

Sonderdruck aus

# Historische Sprachforschung (Historical Linguistics)

bisher

Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung

Begründet von Adalbert Kuhn

In Verbindung mit Claus Haebler

herausgegeben von

Alfred Bammesberger und Günter Neumann

105. Band (1992)

2. Heft

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht in Göttingen und Zürich

ISSN 0935-3518

## The Middle Voice in Lycian\*

In an appendix below I present evidence that the Lycian enclitic pronoun *-ñne* with geminate nasal marks the dative plural of the third person: 'to/for them'. This identification means that the entire sentence of TL 44c, 3-4 may now be analyzed grammatically: *me-ñ [n]e-(e)mu axagā maraza*. We have the conjunction *me*, enclitic *-ñne* 'to/for them', *e/amu* orthotonic I, *me*,<sup>1)</sup> *axagā* (preterite first singular verb) and *maraza* 'judge' (or similar: see Laroche, *FdX* 6. 98). The presence of a first singular verb and *-ñne* 'to/for them' requires that *e/amu* be the subject I. The noun *maraza* could be dative plural agreeing with *-ñne* (cf. dative plural *lada* in TL 39, 4), but dative plural in *-e* is more common for masculine nouns in *-a-*: cf. *xahbe* 'grandsons, descendants' (TL 127, 2), *lataze* probably 'the dead' (as a class) (N 309 c, 9). It is therefore more likely that *maraza* is nominative singular, referring to *e/amu* I. In either case the verb is necessarily intransitive: 'I \_ed for/to them (as) judges' or more likely 'I \_ed (as) judge for/to them.'

If we abstract *-gā* as the preterite first singular ending (cf. *a-gā* 'I made/did'), we are left with a disyllabic verb stem *axa-*. The "lenition" of the consonant of the ending (*-gā* rather than *-xā*) requires a preceding CAnatolian accented long vowel: cf. Lyc. *tadi* 'the places/places' < \**dhéh<sub>1</sub>ti* and see Eichner, *MSS* 31 (1973) 79ff.<sup>2)</sup> Lycian

\*) I cite Lycian texts after the numbering of E. Kalinka, *Tituli Lyciae* ... Vienna: 1901. These texts are also available, often with superior readings, in J. Friedrich, *Kleinasiatische Sprachdenkmäler*, Berlin: 1932. For more recent texts see G. Neumann, *Neufunde lykischer Inschriften seit 1901*, Vienna: 1979 (indicated with N.). For the crucial 'Lëtöon Trilingual' see the authoritative edition by E. Laroche 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.

<sup>1)</sup> It is uncertain whether we should take *-ñneme* as *-ñne-(a)mu* with elision of the first vowel of the orthotonic pronoun or as *-ñn(e)-emu* with elision of the final vowel of the enclitic. Parallels for both processes are found elsewhere in Lycian.

<sup>2)</sup> In principle, the lenited ending could also reflect a disyllabic verb stem with accent on the first syllable. For lenition of stops and \**h*<sub>2</sub> between unaccented

denominatives in *-a* < *\*-eh<sub>2</sub>-* do not show lenition: cf. *prīnawaxa/ā* 'I built', *prīnawate/ē* 'he built', etc. There is thus no likely source left for a disyllabic stem in *-a* except a "stative" in *\*-eh<sub>1</sub>-*. Furthermore, in all clear cases Lycian *x* continues PIE *\*h<sub>2</sub>*: see Laroche, *FdX* 6.84. We are thus led to a preform *\*eh<sub>2</sub>-eh<sub>1</sub>*. No likely PIE etymon is available.<sup>3)</sup>

There is an alternative. If we divide the verb as *a-xagā*, we may identify the verb stem as attested Lycian *a(i)-* 'do, make' and the ending as preterite first singular middle, the formal and functional equivalent of Hittite *-h<sub>2</sub>ahat(i)*. In CLuvian the verb *a(ya)-* 'do, make' means 'become' in the middle: see Laroche, *DLL* 24. This sense would fit our Lycian context perfectly: I became judge/arbitrator for them.<sup>4)</sup>

vowels in Luvian and Lycian see Morpurgo Davies, *KZ* 96 (1983) 245 ff., especially 262, and see further below. However, aside from stems in *\*-eh<sub>2</sub>-* and *\*-eh<sub>1</sub>-* which are dealt with immediately below, the only other likely candidate for such a disyllabic stem would be a basic thematic stem in *\*-e/o-*. Iteratives such as *qastti* and *astti* < *\*-s<sub>1</sub>eriti* indicate that the thematic vowel was syncopated in such an environment, as already seen by Pedersen, *LH* 27.

