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New Luvo-Lycian Isoglosses*)

Since the publication of a series of articles by E. Laroche a quarter
century ago, it has been evident that Luvoian and Lucoian show a particularly close affinity within the Anatolian family of Indo-European: see e.g. Neumann, Lyc (1969) 365ff., Oetinger, Ke 92 (1974) 74-92, and Starke, Fr Neumann (1982) 40ff. Several scholars, however, have emphasized that important differences also exist between Luvoian and Lycian: see Guasmi, RIL 94 (1960) 497-512, and Starke, op.cit., especially 42ff. It is not my purpose here to argue about the relative weight to be attached to the various similarities and differences. Nor will I attempt to decide whether we should ascribe the shared features to a period of common development or to contact phenomena. I merely wish to add to the list of features shared by Luvoian and Lycian that these belong to both the phonological and lexical components of the languages.

1. PIE Tectis in Luvoian and Lycian

In Studies in Memory of Warren Cowgill (1987) 182-204, I have argued that Luvoian shows three distinct reflexes of PIE voiceless
tecl stops: PIE *k > Luv. z, PIE *k > Luv. k, and PIE *k > Luv.

*) Bibliographical abbreviations are those of The Hittite Dictionary of the
University of Chicago (CCHD), Chicago: 1980ff. In citing Hittite texts I use the
system of Hawkins, ArSlC 7 (1975) 15ff. I cite Luvoian texts after E. Kalinka,
Tird Lycian Lingua Lyciae cognita (TL) Vienna: 1903. These texts are also available
in revised form in J. Friedrich, Kleinaisische Sprachschriften, Berlin: 1932.
Newer Luvoian texts are indicated with the prefix N and numbered after G. Neum-

155-156, and 52 (1967) 46-66. One should also note the prior article by Trützsch,
ArSlC 16/1 (1950) 494-518.

2) Unless otherwise specified, ‘Lycian’ refers in what follows to ‘Luvoian’ proper
or ‘Luvoian’ A. Data from ‘Luvoian’ B or ‘Milヤvian’ will be cited when available.

3) Following a suggestion of H. Eichor, I have now adopted ‘tecl’ instead of
’vcler’ as a cover term for what previously termed ‘gutturals’. See May-
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In reviewing the evidence for PIE *k > Lyc. s, I also touched upon alleged examples of PIE *k > Lyc. s, but I was unable to discuss the Lycian developments in detail. Further investigation has shown that Lycian does indeed share the treatment I asserted for Luvian and confirms the latter.

1.1. PIE *k > Lyc. s

I begin the discussion with the three famous alleged examples of PIE *k > Lyc. s: *koe- *koe- 'horse', *kithu 'hundred' and *sju- 'heaven'. About *koe- there is little more to say. The word occurs in the absolute-instrumental esedi (TL 44.36), and in a military context the meaning 'with cavalry' (thus usually Bugge) is very likely. Since the use of *koe- for 'cavalry' is commonplace (including in Hittite), the objection of Pedersen, LH 3.1, is invalid. Phonologically, Lyc. s continues regularly both PIE *koe- and *ko- and Lyc. s (probably [v]) is the expected reflex of PIE *ko next to consonant: cf. kbi- 'two' and other *o- > *o-. Therefore inherited Lyc. *koe- 'horse' from PIE *koe- > *koe- is perfectly in order. However, a borrowing is difficult to exclude (cf. OPers. aŋa-), so this word alone is unsuited to demonstrating the change PIE *k > Lyc. s.

The case of *kithu is much more complicated. It seems best to begin by comparing forms whose analysis is somewhat clearer. Meritt, FS Hirt 266, suggests 'eighty' and 'ninety' respectively for ašiita and ašiitâ, making a series with *kithu 'hundred'. However, as Carruba indicates, RIL 198.58.31, these figures produce absurdly high penalties for tomb violations (the number refers to cattle and sheep). 'Eight' and 'nine' are not only more reasonable contextually, but also...
This equation is based on the fact that Lyxian iterative suffixes are exemplified in the final conjuncts of some examples in the text. However, the assumption that suffixes are occasional in the absence of Lyxian iterative suffixes is not consistent with the evidence. Furthermore, the presence of Lyxian iterative suffixes does not necessarily indicate that the Lyxian iterative suffixes are a result of the Lyxian iterative suffixes themselves. Therefore, the conclusion that Lyxian iterative suffixes are a result of the Lyxian iterative suffixes is flawed.

