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The third Person present in Lydian*

It is well established that Lydian has given up the distinction of number in the third person of both the present and preterite: see Gusmani, Lyd. Wb. p.41. We find as the ending of the third person present graphic -d in some verbs and -t in others. No one has yet presented any convincing explanation for the distribution of these two alternative endings.

Gusmani, OA.4 (1965) p.207 ff., notes that -d is far more frequent than -t and that only the latter occurs after nasal consonants. He then suggests that -d is the regular phonological outcome of final *-VIV as well as final *-t/d in Lydian and that the alternate -t is somehow a conditioned variant. However, except for the case of a preceding nasal he offers no clue as to what the purported conditioning might have been. Furthermore, his evidence for the regular change of *-VIV to d is very weak, while there are several counterexamples.

Gusmani arbitrarily equates Lyd. kud 'where(sic) with Hitt. kwatta 'whither'and Lyd. kot 'how; as with Hitt. kwat 'why'. However, the meaning of both Lydian forms is quite uncertain: note that in the Lydian Araamaic bilingual Lyd. kud matches Aram. łąbhl zj̣aas'. Original final dental stop always

---

* Bibliographical abbreviations are those of The Hittite Dictionary of the University of Chicago (edd. H.G. Güterbock and H.A. Hoffner, Jr.), Chicago 1980ff. To these add Quaderni = Quaderni del Istituto di Glottologia dell' Università di Bologna. For all aspects of Lydian grammar and texts I refer the reader to R.Gusmani, Lydisches Wörterbuch (Lyd. Wb.) and the three fascicles of its Ergänzungsband (Erg.). Meanings of Lydian words not otherwise attributed are taken from the Lyd. Wb. If I do not give a translation of a word, I consider its meaning too indeterminate to be of use.

† Furthermore, one can hardly derive both ku- and ko- from the same sequence *k* o- matching Hitt. kwu-. Oettinger, KZ. 92, p.82, takes kot and -kod from an otherwise unmotivated disyllabic *k* uwod (and kud from the same by syncope?). This is needlessly complicated and ad hoc. Lydian ko- is the regular result of *k* o-: the labiovelar preserves *o as o (vs.
leads to Lydian -d: cf. the nt. nom. -acc. sg. ending -ad < *-od. On both formal and functional grounds we should equate the Lydian generalizing particle -kod with Pal. -kuwat ‘anyhow’ < *-kʷod. Hitt. kuwat ‘why’ is, of course, the same word in interrogative rather than indefinite function. Whatever its precise synchronic meaning, it is rather Lydian kot which equates with Hitt. kwatta, with regular phonological development from a preform *kʷóta. For additional examples of Lydian medial -t- from *-t- see preverb kot- ‘down’ < *kat(V)- and the particle -(i)t- < *-te (=CLuv. -itta). Thus Gusman’s claim that -d is the regular result of *-Vt is quite impossible.

Oettinger, KZ.92 (1978) p.84ff., cites the first “lenition” rule of H. Eichner by which voiceless stops become voiced after an accented long vowel in Common Anatolian. He asserts that if we take this rule into account, then the distribution of the verbal endings -d and -t in Lydian generally follows “Sturtevant’s Law”. However, he offers no explanation for the apparent exceptions. In fact, despite his tentative organization of the Lydian verbs into eight stem classes, his treatment of the problem of the present endings is anything but systematic, being based in large part on a few isolated apparent equations of Lydian and Hittite verbs.

A persuasive account of the -t/-d alternation can come only from careful application of recognized principles of historical linguistics. In what follows, after a brief summary of the data and some preliminary assumptions, I will present a series of regular sound changes for Lydian, based as far as possible on evidence independent of the verb forms I am trying to explain. I will use these sound changes to apply internal reconstruction to the third person present verbs and then analyze the resulting preforms in light of what we know of PIE and Common Anatolian morphology and phonotactics. While I will offer new root etymologies for some of the verbs, these are necessarily speculative, and I stress that I attribute no great significance to them. My emphasis will be on reconstructing stem types, not individual lexical items, and my account of the verbal endings stands or falls on the plausibility of the former, not the latter.

