SECOND THOUGHTS ON *Y AND H₂ IN LYDIAN

It is a pleasure to offer to René Lebrun, in recognition of his contributions to our understanding of the ancient Indo-European languages of Western Anatolia, the following reconsiderations of problems in Lydian historical phonology. What follows was directly inspired by the recent Mémoire of Raphaël Gérard, completed under the direction of Professor René Lebrun1. Our honoree will readily appreciate that my analyses are offered in the spirit of a continuing dialogue and that they make no claim to the status of "solutions.”

1. *y > d in Lydian

In 1994 I argued that PIE *y appears in Lydian as d intervocically and probably word-initially before vowels2. I did not then address the question of the fate of *y in syllable-final position. Elsewhere I did take note of the absence of any compelling examples for reflexes of diphthongs in *Py in Lydian3. I now believe this lack is due to the fact that such sequences also led to Py in Lydian.

As a first example of this development I cite the relative pronoun qed. I have previously followed others in assigning this word to an alternate stem qe- of the relative-interrogative qi-, but there is in fact no other evidence for such an alleged stem5. Descriptively, we simply find qed as an
alternative to neuter nominative-accusative qid. The latter, the quite regular reflex of neuter nom.-acc. singular *K'ud and direct cognate of Hittite kuit, notably serves synchronically for both singular and plural!; I now suggest that Lydian qed is likewise the cognate of Hittite neuter nom.-acc. plural kue. With the loss of contrast between singular and plural in the pronouns in Lydian, qid and qed became mere formal variants with no contrast in function.

The source of the -e of Hittite neuter (collective) nom.-acc. plural kue has long presented a problem. Whatever the origin of the non-direct case endings, all other forms of the nominative and accusative of the interrogative-relative pronoun in Hittite point to an i-stem (kwui, kuyii, kwii, kwüii, kuuud), and no evidence from the other Anatolian languages argues against projecting this situation back to Proto-Anatolian. We thus may reasonably expect an i-stem source for kue, but it clearly does not reflect *Kue. I propose with due reserve that Hittite kue and Lydian qed continue a more archaic type of i-stem collective, a « hysterokinesis » K'ue. Compare Hittite uhdé, udné « land » < *udnöy<udné and kwüii « fallow land » < *K'üii. 

As shown by uhdé, the phonological development to Hittite kue is straightforward. Lydian qed requires some comment. Since original long *e probably yields Lydian i, I assume pre-Lydian shortening of tautosyllabic *ey to *ey, leading to ed. Lydian kwé- « priest » < *kowéy, with lengthened grade generalized from the nominative singular to the rest of the paradigm (cf. Avestan nom. sg. kowá) supports this development, but one then asks why kwé- shows no trace of the d < *ty. This may be attributed to simplification of the nom. sg. *kowery< to attested kwéy from which a stem kwéy- was generalized. Attested sequences of nom. sg. -dii in edii, kurfilad, and patmèi (NB with palatal sibilant!) do not argue against such a reduction of pre-Lydian *x-di, since they may reflect recent syncope of an i-stem nom. sg. ending -di!

As a second candidate for d from syllable-final *y I offer the noun (kat) « kudamél. It has long been established that kudamél- is a compound of kudamél- plus the preverb kat- (cf. Hittite katma « down »). The two words occur together in 10,8-9: ak cernal nāra qa širs ciw-wali kudamél-fak-at-«m- mit šuš « iti kutowal kudamél-. The suggested meaning « Unterschrift » for kudamél- (i.e. the lower part of the inscription) is very unlikely given the modifying adjective ciw-wali « divine ». It seems reasonably certain that kutowalk kudamél refers to the text itself, most of which is a first-person verbal declaration of Katoas. This conclusion is supported by the other occurrences of kudamél- in text 26, which likewise appear to refer to the inscription on the stele or its contents. If we ask what the likely difference is between a divine and human declaration of some kind, one answer is that the former is imposed from above (i.e. downwards, hence the further specification by kat-). Simple kudamél- would be something like «injunction, instruction, bidding » (of an individual), while kudamél- would be « edict, decree » (of some higher authority).