<sup>3)</sup> Lycian has a synchronic umlaut rule by which a low vowel takes on the front/back quality of the vowel of the following syllable (see Neumann, *Lyd* 376, and Melchert, in Proceedings of the VIII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft). The *a*-vocalism of *axa-* could thus be secondary, due to the *a* of the ending *-g-ā*. Since we also are not well informed about the fate of intervocalic *\*y* in Lycian, one cannot exclude an iterative preform *\*oh<sub>2</sub>eye/o-*, but this also leads nowhere.

<sup>4)</sup> The immediately preceding sentence contains the phrase *trbbi Alānas zxxāte*, which probably means 'they fought against Athens'. For *trbbi* 'against' (preverb or preposition?) compare HLuv. *tarpit/arpā* CRUS 'stand against/oppose' (+ dat.-loc.); see e.g. ALEPPO 2,6 and CEKKE B,10 (cf. Hawkins, *AnSt* 25 [1975] 146 f.). For *zxxa-* 'fight' (= a virtual Hitt. *\*zah<sub>2</sub>ah<sub>2</sub>-*) compare Hitt. *zah<sub>2</sub>ah<sub>2</sub>-* 'fight, battle' and *zah<sub>2</sub>hiya-* 'to fight': see Neumann, *Weiterleben* 52, and compare already Bugge, *Fs Bennndorf* 236, and Meriggi, *Fs Hirt* 272 and passim.

I therefore take the meaning of *maraza* in context to be 'arbitrator'. I cannot pursue here the historical ramifications of the claim that the author of the Xanthos Stele served as an arbitrator 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 bear in mind the well-known self-serving hyperbole of such 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.

Note that Lycian *-xagā* matches Hittite *-h<sub>2</sub>ahat(i)* down to the crucial detail that the first consonant is unlenited and the second lenited.<sup>5)</sup> The Lycian ending shows final nasalization, and the Hittite has an added element *-t(i)*, but these are certainly secondary accretions (see further below). The match between Lyc. *-xaga-* and Hitt. *-h<sub>2</sub>aha-* < *\*h<sub>2</sub>eh<sub>2</sub>e-* is exact. Neu, *StBoT* 6 (1968) 24, following Kro-nasser, *VLFH* (1956) 201<sup>33</sup>, attempts to deny the reality of the Hittite iterated first singular middle endings *-h<sub>2</sub>aha(ri)*, *-h<sub>2</sub>ahat(i)*, and *-h<sub>2</sub>aharu*, but his explanation is manifestly forced. As his own examples show, the endings are spelled consistently *-h<sub>2</sub>aha( )* after a consonant, where the gemination of the first *-h<sub>2</sub>-* cannot be shown, but always *-h<sub>2</sub>aha( )* after a vowel: *weriya-h<sub>2</sub>ahari*, *iya-h<sub>2</sub>ahat*, *kariya-h<sub>2</sub>ahat*, *LUGAL-izziya-h<sub>2</sub>ahat*, *wasšiya-h<sub>2</sub>ahat*, *weriya-h<sub>2</sub>ahat*.<sup>6)</sup> We must reckon with a CAnatolian *\*-h<sub>2</sub>eh<sub>2</sub>e(ti)* beside *\*-h<sub>2</sub>e(ti)*.