Let us look first at the data. We find the following examples for -t, organized by the preceding phoneme: bita, (kan)cat, enarbatat, fetwintat, nirat(?); taqultat; ântet; cênit, sitênit; ëtolt; jêdavolt; fisqant, inânt, sâmên, webaqênt, ëndiblint, (fad)int; factot, fawkufot, satrot, tatrot. Compare the following examples for -d: aršma(wa)d(?), bita(a)d, ëtqratad, fasi- tawad, kibrad(?) , silawad, tarbrad; jakarsed, karaed, qisred, uwed; amêd, fatineð, lined; basvâvakid, dcdid, fakatwâmid, fakofid, fasaðid, (f)ênsâlib/fid, fratînid, kâbrakid, katsarakid, mêtût/mêtôid, satarid, warbokid; barîtad(?), błîtarvad, dakrod, ëntarbsod, fattrod, fawcaðod, istrod[d], kantrod, kasmôd, láfod, taktod(?) , tâsod, tlmud, umvod; ëndu.

One can make some preliminary generalizations about the distribution of -t and -d. We find only -t after consonant, most notably after -n-, as already seen by Gusman. In fact, one can probably go further. The syntactic and hence morphological status of amêd, fatineð and lined is quite ambiguous (see Gusman, Lyd. Wb. s.vv.). While the meaning of the stem is unknown, it seems very likely that amêd at least is nominal, namely the nt. nom.-acc. singular matching anim. nom. singu-

The third Person present in Lydian

4 The following list is based on the invaluable reverse index of Gusman and indeed on the updated and expanded version, Erg. 3, p.176ff. It is intended to be complete. The uncertainties of even syntactic interpretation of the “poetic” texts mean that a number of forms in -Vt are ambiguous as to whether they are verbs or nt. nom.-acc. singulars.

usual *ao > a), and the a in turn delabializes the labiovelar (cf. note 8). The word kud may easily represent a *kʷud(V) cf. OCS. kúde with Sommer, KIF.1 (1927) p.45, or Lat. ubi with Heubeck, Lydika p.42.

2 The form -at is not a doublet of -ad, as claimed by Gusman, OA.4, p.208. A careful review of all the examples of -at shows that this sequence occurs only with verbs which take the particle -(i)t- (jaʃân- and (ja)kantra). We must therefore analyze -at as -ad=t, despite the fact that this presupposes a different order than -(a)t=a.

3 For -(i)t- < *-te see Carruba, Quaderni 4 (1959) p.37, who also correctly compares -kod with Pal. -kuwat, ZDMG.111 (1961) p.461. For kot matching Hitt. kwatta see already Oettinger, KZ.92, p.82, note 33.
lar amāš (as admitted by Gusmani). In fact, both endings may be derived regularly from an adjectival stem in *-mōn-: nt. nom.–acc. sg. *-mōn > *mēv + 2ary -d > -mēd with loss of v before consonant (cf. Lyd. Wb. p. 35); anim. nom. sg. *-mōn > *mēv + 2ary *-s (as in Hittite) > -mās again with regular loss of -v. On present evidence I thus take all forms in final -ēd as nt. nom.–acc. singulars. This means that in the third person present we find only -t, never -d, after both nasal consonants and nasalized vowels (see further below).

One may also note that almost all examples after -i-end in -d. The fact that the two exceptions both show the same sequence -ēnīt suggests that their peculiar shape is specially conditioned. Thus, while we observe both -t and -d after -a- and -o-, the endings are to a large degree in complementary distribution, supporting the idea of Gusmani and Oettinger that the difference is conditioned, even if their formulations of that conditioning are inadequate.

I must state explicitly here that I take Lydian to be a descendant of the same common intermediate language (here called Common Anatolian) which is the source of Hittite, Palaic, Lu- vian, Lycian and perhaps other ancient Indo-European languages of Anatolia. Derivation of Lydian from Common Anatolian means that we may assume that Lydian inherited any features which we can establish for CA. on the basis of the other languages.

