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For reasons cited below, the role of Lydian in Anatolian
and Indo-European linguistics has been a
considerable subject of investigation and
research. The most recent and comprehensive
description of the Indo-European language
family is provided by the work of Westergaard
(1968). The major points discussed in this
section are as follows:

1. The Indo-European language family is
   characterized by a number of common
traits, such as the basic vocabulary and
   grammatical structure.
2. The Indo-European languages are
   divided into three major groups:
   (a) The Anatolian group, including
   Lydian, with roots in Anatolia.
   (b) The Tocharian group, with roots
   in Central Asia.
   (c) The Iranian group, with roots
   in Central Asia.
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person ending *d from a "lentid" PA third singular ending *d. See Melchert, 1994a: 338 with references.

Already in Proto-Anatolian PIE *d had become *ti before *y (see Melchert, 1994a: 62). This sound becomes phonemic in Lydian due to loss of the conditioning *s, being spelled with the letter transliterated as Ἂ (:) of the monosyllabic (god) with the suffix *sid, as per Gussmani, 1969: 139, following Shevoroshkin, 1969: 24 & 43.

It is also certain that *di/ti becomes Lydian e (a voiced coronal affricate or fricative) before *i and *e (e.g. Gussmani: *sid = *sid-e, etc. "place; dedicate" < *di/ti-ũe (see Heubeck, 1959: 56f and Melchert, 1994a: 334, both with references).

I would like to suggest another previously overlooked example of the same change, which has further consequences for the overall treatment of the dental stops. The noun ta(ai) means 'vote tablet' or perhaps more generally 'vote offering' (Gussmani, 1964: 207). The absence of a stem vowel in the accusative singular taac/tai=en at dat./loc. taac makes an original *stem likely (Gussmani, 1964: 38), although this pattern is not absolute: cf. the scope of *ti in the preterite first singular ending *-ti (see earlier). The first vowel in taac is long (as marked in two texts, significantly not verse texts). We know that one source of *e before *i is *d (see ciw above). This suggests a Lydian preform *ti, (for the accent see the rule of Eichner referred to in note 1).

There are a dozen stems in -e in Lydian, most clearly nominal (all with apparent accusative singular in -e without stem vowel). One of these, nia(k)ti(e), is analyzable, since it is patently a derivative of the adjective nia(k)ti (Gussmani, 1964: 175f). This points to a suffix -e. The meaning 'will' for nia(k)ti- (adjective) and nia(k)ti= (noun) is not entirely assured, but quite probable. In any case, the derivational relationship of adjective and noun suggests that -e is an abstract-forming suffix. We are thus led to analyze ta(ai)=ta(ai)-e, hence also *ti= as *ti=di.

Internal reconstruction has brought us to a Pre-Lydian *ti=di- 'vote offering' (or similar). A PIE suffix *ti- is wholly unknown, but an abstract/action noun suffix *ti- is commonplace. This suffix is also attested elsewhere in Anatolian. In Hittite the usual form is an augmented *-ti < *-=ti- (Sturtivant-Hahn, 1951: 76), but see directly from *-ti also occurs: *hail(u)ons: 'kingship' < *hail(u)we 'be king' (Watts, 1973: 76; and Oettinger, 1979: 356). Note that this example is deverbal. Starke (1985: 249ff) has further argued for *-ti in Clavian/attis/food and utis/fruit.4 Eichner (1973: 79f) has shown that in Proto-Anatolian voiceless stops undergo "lenition" after accented long vowels and diphthongs. We thus can and should derive the *-ti- of Pre-Lydian *ti-di- from PIE *-di-.