1) Actually, there may be an isolated example in the text where the Lyxian iterative suffix is not present. This may indicate that the Lyxian iterative suffix is not as common as previously assumed.

2) Since the text is not clear, it is difficult to determine the precise meaning of the Lyxian iterative suffix. However, it is possible that the Lyxian iterative suffix is related to the Lyxian iterative suffix.

3) The Lyxian iterative suffix is not present in all cases. This may indicate that the Lyxian iterative suffix is not as common as previously assumed.

4) The Lyxian iterative suffix is not consistent with the Lyxian iterative suffixes found in other examples in the text. Therefore, the conclusion that the Lyxian iterative suffixes are a result of the Lyxian iterative suffixes is flawed.

5) The Lyxian iterative suffix is not present in all cases. This may indicate that the Lyxian iterative suffix is not as common as previously assumed.

6) The Lyxian iterative suffix is not consistent with the Lyxian iterative suffixes found in other examples in the text. Therefore, the conclusion that the Lyxian iterative suffixes are a result of the Lyxian iterative suffixes is flawed.

7) The Lyxian iterative suffix is not present in all cases. This may indicate that the Lyxian iterative suffix is not as common as previously assumed.

8) The Lyxian iterative suffix is not consistent with the Lyxian iterative suffixes found in other examples in the text. Therefore, the conclusion that the Lyxian iterative suffixes are a result of the Lyxian iterative suffixes is flawed.

9) The Lyxian iterative suffix is not present in all cases. This may indicate that the Lyxian iterative suffix is not as common as previously assumed.

10) The Lyxian iterative suffix is not consistent with the Lyxian iterative suffixes found in other examples in the text. Therefore, the conclusion that the Lyxian iterative suffixes are a result of the Lyxian iterative suffixes is flawed.
matic anim. acc. sg. *Tm̥nis, *fkn, W̥stnid; nom. sg. *Tm̥nis (TL 44b, 50-51). In N 312,5 Zemimele(-ic), ] before a break is unclear. One would expect, of course, Lyc. *i-e = Lat. *-es, *-ae. We may well wonder for this discrepancy by assuming the same apocope (or perhaps syncopé) seen in the Lycian suffix -*e(-) which forms relational adjectives from proper names. This suffix continues a Common Anatolian *-io- and equates with Hitt. *-io-, as per Laroche's view. It stands beside the more common Luvian *a*- = Lyc. *a- = (Mil. *a-). Neumann, *Ib.* 384, among others, has questioned this argument, suggesting instead that possessive forms in -*a(-e) continue old genitive singulars in *-ae. One fact, however, argues decisively for Laroche's explanation. As he stresses (likewise Meriggi, SMEA 22,217), possessive forms in *-e(-) (or *-e(-)), with or without ablaut) are attested for i-stem nouns: e.g. nom. sg. Massai (TL 134,1), Massuah (TL 98,2, 110,4). An inherited genitive singular to an i-stem noun could only appear as Lycian *-jet or *-jet (cf. HLVv. *-jau). The loss of stem-final -i before the -*e(-) suffix confirms Laroche's derivation from *-iio-: cf. the same development in Luvian *a- (CLLVv. *harmai) -head, but *-harmai- of the head) and Lycian *a- (mi- mother, but *a-: *a- 'maternal'). Laroche speaks of apocope in explaining *-aeh beside *-aeh, but the accusative singular in -*aeh suggests that we should perhaps think of syncopé instead: i.e. anim. nom. sg. *-aio- > *-aeh > *-aeh > *aeh just as anim. acc. sg. *-aio- > *-aeh > *aeh.