The relevant features of CA. in the present instance are the two so-called “lenition” rules of H. Eichner.5 According to the first rule, voiceless stops become voiced in CA. after an accented long vowel (including diphthongs): *T > *D/*V- (see Eichner, MSS.31, 1973, p. 79f.). The second rule states that voiceless stops also become voiced between two unaccented vowels: see Eichner, Sprache 32 (1986) p. 12–13, Morpurgo Davies, KZ.96 (1982/3) p. 245–270, and Melchert, HS. (1993, to appear). As a result of these two rules, Lydian would have inherited from CA. an allomorph *-di of the third person presen-

t ending beside *-ti. Since we know nothing of just how Lydian lost the distinction of number in the third person present, I believe we must in principle also allow for the possibility that certain examples of the attested endings -d/-t may continue old third plurals in *-(V)ntī. We thus start with preforms *-ti, *-di and *-(V)ntī.

As indicated above, we must base our account of the verb endings on established Lydian sound changes. Some facts are already quite clear. Lydian apocopates short final unaccented vowels. The attested pres.1st singular -w-/*u surely continues apocopated *-wi (cf. Luvian -wi, prob. Lyc. -u, and see already Kronasser, VLHF. 1956, p. 168f.). It is highly likely that we also have pres. 2nd sg. *-s < *-si (Gusmani, Lyd. Wb. p. 148, after Heubeck, Lydiaka 60.60f.). We may therefore easily assume that -d and -t continue earlier *-di and *-ti.

Lydian palatalizes *s after *i and before *y and *e (cf. Gusmani, Lyd. Wb. p. 34): anim. nom. sg. -is < *-is; simrā- ‘sacred precinct, temenos’ < *sērmo- (cf. Lyc. hrmnt ‘land section’ < *s(e)rmn and see Innocente, InCling.12, 1987, p. 111f.); serlī- ‘supreme authority’ < *sērli- ‘high’. Note that pres. 2nd singular -ts < *-ssi presupposes that this palatization precedes apocope of final *-i.

CA. *d (< PIE. *d and *dʰ) becomes Lyd. c ([z], [dz] or similar) before *i and *u (and surely also *y): ciw- ‘god’ < *diw-; (da-)cu(we)- ‘place, establish’ < *duw(V) ( = Luv. tūwa- and Lyc. tuwe- ‘place’).7 Compare the slightly different formulation of Heubeck, Lydiaka 51 ff., and also that of Van Brock, Glotta 46 (1968) p. 120. It is possible, but less certain, that the same change occurred after *u: preverb wc- < *ud- (Carruba, Quaderni 4, p. 30, but a preform *uds is also possible). Notice that derivation of the third person ending -d < *-di requires that this palatalization follow apocope of final *-i.

---

5 For reasons which I cannot discuss here, I view the actual process as voicing, but I retain the established terminology for simplicity’s sake.

6 By an unfortunate convention too well established to be altered, Lydian s equals a palatal or palatalized sibilant, while s is the dental/alveolar!

7 It does not matter for present purposes if one derives *duw(V) from *dʰeh₁- (‘place, put’ or follows Heubeck in connecting it with *deh₁- ‘give/take’.
Lyd. ṑarna- ‘mother’ < CA. *ānna- argues that Lydian simplifies CA. geminates, at least *-nn- (for the CA. geminate compare Hitt. anna-, CLuv. ānna- and see further below). This conclusion is supported by the fact that attested geminates in Lydian are rare, usually alternate with simple consonants, and in the few clear cases are obviously secondary: e.g. sellī- ‘supreme authority’ beside serli- < *serli-.

As already indicated by Gusmani, Lyd. Wb. p.31, and Oettinger, KZ. 92, p.87, the synchronic coexistence of alarmas and alarmi- and mlimmas and mlimmi- suggests that the alternates with a in the final syllable are due to a late and sporadic anaptyxis (cf. also Heubeck, HbOr. 1969, p.405). I emphasize this point here because in some cases this anaptyxis restores a previously syncopated vowel (see below).

