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H. CRAIG MELCHERT
THE LYDIAN EMPHASIZING AND REFLEXIVE PARTICLE
-ir-ir*

I. Emphasizing -ir

Among the many puzzling features of Lydian stands the final -ir of the words artaklassi (2,1) and miriartaksi (24,17). The complete parallelism of both ... 1-1-2 with beri ... arta/klassi (k) gwmwkh 11-1-2 demands that we take both as dative-locative singular, as per Guinnan, Lyd.Wb. 62. Furthermore, a dative-locative is also required, not merely possible, for 24,17: seriâk smnîs òtto k wma miriartaxi kônti fain ... The supreme authority of the noun so proclaims: "I too I (verb) a k. (noun) for M." Guinnan properly rejects any interpretation of -ir as a special genitive ending.1

The only other attempted explanation known to me is that of Veres, SBOAW 233/2, 1959, 13 & 60, who claims that the -ir is an animate nominative singular pronom. This must be rejected as totally improbable. First of all, we now have reason to believe that other alleged examples of pronominal -ir belong to the reflexive particle instead (see below). The only form of the animate nominative singular enclitic


1 The proposal of Geogheg, Ling. Bull. 25, 1984, 6–9, that Lyd. -A (and hence -A) has a genitival function is anything but persuasive, pace Hamp, HS 93, 1988, 89. That the Aramaic translation of the dating formula in text 1 has a genitive of the ruler's name proves absolutely nothing for the Lydian. As already indicated by Guinnan, there is also no merit in the idea of a connection with Firerian -AD.
The key to understanding this sentence is in recognizing the
syntactic structure and coordinating clauses. The sentence begins
with a noun phrase, "The key," followed by a prepositional phrase,
"in recognizing the sentence," indicating that recognizing the
sentence is important. The second part of the sentence explains
why recognizing the sentence is important, "the sentence begins
with a noun phrase." The sentence then continues with.

1. The key to understanding this sentence is in recognizing the
syntactic structure and coordinating clauses. The sentence
begins with a noun phrase, "The key," followed by a
prepositional phrase, "in recognizing the sentence," indicating
that recognizing the sentence is important. The second part of
the sentence explains why recognizing the sentence is important,
"the sentence begins with a noun phrase." The sentence then
continues with.

2. The key to understanding this sentence is in recognizing the
syntactic structure and coordinating clauses. The sentence
begins with a noun phrase, "The key," followed by a
prepositional phrase, "in recognizing the sentence," indicating
that recognizing the sentence is important. The second part of
the sentence explains why recognizing the sentence is important,
"the sentence begins with a noun phrase." The sentence then
continues with.

3. The key to understanding this sentence is in recognizing the
syntactic structure and coordinating clauses. The sentence
begins with a noun phrase, "The key," followed by a
prepositional phrase, "in recognizing the sentence," indicating
that recognizing the sentence is important. The second part of
the sentence explains why recognizing the sentence is important,
"the sentence begins with a noun phrase." The sentence then
continues with.

4. The key to understanding this sentence is in recognizing the
syntactic structure and coordinating clauses. The sentence
begins with a noun phrase, "The key," followed by a
prepositional phrase, "in recognizing the sentence," indicating
that recognizing the sentence is important. The second part of
the sentence explains why recognizing the sentence is important,
"the sentence begins with a noun phrase." The sentence then
continues with.
The phonetic value of the letter "j" is that of [j] or [i] in German, Abibinarum, 4th ed., 135, following Skravenas. In Latin, the symbol for "j" is "jv", which is pronounced very close to the letter "j". However, the spelling of "jv" for "j" is not standard and may vary. In some cases, the sound may be approximated as [j], while in others, it may be approximated as [i].

