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Lydian alone, of all the Indo-European languages of Anatolia, has no
synchronous 'y'. Obviously, this could easily result from a complete loss
of inherited 'y', but our current very limited understanding of Lydian historical
phonology also permits us to consider other possibilities.

E. Vetter; SBÖAW, phil.-hist. Kl., 232/3 (1959), 44ff, has dem-
onstrated convincingly that Lydian verbal forms in -d- are preterite first singu-
lar. Although not all of his examples are valid, it is the merit of GUIMANN,
RL 94, 1960, 281ff, to have shown that the actual preterite first singular
ending is simply -d-. GUIMANN also points out, RL 94, 288, that several of
the verbs in -d- are denominative, while HEUBRECK, HEOz, 1969, 413f,
suggests, that -d- (vs. -i), pres. 3rd person -d- (vs. -i), and pret. 3rd
person -d- (vs. -i) are characteristic in general of derived verbs (vs. base
verbs).

The analyses of both GUIMANN and HEUBRECK are essentially correct,
but there is one crucial exception whose significance has not been appreci-

---

1 Bibliographical abbreviations are those of The Hittite Dictionary of the University of Chicago
(eds. H.O. GÜTERMECK and H.A. RÖPPPEL, Jr.), Chicago 1969. For the terms and all aspects
of Lydian grammar I refer the reader to the invaluable handbook of R. GUIMANN, Lydisches Wörter-
buch (Leipzig 1969), and the three facsimiles of its Ergänzungsbänden (1967).

2 C. CARUBA, Atticaccent 38, 1960, 33f., and 47, 1969, 75f. The crucial passage is
that of sect. 242.4: *h₂-s₂-k₂-m₂-s₂-æ-s₂-æ-s₂-æ-s₂-m₂-æ-s₂ (lautenw.). The presence of the
third person singular direct versus -d- 'in him' makes it impossible too for one to be able to derive
'd' for 'me', as already correctly emphasized by GUIMANN, RL 94, 287f. It must be the subject: "...,
I give to him (the supreme authority of the terminus is a d., and whatever else I designated
for him)" (cf. VETTER).

3 I will soon argue in detail elsewhere that adverbs in a preterite 'from' (see already VETTER,
SBÖAW 22/1, 154f), while usual in adverbs, as per CARUBA, Atticaccent 38, 47. However,
GUIMANN's examples 'from' and 'now' are solid.
at: b(ud) "give". The stem bi- (also in fo-bi-fo) was correctly compared
with Luv. pypa- and Lyc. pīja- "give" by CARRUBA, Athenaeum 38, 42 and
ZeMGG 111, 1961, 460. GUSMANN, RIL 95, 282, correctly isolated the stem
bi- (in pret. 1st sg. bid and pret. 3rd person bilt < bid-).* For obvious
reasons no one would take this example as a derived denominative verb.
HUEBNER, HaCr, 414, also analyzes bid-er. Note, however, that in some
phonological terms bid- and bid-er match derived (denominative) stems in
-ird and -ild.

This parallelism is not accidental, nor is its source at all obscure. Just
as C.m. pret. 3rd sg. pīpyā "gave" matches -yel-0- denominative pret. 3rd
sg. sīvītānīsāta "curse", so Lyd. bid- "I gave" (< pīyom) matches
denominative fitamūridē "I designated" (< -yom). The source of the -d-
in pret. 1st singular -ird is interlocutary 'y'.

The assumption that interlocutary 'y'becomes Lydian d not only ac-
counts for the unexplained -dr- of pret. 1st singular -ird, but for other ex-
amples of Lydian d as well. The verb nīdrē, which occurs twice in text 10,
5-6 preceding the clear pret. 1st singular qīnūridē, must also be taken as
pret. 1st singular. This form shows a -dr- which does not appear in other
forms of the stem nī- (attested in the compounds ja-nīrē, sa-nī-rē, (q)nī-
rē, (q)nī-irdē).

Likewise, contra GUSMANN, RIL 95, 1961, 176, the context of qīnūdrē
in text 18 also supports an interpretation as a pret. 1st singular: [ ] rē nābā
qīnūdrē ni-m as [k]tēsill[if] bid-ak-m=m in lfg. The enclitic -m- of the next
(prohibitive) clause is most plausibly taken as an obsolete form of "me",
while the best solution to the odd-looking lfg remains that of BOSSERT, Heh.