I also accept the analysis of the synchronic Lydian accent by Eichner, Sprache 32 (1986) p.7 ff. /esp. 8-9) and KZ.99 (1986) p.203 ff. I find the criticisms and methodological reservations of Gusmani, HS.101 (1988) p.241 ff., unconvincing. While certain individual examples require further research and may call for minor revisions in the scheme, Eichner’s overall thesis is too internally consistent and accounts for too many separate Lydian facts for it not to be correct in its essentials. The conclusion which is relevant for our present purposes is that the vowels e-o, e and a occur only under the accent. This means that any word containing two of these vowels must be the result of a univerbation or other secondary development.

To the above rules I propose to add the following. First, short accented non-high vowels apparently merge in Lydian before a nasal. The evidence is very good in closed syllables, where the result is consistently Lydian ë: *éndo > īt- ‘in’-; *éν- > īν- ‘in’- (in cpds. before initial consonant); *oś/ōnt- > -ōt(i)- in šfard-ēt(i)- ‘Sardian’, *-ōm > -ēv (anim. acc. sg., nt. nom.–acc. sg., dat.–gen. pl.); *ānna- > ēnna- ‘mother’. I believe that the same vowels merge to Lydian ā in open syllables before a nasal, but I admit that a demonstration of this depends on verb forms analyzed below: *wemyedi- > *wemyidi- > *wēmūdi > -wāmid ‘meets with’ (not Hitt. wemyezzi ‘finds’), *gēsēn- > -qān- ‘strike’ (details below); *gānā- > kānā- ‘wife’ (see Gusmani, F.s. Knobloch, 1985, p.127 ff.). As already argued by Bossert, Heth. Kôn. (1944), p.111, Lydian ā is probably a relatively long low back or central vowel, while é is a short low vowel. The treatment of an accented short vowel in an open syllable as long would, of course, be in accord with other developments within Anatolian.

If short accented non-high vowels merge to é in closed syllables before nasal, then examples of ā in (originally) closed syllables must have some other source. From the discussion above we would expect this source to be original long vowels, and there are in fact several examples to suggest that this is the case. The best is the conjunction nāv, which may be equated directly with Lat. nam < *nām. The meaning of the Lydian conjunction itself is hardly demonstrable, but the fact that nāv is used to reinforce the interrogative/relative stem (nāgi- ‘whosoever’) like Lat. nam quis and quismam can hardly be a coincidence. Now that feminine ā-stems have been demonstrated for Anatolian (see Melchert, Proceedings of the VIII. Fachtagung der Idg. Gesellschaft), I also see no reason not to take Lydian anim. acc. singulars in -āv from *ām and dative (< genitive) plurals in -āv < *-ām < *-ām. As sug-

---

8 However we are to explain it, a preform *grōnā- with *r is required by the delabialization of the labiovelar in Lyd. kāna-, as properly emphasized by Gusmani. CLuv. wāna- also demands an *r, contra Starke, KZ.94 (1980) p.85, since by “Cop’s Law” a *grēnā- would have led to CLuvian *wanna-

9 I accept the view of Eichner, KZ.99, p.211, that the vowels a and é are still synchronous nasalized vowels. Gusmani is ambivalent about this point: cf. OA.4, p.208 vs. HS.101, p.246 ff. The important fact is that in all demonstrable cases these vowels continue vowels which once stood or still stand immediately before a nasal. As in the case of the q from labiovelars, then, the precise synchronic realization is actually of limited interest.


11 This derivation is implicit in the comparison of nāv with Hitt. namma ‘further; again’ by Carruba, ZDMG.111, p.462, since the latter is surely *nam plus the particle *nā of Hitt. -ma.
gested above, the same development is also likely for long *ő: anim. nom. sg. *môn+s > -maš in amaš.

All clear examples show that the nasal consonant is lost in original sequences of *-Vnt/d-: *éndo > ét- *in-s, *é/ônt- > -ét- in sjaradét(i)-, */h)y/ônt- *walking > dét- ‘mobile property’ (see further below). This means that attested sequences of n plus dental stop must be secondary.