The identification of Lycian *axagā* as a preterite first singular middle 'I became' 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, CAnatolian had available the iterated form of the first person singular middle ending: *\*-h<sub>2</sub>eh<sub>2</sub>e+*. Third, as J. Jasanoff has reminded me, the *a*-vocalism of *-gā* in Lyc. *-xagā* furnishes evidence that the first singular middle ending reflects PIE *\*-h<sub>2</sub>e*, not *\*-h<sub>2</sub>o*, as often alleged.<sup>7)</sup> 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 *\*h<sub>2</sub>* between unaccented vowels, confirmed for Luvian and Lycian by Morpurgo Davies, *KZ* 96.24 ff., 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-

<sup>5)</sup> After the verb stem *a-*, which reflects *\*yeh<sub>1</sub>-* (Melchert, op.cit. and already *Phon.* 159), we would properly expect the first consonant of the medial ending also to be lenited (see above): *\*agagā*. The attested *x* of *axagā* is analogical, just as in the corresponding active *a-xā* beside phonologically regular *a-gā*.

<sup>6)</sup> Such hypercharacterized endings are hardly unusual in IE languages. Compare among others Skt. masc. nom. pl. *-āsas* or the isolated Hittite instrumental *ešhanat* 'with blood' (1041/c IV 1, cited by Neu, *StBoT* 5.79).

<sup>7)</sup> For Lycian *a*-vocalism in final syllables as a direct reflex of PIE *a*-vocalism see my paper referred to in note 3 above, where I already cited the Lycian preterite active 1st singular ending *-xā/gā* (= Luvian *-ha*) as evidence for a preform *\*-h<sub>2</sub>e*. The latter, of course, may be interpreted as the perfect first singular ending.

other example in which the "minor" IE languages of Anatolia furnish crucial evidence lacking in the better attested Hittite.

Confirmation that lenition of voiceless stops between unaccented vowels is Common Anatolian has a further important consequence. Neu, *StBoT* 6. 144 ff., has suggested that the source of the Hittite medial ending *-t(i)*, found throughout the preterite and in some forms of the present, is the Anatolian reflexive particle *-ti*: Luvian and Lycian *-ti*, Hittite *-z(a)* (before *y-* preserved as *-zzi*). Neu's account is very attractive morphologically and semantically, but it had faced the problem of why *\*-ti* did not assibilate in the medial endings as it did when it was the reflexive particle. We now understand why: in the overwhelming majority of cases *\*-ti* added to the medial endings stood between unaccented vowels. Thus it was lenited already in Common Anatolian to *\*(V)di* and never underwent the assibilation of *\*ti* in Hittite.

The attestation of the middle voice in both Cuneiform and Hieroglyphic Luvian is sparse. Nevertheless, it would be surprising if the hapax *axagā* were the only example of the entire category in Lycian. In particular we might expect to find at least a few instances of media tantum such as 'sit' or 'lie': cf. Pal. *kītar* and CLuv. *zīyar(i)* beside Hitt. *kitta(ri)* 'lies'.

Indeed, Pedersen, *LH* 18, long ago pleaded for an interpretation of Lyc. *siĵēni* as 'lies'. I have recently presented, *HS* 102 (1989) 26 f., new evidence for the supposed sound change of PIE palatal *\*k̑* to Lyc. *s*. Nevertheless, Pedersen's interpretation remains problematic morphologically. His comparison with the type of Hitt. *iyannāi* 'marches' has no independent support. Furthermore, it faces the obstacle cited by Gusmani, *IF* 67 (1962) 162: in *TL* 128,2 the form *siĵani* apparently is construed with a first person singular subject: ... *isbazi amu [siĵ]ani teli se lada*. The cooccurrence with both first and third person subjects points to a non-finite form, and Gusmani tentatively suggests a participle comparable to Gmc. *\*-ono-*. However, there is no other evidence in Anatolian for such a participle. In the article cited in note 3 I have proposed that *siĵēni/siĵani* represents an infinitive in predicative use: 'So-and-so (is) to lie'. For the form I compared *kumezeini* in *TL* 65,12 beside usual *kumezeine* 'to sacrifice, worship'. Since we know that the Lycian tombs were often prepared in advance, a prescriptive infinitive 'is to lie' is contextually appropriate. Nor would two infinitival endings be surprising: cf. Hitt. *-anna* and *-wanzi*. Nevertheless, the hapax *kumezeini* in an unclear context is a slim basis for assuming a class of infinitives in *-ni*.

