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The Middle Voice in Lycian*)

In an appendix below I present evidence that the Lycian enclitic pronoun -(e)ne with geminate nasal marks the dative plural of the third person: 'to/for them'. This identification means that the entire sentence of TL 44,3-4 may now be analyzed grammatically: meri [ \( *\)i(e)mu] asa ne manaz. We have the conjunction meri, enclitic -(e)ne 'to/for them', asamu orthotonic 'I, me,'
(see Ostermiller, 6, 98). The presence of a first singular verb and -(e)ne 'to/for them' requires that asamu be the subject. The noun manaza could be dative plural agreeing with -(e)ne (cf. dative plural lada in TL 39,4), but dative plural in -(e) is more common for masculine nouns in -a: d. xadda 'grandsons, descendants' (TL 127, 2), lataza 'probably the dead' (as a class) (N109,49). It is therefore more likely that manaza is nominative singular, referring to asamu T. In either case the verb is necessarily intransitive: 'I ended/for them (as) judges' or more likely 'I ended (as) judge/for them.'

If we abstract -gd as the preterite first singular ending, (cf. -gd 'I made/did'), we are left with a disyllabic verb stem aza-. The "reflection" of the consonant of the ending -(e)ne rather than -(e) requires a preceding CANatolian accented long vowel: cf. Lyc. tadi 'he places/puts' < *delkiti and see Eichler, MSS 31 (1973) 75ff.) Lycian

*) I cite Lycian texts after the numbering of E.Kalina, Texts Lyciques..., Vienna: 1901. These texts are also available, often with superior readings, in J. Friedrich, Kleinasiatische Sprachwissenschaft, Berlin: 1932. For more recent texts see G. Neumann, Neufunde lybischer Inschriften seit 1921, Vienna: 1979 (indicated with N). For the crucial Lüdien Trilingua see the authoritative edition by E. Larocque in Fouilles de Xanthos 6 (1979) 49-127. This analysis was first presented at the Eighth East Coast Indo-European Conference, Harvard University, June 16, 1989.

**) It is uncertain whether we should take -asama as -(e)ne with elision of the first vowel of the orthotonic pronoun or as -(e)na-e with elision of the final vowel of the enclitic. Parallels for both processes are found elsewhere in Lycian.

**) In principle, the lentin ending could also reflect a disyllabic verb stem with accent on the first syllable. For elision of stops and *e, between unaccented
Note that Lycian -xagō matches Hittite ḫaddāt(i) down to the crucial detail that the first consonant is unlenited and the second lenited. The Lycian ending shows final nasalization, and the Hittite has an added element -ti(i), but these are certainly secondary accretions (see further below). The match between Lyc. -xagō and Hitt. ḫaddāt- is exact. Neo, IBtu7 6 (1968) 24, following Kro-nasser, VLPH (1996) 20, attempts to deny the reality of the Hittite ḫaddāt- by saying that it is an attached vowel, perhaps the unattested ḫaddāt-awu, but his explanation is manifestly false. As his own examples show, the endings are spelled consistently -ḫaddāt- after a consonant, while the gemination of the first -ḫ- cannot be shown, but always -ḫaddāt- after a vowel: wewt-ḫaddarī, iy-ḫaddarī, karḫu-ḫaddarī, LUGAL-ištarḫaddarī, usiruḫaddarī, wewtḫaddarī. We must reckon with a Canaanite *haddāt(-i) beside *ḫērēt(-i).

