIV sets up an athematic paradigm 3 sg. *st-i-steh2-ti : pl. *st-i-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. *st-i-sth2-h2e, 2 sg. *shh2e, 3 sg. *-e, 3 pl. *st-i-sth2-nti (= the “µίμνω-type”; cf. Jasanoff 2003: 128ff.). Under this analysis, the non-Greek thematic forms (tıisth, sistō, etc.) were the quasi-regular reflex of the athematic h2e-conjugation paradigm, while the Greek active forms (hanaμ, etc. for expected *ʌtpe to etc.) were created secondarily, probably by back-formation from the middle (ḥṣṭāμ etc. < *st-i-sth2-). The two theories agree in positing i-reduplication for the present of *steh2-, thus clearly separating this...
verb and its congeners from the type represented by *dheh₁₁- ‘put’ and *dheh₂₂- ‘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-st’eh₂₂-ti and *st’ı-sth₂₂-e, with complete reduplication of the cluster, are only formulaic; underlying sequences of the type *sT/i-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. *sastar (: stā-), Gk. ἔστακα 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’), *pleh₁₁- : *peploh₁₁- (‘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. tāsthau, 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 *sT/i-e-sT- (cf. Go. af-skaidan ‘cut off’, pret. af-skaiskaid, Toch. B stām- ‘stand’, ptcp. (caus.) šešč(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. steti (: stistō and stō ‘stand’), OE spoft ‘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’, wānīnu- ‘turn (tr.)’ beside weh-/wah- ‘turn (intr.)’); or transitive, with the same meaning as tittanu- (cf., e.g., laknu- ‘make fall’ beside lak- ‘id.’, aščanu- ‘settle’ beside ašš- ‘id.’). In fact, a transitive 3 sg. tīṭtai is cited by Kloekhorst (2008: 881f.) in the broken passage KBo 19.162 iv (11) ma-a-an [, . . .] (12) GIS-ru ti-it-tu-i, which he renders ‘when [, . . .] 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 sāspārtwa, 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 GİˇS 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.GALGIBIL GİˇS hˇa-at-ta-wa-aˇs GİˇS-ru
(38) ti-it-ta-na-wa-an-zi LÚ zˇi-li-pu-ri-ya-ta-la-aˇs
(39) *r aˇ-pˇı-ya-ak-ku a-ni-ya-zi ta ki-e INIM MÉS 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 (GİˇS h˘a-ttalwaˇs or GİˇS h˘a-ttalwuˇs t˘arə) 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˘akˇ to laknu- or aˇsˇaˇsˇ to aˇsˇaˇsanu-.

Scholarly opinion has long been divided over whether to refer *tittanu-*(and hence also *titta-*) to *steh*2-‘stand’ or *dheh*1-‘put’. Puhvel (HED, 465), following (inter alios) Sturtevant (1933: 78 and passim) and Pedersen (1938: 183), favors a derivation from *steh*2-; Kloekhorst (2008: 884) and Oettinger (1979: 350), following Friedrich (1952: 225), prefer *dheh*1-. Semantically, *steh*2- 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*1-), which means ‘lay down’; significantly, the passive of *dai-* is supplied by ki-‘lie’. Like Gk. ἵστημι and Lat. statuorem (constituorem), *tittanu-* is the verb for appointing people to ranks and offices (kingship, priesthood, etc.). The compound para tittanu- ‘present’ functions as the causative of para tiya- ‘step forward’ (CHD s. v. parə); another compound, šarə 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*1- over *steh*2- as the etymological source of *titt(a)u*- is phonological: *titt(a)-* can be taken directly from *dhi-duh(h1-)* but not from *stis(h2-)*. 20 But *titt(a)-* need not have come from *stis(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

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-duh(h1-)* is a pure abstraction; the present of *dheh*1- had e-reduplication in PIE.
imaginable scenario, PIE (ideal) *stist(h)₂- would first have been remodeled to *stist(h)₂- (cf. Ved. tiṣṭhati), which would then have given *tit(h)₂- (titt(a)-) as part of the general replacement of *st by *t in the forms of the verb “to stand” (cf. *sth₂-iez/iez ⇒ tiye/a-, etc.).

Alternatively, the initial remodeling could have been to *stit(h)₂- (cf. Lat. sistē¯); this too would eventually have been simplified to *tit(h)₂- (titt(a)-) as part of the general replacement of *st by *t in the forms of the verb “to stand” (cf. *sth₂-i-e/ie- ⇒ tite/a-, etc.).

21 The synchronic isolation of Hitt. ıˇstantai¯ ‘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. ādhat = Gk. ἔπρα ‘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.
en *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. στ(peer)α-, but with the Hittite reduplicated hi-verb titta- and its better-known derivative tittanu-.

Works cited


CLuv. -tta (not -te), 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.
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