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II. The Dialectal Position of Lydian

There is a general consensus on the "relatively" early isolation of Lydian from the other dialects: see e.g. Kronasser (1956: 234), Carruba (1963: 398), and Oettinger (1978: 92) - but compare the stemma in Starke (1997: 468). Opinion diverges as to its further affiliations. One viewpoint claims an especially close affinity with Hittite (with or without Palaios); cautiously Kammhuber (1959: 12), citing Sommer (1947: 32f.); Carruba (1961: 45f.); and 1963: passim. As an alternative proposal makes Lydian part of a "western Anatolian" group (again with or without Palaios): thus Oettinger (1978: 92), Gusmani (1985: 13), Starke (1997: 468).

I do not find the evidence cited for the first viewpoint compelling. Most features shared by Lydian with Hittite are retentions: the pronominal nt. nom.-acc. sg. ending in -d (Kammhuber 1959: 12); the gen./dative, pl. ending -av = OH -an (Carruba 1961: 461 - accent in any case Lydian -d), relatively less: "-enutation" in a-stems (Carruba 1961: 459). The clumed common innovations are either false or unprovable. If Hittite pronominal genitive -d is cognate with Lydian dat. sg. -d, this feature is not a clear innovation, since it is not borrowed from Hittic -d (contra Sommer 1947: 33 et al.) - see rather Gusmani (1995: 14). But the equation is by no means assured: cf. Oettinger (1978: 85 after Eichner). The Lydian pretetitne 1st sg. ending -v may reflect directly *-om, and there is no proof that it matches the innovative Hittite by-ending -bha, while Lydian -av is probably first plural (contra Carruba 1961: 460 & 1963: 407). Contra Carruba (1961: 45f.), the Lydian iterated dat.-loc. plural ending -av is not cognate with the Hittite pronominal gen. pl. -ean (for the latter see Melchert 1994a: 121 with refs.). There is also no general contraction of *-iye > i in Lydian (Melchert 1994a vs. Carruba 1963: 386) - in any case Lydian shows the same syncope. In sum, I am not aware of any compelling common innovations of Hittite and Lydian. One cannot help but conclude that their alleged similarity consists essentially in that they do not share in several features peculiar to Luwian and Lycian.

On the other hand, there are a few solid and significant common innovations shared by Lydian with Luwian and Lycian: (1) pres. 1st sg. in *-ei (Carruba 1963: 392, Oettinger 1978: 84); (2) new stem *bev-i: "place, put" (Oettinger 1978: 89); (3) PIE *beh > d (Melchert 1979); (4) *ye > y (Oettinger 1976/77), but false for Palaios. Even if one accepts all of these, however, their number is modest. I believe we must cautiously concede that current evidence leaves open three scenarios.

The first possibility is that Lydian is simply one more Anatolian dialect like all the others: it has diverged from the common pre-stage Proto-Anatolian by a series of unique

- Further examples are less assured in terms of the Lydians: a new anim. nom. pl. in *-me (Melchert 1991: 138); active pres. 3rd sg. in *-e (Oettinger 1978: 66); 3rd pers. sg. dat. in *-a (Oettinger 1978: 85 after Eichner).
innovations. A few of the features it shares with other dialects are due to later developments spread areas. Its unique, aberrant appearance is an illusion due to the paucity of data and our very limited understanding of what we do have. Note that it currently seems possible to view Carians as a transition dialect between Lydian and Lydian, removing the latter from some of its isolation (cf. van den Hout 1999 et al.).

The second possibility is that Lydian was the first Anatolian dialect to isolate itself from the others, presumably in the far west of Asia Minor. The relatively few shared innovations with the other western dialects (notably Luvian and Lydia) would be due to later contact when speakers of these languages (or rather of their predecessors) moved into the area. See the remarks of Carroba (1963: 395ff.) and especially those of Stacke (1987: 457ff.) on the spread of Lydia.

Despite my previous strong claims to the contrary (e.g. Melchert 1994a: 5ff.), I also do not think we can entirely exclude a third possibility: Lydian is not derived from the common prestige we define as Proto-Anatolian, but is an independent IE branch in Anatolia (like the later Phrygian). What features it shares with Anatolian (most notably Luvian and Lydian) would be due entirely to convergence through contact once these languages spread into Western Asia Minor.