A sense « decree » is also very compatible with the context of the verb karvi-, which appears repeatedly in text 22. As established by D. Schäfer, text 22 deals with declarations made by the inhabitants of Sardis regarding a group of persons designated by the word mlimn-. Despite our very imperfect understanding of the specifics, D. Schäfer is surely correct in supposing that the basic subject matter is the legal status of the mlimn-, probably with particular attention to property. I therefore suggest that the verb karvi- « decree » contains not only the same prefix as the noun kudamél- but also the same root: *kvi- beside kiš. The forms *kvi- and kiš- reflect ablaut variants *vi- and *viy-. An Anatolian verbal root with suitable semantics is not hard to find: *kviyi- « bind », among whose derivatives is Hittite dḥam«, with a range of meanings that includes «injunction, instruction, statute ».
We may thus revise our preforms to *s[h]ji- and *s[h]wp, We have no hope of recovering the pre-Lyrian inflection of the verb, but *sdhme- * binding > « injurious, instruction » may be analyzed as a mon-stem of the type of Greek saxe/o- « shepherd », from a virtual *s[has]y-μεν-. This would have led by regular developments to Lydian *sdhme- which was trivially altered to *sdnme - under the influence of the corresponding verb, where *yn- < *yn- was regularly palatalized to *yn- after loss of the laryngeal between consonant and vowel.

Whether any other cases of syllable-final *d in Lydian reflect *y must be left as an open question (waretsax in 11.5 remains opaque to me).

2. *h₁ > Lydian h?

A consensus appears to have developed that Lydian shows no direct trace of the PIE « laryngeals », including *h₁. The general dearth of assured etymologies for Lydian does mean that this conclusion is based on very restricted evidence. Even if we are generous in including all remotely plausible examples, we are limited to cases in postconsonantal or word-initial position: e.g. aara- « courtyard, property » < *h₁arh₁- (if cognate with Hittite arh₂- « border, territory »), eso- « child, offspring » < *h₁es₂, wexfa- « living » < virtual *h₁wex₁wera-. Notably lacking here is evidence for intervocalic *h₁.

As I have suggested elsewhere, Lydian karha- means something like « protector, patron », and a sense shall watch over, protect » is also suitable for the compound verb karandur in 11.2. The presence of the preverb kar- « down » in the latter led me to compare Avestan nr-hur- « watch over, guard ». A meaning « protection » likewise fits well the context of the noun karaka- in 24.1.4-15: artimal-k-ii « ever-in

karaka=k nikamek sawer- « He (the violator) also shall not in any way experience » and protection from/on the part of Artemis ».

We may thus isolate a Lydian suffix -aka- that forms abstract nouns. It appears also in the nouns aðokad (10.14) and aðok- (11.8) and indirectly in the denominative verbs karpok-ad- « steal », kadarkad- « bring defeat, demotion », and wapzkad- « enahre » (?)5Lydian aðrok(1-2) recalls CLuvian aðrisk-, but the meaning of both words is too uncertain to assert with confidence that they are related. Nevertheless, the formal resemblance emboldens me to suggest that Lydian -aka- reflects a secondary « thematization » of the same abstract suffix as that seen in CLuvian -aj- and -also indirectly in Hittite -atar. For the secondary treatment as -a- stems compare the similar development in Hittite manauqu-da- « portion, share ».

We should also probably assume synchronic stems *alwanz₃h₂- « witchcraft » (attested in the instrumental alwanz₆h₂st and ablative alwanz₃h₃st) and *mamnukuwa₃h₂- « victory » (attested in the dat.-loc. singular mamnukuwa₃h₂). I assume a similar development in Lydian nouns in -aka. The apparent discrepancy in gender between Hittite manauqu-da and Lydian aðokad is not a serious obstacle, since the treatment as -a- stems would surely have been independent. The appearance of *h₁ as a dorsal stop is paralleled in Lydian, where there is widespread agreement that it appears under at least some conditions as q or qʷ. The preservation of *h₁ intervocally versus its loss word-initially before vowel is admittedly surprising, but hardly impossible. A far more serious issue is the o-vocalism of -aka- allegedly from *s[h]wp (i.e. *-[h]-HV-). A complete reassessment of the problem of o and o vocalism in Lydian is not possible here, and I restrict myself to the following remarks. First of all, Lydian o likely represents a relatively open vowel [o] or [ø]. Second, prehistoric short *e and *o merge (together with *e) as e and ã
in accented position before nasal in closed and open syllables respectively, and short ´a, o and e also merge as a in unaccented position\(^1\). Third, other than in the alleged environment in question, *-dH*, we unfortunately have no secure reflexes of accented short *o* in Lydian\(^2\). Finally, while accented short *o* other than before nasal clearly yields Lydian *z* in some environments, we have no evidence for many others, including notably *-dHz*\(^3\). It is highly unlikely that all cases of attested *o* in Lydian may be attributed to the presence of an adjacent prehistoric *e* or labiovelar\(^2\).