The identification of Lycian axagō as a preverter first singular middle 'I become' has several important consequences. First, we are now assured that the middle voice did survive in Lycian, at least to a limited extent as in Luvian. Second, Canaanite had available the iterated form of the first person singular middle ending: -hērē; Third, as J. Jasnow has reminded me, the a-vocalism of -اغō in Lyc. -xagō furnishes evidence that the first singular middle ending reflects PIE *-hērē, not *-hō, as often alleged. Finally, the consistent lenition of the second consonant of the ending (in Hittite as well as Lycian) can only be attributed to its position in the ending, where we can suppose it was always between unaccented vowels. This confirms the important claim of Eichner, Sprache 32 (1986) 12–13, that the lenition of stops and *k between unaccented vowels, confirmed for Luvian and Lycian by Morpurgo Davies, KZ. 96, 24f1, is in fact CAnatolian. In this case as in that of the lenition after accented long vowel, Hittite has analogically removed or blocked more of the effects of the rule than the Luvian languages. We thus have yet an-

vowels in Luvian and Lycian see Morpurgo Davies, KZ 96 (1983) 245ff, especially 262, and see further below. However, aside from stems in *-eh-, and -*-eh-, which are dealt with immediately below, the only other likely candidate for such a diphthongal stem would be a basic thematic stem in *-ēt-. Iterative stems such as xagō and xneti in *-ēt-i indicate that the thematic vowel was syncopated in such an environment, as already seen by Petersen, LH 17.

2) Lycian has a synchronic unblatant root by which a low vowel takes on the front/back quality of the vowel of the following syllable (see Neumann, Lb 37f, and Melchert, in Proceedings of the VIII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Ge-sellschafts). The a-vocalism of axagō could thus be secondary, due to the a of the ending -ū. Since we also are not well informed about the fate of intervocalic /y/ in Lycian, one cannot exclude an iterative preform *hērēt(-i), but this also loads nowhere.

3) The immediately preceding sentence contains the phrase tribi ḫaddarī zaža, which probably means 'they fought against Athens'. For tribi 'against' (equivalent or preposition?) compare Hitt. ḫaddarī 'stands against/ opposite' (+ dat.-loc) see e.g. ALEPPO 1.6 and CECKE 8.10 (cf. Hawkins, ASz 25 [1972] 46f.). For zaža- 'fight' (= a virtual Hitt. -zaḫa) compare Hitt. zaḫa- 'fight, battle' and zaḫa- 'to fight'; see Neumann, Wörterbuch 51, and compare already Bugge, Fr Bernoull 236, and Meriggi, Fr Hitt 272 and passim.

I therefore take the meaning of zaža in context to be 'arbitrator'. I cannot pursue here the historical ramifications of the claim that the author of the Machtan Stele was the king between the Persians and their Greek allies (or between those parties and the Athenians). I stress only two points. First, my interpretation of the sentence is based on independent facts of Lycian grammar. Second, we must keep in mind the well-known self-serving hyperbole of poetic inscriptions. From the point of view of the other parties (and in fact), the role of the Lycian may have been no more than that of a glorified messenger-boy. This would not have prevented him from inflating his role in an inscription composed in his native language, which would likely have been inaccessible to the Persians and Greeks.

denominatives in -a-/*-ēh-, do not show lenition: cf. priamukuxa/i 'I built', priamuzatati 'he built', etc. There is thus no likely source left for a diphthongal stem in -a- except a "stative" in -*-ēh-. Furthermore, in all clear cases of Lycian PIE *-e-, see Laroche, DLL 24. This sense would fit our Lycian context perfectly: I became judge/arbitrator for them.

...
Since the inclusion of the "minor" languages of Anatolia, the issue of the "minor" languages of Anatolia has been of great interest to Hittite scholars. The "minor" languages of Anatolia are a group of languages that were spoken in the region of Anatolia and are not related to the Hittite language. The "minor" languages are thought to have been influenced by the Hittite language, and they are often referred to as "Hittite" or "Hittite-related."
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The Middle Voice in Lydian

H. Craig Melchert

In my previous work, I have argued that the concept of the Middle Voice in Lydian, as found in the Lydian texts, is based on the idea of a third person singular, where the subject of the verb is not explicitly mentioned in the text. This is in contrast to the Old Greek Middle Voice, which is characterized by the use of a specific form of the verb to indicate the presence of a third person subject.

The Lydian Middle Voice is typically represented by the use of the feminine form of the verb, which indicates the presence of a third person feminine subject. This is evident in the Lydian texts, where the feminine form of the verb is consistently used to indicate the presence of a third person subject.