Since *siĵēni* itself is not helpful, let us attack the problem of the middle voice in Lycian by means of forward reconstruction. Thanks to recent work by K. Yoshida,<sup>8)</sup> we now know that Common Anatolian inherited medial endings with final *-r* (at least in the third person). There was a barytone type such as *\*kēyor* and *\*kētor* 'lies' and a less common oxytone type such as *\*tkōr* 'is visible'. Final *-r* was then lost in CA after unaccented vowels,<sup>9)</sup> and the particle *-i* was added to the type with preserved *-r*: hence *\*kēyo* and *\*kēito* but *\*tkōri*. With minor adjustments this is the pattern attested in Old Hittite: *kitta* but *tiqāri*.

Lycian would have inherited the preforms just cited as *\*sije*, *\*site*, and *\*tkēri* (for the phonology see my works referred to above). I am not aware of evidence for any of these. The type of *\*tkēri* was not numerous and could have been lost without a trace. The type of *\*sije* and *\*site* with its undercharacterized ending would have been subject to renewal. We know that under conditions which are not yet clear Lycian added a final nasal to most finite verbs.<sup>10)</sup> The nasal leaves no trace in the present active, because nasalization is lost in high vowels, but we have no reason to suppose that nasalization was restricted to the preterite. We would also expect the nasalization to have affected most middle forms, and the preterite ending *-xagā* identified above confirms that this happened. The preform *\*sije* would thus have become *\*siĵēn*. Addition of final *-i* to mark the present (analogical to the present active) would lead to the attested *siĵēni*.

The above scenario of addition of first final nasal and then final *-i* is of course purely hypothetical. A more obvious and serious

<sup>8)</sup> *The Hittite Mediopassive Endings in -ri*, de Gruyter, Berlin/New York (1990).

<sup>9)</sup> I have elsewhere presented independent evidence for this rule in Hittite nouns: see *A Linguistic Happening in Memory of Ben Schwartz* (ed. Y. Arbeitman), Louvain (1988) 215-234.

<sup>10)</sup> While we do not yet understand the precise conditioning for this phenomenon, it is certainly not random, as already seen by Imbert, *MSL* 10 (1898) 217. See the thorough discussion by Meriggi, *IF* 46 (1928) 151 ff. The contention of Laroche, *FdX* 6. 87 f., that the phenomenon is purely graphic is manifestly false, as is his claim, *ibid.* 82, that *ē* and *ā* do not always indicate nasalized vowels. The non-random distribution of the nasalized endings likewise argues against the analysis by Carruba, *SMEA* 24 (1984) 57-69, whose ingenious attempt to find nasalized endings in HLuvian is also unconvincing. For a generally persuasive account of the Lycian nasalized endings see the article by A. Garrett to appear in *MSS*. I will return to this issue below.

objection is that this account, like Pedersen's, must assume that *siĵēni* is specifically third person singular: what are we to do with *siĵani* which occurs with a first person subject?

A reexamination of TL 128 brings a considerable surprise. Kalinka's own drawing, TAM I 85, shows only the top portion of the first three letters preserved. The reading of the first two as *si* is reasonably certain, but the third consists only of the topmost part of a vertical stroke. This may easily be *j* (yod), which in the Lycian alphabet consists only of a vertical stroke. However, it could just as well be *x*, which has the shape ↓. Moreover, Kalinka in his notes indicates that Arkwright, who collated the inscription in 1894, thought he could read more of the word than Kalinka. Arkwright in fact reads the third letter as a complete and unmistakable *x*! Kalinka's reading *siĵani* is clearly influenced by the notion that the word is a variant of the better-known *siĵēni*. On the other hand, there is nothing to indicate that Arkwright had any preconceptions about what the word ought to be. Objectively, then, his reading *sixani* is to be preferred.

The C-Anatolian preform of the first person singular of 'lie' would have been \**keiĥ<sub>2</sub>e(r)*. This would have led regularly to Lycian \**sixa* and by the same steps outlined above for the third person to the attested *sixani*, which I assert is the regular Lycian reflex of 'I lie'.