I will soon present elsewhere the full evidence for the change of *y to Lydian ä initially before vowel and between vowels. Here I cite only the compelling arguments of Vetter, SBÖAW., phil.hist. Kl., 232/3 (1959), p. 44ff., that verbs in -iv are preterite first singulars (contra Carruba, Athenaeum 38, 1960, p. 33ff. and 47, 1969, p. 75ff.), and those of Gusmani, RIL. 94 (1960) p. 281ff., that the preterite first singular ending itself is only -v. We can only conclude, then, that the -d- of -iv is part of the stem, and to my mind the derivation of -d- from the expected *y- imposes itself: bidv ‘I gave’ < (virtual) *pyivom.

Finally, there is considerable evidence in Lydian for syncope of unaccented vowels in final syllables: anim. acc. sg. *Cim > -Cv (émv, ta(a)cv); pret.1st sg./dat.-gen. pl. *Com > -Cv (tamuvi ‘I built’; niws-w ‘in evils’ or sim.); pret. 3rd pers. *-CVl > *-Cl (inl ‘he made’, bill ‘he gave’ < *bidl); nom. sg. *CVs > -Cs (ararm’s ‘oneself’). Note that the examples above include at least the vowels *i and *o and the final consonants *m, *l and *. Naturally, I cannot provide examples of final *t from nouns.

I realize that the rule as stated is very powerful, but I believe that all apparent exceptions may be explained in one of two ways. First, even in a language as tolerant of consonant clusters as Lydian, phonotactic constraints would surely have blocked the syncope in some cases: e.g. nom. sg. wesfaš, acc. sg. taacat. These cases, plus oxytone stems like aλa- ‘other’ (alaš, aλev, aλak) could have led to analogical wanaš, wanaλ, etc. Note that the sporadic anaíptis cited earlier suggests that the presence or absence of a vowel in an unaccented closed final syllable in Lydian is sensitive to the consonant pattern.

Armed with the above phonological rules, let us now turn to the Lydian third person present verbs. I begin with the two examples ending in nasalized vowel plus -t: ânêt and taqtaqt. Lydian ânêt must mean ‘proclaims, declares’ or similar. It has been repeatedly compared with Hitt. ḫanda(i)- ‘determine, arrange’, almost entirely on the basis of its superficial phonetic resemblance. The presence of two accented vowels ā and ē already falsifies this equation (Eichner, Sprache 32, p. 9), and the rest of the phonology confirms the error. Gusmani, Athenaeum 47 (1969) p. 136ff., has now shown that Lydian t in all clear cases represents *y+s or *y. In the middle of a verb the latter is far more likely. As we have seen, ēt presupposes *Vnt, and we may of course assume a final *k. The preceding attested sequence -nr- cannot be original – an intervening vowel must have been syncopated. This means that the initial ā would have been in an (accented) open syllable and may continue a short as well as long vowel. By purely internal reconstruction, then, we arrive at a preform *VnVtyVnti, whose two accents demand a universion of preverb plus verb.

If we assume that the syllable *(t)yVn is the root, we are faced with a very unusual PIE. root shape. A sequence -ty- in a PIE verb stem is far more likely to reflect a *ye/o-present of some kind. We thus divide *VnVtyVnti. This means, however, that the n of -nti can be nothing else but the nasal of a third plural ending. I assert, then, that ânêt continues an old present third plural. Further analysis is more speculative, but given a preverb èn- before consonant in the language, it seems most plausible to assume that ân- here is the corresponding prevocalic reflex *én+V- with another example of short accented vowel to ā before nasal in an open syllable. I tentatively sug-
gest as a possibility that āntēt reflects a virtual *én+h₂tyōnti ‘they inscribe’ via *énatsyōnti and *ānatsyēt with loss of laryngeal and syncope of the medial unaccented vowel. Compare Hitt. ḫazzīya- ‘strike; inscribe’ and HLUvian ha-zî-mî-na ‘we inscribe’. For the shift from ‘inscribe’ to a verb of speaking compare Modern English, where one may now ‘register’ a complaint or opinion without writing. I certainly do not insist on this etymology, but merely on the structural analysis as an old third plural of an accented *yē/ō- verb.