The phonetic value of the letter "j" suggests that the sound may vary depending on the context and the language in which it is used. In the case of "jv", the sound is likely to be approximated as [j] or [i], but this may vary depending on the speaker's dialect and regional variation. Therefore, it is important to consider the context and the language in which the word is used when attempting to accurately pronounce the sound represented by "jv".
reinforced by amo:n in 4.14. My interpretation allows us to retain it as pret. 3rd person 'made, did'. The emphatic initial position is not surprising in a verse text.

The final palatal -r of -am has presented insurmountable difficulties for its usual interpretation as nominative singular of a personal name: see the discussion of Gusmanian, Sprache 17.5. In interpreting amo: as animate accusative plural 'those/these', I am extending and modifying a proposal of Heubeck, Sprache 11, 1961, 78, who derives Lydian anim. nom. plural -ui from *sui (for the existence of the ending see Heubeck, Op. cit.; Lohf. 244). Heubeck compares, of course, Gusmanian anim. nom. pl. -aui, anim. acc. pl. -aui(a) and Milyan anim. nom. pl. -aui, and Milyan anim. nom. pl. -u:ui (means 'good'). Note, however, that the nominative form in Luvian is actually -uy with a final -u, and in HLuvian the nominative ending in -uy has been generalized to the accusative plural as well. I therefore take Lydian anim. nom. plural -ui from *au =ui ( = Luvian -uy) and anim. acc. pl. -u < *au =ui ( = Luvian -uy) with an independent generalization of the nominative to the accusative as in HLuvian.15

15 I also see *au ( = Hitt. amo: in the form -ami of 2,2, which is provided by the pren. in singular generally and followed by the pren. in singular *om (on which see note 11). A meaning for amo: in *om is also likely for amo:n ( = Hitt. amun) (see note 11) where in discussion initial position the particle *om =ni ( = Hitt. anum) is virtually excluded. Note the first singular generally and frequently later in the same text. I also follow Eichler, Unters. 32 & 48 and Sprache 27, 1981, 209, in his analysis of the type of amo:n in *i (om) of Massa: *om ( = Hitt. amun) refers an old dative -ui used here to mark a nominal sentence as the first person, like HLuvian -om. Compare the same use of the reflexive particle in Neo-Hittite, as described by Hoffner, JANES 28, 1969, 225 ff., and see my discussion of the HLuvian type, Arch. 38, 1988, 41–42. The alternative analysis of the Lydian type as containing a reduced form of the particle *gocium (Gusmanian, Sprache 17.5) is in and of itself unacceptable, but the other evidence for dative *om and the parallel developments in HLuvian and Hittite make Eichler’s analysis more likely. For the possibility that some cases of *om represents ‘ten’ see already Carriini, Unters. 32 & 48.

16 Deriving nom. pl. -aui (and secondarily acc. pl. -aui) from *au =ui explains why the Lydian plural is paradigmatically Hittite like Hitt. amun could not account for. The creation of a new animate nominative plural based on the accusative ending -uy would thus be a further shared by all the western Anatolian languages. Whether this is true for Lydian or not, it certainly is for the Lydian loan *laiou ( = Hitt. -laiu) is nominative plural, perfectly regular from *laiun with generalized -en ending via *laiun and *laiu. For the loss of Hitt. -aui compare the Greek *laiou ( = Hitt. -laiu) and *laiu for *laiou ( = Hitt. -laiu). Likewise nom. pl. *mai =ui (with two realized wordfolds): *mauiui > *mauiui > *mauiui > *mauiui > *mauiui. Compare for the generalized nouns ending and for the phonology. JTS 1970. 76f. See Eichler, Unters. 32 & 48. The syntax correctly analyzes (with differing details) see already Eichler, Unters. 1974, 62f. The pointing of a completely unattested nom. pl. ending -u ( = Hitt. -u) Heubeck, InLing, 1975. 79. 1., and Omont, InLing 32, 1977.