The monosyllabic base points to a primary formation, and the approximate meaning 'vote giving' and phonetic shape *-ti- suggest derivation from *dhi- 'put, place' (virtual) *dhi-< (for the meaning compare Grk. ὅδελετο). The development of initial *dhi- to Lydian e has parallelisms (om. *build < *dem- cited above, and tro(d) 'hand over, grant' < (virtual) *downe(y)d-e (for details see Melchert, 1992: 52f). The development of *shâ > *d would match that in Lydian and Lydian (di = ha-let go, t-rel-< *shâ): see Melchert, 1989: 38f, with further examples. For the full-grade root compare Grk. ἀρµίτω 'wisdom, plan'.

The above derivation, well-founded on both internal and external grounds, does fly in the face of two very popular Lydian etymologies. As already intimated, at least some examples of the word dâv have been interpreted as preterite first singular 'I gave', and the remaining occurrences (in dating formulas) as a frozen form of the same verb (Gussmani, 1960: 282ff and 1964: 960). This analysis leads to a derivation from *dehâ- 'give/take' and implies that PIE *di- results in Lydian initial d, in direct contradiction of the examples for *d > t cited above. A complete reexamination of the evidence for dâv is necessary.

The word dâv occurs most often as part of the dating formulas which introduce a number of the Lydian texts. These formulas appear in two distinct forms. The first may be 4personally continue to interpret these examples as second singular verb forms with Morphorps Davies, 1980: 106f, but Starke's arguments are well taken. I concede that incomprehensible evidence for a verb ending *-i in Clavian is still lacking.

4The fact that the suffix appears to be *e (< *di-) consistently in Lydian does not, of course, force us to assume that all examples had an original preceding accented long vowel. The limited form may easily have been generalized, just as *e is the only productive form in Hittite.
illustrated by 2,1-2: (h) [r]k X H III OX ovak avakeikaiak-axi (ga)kakal dāv. This type also occurs in 10,2-3, 41,1-2, 42,1-2 and 50,1-3. In this type we always find the word for ‘year’ in the dat.-loc. singular with a numeral, followed optionally by the name of a month in the same case, then the name of the ruler and the title, gaoxakal, like those in the dative, and finally dāv.

The second less frequent type consists of the dat.-loc. plural of ‘year’ with a numeral followed directly by dāv, and then optionally the name of the month, as in 43,1-3: brauvi II dāv ovak kalaiekut naukhiak. This type also occurs in 25,5 as brauvi(l) (a) III II dāv, with the emphasizing particle 4 (see Melchert, 1991: 1330).

Notice the consistent differences in the two types. In the first, ‘year’ is in the singular, and dāv always follows the ruler’s title and name; in the second, ‘year’ is in the plural, and dāv follows it directly. The singular number of ‘year’ in the first type argues that the numeral is to be read as an ordinal: ‘in the Xth year (in the month of Y) King Z dāv’. The plural brauvi requires rather a cardinal: ‘X years dāv (in the month of Y)’. The explanation of the use of dāv as a frozen verb ‘I have given’ in the sense datum (Gusmani, 1964: 97) cannot account for the syntactic differences in the two formulas. What is required to give a consistent universal interpretation is a postposition meaning ‘from, since’: ‘to the Xth year (in the month of Y) since King Z’ and ‘since X years (in the month of Y)’, in the second type the point of reference is unstated, but it was undoubtedly clear enough to the writer and his intended audience (just as 1988 means ‘C.E.’ to us). As Vetter (1959: 130) had already seen independently, the analysis of dāv as a postposition is supported by the remaining occurrences outside the dating formulas, which we must now review. The example in 11,5 (g)akal(l) (a) k’itumil dāv cagriak atrahak will not detain us long. This poetic text with its unusual word order continues to defy systematic analysis. I will only point out that both the immediate context (line 8 gis kalbelin and line 10 ‘k’ak-at et inal) and the entire text show only third person verb forms (on the alleged pretetive first singular kav see below). Gusmani’s attempt (1960: 286) to read dāv as ‘i gave’ is clearly forced. Note that the word order is quite consistent with a postposition (thus already Vetter): ‘from Artemis of the Sardians, the holy’ (a). While this analysis is by no means assured, it is also worth adding that the above phrase with dāv is coordinated with the word gaoxakal, which Meriggi (1936: 2,285) takes as an ablative ‘from the king’.