The Lycian third person singular *siĵēni* matches CLuv. *ziĵar(i)* and Vedic *śáye*, continuing a third singular ending without \*-*t*-. As already suggested, Hitt. *kitta(ri)* and Pal. *kītar* 'lies' show that Anatolian also had a third person form \**keitor*, which led to \**keito* and pre-Lycian \**sīte* as per above. Addition of a final nasal and then -*i* would in this case lead to *siĵēni*.

This predicted middle 'lies' is attested twice. One example may be regarded as quite certain. In the Létōon Trilingual (N 320, 25) we find: *me-tje-sitēni-ti: hlāmīpijata (= καὶ ὄτι ἄν ἐκφάριον ἐκ τούτων γένηται)*. The Greek translation makes the overall sense clear enough, and Laroche, *FdX* 6.72, analyzes the Lycian as *me-* (conjunction), *-ij(e)-* 'therein', *-esi-* 'is', *-ti* 'which' and *hlāmī-pijata* 'tribute, income' (or similar). He translates freely 'et tout le profit que l'on retirera' (i. e. 'and the income which is therein'). However, he admits that this leaves the element *-tēni-* unaccounted for. I assert that the verb is not 'is', but rather *siĵēni* 'lies': 'And the tribute which lies therein'.

The other example of *siĵēni* is found in TL 44b, 61. As usual in the 'Stele of Xanthos', the precise sense of the passage is not yet

determinable, but the overall context is certainly compatible with the sense 'lie': ... *se-ti Teθθiweiĵi: ada mē: Leθθi: qlā: me-siĵēni: eb[e]lja Gatāi: Zeusi: ŋterwē: Xñtawati: sberide: xñtawati tpelezije: se-ñterwē: Suxinaje: tpelezije: xñtawatiĵe* ... And Tethiweiĵi likewise (?) made for himself the precinct of Leto.<sup>11</sup>) And these (monuments) lie opposite King Zeus ... and opposite Sukina in the royal ... That much remains uncertain is obvious, but we know enough of the Lycian lexicon to be sure that at least the preceding fifteen lines refer to the building of various cult centers. I find it likely that the neuter plural *ebēĵja* 'these' refers to some subset of these. The Lycian word *ñterwē* is the functional equivalent of Hitt. *menahhanda* 'opposite, facing'. It is thus reasonable that the sentence containing *siĵēni* refers to the physical location of the complexes described. A verb 'lie' is obviously appropriate for such a context. A singular verb with a neuter plural is, of course, quite natural for an old IE language.<sup>12</sup>)

Whatever the sense of the preceding passage, the meaning of *siĵēni* 'lies' in the Trilingual is reasonably certain. Our forward reconstruction has thus led us to the discovery of three attested finite forms of Lyc. *si-* 'lie': present first singular *sixani*, present third singular *siĵēni*, and present third singular *siĵēni*.<sup>13</sup>) Unfortunately for my hypothesis, Andrew Garrett, in a paper to appear in *MSS*, has made a strong case that the nasalized endings in Lycian active verbs ultimately reflect an enclitic accusative (singular) pronoun and occur only with transitive verbs. If his analysis is correct, then we must seek another source of the nasalization in the Lycian middle endings.

As for the preterite first singular ending *-xagā*, it could be equated with the *-ān* of the Greek first singular ending *-μᾶν*, where the *-m-*

<sup>11</sup>) For the interpretation of this sentence see Laroche, *FdX* 6.114.

<sup>12</sup>) A present third plural preform \**keŋontor* would have led by the same hypothesis to a Lycian \**siĵēni*. Since we do not yet control the conditions for syncope in Lycian, it is conceivable that the plural would also have resulted in *siĵēni* (with syncope of the second syllable). Obviously, a neuter plural might be construed with a plural verb in first-millennium Lycian. However, *pijata* 'gift' is elsewhere an animate noun, so I find the singular interpretation more likely. Note that both instances of *siĵēni* are in relatively late texts. It is thus possible to view the form not as an inheritance alongside *siĵēni*, but rather as a renewal of the latter (like Skt. *śete* for *śáye*).