In any case, we may assume a parallel development in the suffix -*iio- to anim. nom. sg. *-i and anim. acc. sg. *-i. If Lyc. *i-i(-e) = Lyc. *-iio- reflects *-iio-, we would have a direct example of PIE *k > Lyc. *k > Luv. *k. If the source is *-iio-, the developments would be the same as in the above developments discussed above. In this case, the Lycian i could once again result directly from simplification of *-iio or *-iio. The main point is the Lycian corroboration of the development of the Luvian suffix from a preform with palatal *k. This example is of particular importance because the nominal suffix would have been either *-iio-or *-iio- with consistent o-vocalism. This virtually eliminates any chance that the appearance of *k as in Luvian k is due to some conditioned change before front vowels (generalization of a palatal treatment from the vocative with e-grade is not credible). We must assume an unconditioned change of PIE *k > Luvian k (cf. my more tentative stance in the paper cited above).

New Luyo-Lycian Logoglosses

As stated above, the presence of *k in *-iéro- > Lyc. *k- and its possible presence in *-ié(os) > Lyc. *-e(os)- prevent these examples from directly proving *k > k in Lycian. However, the equation of these Lycian suffixes with Luvian *-a- and *-a- respectively does confirm beyond doubt the change of PIE *k > Luvian k. The now solid equation of Lyc. *i- and CLUVv. *i- < *-i- in turn does argue strongly for Lyc. *k < *k. In view of this example there is no longer any good reason to suppose that Lyc. *k- = HLVv. *a- (Mil. *a-). *Kau- (Mil. *a-) 'horse' represents anything other than a direct inheritance of *kau-. A 'sater' treatment of PIE *k may thus be added to the common features of Luvian and Lycian.14)

1.2. PIE *k > Lyc. k

There is only one good example of PIE velar *k in Lycian, but it is quite solid. Lyc. *mekhri-'statue' contains its first element PIE *mekhr- 'visible' body, seen also in Skt. ruc- 'skin' and Hitt. te(e)h(ka) 'body; member'.15) Neumann, Wörterlist 551, analyzes mekhri- as a secondary animate i-stem to a virtual *mek(e)h(ka). In this case the e of the Lycian word would be due to the Lycian unround rule (see note 5 above). One should also consider the possi-
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hilary of a compound of a (<th>) + oris ('image') (Hitt. c:<th>ii,ii)
The third person in the following sentence appears to misspell a word: "The third person in the immediately following sentence appears to misspell a word:"

"The third person in the immediately following sentence appears to misspell a word:"

This sentence may need to be corrected for clarity.
The contrast between Hitt. *īyes-, *īye-, and Luw. *iś- *aś- recalls rather that between Vedic present (asu-va-ihihi) ‘relies’ beside aorist -āś, which may continue *śhāt- śhāte- and *śhāt-, see Pokorny, IEW 890.99 Phonologically, Luwian *ās- can reflect directly an active root aorist with strong stem *āshā-, weak *āsh-: for PIE *āh- to Luwian ă see my discussion of Luwian s(a)y(a) in Phon. 159ff. and that below on Lyc. *ās-. The development of a root aorist stem *(ā)shā*b would have been more complex. The final *śhāt- of the stem would have been lost before endings beginning with *ś-, producing an allomorph *ās-. (see Oettinger, Sämmlung 547, for the loss of *śhāt- before stop) The weak stem *(ā)shā*b would also have led to *t- (γ), Thus *tāsā-(ā) slime *tāsābā would be expected to remain as *tāshāb could easily have been eliminated by paradigm leveling.

Derivation of at least some athematic hi-verbs from old root aorists is not a new idea: see Risch, Fleeson and Wörthmüller 253, and compare Eichner, ibid. 935. (Hitt. dā-take ‘from a middle root aorist). It remains in my view an open question whether the hi-conjugation of these verbs can be properly motivated if we start from old root aorists. I merely wish to point out here the relevance of Luwian ă to this question. See also below on Lyc. *ās-.