The crucial instances of dāv are those in 23,6 and 24,4, where we find amudāv. Note that this phrase is written as a single word in both cases, suggesting a single accented unit amudāv. This fact strongly supports the interpretation of dāv as a postposition, not a verb. The example in 23,6 is compatible with either: ‘I have given’ or ‘from me’: ciNK buk afaris q en amudāv ‘The c. or the descendant(s) to whom I have given property/to whom (there) is property from me (=who has property from me).’

In 24,4, however, ‘I have given’ is impossible. The full context reads: ak-ut nāpil titis smāli amu fahitil bakh-taq eqam amudāv fak I tak NV bakh-axm amu bićev il ḍāv eqam, aqak ʃamāl. The structure and approximate sense of the first, third, and fourth sentences have been elucidated by Vetter (1959: 44) and Gusmani (1960: 286). In the first sentence the subject is clearly the ‘surpreme authority of the temenos’ (titis smāli), and amu is ‘me’ (dative). In the third and fourth sentences the subject is in the first person. This is confirmed by the presence of mak ‘to/for him’ (dative).

The form fak[N]ak in the second sentence also appears to be pretetive third person (thus Vetter), eliminating ‘I gave’ for amudāv. However, since there are other forms in which seem

8The received interpretation for afaris is ‘Schenkungskunde’ (e.g. Gusmani, 1961: 178), which leads to a similar sense for the coordinated ciNK. This requires that the dative ciNK mean ‘to which’, which is quite conceivable, but unparalled in Lydian. Furthermore, it is contextually more likely that a document about property settlement would refer to the people involved (and their responsibilities to and the necessities of documentation. I suggest that afaris is ‘descendant’, a substantivation of *agnus’/’latter, younger’, attested in Hittite *agnus’/’POST-ŠK(a)s’). The sense of ciNK would be in the same sphere. Given the disjunctive bakh, the figura bakhasiš bakhil in the next sentence surely expresses reciprocit, I therefore interpret the passage of 23,6-8 (ciNK ... aqak) as: ‘The or descendant who has property from me—the one shall safeguard it’ (aw) for the other, as I have declared’.
to function as infinitives (cf. cited below), this argument is not compelling. Gusmani translates ‘or I gave it to’ for *wag*.

What he overlooks is the evidence of the enclitic pronouns. If *omudav* meant ‘I gave’, we would expect -m. to ‘him’. The dative pronoun marking the recipient is never omitted in Lydian (cf. the next two sentences). Furthermore, *-c* is now to be analyzed with Gusmani himself (1969: 156f and 1982: 95 & 104) as particle -c plus the reflexive particle -c (see in detail Melchert, 1991: 155).

Obviously, the reflexive pronoun cannot be reconciled with ‘I gave it (to him) to’. We must therefore interpret: Whatever the high priest demanded of/imposed on me, whether he took it from me for himself, or he gave it to him as a gift, and whatever else I assigned to him...”

The remaining instance of dāv is in the broken and obscure context of 14:8: dāv(y)-k-hātum ex simq, i.e. sennāl takhd. The position of dāv(y) suggests that it is functioning here as a conjunction. A development of a postposition ‘from, from’ to a conjunction ‘since, after’ would, of course, be trivial.

Lydian dāv is thus in all its uses a postposition meaning ‘from, since’ and has nothing to do with *deh-, give, take.* Its true source remains obscure, but cannot be used as evidence against a rule PIE *dH1>*lydian *-c, as I assume for *tam, tredh, and *apic. Note in particular that the evidence of omudav raises the very real possibility that the -c of dāv represents the medial treatment of whatever sound is represented here.