<sup>13</sup>) Given the lenition rule after accented long vowels cited at the beginning of this paper, we would actually expect 1st singular \**siĵani* and 3rd singular \**siĵēni*. Analogical restoration of the unlenited forms is hardly surprising: cf. note 5.

is certainly secondary. It is also worth mentioning within Anatolian the HLUvian ending *-han*, which Carruba, *SMEA* 24 (1984) 60 ff., has convincingly shown is preterite first singular, not plural. It is true that *-han* appears to be synchronically isofunctional with the regular preterite active ending *-ha*, but such "irrational" nasalization must have started somewhere.<sup>14)</sup>

Sanskrit, of course, shows a secondary middle ending *-dhvam* in the second person plural, but the real locus of middle endings with a final nasal is in the imperative, where we find 3rd sg. *-iām* and *-ām*, 3rd pl. *-ntām* and *-atām*. As argued by Watkins, *Idg. Gram.* III/1. 93 f., these third person forms are at least as old as Indo-Iranian, and there is no good reason not to take the third singular form *-ām* without *-t-* as an archaism like its counterparts without dental stop (cf. Lyc. *sijēni* etc. above). See also his tentative comparison with Grk. *-μᾶν*, *ibid.* 130.

Obviously, the status of these various middle endings with final nasal relative to each other and to other middle endings (such as those in *\*-r*) is anything but clear. I would in any case not wish to assume a fully elaborated paradigm of such endings for Common Anatolian. It does seem possible to suppose that Common Anatolian, and hence Lycian, did have some middle forms marked by a final nasal. These could have been taken as the starting point for the apparent (I stress **apparent!**) synchronic Lycian system of preterite middle endings in final nasal (*-xagā*) versus present middle endings in *-ni* (*-xani*, *-ēni*, *-tēni*).

Whatever the correct explanation for the nasalization of the endings, I believe the comparison of Lyc. *-xagā* and Hitt. *-ḫaḫat(i)* is compelling. Furthermore, when we find Lyc. *sixani* (sic!) construed with a first singular subject but *sijēni* and *sitēni* with third singular subjects, it is hard to avoid the conclusion that these are finite forms. The interpretation of Lyc. *si-* as 'lie' is also phonologically impeccable (cf. especially CLuv. *zīyar*), and the meaning 'lie' fits all contexts in which the verb occurs. The verb 'lie' is elsewhere within Anatolian and Indo-European a medium tantum, and the attested Lycian endings are clearly not the regular active forms. Lycian *-xani*, *-ēni* and *-tēni* can hardly be anything but **present middle endings**. Lycian

<sup>14)</sup> The other examples of such "irrational" nasalization cited by Carruba in Anatolian are all found in pronominal adverbs and are likely to have a common starting point. However, it is hard to see what would have motivated the spread of such a pattern to a verb ending.

must be added to the list of Anatolian languages which preserve the middle voice.<sup>15)</sup>

#### Appendix: Enclitic *-ñne*

The Lycian enclitic *-ñne* has previously been taken as a mere variant of *-ē(ne)*, the enclitic third person accusative pronoun 'him, her, them'; see e.g. Larøche, *FdX* 6 (1979) 61 and 64.<sup>16)</sup> Neumann, *Sprache* 20 (1974) 112 f., has even suggested that the sequence *mēñna/mēñne* represents a word 'city' (for the problems of this proposal see Larøche, *FdX* 6.112<sup>1)</sup>).

A closer examination, however, shows that the enclitic *-ñne* with geminate nasal does not stand in free variation with accusative *-ē(ne)*. The clearest example is found in *TL* 45, 1 ff.: [*pijet*]e-*ññ-ē* *Pi-xe[s]ere Katamlah Arñna se Tlawā se P[inal]e se Xadawāti me-ññ-a*[...]. For the correct restoration of [*pijet*]e (= *ἔδοξε*) in the Greek text) see Larøche, *FdX* 6.111. Larøche interprets *-ññē* as proleptic accusative 'it', but **nowhere** in Lycian is the accusative pronoun *-ññē*, with geminate nasal **plus** a final nasalized vowel. The only reasonable analysis is that the final *-ē* represents the accusative pronoun 'it' (as often), while the preceding *-ññ(e)*- must mean something else. The context suggests that *-ññ(e)* is proleptic dative plural 'to them', referring to the cities named in the dative: 'To them Píkhesere son of K. gave it—to Xanthos, Tlos, Pınara and Kadyanda.' As already indicated by Larøche, *me-ññ-a*[...] begins a new clause: 'And to/for them ...'. As often, the final vowel of the enclitic has been elided before a vowel: cf. *m-en-adē* for *m-ene-adē* 'made it' in *TL* 71, 1.