For example, in the Lydian text 7.18 (MSS 1), the verb is used in the feminine form to indicate the presence of a third person feminine subject. This is consistent with the concept of the Middle Voice, where the subject is not explicitly mentioned in the text.

The use of the feminine form of the verb in Lydian is also consistent with the grammatical structure of the Lydian language, which is characterized by the use of gender markers to indicate the presence of a subject.

In conclusion, the Middle Voice in Lydian is a unique feature of the Lydian language, which is characterized by the use of the feminine form of the verb to indicate the presence of a third person subject. This is in contrast to other languages, such as Old Greek, where the Middle Voice is characterized by the use of a specific form of the verb to indicate the presence of a third person subject.
is certainly secondary. It is also worth mentioning within Anatolian Gin. The Hittite ending -en, which Carabba, SNAK 24 (1986) 60ff, has convincingly shown to be a productive ending, first singular, the plural, is in use within Anatolian Gin, as the ending -i, which Carabba shows to be a secondary form, is also productive here. As in the Hittite language, these forms are at least as old as Indus-Greek, and they continue to be productive in later forms. In the case of Turkish, the ending -en is often used in loan words from other languages, such as English and Russian. The ending -en in the Hittite language is also productive in loan words, such as the English ending -en. The ending -en is also productive in loan words from other languages, such as English and Russian. The ending -en in the Hittite language is also productive in loan words, such as English and Russian. The ending -en is also productive in loan words from other languages, such as English and Russian. The ending -en is also productive in loan words from other languages, such as English and Russian.

The Lydian ending -en, which has previously been seen as a mere variation of -en (the Lydian ending -en is in use within Anatolian Gin, as the ending -i, which Carabba shows to be a secondary form, is also productive here. As in the Hittite language, these forms are at least as old as Indus-Greek, and they continue to be productive in later forms. In the case of Turkish, the ending -en is often used in loan words from other languages, such as English and Russian. The ending -en in the Hittite language is also productive in loan words, such as the English ending -en. The ending -en is also productive in loan words from other languages, such as English and Russian. The ending -en in the Hittite language is also productive in loan words, such as English and Russian. The ending -en is also productive in loan words from other languages, such as English and Russian. The ending -en is also productive in loan words from other languages, such as English and Russian. The ending -en is also productive in loan words from other languages, such as English and Russian. The ending -en is also productive in loan words from other languages, such as English and Russian. The ending -en is also productive in loan words from other languages, such as English and Russian.
The Middle Voice in Lycian

various attempts to solve this passage. My suggested interpretation of *tisyai as a nominative plural of the relative pronoun (referring either to *lada or *dorttai) is quite speculative, but both *lada and *dorttai are certainly plural. Likewise epitheti 'thai' implies that the *eme of -me-mne must be plural.

The few other instances of -me are compatible with a sense 'to/for them' but are too unclear to furnish further evidence. In TL 29.2, *se-eme follows reference to 'himself and his wife'. In TL 29.7 and 10, where me-eme cooccurs with pretensive third plural verbs (pisipte and tebiti respectively), -me could be functioning as a dative reflexive (cf. Hitt. *emal), but this cannot be asserted with confidence. The occurrences in TL 44.b.14 and 54.k are in contexts too unclear to make any interpretation. In view of the evidence presented above, it does seem likely that TL 27.1f. shows the same structure as TL 45 with a faulty spelling: Mesiisti-(h) -me [1] witha atb ekkhi Xsaxalag tailemu o-badi ebbi Mesiintaua[e] ... For them Mekhthos erected it—for himself, son of Skhuylos, and for his wife, Merinuwa ...?"

In summary, then, all occurrences of -me in Lycian are consistent with the meaning 'to/for them'. Some instances such as TL 45, 1 and those for the second person singular seem more likely for Lycian -me as an enclitic third person plural dative pronoun 'to/for them'.
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