I personally lean at present towards the second alternative, but the basis for a decision rests on relatively few common innovations (and the apparent absence of unique shared features with Hittite). New data and further research may either confirm or alter the current picture.

III. The Dialectal Position of Lydia

It is safe to say that the standard current opinion is that Lydia is a “Luvian” dialect, see Owstinger (1976: 92), Stacke (1997: 468 and emphatically 476ff.), and even more expressly Kamenhuber (1989: 12), who takes HLuvian, and “alnem Anschein nach” also Lycian, as a constituent of CLuvian. We even find the peculiar claim of Stacke (1982: 419ff.) and (1997: 468) that Milyan (“Lycian R”) should be grouped with CLuvian and HLuvian under Lycian.

The close relationship of Lycian with Lydia has been taken as established since the work of Trirsch (1950) and Laroche (1960) and (1967). However, the claim that Lycian is a mere (late) dialect of Lydia has been challenged: see Gusman (1960, esp. 497ff.) and Melchert (1992).

That Lycians and Lydia share a very large number of glosses, including significant

4 Pursuing the ideas of Stacke, Tho van den Hout at this congress has spoken of Lydia as a linguistic “enclave” (cf. relic areas) in the west. I wish to emphasize that this terminology is independent of any ideas about where the speakers of the other dialects came from (i.e., from central Anatolia or from elsewhere). All that is crucial is the notion that the speakers of (proto-)Lydian arrived in Western Asia Minor significantly earlier than the others.

5 Aside from the trivial replacement of Lydian /u/ by MBryan /u/, this bizarre claim is based entirely on the false premise that Lydian A does not share in the plural of the animate nom. plural by an ending -OUS. As already shown by Eichner (1974: 20), the Lydian attested form plural is also based on -OUS. See also Melchert (1994a: 317f.). Whenever one decides about the dialectal position of Lydia, Lydian A and B (= Milyan) are uncontroversially closely related dialects of a single language.
common innovations, is undeniable (see Section IV below). There are, however, also crucial divergences. As pointed out by Gusmani (1960) and others, Lycian shows a gen.
plural in -e < *-om and dat.-loc.
pl. -e < *-os versus the total loss of the genitive plural and a renewed dat.-loc.
plural in *-ara in Luvian. The Lycian four-verb system /la/, /el/, /ar/, /al/ of Proto-Luvian.
Contra Stark (1997: 476f.), * conditioned split of short /a > Lyc. e is not possible - No preter.
1st sg. *-ha > *gka. The arguments of Melchert (1992) and Rasmussen (1992) for a merger of Proto-Anatolian *a with /a in Lycian versus its merger with /a in Luvian has not won universal acceptance, but no genuine arguments against their analysis have been presented. Indeed, the critical review of Hajnal (1995: 91ff.) upholds the basic claim. I must in any case insist on the absence of any demonstration that the Lycian vowel system can be derived from that of Luvian. I may add here as another divergence the use of me as the fundamental conjunction of Lycian versus its total absence in Luvian.

In sum, it is quite impossible to derive all the features of Luvian and Lycian from a single prestige stage that one could define as "Proto-Luvian", a common prestige distinguished from Proto-Anatolian by a series of common innovations and redevelopments that would justify a separate "node" in a stemma model. We should rather speak of a "southwestern" dialect group comprising at least Luvian, Lycian, and Carian, probably also Sidetic and Pisidian.6 The group is defined by a significant set of shared innovations (see Section IV below), but by the tenets of classical dialectology (as opposed to a rigid stemma model) this in no way precludes that some members of the group may also share innovative isoglosses with other Anatolian dialects (Luvian with Hittite and Palaeic, and Carian perhaps with Lydian).7 I submit that it is beyond our capabilities and therefore useless to try to decide whether the situation we observe is due to: (1) a period of post-Proto-Anatolian common development, then divergence with some subsequent secondary areal influence; or (2) simply divergence from Proto-Anatolian and then secondary contact.

IV. Tentative Inner-Anatolian Isoglosses and Subgroupings

The following list of isoglosses should be viewed as provisional and subject to change at any time. I have tried to indicate the source for the claimed shared feature, except for those generally accepted in the field.