On the basis of the number of syllables alone, taqtulāt is surely denotative. Given the necessary analysis of āntēt as a plural, I see no reason not to take taqtulāt likewise as an old third plural of the denotative type in *ēh₂-, well represented in Anatolian: *-ēh₂Vntti > *-āVntti > *-āntī > *-ānt > -āt. See below for further examples of the *ēh₂- type.

We turn now to the verbs in -nti, where I repeat that the attested sequence of nasal plus dental stop must be secondary. I begin with the pair sawēnt and webaqēnt. The -nti- suggests a syncopated vowel, but the ē requires an original closed syllable: hence -VnnVtii. Gusmani, Lyd. Wb. p. 191 ff., claims that saw- is a prefix, but the derivative sawtaar- can hardly be anything structurally except what it appears to be: an agent noun in *-tor(o)-, itself the base of the denotative verb sawtār- (see further below). This means that saw- is surely a verbal root. Hence the ē- < *VnnVtii- of saw-ēnt must be either a primary or deverbal suffix, not denotative. As explicated by Carruba, Athenaeum 47 (1969) p. 51 f., saw-ēnt is a transitive verb meaning approximately ‘see, experience’. The agent noun sawtaar- in turn means ‘watcher’, hence ‘guard, protector’, and the denotative sawtār- ‘to guard, protect’ (for the latter see already Gusmani, RIL. 95 1961, p. 177 f.). As a possible source of saw- ‘see’ I suggest CA. *seg₂- < PIE. *sek₂- ‘see’. Once again, however, I insist not on the root etymology, but merely on the formal analysis as verbal root saw- + suffix *-VnnV-

An unprejudiced interpretation leads to the same conclusion for webaqēnt. While we- is surely a preverb, there is no preverb ba- in Lydian, pace Gusmani, Lyd. Wb. p. 74.15 This means that the root must lie in -bag-, and -ent is once again primary or deverbal. The verb expresses an action which the gods are to take against tomb violators and takes a dative-locative. Given these facts and the preverb we- (< *ud(s) ‘up(on)’), I suggest as a possible meaning ‘trample upon’, with Lyd. ba- < *paKw- matching Hitt. pakku(ss)- ‘crush’: cf. Eng. ‘stomp (on)’ beside ‘stamp’.16 Again it is the structural analysis *ud(s)-PaK²- VnnVtii which is crucial, not the specific etymology.

A pre-Lydian primary or deverbal suffix of the shape *-VnnVti can hardly be anything but the cognate of the Hittite “durative” suffix -anni/a/- (also in CLuvian as -anana-). I accept with slight modifications the analysis of Hittite -anni- (the original form) as *-eh₂h₂- by Jasanoff, IF. 88 (1983) p. 74 ff. No other analysis can in my view explain the CA. geminate nasal or the original athematic Hittite hi-conjugation.17 However, all that is crucial for the Lydian analysis is the inner-Anatolian derivation from CA. *-Vnni-. Lydian unsurprisingly replaced the hi-conjugation with mi- conjugation endings, whence regularly *-ēnniīt > *-ēnniī > -ēnniī > -ēnīī > -ēnt.

We cannot, of course, derive the third person forms in isolation.

14 The same root occurs, of course, in Hitt. šakwa ‘eyes’ and Luv. tāwii- ‘eye’, which is most easily taken as an old action noun *sāk₂-o- ‘seeing’. However we are to account for it, PIE. *k₂o in morpheme-internal position appears regularly as CA. *g₂o: cf. Hitt. tarku = CLuv. tarw(a)- ‘dance’ < *terk₂.

15 The same root occurs, of course, in Hitt. šakwa ‘eyes’ and Luv. tāwii- ‘eye’, which is most easily taken as an old action noun *sāk₂-o- ‘seeing’. However we are to account for it, PIE. *k₂o in morpheme-internal position appears regularly as CA. *g₂o: cf. Hitt. tarku = CLuv. tarw(a)- ‘dance’ < *terk₂.