Since the context of *omus in 4.47 is hopelessly broken, my interpretation of amo:n cannot at present be confirmed. Note, however, that the extended stem *omus(=ui) behave dative plural *omus argues strongly that *omus is a plural, and an animate nominative or accusative seems the only likely possibility.16 In any case, *omus, our point of departure for this discussion, is at least as likely to be a demonstrative 'this' as it is a sequence *om =us.17

17 The sequence *sau =ur in 4.16 and 8.80 cannot be analyzed with Gusmanian *sau =ur =uy, with a subject pronoun and accusative singular animate of the relative pronoun, because already argued above a subject pronoun does not co-occur with a direct object. The context of the first occurrence makes such an analysis improbable in any case. If we take *sau =ur in 4.16 as introducing a new clause, then the only other word in the clause is *nuwissu, which is surely nominal. That would leave the alleged accusative *sau =uy with no verb. We can only conclude that *sau =ur is an animate noun of unknown meaning in the accusative singular. Compare *sau =or, which we now know is also an animate noun in the accusative singular: see Gusman, Erg. 2.61.

With no other evidence for the alleged 'predictive' use with relatives, we must take the example of 23.18b, d: 1 my *tewm mu thew maw we fixwus in as a clear reflexive, given the presence of both a subject *tew and an object *tew.

When we have eliminated all the cases above, there is to my knowledge only one case left of the alleged subject -u. In 13.7 we find a clause *sun =wi =am *sueni inam *sueni. While the meaning of the entire sentence is quite unclear, we have no expressed subject or direct object. A subject pronoun with an intransitive verb would
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The Lydian particle -uy
thus be quite in order. We know further from *aīnāv = *aināl that the pronoun *aināl follows the particle *aiti. And in all known cases the particle *aiti is the last member in the enclitic sequence. Thus is thus no difficulty in assuming *aīnāv = *aināl = *aināl. The loss of the vowel of the enclitic subject pronoun is = could be due to its unique position before the particle *aiti.

Since we have no attested cases of *aiti = *aināl, the interpretation of the *aiti of *aīnāv = *aināl as a subject pronoun can thus not be excluded. However, so long as the meaning of the sentence remains undetermined is a reflexive with a transitive verb used absolutely or even with an intransitive verb is also possible. Given many instances where only a reflexive reading is possible and none where a subject is required, I prefer the simpler hypothesis that Lydian *aiti always represents the reflexive particle (except, of course, for those instances discussed in Section 1 which are emphasizing).

There is another alleged variant of the subject enclitic pronoun *aiti, namely *aiti (Guinness, Lyd.Wb. 129). This interpretation may bow be sacrilegiously, since the form co-occurs in 24.7.4 and 24.8 with direct objects, respectively cintial and qif(w) = k. As indicated above, such a subject pronoun cannot co-occur with a direct object. In 10.3 and 12.2 a subject interpretation is also improbable, since the clauses already contain other nominal subjects.

On the other hand, a reflexive interpretation is possible for all instances of *aiti, and at least one, 24.8, calls for such a meaning: *aiti = *aināl = *aināl = *aināl. As noted above, text 24 begins with *medadatā pledge his property to the supreme authority of the tovomai. There then follows a series of relative clauses detailing possible violations of this property, which the gods are to punish. Lydian *aiti means *aiti; *aināl is a derivative of disadvantage referring to the supreme authority, and qif(w) = k is a neuter indefinite *anything. Several scholars have already compared the verb *farradā to Hitt. karsī: cut'; see Guinness, Lyd.Wb. 115 with references. However, they have attributed a rather more general meaning of 'destroy, harm' to the Lydian verb. While this is possible, the Hitt. karsī is often used to mean 'cut off, out' in the sense 'segregate, separate.' I propose that Lydian *farradā

has the same meaning, reinforced by the reflexive particle *aiti: 'or cuts off anything from him for his benefit.'