My suggested derivation of *tās-ci>* *-dāv, ‘put, place’ is also in conflict with the suggestion the Lydian *-c* (and derivatives) is the direct representative of this PIE root (Gusmani, 1964: 87f, with references). A further problem is presented by the interpretation of Lydian wēc(ī) (in -dēc- and -nci) as ‘build, erect’ and its equation with Hittite wēc(e)/a ‘build’ < *wec- or *wek-. (Heusbeck, 1959: 53f; van Brock, 1968: 120; Oettinger, 1979: 130; Shevoroshkin, 1982: 213). These of these etymologies imply that the initial *dH1>* of *deh-

Parallels in Anatolian syntax (cf. cited below), this argument is not compelling. Gusmani translates ‘or I gave it to’ for *wag*. What he overlooks is the evidence of the enclitic pronouns. If *omudav* meant ‘I gave’, we would expect -m. to ‘him’. The dative pronoun marking the recipient is never omitted in Lydian (cf. the next two sentences). Furthermore, *-c* is now to be analyzed with Gusmani himself (1969: 156f and 1982: 95 & 104) as particle -c plus the reflexive particle -c (see in detail Melchert, 1991: 155).

Obviously, the reflexive pronoun cannot be reconciled with ‘I gave it (to him) to’. We must therefore interpret: Whatever the high priest demanded of/imposed on me, whether he took it from me for himself, or he gave it to him as a gift, and whatever else I assigned to him...”

The remaining instance of dāv is in the broken and obscure context of 14:8: dāv(y)-k-hātum ex simq, i.e. sennāl takhd. The position of dāv(y) suggests that it is functioning here as a conjunction. A development of a postposition ‘from, from’ to a conjunction ‘since, after’ would, of course, be trivial.

Lydian dāv is thus in all its uses a postposition meaning ‘from, since’ and has nothing to do with *deh-, give, take.* Its true source remains obscure, but cannot be used as evidence against a rule PIE *dH1>*lydian *-c, as I assume for *tam, tredh, and *apic. Note in particular that the evidence of omudav raises the very real possibility that the -c of dāv represents the medial treatment of whatever sound is represented here.

My suggested derivation of *tās-ci>* *-dāv, ‘put, place’ is also in conflict with the suggestion the Lydian *-c* (and derivatives) is the direct representative of this PIE root (Gusmani, 1964: 87f, with references). A further problem is presented by the interpretation of Lydian wēc(ī) (in -dēc- and -nci) as ‘build, erect’ and its equation with Hittite wēc(e)/a ‘build’ < *wec- or *wek-. (Heusbeck, 1959: 53f; van Brock, 1968: 120; Oettinger, 1979: 130; Shevoroshkin, 1982: 213). These of these etymologies imply that the initial *dH1>* of *deh-

This result reached internally agrees with the external evidence. As discussed in Melchert, 1989: 44f, following Benveniste, the PIE verbs for reciprocal ‘giving’ and ‘taking’ *stH* and *deh* were both specialized to ‘take’ in Anatolian, and a new opposition *peH* was created for ‘give’. Lydian *deh* ‘give’ shows that Lydian shared in the second of these developments. It is therefore highly unlikely that it did not share in the first. The meaning ‘take’ for *deh* is surely Proto-Anatolian.

develops to Lydian *c*, while the variant *wag* > *aici* also assumes *aric* > Lydian *c*. I omit phonological and morphological arguments regarding these words as irrelevant since the meaning traditionally assigned them, which apparently have never been questioned, are totally unsupported by the texts, pace Gusmani (1964). We may begin with *aici* and its derivatives. The assigned meaning ‘set (up), dedicate’ implies that *aici* is a transitive verb. We therefore expect it to take a direct object (such as ‘stele, votive offering’ or the like) and probably an indirect object (the name of a god or person). In actual fact, the one occurrence of *aici* in 11.5 has no verbal complements at all: *ket-aici ait*! The context assures us that the sentence is complete: subordinating conjunction *ket, enclitic subject pronoun -aici, and present third person verb ait.* Gusmani (1964: 204, sub *f/m*) translates: ‘weier (fem) sent, bestimm’t.