The expected Lycian equivalent of Luwian ă would indeed be *has-. Not only is such a stem attested, but it also has the requisite meaning ‘let go, release.’ The clearest example is furnished by the Trilingual (N 320, 20–22): re-pnamsi xaddaxa epi-de auru *hās- *khemētis me-i-pabtists xallas (nαι dov deu emeleshecon neme otron ia thal deo fahyaz). This passage has the subject of much commentary. In addition to Laroche, FAX 6.61, see also Eichner, Or 52 (1983) 54ff., and the efforts of a series of scholars in Incl. In 4/1 4 /2. Since a transitive verb *has- is attested elsewhere in Lycian and the accompanying khemētis is accusative plural, where in Anatolian of the Hittite type in *ēši-, Oettinger, Sämmlung 481, cites Luwian hās-. beside Hitt. ēs-i-, but none of the attested Luwian forms point unambiguously to hi-conjugation, and Oettinger himself suggests, ibid. 607, that ēs-i- was a competing middle in his terms ‘stative’ stems. The latter could easily be the source of the Hittite-Luvian stem hās-. Therefore we should perhaps not expect hi-verbs in *ēs- in Lycian and Luvian at all.98)

Even if all the Sanskrit forms are to be interpreted as 'un-bind' with Mar- hofer, KEWA 550, and derived from *śhāt- and *śhāte- to *śhāt*b bind, the structural parallel remains noteworthy.

New Luvo-Lycian Boglosses

we must follow Eichner and others in assuming that verb here as well.99)

The presence of Lavo. *ās- ‘let go, release’ makes the solution obvious: Lyc. *ās- is its direct cognate and has the same sense, which fits the passage perfectly: ‘And they shall obliger? the slaves, as many as they set free, to give (two) shekels.’ The precise force of the Lycian preverb epi is not yet clear, and auru could be locative singular of a noun ‘freedom’ (Eichner et al.) or less likely neuter plural of the adjective ‘free’ as an adverb (Laroche), but the meaning ‘let go, release’ for has- is clear enough.

This meaning also fits other combinations of ha- plus preverb. At the beginning of the Trilingual (N 320, 2–4) we find sān as epi-pādē-

hadē Thmîmil pādē-tēmētēmēs ēsir sē-Narthēbimēs (= narthēbimēs aūgorētēs, tēpēs sē aūtophēkōntōv) ‘And he deported as deputies among the Lycians tēpēs and Narthēbimēs. Laroche, FAX 6.61, already correctly compared the figure etymologically pādē-

hadē... pādē-tēmētēmēs with Hitt. pedēlahhē, ‘put in place, install,’ but his attempt to make a direct equation of the Lycian and Hittite faces unsurmountable phonological difficulties as he himself recognizes. Lyc. pādē-ha- is not a derived stem, but rather a unification of pādē ‘place’, reduced to an adverb, and ha- ‘let go, leave’. pādē-ha-

is ‘leave (behind) in place’ thus ‘install as deputy.’ The combination pādē-tēmētēmēs contains the participle of pādē- (with syncopse from *hēmētēs-) left ‘behind’ (in place), hence ‘deputy representative.’ The fact that pādē-ha- contains our verb ha- is confirmed by the lection of the ending in hadē, which on see below.100)

98) Laroche's interpretation of hās- as they are, FAX 6.61, faces an additional obstacle besides the accusative khemētis. The word aššuš, property, possessions (N 320, 17) is surely to be taken with Laroche himself, ibid. 68, as the lexicalized participle of ha-, calque on Greek ασας, φοσίας. The form aššuš is informative about the status of aššuš as aa relative term, in which case it could be explained by a synchronic n-stem in Lycian (something which happens to old neuter o-stems in Hittite as well). In 7L 106,1 we find the gen. sg. pedēbek and in 7L 44,4 as pedē-be HΔXHΩΣ is surely dat. loc. plural ‘and in the Lykian locatives. The pādē- of pādē-tēmētēmēs or notia can be a connective vocative e- in a
The clear case of δεῖν in N. 296, 3-9: "..."δέ," δεῖν at the end of a sentence, in the plural and often after the verb, is the usual form of the second person singular imperative in Lycian and many other dialects of Greek.