* The single I of fo-bi-fo (and perhaps once bid) can be explained variously. First, it is not certain that the stem bid- was regular outside the first person singular present. Thus bilt could be regular, and bid < *bild archaistic. Alternatively, if the regular stem was bid- (as bid-er) could easily be a

* This meaning of (q)nī-, which is attested in synonyms with (q)nī-, was demonstrat-
d by C. WATKINS at the Eight East Coast Indo-European Conference, Harvard University,

Kön. 125, a present-fut. 1st singular with / for regular /: "I said [...this]"
no one shall disturb/ violate me. I shall be well (or sim.)."

Finally, despite the problematic bi- in the same clause, unad in text
10,18 is also in all likelihood pret. 1st singular, given the clear /t/nd< of
the next clause. In general, I find unconvinving the arguments of GUSMANN,
RIL 95, 176ff, for interpreting any of these cases as present third persons in
lād plus enclitic anim. acc. sg. object -o. There is simply no independent
evidence that Lydian attaches enclitic pronouns to verbs (especially redun-
dantly). The Lydian enclitic anim. sg. third person pronoun is -o, always
with -o- and always in the expected "Wackenagr" position, second in the
sentence. See the cogent arguments of CARRUBA, Athenaeum 38, 28ff, whose
own analysis is also unpersuasive, however (see n. 2 above).

The presence of pret. 1st singular in -ird, -erd, and -erd beside -ird
is not only unsurprising but in fact predictable. The other IE languages of
Anatolia show other "y" formations besides simple denominative -yelo-, and
we would expect to find reflexes of these in Lydian as well. Hitti has a
rampantly productive class of denominatives in -ird-< which reflect -yelo-,
renamed as -yelo-〈renamed as -yelo-〉: see MELCHERT, Phon. 39ff, with references. Given the change of interlocutary 'y' of d in Lydian, a pret. 1st singular is "yom would
regu regularly in -ird.

As indicated by GUSMANN, Lyd. Wh. 30, the only clear source of
Lydian o is sequences of 'owe, where pre-Lydian 'o can probably represent
'or ' or 'a. As I will argue in detail elsewhere, Lyd. trod-f-, which clearly
means "grant, confer" or the like, is cognate with Cluv. (pari) tādrō(ya)-
"hand over". The Lydian stem reflects a virtual 'droot-〈, i.e. another
denominative in 'yelo-〈. In this case, syncope led to a preform 'droot-〈
and hence Lydian o instead of a, but the development of interlocutary 'y of d
in the pret. 1st singular trod-f is the same as in unady.*

* For precise syncope in Lydian (especially in sequences involving a consonant) compare simil-
"of the sacred precincts' (< 'airmet: to Kemp."
While the meaning of *gireš* (--) can only be guessed at, its phonological shape severely limits the possible morphology of its preform. A distylistic verb stem with --/* in the middle is surely a denominateive of some sort. I have shown (Philo 20), that Hittite possesses at least one denominateive in --/*s--/* from a thematic stem, formed in the "classical" fashion from a-grade of the base, hence in --/*s--/* Hittite *gireš* (--) may likewise represent such a denominateive to a ro-stem. In the prev. 1st singular, --/*s--/* would give regularly --/*s--/* (there likely present second singular karašes (HEUBECK, Lydika 60) would represent the same type: --/*s--/* > --/*s--/* > --/*s--/* > --/*s--/* > --/*s--/*).

Evidence for the change 'y > Lydian d is not limited to the preterite first singular in --/*s-. The Lydian word for "earth" is *kidos-. Pünter has tentatively suggested a comparison with the obscure Grk. ehilevov "mud, flint," but more likely is a connection with Grk. ghelov "glue," kálycov "sticky substance," Russ. glav "clay," Eng. clay, etc. Lyd. *kidos- (gender indeterminate) could match directly Grk. ghelov < *klyevov."

While the above etymology is merely possible, a much more solid example of d > 'y in nominal formations is furnished by the suffix --/*s--/*, already correctly isolated by MERIÜG, RHA 3, 1935, 89-90. We find naac--/*s--/* beside naac--/*s--/* beside *gfn--/*s--/*, and *mle--/*s--/* beside *mle--/*s--/*. As we might expect, in none of these cases is the meaning of both the base and derived form clear; see the lemma in GUOMANI, Lyd. Wh.

1 This is also the source of the much more productive type of Latvian, *ūd-, *ūds- and Lycian *ūd-, -st-, as I seem to show elsewhere.