This interpretation runs completely counter to the rules of Anatolian syntax. Garrett (1990) has recently demonstrated that subject enclitic pronouns in Hittite never cooccur with a transitive verb, only with a subset of intransitives. I have confirmed the same facts for both forms of Luwan. In principle, of course, Lydian of the first millennium could have innovated in this regard. However, it is instructive that in the Lydian curse formulas, whose syntax we understand best, the pronominal usage matches that of Hittite and Luwan exactly: see Gusmani, 1964: 50-51. Under these circumstances it is totally illicit to assume wholesale violations of these rules just in passages whose structure we do not control. The only unprejudiced reading of *ket-aici ait* is ‘As because where he _aici_’ (intransitive).

Likewise the compound verb *wagani* in 10.4 occurs in a sentence with no direct object. The context of *wagani* in 13.10 is ambiguous. The extended stem *aric* - has no apparent direct object in 10.20 and definitely has none in 10.8. The analysis of *wagen* and its context in 22.8 is hopeless. The form *wagen* (pret. 1st sg.) in 13.1 has no direct object. The stem *aric* (if it indeed betargs here) may have an object in 10.15-16. Of all the forms of *aici*, only the compound *aricani* is clearly transitive: 50-
open many possibilities for an etymology of the stem *os-
Turning to the formal side of the problem, if we restrict ourselves to what is known, the only possible preform for *os-

The verb stem *os- (and *gan) is thus inherently intransitive.

The fact that one of its compounds is intransitive is hardly surprising, since preverbs can often change intransitives into transitives. In fact, the striking contrast between *fenea, which shows normal transitive syntax, and its base, which does not, strongly supports the conclusion that the latter is intransitive.

The verb *os- therefore cannot possibly mean 'set (up),

dedicate' and be derived from *"d*ah. Determining just what it does mean is difficult. The context of the one instance of the simplex cat in 11.5 is so obscure that nearly any intransitive meaning is possible. We can also only speculate on the sense of the examples *dow/ chan and *dowiv.

The second example of *fenea-cited above (54.8) refers to the mobile property of a potential tomb robber. A meaning 'dedicate' is thus appropriate for this compound if one understands 'dedicate' in the sense of 'promise, pledge': one has committed the property to Artemis, but obviously not yet delivered it.

In 10.4, we find *dow-mis: *sells usw(f)i-k *wars dacaal. This sentence immediately follows the dedication of the stèle by Ktawos to his son Ktawos. We know that *sells means 'supreme authority' (of the religious precinct), *wars means 'son' and *usw(f)i probably 'living' (for the last see Guzman, 1985: 110f.). The enclitic *mka means 'for/to him' referring either to Ktawos or to Ktawos. I have argued (Melchert, 1991: 140f) that it is a variant of the reflexive pronoun, but this is not essential to interpreting the sentence. The exact meaning of the conjunction jan is not yet clear. What is important is that *dowal refers to some action taken by the supreme religious authority and Ktawos' living son in regard to the dedication of the stèle to Ktawos. The most likely meaning for dacaal is thus 'have asentled, have given approval'.

The common denominator of 'promise, pledge' and 'agree, assent' is a (positive) expression of the will of the subject. Obviously, this rather vague characterization leaves

10For *jan in particular, compare Lat. nos 'enter' beside os 'go'; *indos 'declare; impose' beside ditos 'say, speak' and similar pairs in German: (uns)geben, (uns)reden.
the third person enclitic pronoun, we may venture 'And everyone shall watch over them.' In any case, the remaining *w√xw* *wVK* and must form a complete clause, whose interpretation depends crucially on *wVK*.