16 See for a root etymology of Hitt. pakku(ss)- Oettinger, Stammbildung p. 212, who takes the u as anaptyctic. My equation requires that Lydian treat *kw like *k₂, in my view an unobjectionable assumption.

17 For previous proposals and a new alternative analysis see the article by N. Oettinger to appear in the memorial volume for Charles Carter.
tion. The present first singular cēnu (NB. clearly deverbal from the synchronic stem ca-) is perfectly regular by the rules above: *ēnniw > ēniw > *ēniw > *ēniw > ēnu (with the syncope the w automatically syllabifies – cf. Lyd. Wb. p. 41). On the other hand, the preterite third person cēnal shows a new anaptyctic vowel for expected *cēnl < *cēniw: see further below.

The verb int (also with preverb fas-int) means ‘makes, does’ and is clearly an extension of i- ‘idem’. The attested sequence nti points to a syncope: *i-nV- ti. A suffix *nV- added to an existing verbal stem is no surprise: cf. Palaic deverbal -nā- < *neh₂- and mutatis mutandis also Hittite deverbal -nā(i)- < *neh₂-ye/o-, as discussed in Melchert, KZ.97, p.37f. Because of the Hittite, I suggested there that this type was originally denominative, and cases such as labānāl to labāna point in the same direction for Lydian.

Lydian int < *i-nati < (virtual) *ih₂-neh₂- ti requires a retraction of the accent onto the root. I can offer no better motivation for this at present than influence of the base i-. However, S. Kimball (pers. comm.) has pointed out to me that several examples of nasal presents in Hittite appear also to require such a retraction: e.g. hūm(n)k- ‘wounds’ (with secondary long ū by accent in an open syllable). Thus Lydian *i-na-nti may be part of a larger problem. See below for independent evidence for the -a- of *i-na-ti. The preterite int shows the same regular syncope from *i-na-₁ (perhaps ultimately < *inalo), while inal shows a new anaptyctic vowel like cēnal.

Lyd. inānt also means ‘he makes, does’. I take the inā- to be the original stem *ih₂-neh₂- posited for int above with the *ā preserved due to the addition of a further nasal suffix. The latter must once again have contained a vowel: *i-nā-nViti. Since we have already established a deverbal suffix of approximately this shape, I propose to see it here as well and derive inānt from a virtual *i-na-enni- ti (or *i-na-ēnni-ti): contracted *inānniti > *inānni > *ināni > inānt.

Confirmation for derivation of inānt from the “durative” suffix *-ēnni- comes from the preterite first singular, which is (unexpectedly in synchronic terms) ināndv, with an allomorph -āni- beside -ān-. The preterite ināndv not only provides independent evidence for the -i- of the suffix, but is also crucial for determining the phonological developments in this entire set of words. Lydian has a second syncope rule not mentioned above by which a penultimate vowel is deleted following the accent: e.g. armr₳- ‘of the Moon-god’ < *arṃr₳a- to *arma- ‘Moon-god’ (see Innocente, IncLing.12, p.117, after Gusmani and Shevoroshkin). However, if one applies this syncope rule to original *inā-nilvom and *inā-nil, it would delete the i in both forms, which is clearly false. Rather we must assume first apocope of final *i, producing *inā-nil beside *inā-nilvom. Now when the syncope rule deleting vowels of final syllables applies, it deletes the i of the former, but the o of the latter, yielding attested inānt but ināndv (the latter via *inān-idvom). 18

The verb fšqānt may be analyzed as containing the preverbs f(a)- and is- plus root -qān-. It takes an accusative object and refers to a negative action taken against the tomb. Hence in this case a meaning ‘destroys’ is appropriate, as is derivation from the root *g₂šēn- ‘strike’ 19 However, given the well-founded phonological rules above, -qānt with ā and preserved n cannot continue directly an athematic third singular *g₂šēnti: we would expect *gēnt. However, the corresponding present first singular in pre-Lydian would have been a (virtual) *g₂šēnni. Aposcope of the final *i would produce *qēnu (with automatic syllabification of *w to u after consonant). This places the accented *ē in an open syllable, yielding regularly *qānu. Given