2 The best example for accented short 'd > Lydian d before nonfinal consonant is naac- / *naac--/* "sweetness, sweetness,", where the d can hardly represent long (D, since the letter appears in Lydian *n*--/*s--/* "sweetness, sacred preciosity" < *n-s-* (for the same of the letter and connection with the Latin "sweetness") = INNOCENTI, Ind. ling, 12, 1937, 117). Compare also probably *kaf-"living"< *kaf-/* (per GUOMANI, Erg. 3, 140.

The accent on the 'd--/*s--/* is due to the influence of the primary type with a-grade of the root and suffix 'y-*, represented in Lydian by *auror-"hors" < *auror-. Compare the eventual retraction of the accent in Sanskrit denominateives in --/*s--/* after the --/*s--/* is --/*s--/*.


38 However, in all cases the suffix is clearly denominative, and naac- and *gfn-/*s--/* are definitely substantives. On general grounds we would expect a suffix added to substantives to be an adjective-forming suffix. The fact that some of the derivatives might be attested as substantives themselves would not be surprising. Furthermore, the Lydian sequence --/*s--/* in *gfn--/*s--/* cannot represent original 'n plus dental stop, because in original sequences of this kind the nasal consonant is lost: cf. *d--/*s--/* < *fndō-. The original shape of the suffix must thus be --/*s-<, with a vowel which has then been syncopeated: cf. for the syncpe anamara- "of the Moon-god" < *dmarara- to dmaro- "Moon- god" (see GUOMANI, Athenaeum 47, 1969, 139, following SHEVOROSHUKIN, for the suffix and INNOCENTI, Inc. Ling 12, 117, for the syncope). 10

By purely internal reconstruction we have been led to a denominative adjective-forming suffix of the shape --/*s--/*.' In view of the above evidence for 'y > Lyd. d, an interpretation of Lyd. --/*s--/* as *--/*s--/* < PIE *--/*s--/* imposes itself. The --/*s--/* suffix, though poorly attested in Hittite, was very productive in other languages of Anatolia: see my article in Historische Sprachforschung 103 (1990), 198ff.

GUOMANI, Lyd. Wh. 115f, suggests that *sacid-, *sacit- and *sac--/* "work, do" (the last being in "ideom") may contain two preverbs: *-a-/*d-. However, we find no unambiguous examples of *-a-/*s--/*-d-. This contrasts with the case of all other certain preverbs in Lydian: *uškar-< *uškar-< *-uškar-< *-uškar-< *-uškar-< *-uškar-< *-uškar-< *-uškar-. We also have no examples of *d-/*s--/*-d-. It is therefore far more
likely that the -d- of fadadi- "do, make" and fadadda- "demand, impose upon" is the reflex of a secondary *y* which developed out of the univocalized sequence *fa yedu* : *fa yedu* > *fay* > *faddi-

If intervocalic *y* becomes Lydian as argued above, we may wonder about the outcome of initial *y*- before vowel. There is in fact at least one likely example of the same change *y* > *d*. The meaning "wealth, property" for *ylyy* is required by the occurrence in 24,19-20: *ak uram nadjikit fadadimur nuk auran nuk bira = krj[a] *ef *d *t *e *m* - "Whatever I possess, both estate and house and my . . .". As indicated by GUdMANN, *ylyy,* was *ylyy.* The occurrence with "estate" and "house" suggests that *d*-refers to a particular kind or part of one's property. In Indo-European, including Indo-European Anatolia, the most basic division in property is between "mobile" and "immobile" wealth: see WATSON, Hebd. and Idg. 265-287 with references. This suggests that *d* refers to "mobile wealth" beside *najjiki* "estate" and *bira-"house" (thus already Vetter, SBOAW 233, 3, 17). GUdMANN, *ylyy,* had already compared Lyd. *ylyy* with Hit. "sby creation of a sheep" on morphological grounds. Given the other evidence for *y* > *Lydian d* before vowel, we may equally equate the two words. Both continue a participle *(h)dyt/dan-* "walking," For Lydian *y* > *hit* compare *hit* < "hdn*.

The word *d*- is attested as both animate and inanimate in Lydian. GUdMANN, *ylyy,* 99, tries to account for this by assuming both animate and inanimate forms of the participle. However, *(h)dyt/dan-* is a transferred epithet "walking (wealth)," and *(h)dyt/dan-* is consistently inanimate in Hittite. See the same objection by NEUMANN, Gnomon 37, 1965, 273, who also points out that the st. nom.-acc. singular of the participle would almost certainly have lost its final stop, as in Hititite and Luwian. What GUdMANN does not make clear is that endings *d* is assumed at least twice as animate