The suggestion of Guimani (1964: 238) that *wVK* is an introductory particle is impossible in view of the other occurrence of the word in 11:11–12: *wVK-* AV ἐπετέλεσεν ὅτι τοὺς θανάτους. The essentials of the last sentence are clear: 'Let the a. or not great is (-AV, animate singular!) to him.' In the preceding sentence *qis* is the subject 'the one who', *fakonfal* is the finite verb (third person present). Given the demonstrative *e试探* and the conjunction *bk* 'or', the word *katanfal* must be dative-locative plural conjoined with *wVK*. The remaining *ψvf* must be an infinitive depending on *fakonfal*. We thus arrive at: 'The one who tries/dares to seize (?)...from these k or the stel'.

Note first of all that *e试探...katanfal* is plural, while *wVK* is neuter. Thus far, then, we have no antecedent for the animate accusative singular *wVK* at the beginning of the sentence. Second, there is no direct object for the preceding sentence. This missing element can only be located in the initial *wVK-* *wVK*. Since we must have an animate antecedent, we must analyze *wVK-* *wVK* (with usual loss of *AV* before consonant).

The stem *wVK* is thus an animate *AV* noun, which we may interpret as a substantival adjective in *AV* from *wVK*—'bomb' in its *AV* original meaning of 'rock-face' and the like (cf. *AV*). *wVK-* 'of a rock-face, cliff' and *AV* 'of the cliff'.

Eichner (1993: 120) arrives at a similar analysis, except that he joins *e试探* with *wVK-* as a dative-locative plural parallel to *wVK*, taking *katanfal* as the animate direct object. This is also quite possible: 'Whoever dares tries to seize (?) the k from these stone-works or the stel'.

In any case, *wVK* in the earlier *wVK* and must be nominative singular of the same stem. Eichner attempts to take it as accusative plural, constructed with *AV*, the object of the alleged *wVK* 'I have built'. This is impossible for several reasons. First, we have seen that *AV* is in the next clause (Eichner leaves katanfal-*AV* entirely unaccounted for). Second, *wVK* offers no independent support for AV as the Lydian animate accusative plural ending (for arguments that the ending is AV, with palatalized *wVK* see Melchert, 1991: 138). Third, every other identifiable finite verb form in the entire text in the third person, including those which must refer to the builder/dedicator. Fourth, Eichner's analysis leaves the second dative and unaccounted for.

The structure of *wVK* and must be parallel to that of AV and AV, (read with asterisk, with "gapping" of the predicate noun: 'This stel' is a vow to S.A., the *to Ares*). The presence of nominative singular *wVK* precludes *wVK* being preterite first singular of a verb, meaning 'I built' or anything else. As already seen by Garruba, 1960: 47, the word *wVK* is rather a case form of a noun in AV (see above) functioning as an adverb, like *AV* 'for/in evil'. As often in Lydian, the range of possible meanings is wide: 'likewise, in turn, on the other hand'.

The other example of *wVK* can hardly be a first person preterite verb form either: 22:1 AV and *wVK* AV, Guimani (1963: 295) translates: 'AV', *AV* (read with asterisk) 'built this stel'. Once again, however, it is striking that not a single first person verb form occurs in the entire remainder of the text! Even more telling is the fact that *AV* is consistently treated as third person in the text of the inscription.

As already suggested by Meriggi, 1955: 95, note 49, the word *wVK* must modify *AV*. If it were modifying *AV* as per Guimani, it would have to be *wVK* (cf. 22:13). For *wVK* as neuter nominative-accusative singular *wVK* emphasizing *wVK* see Melchert, 1991: 134. This forms a complete nominal sentence with *wVK*; 'This stel is Sardian!'.

The structure of this first sentence and the presence of emphasizing *wVK* suggest that once again the phrase with *wVK* is a contrasting sentence with parallel structure: 'The * in turn on the other hand (in *AV*). The crucial point is that the
overall context of 22.1 gives no support for wicw as a pr?re?ase first singular verb, while in 11.12 we have seen that such an interpretation is impossible. Current evidence suggests that wicw is a case form (accusative singular or dative-locative plural) of a nominal steme. The verb das-wecil (note the *-i) may be a perfectly regular demonstrative steme in *dash-awecil). The immediate context of das-wecil in any case excludes a meaning ‘built’.