6 The extremely sparse evidence for the last two languages would permit them to be viewed as later manifestations of Luvian in the narrow sense, but I believe proper method demands that we make the weaker hypothesis that they are closely related dialects until such time as there is evidence for their sharing specifically Luvian innovations.

7 I must in any case earnestly ask my colleagues who insist on a common Luvian-Lycian prefixe to desist from using the term "Luvian" for such a notion. First of all, such a usage misleads the unlimitedly large scholarly community that is being claimed. I can as merely one example the statement of By computational studies, JNES 33 (1992) 129: "The first millennium language spoken in Lycian was clearly <a direct descendant of Luvian,..." (even Stark (1997: 468) clearly contradicts this claim). Second, the use of the term "Luvian" in this broader sense seriously confuses the quite legitimate issue as to just how widespread geographically Luvian in the strict sense was in western Anatolia - see Stark (1997: 457ff.).
The Diachronic Position of Lydian and Lydian within Anatolian

Phonology (see globally Melchert 1994a):

2. *ph = *ph (Luvian, Lycian, Lydian) (Oertel 1976/77; but false for Palaiac)
3. *m > *m (or sim.) (Luvian, Lycian, Carian) (Melchert 1987&1989; for Carian see Adegeo 1993: 169)
4. irregular *s > *- (Luvian, Lycian)
7. *∅ > *∅ (Luvian, Palaiac, Hittite)
8. *∅∅> *y > *∅ (Luvian, Lycian) (Kimball 1994)
10. *kaw > kaw (Luvian, Lycian – A only?) (Laroche 1967: 46ff)

Morphology/Syntaxes

13. Synchronic Ptc. in *-omot/ot (Luvian, Lycian, Carian, prob. Palaiac)
17. Pres1sg -we (Luvian, Lydian, Lycian) (Carruba 1963: 392; Oertel 1976: 84)
21. "Relations" Adj. replaces genitive (Luvian, Lycian, Lydian, Carian)

Based on the preceding isoglosses, we may establish the following tentative subgrouping:

Luvian, Lycian, Lydian (+/- Carian): 1, 2, 11, 17, 20, 21
Luvian, Lycian (+/- Carian): 3, 4, 8, 10, 13, 18, 19 (last could belong in previous)
Luvian, Palaiac, Hittite: 5, 6, 7
Luvian, Lycian, Palaiac: 12, 16
Luvian, Palaiac: 14 (possibly also Lydian)

Palaic, Hittites 9, 15 (but NB one is retention, other trivial assimilation)
I have bracketed features number 11 and 21 in the first grouping because I do not consider my arguments for the first in Lydian to be beyond doubt, while the fact that Lydian uses a different productive suffix for the genitival adjective from the rest makes it uncertain whether this usage is truly a shared innovation in the strict sense. In any case, the southwestern dialect group is obvious (combine the first two lists of shared features!), but so is a western group that includes Lydian. The status of Luvian as a transitional dialect between east and west is also clear – hardly surprising given its geographic position – but it is worth noting that the eastern connections are rather shallow, consisting entirely of phonological changes of a typologically rather trivial sort. If Starke (1997) is correct in arguing for Luvian (in the strict sense) as being relatively widespread across western and southern Anatolia, such a distribution suggests a relatively recent spread – are we then to suppose that the shared innovations with Palaic and Hittite are likewise recent phenomena? Be that as it may, one is struck by the relative conservatism of Hittite and Palaic, which share only two quite trivial isoglosses. One is left with the impression of a southwestern “focus area” of innovations away from a more stable (north)east. Some of these innovations predictably spread farther than others, while a relatively recent expansion of Luvian may have further isolated the western dialects of Lycian, Carian, and Lydian from Hittite. I must emphasize again in conclusion that the picture just presented is a snapshot, subject to change at any time with the discovery of new evidence, especially for the western dialects.

*This does not, of course, mean that these languages did not undergo a significant number of innovations – they did – simply that most of these are unique to each individual dialect. We must also never forget that our knowledge of Palaic is severely limited, and more data might reveal more shared innovations, with Hittite or with the western dialects.
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