The interpretation of *-ñne* as dative plural 'to/for them' is confirmed by the two occurrences in the Létóon Trilingual. In lines 2–4 we find *sē-ñne-ñite-pādēhadē Trñmile pādēnehñmis İjeru se Natrbbi-jēmi* 'And for them, the Lycians, he appointed as deputies I. and N.'<sup>17)</sup> The *-ñne-* cannot be proleptic accusative 'them' (anticipating

<sup>15)</sup> There are a number of other verb forms ending in *-ēni* or *-āni* which may represent additional examples of the present middle in Lycian, but I cannot yet offer persuasive interpretations for any of them: *lawitēnu* (*TL* 107 a, 2), *maxitēni* (*TL* 26, 5), and *zasāni* (*TL* 150, 9). Note also the Milyan forms *ñuwitēni* (*TL* 44 c, 45–46. d 29.31) and *pidritēni* (*TL* 44 c, 56–57).

<sup>16)</sup> The accusative enclitic pronoun is, as Larøche suggests, surely generalized from anim. acc. sg. *\*-om* (= Luv., Hitt. *-an*), attested both with (*-ēne/-ene*) and without (*-ē*) a prop vowel.

<sup>17)</sup> The nasal vowel of *sē-* could be secondary, provoked by the following

*padēnehm̄m̄is*), because the Trilingual never uses a proleptic accusative pronoun.<sup>18</sup>) This includes a number of clauses with structures parallel to the sentence above, as in the immediately following *se(j)-Arīna asaxlazū Er̄timeli* 'and (appointed) for Xanthos as governor E.' Compare also line 20: *se-šm̄mati xddazas* 'and he obliges (or simil.) the slaves ...'

On the contrary, the remaining example of *-ñne* in the Trilingual also cooccurs with a dative plural (lines 9–10): *sē-ñn-aiitē kumazu mā-hāna ebette Eeimiju Qūturahahñ* 'And for them – these gods – they made E., son of Q., priest.'

The sense 'to/for them' also fits all other occurrences of *-ñne*. In the 'Stele of Xanthos' *TL* 44 c, 3–4 *me-ñ[n]-emu axagā maraza* means 'I became judge for them' (see above). The third person plural referent is demanded by the preceding *zxxāte* and following *hātē* (both preterite third plural). Likewise *TL* 44 c, 14: ... *Kizzap̄r̄na epr̄ti-se-Parza me-ñne* ... '... Tissaphernes the subaltern (?) and the Persian. And to/for them ...'<sup>19</sup>)

A plural reference for *-ñne* is also demanded by the context of *TL* 39, 4–6, although the precise sense of this difficult text still eludes us: ... *se-θurtiāi lada se-ñne šm̄mati tijāi kbijehis me-ñne ni(j)-esu esedē-ñewi epttehi ñepte-tāne* '... and for the wives of the t's. And the ones who (??) — those of another for/to them, may it not be (permitted) for them to put in their descentance.' See Laroche, *FdX* 5.131, for

nasal consonant, as per Laroche, *FdX* 6.61, but see the alternative explanation of Garrett in the article cited.

<sup>18</sup>) The *-ē* of line 39 is not the accusative pronoun, contra Laroche, *FdX* 6.75 and 120. Lyc. *ē* = Grk. *δν* 'if': see my article cited in note 3 above, with prior references back to Torp! The lack of any proleptic accusatives *-ē(ñe)* in the Trilingual presumably is due to the fact that this text does not show the proposed accusative object so frequent in the tomb inscriptions: X (acc.) *m-ene/m-ē-ti* ... See Laroche's summary in *FdX* 6.97. For a systematic treatment see the article by Garrett cited above.