Under these circumstances it does not seem that a partial or even complete merger of prehistoric short *a* and *e* can be excluded. Current evidence would permit either a complete merger of short *a* and *e* to *o* (i.e. [2] or [4]) versus long *a* and *e* to *o* (cf. Slavic), with a secondary conditioned split of the new *o* into *a* and a under conditions to be determined, or merely a partial conditioned merger of prehistoric short *a* with *o* as *o* ([2]). Obviously, pending a successful determination of such conditioning or the discovery of new evidence the account proposed here of -oku- as a reflex of *-auU2I* must remain hypothetical.

---

H. Craig MELCHERT
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

---

1 GÉRAD, R., *Phonétique et morphologie de la langue lydienne*, louvain, 2001. I am much indebted to the author for generously making a copy of this most stimulating work available to me in advance of its formal publication.


5 See 2.6, where *motBell/Anaven t[b]on gdr*-a *tarr *all those m. which I built* and GUSMANN, R., *LW*, p.44.

6 I see nothing to recommend a derivation from a dual ending *-e*, as suggested e.g. by EICHNER, H., *JST* 31, 1973, p.79. His alternative suggestion of a plural ending *-e* would represent a more archaic version of the *-e* presented here. A prefix *-*[a/*i*] without final lenisatal (JASANOFF, L., pers. comm.) is also possible. However, given the presence of other examples in Hittite of lengthened-grade collective plurals to stems in sonorant (e.g. qatuš-er/*-e*), I prefer to assume likewise already *-e* for Proto-Anatolian. The older comparison with Latin *aeus* (e.g. STORTEVANT, E. H., *A Comparative Grammar of the Hittite Language*, Revised edition, New Haven, 1951, p.36) is no longer viable. Latin *aeus* surely reflects *-auUr*: see


* Cf. kru- « house » with secondary *-stern from original * peers cognate with Hittite kru- and see MELCHERT, C., AHP, p.367.

* Lydian a-ter = *-t-ter obviously precludes monophthongization of the long diaphong *-t- already in Proto-Anatolian, against MELCHERT, C., AHP p.345 et al. Hittite kulti infa und subj cit in above also argues against any previous assumption. The alternative derivation from *-t-ter cited in note 6 above would likewise require preservation of the short diaphong *-t- in Proto-Anatolian. Arguments for monophthongization of *-ter in PA remain fragile: on this issue see MELCHERT, C., AHP, p.56, and GÉRARD, R., op.cit., p.53 with references.

If paintall represents a possessive name (see GUSSMAN, R., LW p.76), it is conceivable that it reflects the type man in Lycian Piyel, etymologically < *-t-the splendid one(s), with the Anatolian *ntion-i added to an *-stern formed with *individualizing = *-ion- (type of Lycian Nadelj), * the noble one(s). On these see MELCHERT, C., Tocharian and Indo-European Studies 9, 2000, p.70. A nom. sg. *-t-er could have led to *-er, whereas a new stem in *-er, which was later extended to *-er, as in Lycian. Hiatu-filling *-er in Lydian gave *-er-er- (in the nom. sg. *add -add).
His own solution in terms of loss of inter-inali- *y* before *e* leaves unexplained these forms in *Fyo* (though obviously unsatisfactory leveling cannot be excluded). I now prefer to return to my original formulation, IF 97, 1992, pp. 46 ff., by which the change *pe* > *e* takes place intonationally in regular fashion, followed by syncope of the vowel of the ending. We treat the change of *y* to *e* in such place here may be left open. Thus e.g. pr. 444 *sodem > a *sodem > a *sadem > a *a* while pros. 3rd sg. *sipol > *sipol > *s/edol > *s/edol > *ed and *dedy > *dedy > *dedy.  

26 See e.g. MELCHERT, C., AHP, p. 361, and GERÄRD, R., op. cit., p. 76. As per MELCHERT, C., AHP, p. 65, "may well have already been lost in Proto-Austro-Albanian. I am in any case not aware of any proposed reflexes of *Hy* as a consonant in Lydian. I know of no plausible examples that provide any evidence for the fate of *Hy*. We see this thus for proper names, and set a limit to the consideration of the reflexes of *Hy*.  