There is thus no philological basis for the widely quoted ca- dedicating, set up and (das-wecil) ‘build, erect’ nor for the etymologies and other diachronic conclusions based on them. Therefore nothing stands in the way of the proposed derivation of tata(â) ‘voice offering’ from a virtual *d-âthâ- with Proto-Anatolian lenition to *-d- by Eichner’s rule and regular Lydian developments.

We may now return to the overall problem of the representation of dental stops in Lydian. The evidence of tam< of *dem, tre(d)< of *dremâ and ta(a)< of *dâthâ, cited above, argues for a general rule by which initial *d- was devoiced to t-.

There are nevertheless a few Lydian morphemes which begin with d- dâ- ‘mobile property’, dâv ‘from, since’, dam(m)- (a subordinating conjunction), and the preverb da- (in da-cau(?)", da-vo, and da-ucil). This fact is in itself not a compelling argument against the supposed rule. There is even stronger evidence for such a development in Lydian, but the latter language also shows a few examples of initial d(ê), of as yet unknown secondary origin: see Melchert, 1994a: 301f and 309. I have presented elsewhere arguments that the d- of Lydian dêh ‘mobile property’ reflects original *h̥ (Hitt. âyantâ sheep) < *pâ(ê) ‘walking’; see Melchert, 1994b. As already noted, the d- of dâv may easily reflect a medial treatment in a postposition. A secondary origin for the d- of da- and dam(m) is thus quite possible. Our current very limited knowledge of Lydian makes further speculation pointless.

I do not claim to have answered all questions regarding the fate of *d and *d(ê) in Lydian, but some points now seem clear:

(1) A final dental stop appears as Lydian d- (a Proto-Anatolian change): ad, qid, kod.

(2) The Proto-Anatolian affricate *ts resulting from *t before *s is represented by Lydian t, which is now phonemic due to loss of the conditioning *y. am tus, wiuw-tus.

(3) PIE *id regularly preserved in Lydian: tawis, kat-,-(i), pres. 3rd person d-, dêd-, yârdâtik. dêd-

(4) PIE *t and *d become Lydian t before *i, *e and *y, tawis, ta(a)ve, time, and probably vs.

(5) Intervocalic PA *d- (CIE *Pd- and *k and lenited *k) is continued by Lydian ku(?,) de, de, pres. 3rd person d- and probably ku.

(6) Otherwise, PIE *d(ê) becomes Lydian t- (initially and after nasal) tam, tre(d), ta(a)ve, ku(?,) de,

(7) Lydian dêv is a postposition ‘from, since’ and has nothing to do with *dâh ‘give, take’. Whatever their precise meaning and derivation, ca- and (da-)ucil must also be separated from *dâthâ-, ‘put, place’. As to the synchonic realization of these xw-û-ds, Lydian t regularly represents a voiceless stop (note the glosses ῥας and τατος for tawis). However, in favorable-voicing environments it was probably realized as d-: note adâkawis = Aôdôkawis, adâkawis = Adôkawis. The same spelling for t- < wids suggests that voiceless and voiced stops had merged in this environment, as in Lydian: see Melchert, 1994a: 282 and 329 with references.

If t equals both [t] and conditionally [d], then d must represent something other than a voiced dental stop. The borrowing of dêv as low- and dêvâk as lamâku- also argues that Lydian has no initial voiced dental stop; initial d- must be something else. It is therefore likely that d stands for a voiced interdental fricative [ð], as in Lydian: see already Littmann (1916: 116f) and Cony (1921: 3), among others. Gusman expresses reservations about this claim (1964: 32 and 1965: 295), but later also tentatively adopts this view (1978: 442). The overall facts of Lydian seem to me to support this conclusion.
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