<sup>19</sup>) The context suggests that *epr̄ti* is somehow attributive to *Kizzap̄r̄na*. I tentatively analyze *epr̄ti* as a nominal relative clause *epr̄ti-ti*, literally 'who (is) behind'. For Lyc. *epr̄ti* = Luv. \**appari*- 'rear-'; later; younger' see Carruba, *Fs Bonfante* 133. An interpretation 'the younger' makes little sense, since we have no evidence to suggest the existence of more than one Tissaphernes. We do know that Darius eventually appointed Cyrus as overlord in Western Anatolia, thus effectively demoting Tissaphernes: see Xenophon, *Hell.* 1.4.3–7. I therefore find it conceivable that Lyc. *epr̄ti-ti* expresses the subordinate role of Tissaphernes. Whether this is correct or not, it is unlikely that *se* connects a relative clause and an adjective both modifying *Kizzap̄r̄na*: 'T. who (is) *epr̄ti* and a Persian'. *Parza* 'the Persian' must thus refer to someone in addition to Tissaphernes.

various attempts to solve this passage. My suggested interpretation of *tijāi* as a nominative plural of the relative pronoun (referring either to *lada* or *θurtiāi*) is quite speculative, but both *lada* and *θurtiāi* are certainly plural. Likewise *epttehi* 'their' implies that the *-ñne* of *me-ñne* must be plural.<sup>20</sup>)

The few other instances of *-ñne* are compatible with a sense 'to/for them' but are too unclear to furnish further evidence.<sup>21</sup>) In *TL* 29, 2 *se-ñne* follows reference to himself and his wife'. In *TL* 29, 7 and 10, where *me-ñne* cooccurs with preterite third plural verbs (*pijēte* and *tebētē* respectively), *-ñne* could be functioning as a dative reflexive (cf. Hitt. *-šmas*), but this cannot be asserted with confidence. The occurrences in *TL* 44 b, 14 and 54, 5 are in contexts too unclear to make any interpretation. In view of the evidence presented above, it does seem likely that *TL* 27, 1 ff. shows the same structure as *TL* 45 with a faulty spelling: *Mexistē-(ñ)n-ē ep[i] twete atli ehbi Sxxulijah tideimi sa-ladi ehbi Merimawaj[e] ...*, 'For them Mekhistos erected it — for himself, son of Skhuliyos, and for his wife, Merimawa ...'<sup>22</sup>)

In summary, then, all occurrences of *-ñne* in Lycian are consistent with the meaning 'to/for them'. Some instances such as *TL* 45, 1 and those in the Trilingual demand such a sense. I repeat that in over a hundred occurrences the accusative enclitic pronoun is never spelled with a geminate *-ñn-*. We therefore not only should but indeed must isolate Lycian *-ñne* as the enclitic third person plural dative pronoun 'to/for them'.<sup>23</sup>)

CB # 3155, Dey Hall, U.N.C.  
Chapel Hill, N.C. 27599, U.S.A.  
H. Craig Melchert

<sup>20</sup>) *esedēñewi* is clearly dative singular, with Thomsen, *EL* 61 f. The syntax of *esedēñewi ... ñepte-tāne* is the Lycian continuant of the PIE 'double dative' construction, also well-attested in the other IE languages of Anatolia.

<sup>21</sup>) Kalinka's emendation of *meñje* to *meñne* in *TL* 134, 1 is unjustified and makes no sense in the context. Read the text as it stands with *m-eñ-je* 'and her therein' (syncopated from expected *m-en-ije*).

<sup>22</sup>) For the nasal *-ē* of *Mexistē* see note 17 (but a nominative singular *Mexistē* cannot be excluded!). For the defective spelling with single nasal cf. *ebēñē* for usual *ebēññē* in *TL* 4, 1.

<sup>23</sup>) We have no way to determine whether *-ñne* also serves for the first and second person plural dative. Phonologically, Lycian *-ñne* is most easily derived from \**-ñōs* (cf. Hitt. *-ñmas* 'us' likewise with secondary geminate *-m-*), but a generalization of the first person form to the second and third person would be quite unexpected.