27 I now accept the arguments of GERÄRD, R., op. cit., pp. 39-40, that Lydian *e* represents a relatively open vowel such as [e] (or even [i]) and also say that it does represent its nasalized counterpart, as phonetic [β], against MELCHERT, C., AHP p. 343 et alius 14, for this reason I cannot accept the proposal of SCHÜRR, D., Kadmos 31, 1999), p. 372, to transliterate *ε* as *ε* as I now assume a development *φηινος > *φυς (for precompositival *φυς > *φυς see MELCHERT, C., AHP, p. 365) > *μεν ~ loss of nasalization in an original sequence *νε. Cf. the alternate solution of GERÄRD, R., op. cit., pp. 47-48.  

28 The derivation of *marnas- (stem of or context of a grave) from a PA prefix *me- (stem of *smarnas, *huma) (MELCHERT, C., AHP, p. 331, after GUSSMANN, R.), is a mere possibility semantically and highly unlikely phonologically, since it form an original sequence *ne-* we would expect only *ne* if accented and *ne* if unaccented (see MELCHERT, C., AHP, pp. 348 and 343 respectively). For this reason I now reject this etymology.  

29 MELCHERT, C., IF 97, 1992, p. 47.  

30 The same expression occurs with *εν the place of these gods* in 23.13-13. For Lydian *su-mus-* as *see, experience* see CARRUBA, O., Athenaeum 47, 1969, p. 51f. For a possible etymology *συμ* see MELCHERT, C., IF 97, 1992, p. 48.  

31 I take attested *arail* as the *sc. singular* (for *I* instead of regular *I* the consensual cf. glided in 23.l). Against SCHÜRR, D., Zeitschr. Linguistik 23 (2000), p. 114, the word argirō (nct 11,4) is related. No metathesis is required, merely syncope of the prothetic vowel in a derived adjective *arail Nikola* (for the suffix -ail- cf. kundail-) and then roasting of it next to a (real tendency despite SCHÜRR's protestations to the contrary).  

32 For the unity of this set see already correctly SCHÜRR, D., op. cit., p. 115. Against SCHÜRR, D., ibid. p. 116, I retain the meaning *steals* for *kuproko*, and derivation from a *kuprok-*, *thief, thievery* (see MELCHERT, C., op. cit., DETTINGER, N., IF 108, 1994, p. 43, after an idea of WEISS, M.). For *kudarok-*, *steal* I reject the reading *steal* in Lydian, and the paradigm:  
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36 For the unity of this set see already correctly SCHÜRR, D., op. cit., p. 115. Against SCHÜRR, D., ibid. p. 116, I retain the meaning *steals* for *kuproko*, and derivation from a *kuprok-*, *thief, thievery* (see MELCHERT, C., op. cit., DETTINGER, N., IF 108, 1994, p. 43, after an idea of WEISS, M.). For *kudarok-*, *steal* I reject the reading *steal* in Lydian, and the paradigm:

22 I add further Lydian a, but this development is not universally accepted. See for discussion with references to divergent views MELCHERT, C., AHP p.305ff. See further HÄNSEL, I., Der Ly frikische Faktussatz, Graz, 1995, pp.18-21 and 26-30, on both the synchronic value of q and a as stops and on their prehistoric sources.

23 See GÉRARD, R., op.cit., p.39, correcting the grievous error of MELCHERT, C., AHP, pp.43, 343, et aliter. Cf. note 21 above on the similar accusative regarding Lydian e.


25 We cannot, of course, prove that the *a of *aHw· was accented, but that merely is the unmarked assumption. Neither of the two purported examples of accented short *a cited in MELCHERT, C., AHP, p.369, is probative. If the suggested etymology of *qu(s) *possae is correct, it likely reflects long *a*s. (cf. Greek *o()s ja>ja pompae) and see correctly GÉRARD, op. cit. p.66). The *Lalw·or* a father's sando- can easily reflect a preton *adda*- instead of *adda*.

26 For Lydian a · *a see MELCHERT, C., AHP pp.347, citing examples such as ad(a)-, ad(a)·, and ad(a)·- (in accent, casual, ad(a)·-). The accent here is ensured by sec. sg. ad(a). On the Lydian accent see the fundamental work of EICHER, H., « Die Akzentuation des Lydischen », Sprache 32, 1986, pp.7-21.

27 See the discussions in MELCHERT, C., AHP pp.346 and 368, and GÉRARD, R., op.cit. pp.45-46 and 50, neither of which accounts for more than a fraction of the examples of a.