The variant *aiti of refrain *aiti is phonologically conditioned. The former occurs seven times, always before *corps(t) 10.3; 12.2; 14.1; 14.11; 23.9; 24.7, 24.8. The form *aiti occurs twenty-five times, in all but four cases before a vowel (the exceptions are in 2.2; 22.7 (twice) and 23.18). This distribution shows convincingly in my view that *aiti has developed from *aiti by anaplexis. Since the anaplectic vowel in this case is *aiti, it then automatically parallels the following syllables, for the later Guzman, Lyd.Wb. 34.

The anaplexis here is completely parallel to that in the particles *aiti- and *aiti-m, for which see Carruba, Quaderni 4, 1959, 35.8, and Heeck, Hfib., 1960, 405. In these two cases also the syncretic, or 'aiti- and *aiti- in the sense 'their', for which see Carruba, Quaderni 4, 1959, 35.8, and Heeck, Hfib., 1960, 405. In these two cases also the syncretic distribution of the allomorphs is no longer perfectly complementary, but the original pattern is quite unmistakable.

There is also a rare form *aiti. Guzman, Erg. 2.60, accepts Metzger's argument that this cannot be a subject pronoun. Indeed, in its only contextually clear occurrence (24.6) *aiti is accompanied by both a overt subject and direct object, so an enclitic subject pronoun is excluded: *aiti = *aiti (Hitt. karsī, cut'). The context of the example in 80.17 it is too broken to draw any conclusions, while that in 14.6 is clearly accompanied by a preterite first singular verb, a fact which again eliminates an enclitic third person subject pronoun.

Guzman, Lyd.Wb. 204, restores the verb of 42.6 as *aiti (Hitt. karsī, cut'). But this is impossible, since the latter verb always takes a dative locative complement, never a direct object. This means that the verb is unknown, and a reflexive reading for *aiti is quite possible, and the one who *aiti these *aiti for himself. It is important to notice that all these occurrences of *aiti are attached to the first word in the sentence, as we
would expect of the reflexive, and furthermore all three are before a consonant, like -ii. No proof is possible with our current data, but I tentatively take -ii as a variant of the reflexive -ii-i. If this is correct, one can only guess that the phonologically regular -ii has had the dental sibilant restorted after the form -i.

While the status of -ii must remain uncertain, I consider Meriggi’s analysis of Lydian -i as a reflexive to be assured. Since most examples of -i cannot be subject pronouns and none must be, I see no reason to assume a subject pronoun -i for Lydian at all. The syntactic and phonological distribution of -ii argues that it is thereby a variant of reflexive -i.

Gusmani, Erg. 253, compares Lydian reflexive -i with Hittite -ci. However, the latter reflects Common Anatolian -*ii, as preserved in Luwian and Lydian. We know that -*ii assimilates to free (**) in Lydian before -y (Gusmani, Athenaeum 46.139, following Shevoroshkin). I know of no good evidence that -*ii assimilates to -i (dental) before -y in Lydian.3 Even if this were true, it would be difficult to reconcile the unchanged -i of the present third person ending < -*ii with its assimilation in the particle -*ii. One would have to assume apocope of the final -i in the verb, then assimilation, then another separate apocope of the final -i in the particle.

I find it far more likely, then, that Lydian reflexive -i continues CA enclitic -*aii, with regular loss of a final unaccented vowel. For the reflexive use, compare Pal. -*ii in ni=ri=ri=ri - malam ‘but they are not satisfied’ (see Carruba, StBoT 10 (1970) 70). It is probably no accident that -*aii, which means ‘to/for him’ in Hittite, develops a reflexive sense in Lydian and Palaiq, languages where the third person singular dative pronoun is replaced by -*aii and -*ai respectively.

3 None of the examples of -y — (Nih. palaiq) before -y cited by Hins, Sprache 8, 1962, 175, is compelling. However, since original -*ii is palatalized to Led. -i before -y and -*aii, we need some other source for unaccented -i. We cannot exclude in this point that some (of) these reflect original -*ii.