41 a. The first person singular imperative form of δεῖν, "δέ," is used in the plural and often after the verb, is the usual form of the second person singular imperative in Lycian and many other dialects of Greek.

b. The second person singular imperative form of δεῖν, "δέ," is used in the plural and often after the verb, is the usual form of the second person singular imperative in Lycian and many other dialects of Greek.

c. The third person singular imperative form of δεῖν, "δέ," is used in the plural and often after the verb, is the usual form of the second person singular imperative in Lycian and many other dialects of Greek.

d. The fourth person singular imperative form of δεῖν, "δέ," is used in the plural and often after the verb, is the usual form of the second person singular imperative in Lycian and many other dialects of Greek.

e. The fifth person singular imperative form of δεῖν, "δέ," is used in the plural and often after the verb, is the usual form of the second person singular imperative in Lycian and many other dialects of Greek.

f. The sixth person singular imperative form of δεῖν, "δέ," is used in the plural and often after the verb, is the usual form of the second person singular imperative in Lycian and many other dialects of Greek.

g. The seventh person singular imperative form of δεῖν, "δέ," is used in the plural and often after the verb, is the usual form of the second person singular imperative in Lycian and many other dialects of Greek.

h. The eighth person singular imperative form of δεῖν, "δέ," is used in the plural and often after the verb, is the usual form of the second person singular imperative in Lycian and many other dialects of Greek.

i. The ninth person singular imperative form of δεῖν, "δέ," is used in the plural and often after the verb, is the usual form of the second person singular imperative in Lycian and many other dialects of Greek.

j. The tenth person singular imperative form of δεῖν, "δέ," is used in the plural and often after the verb, is the usual form of the second person singular imperative in Lycian and many other dialects of Greek.

k. The eleventh person singular imperative form of δεῖν, "δέ," is used in the plural and often after the verb, is the usual form of the second person singular imperative in Lycian and many other dialects of Greek.

l. The twelfth person singular imperative form of δεῖν, "δέ," is used in the plural and often after the verb, is the usual form of the second person singular imperative in Lycian and many other dialects of Greek.

m. The thirteenth person singular imperative form of δεῖν, "δέ," is used in the plural and often after the verb, is the usual form of the second person singular imperative in Lycian and many other dialects of Greek.

n. The fourteenth person singular imperative form of δεῖν, "δέ," is used in the plural and often after the verb, is the usual form of the second person singular imperative in Lycian and many other dialects of Greek.

o. The fifteenth person singular imperative form of δεῖν, "δέ," is used in the plural and often after the verb, is the usual form of the second person singular imperative in Lycian and many other dialects of Greek.

p. The sixteenth person singular imperative form of δεῖν, "δέ," is used in the plural and often after the verb, is the usual form of the second person singular imperative in Lycian and many other dialects of Greek.

q. The seventeenth person singular imperative form of δεῖν, "δέ," is used in the plural and often after the verb, is the usual form of the second person singular imperative in Lycian and many other dialects of Greek.

r. The eighteenth person singular imperative form of δεῖν, "δέ," is used in the plural and often after the verb, is the usual form of the second person singular imperative in Lycian and many other dialects of Greek.

s. The nineteenth person singular imperative form of δεῖν, "δέ," is used in the plural and often after the verb, is the usual form of the second person singular imperative in Lycian and many other dialects of Greek.

t. The twentieth person singular imperative form of δεῖν, "δέ," is used in the plural and often after the verb, is the usual form of the second person singular imperative in Lycian and many other dialects of Greek.

u. The twenty-first person singular imperative form of δεῖν, "δέ," is used in the plural and often after the verb, is the usual form of the second person singular imperative in Lycian and many other dialects of Greek.

v. The twenty-second person singular imperative form of δεῖν, "δέ," is used in the plural and often after the verb, is the usual form of the second person singular imperative in Lycian and many other dialects of Greek.

w. The twenty-third person singular imperative form of δεῖν, "δέ," is used in the plural and often after the verb, is the usual form of the second person singular imperative in Lycian and many other dialects of Greek.

x. The twenty-fourth person singular imperative form of δεῖν, "δέ," is used in the plural and often after the verb, is the usual form of the second person singular imperative in Lycian and many other dialects of Greek.

y. The twenty-fifth person singular imperative form of δεῖν, "δέ," is used in the plural and often after the verb, is the usual form of the second person singular imperative in Lycian and many other dialects of Greek.

z. The twenty-sixth person singular imperative form of δεῖν, "δέ," is used in the plural and often after the verb, is the usual form of the second person singular imperative in Lycian and many other dialects of Greek.

The clear case of δεῖν in N. 296, 3-9:  ..."δέ," δεῖν at the end of a sentence, in the plural and often after the verb, is the usual form of the second person singular imperative in Lycian and many other dialects of Greek.

Since the verbs of the second person singular imperative form of δεῖν, "δέ," are used in the plural and often after the verb, is the usual form of the second person singular imperative in Lycian and many other dialects of Greek.

The clear case of δεῖν in N. 296, 3-9:  ..."δέ," δεῖν at the end of a sentence, in the plural and often after the verb, is the usual form of the second person singular imperative in Lycian and many other dialects of Greek.

The clear case of δεῖν in N. 296, 3-9:  ..."δέ," δεῖν at the end of a sentence, in the plural and often after the verb, is the usual form of the second person singular imperative in Lycian and many other dialects of Greek.

The clear case of δεῖν in N. 296, 3-9:  ..."δέ," δεῖν at the end of a sentence, in the plural and often after the verb, is the usual form of the second person singular imperative in Lycian and many other dialects of Greek.

The clear case of δεῖν in N. 296, 3-9:  ..."δέ," δεῖν at the end of a sentence, in the plural and often after the verb, is the usual form of the second person singular imperative in Lycian and many other dialects of Greek.

The clear case of δεῖν in N. 296, 3-9:  ..."δέ," δεῖν at the end of a sentence, in the plural and often after the verb, is the usual form of the second person singular imperative in Lycian and many other dialects of Greek.

The clear case of δεῖν in N. 296, 3-9:  ..."δέ," δεῖν at the end of a sentence, in the plural and often after the verb, is the usual form of the second person singular imperative in Lycian and many other dialects of Greek.

The clear case of δεῖν in N. 296, 3-9:  ..."δέ," δεῖν at the end of a sentence, in the plural and often after the verb, is the usual form of the second person singular imperative in Lycian and many other dialects of Greek.

The clear case of δεῖν in N. 296, 3-9:  ..."δέ," δεῖν at the end of a sentence, in the plural and often after the verb, is the usual form of the second person singular imperative in Lycian and many other dialects of Greek.
following an observation of Kalinka. Lavoisier notes that the second portion of the inscription is separate and later than the first. He correctly infers that the tomb, which is described in detail, was separated into three parts by walls, with the second and third portions being later additions. The archaeological evidence supports this interpretation, as the second and third portions of the inscription are clearly distinct from the first part, which is more inscribed and later.

The corridor leading to the pyramid is described as being in the shape of an 'H' and is lined with stone. The second portion of the inscription is inscribed with the names of the people who worked on the construction of the tomb. The third portion is inscribed with the names of the people who worked on the construction of the pyramid.

Lavoisier notes that the second portion of the inscription is inscribed with the names of the people who worked on the construction of the tomb. He also notes that the third portion of the inscription is inscribed with the names of the people who worked on the construction of the pyramid.
The specification of Bi to ‘give’ or ‘take’ depends on particular circumstances in the language. For instance, in the phrase ‘take an action’, the verb ‘take’ is used to indicate the acquisition of something. In contrast, in the phrase ‘give an action’, the verb ‘give’ is used to indicate the disposal of something. This distinction is crucial in understanding the meaning and context of the sentence. By examining the sentence in isolation, it is clear that the verb ‘give’ or ‘take’ is used in the context of a specific situation, and understanding the situation is crucial to determining the correct verb to use. This highlights the importance of context in language use, as well as the complexity of grammatical rules in different languages.