---

18 After syncope of the vowel of the final syllable, syncope of the penultimate vowel is blocked by phonotactic constraints: *ināni. I realize that I am assuming deletion of the a of the base ca- in cēn(i)- but contraction in ināni(ū) - from ināni. This can easily be due to the difference in the age of the formations. The latter must be quite old, since it is based on the stem *inā-, which is no longer present in int. On the other hand, cēn(i)- may represent the productive process by which -ēn(i)- is added to an existing synchronic stem.

19 For this etymology see Heubeck, Lydiaka p.44f. The preverb is- can easily be *ēks ‘away’ with a perfectivizing force as in Lat. effīcēo etc. Loss of *ē in the clusus with compensatory lengthening would yield *ēs- whence regularly is- with palatalization.
an allomorphy \(*q\ddot{a}n(u), \*q\ddot{e}(t)\), I find reasonably plausible the assumption of analogical spread of \(-q\ddot{a}n\) to the third person. Compare similarly Hitt. third singular ku\(\ddot{e}\)nzi (for phonologically regular \(*k\ddot{w}anzi\) after first singular kuem\(\ddot{e}\)).

As indicated above, the verbs c\(\ddot{e}\)nit and s\(\ddot{e}\)nit are exceptional in showing -\(i\)- before -\(t\). Several factors argue that they are variants of the type in -\(\ddot{e}nt\) described earlier. First, it can hardly be accidental that they show precisely the sequence -\(\ddot{e}nit\). Second, it is hard not to relate c\(\ddot{e}\)nit to c\(\ddot{e}\)nu and c\(\ddot{e}\)nal. Third, we have seen good reason to suppose that the suffix -\(\ddot{e}\)nt is syncopated from an earlier -\(\ddot{e}\)nit.

There are two possible ways to explain the -\(i\)- of c\(\ddot{e}\)nit and s\(\ddot{e}\)nit beside those in -\(\ddot{e}nt\). First, as we have seen from in\(\ddot{n}\)id\(\ddot{v}\) beside in\(\ddot{a}nt\), the preterite first singular of the type in -\(\ddot{e}nt\) was surely \(*\ddot{e}\)nid\(\ddot{v}\). There would thus have been an allomorph \(*\ddot{e}ni\) beside -\(\ddot{en}\)- which could have been spread analogically. Second, if \(\ddot{a}n\ddot{e}nt\) and ra\(\ddot{q}\)tul\(\ddot{a}\)t must be explained as coming from old third plural forms, such a derivation is also possible for those in -\(\ddot{e}nit\):

\[\begin{align*}
*\ddot{e}\text{nny}Vnti & > *\ddot{e}\text{nnd}Vnti > *\ddot{e}\text{nd}Vnti > *\ddot{e}\text{nd}Vnti > *\ddot{e}\text{ndat} > *\ddot{e}\text{nit} > -\ddot{e}\text{nit} (\text{cf. } -\ddot{ad} = -\ddot{a}t \text{ in note 2}).
\end{align*}\]

Turning to verbs in -\(at\), we may begin with an internal analysis of f\(\ddot{e}\)w\(\ddot{in}t\)a\(\ddot{i}\). Separating off the preverbs f(a)\(-\) and d\(\ddot{e}\)\(-\), we are left with a stem -\(\ddot{w}\)in\(\ddot{a}\)\(-\)- whose preserved -\(\ddot{nt}\)- implies syncope and hence a preform \(*\ddot{w}\)in\(\ddot{V}\)nta\(\ddot{i}\), but we have far more direct evidence for this conclusion. Collation by Gusmani (see Erg.3, p.159) makes it likely that we should now read w\(\ddot{in}\)ta\(\ddot{i}\) in line 1 of text 23. This is then the nominal base of the verbal stem w\(\ddot{in}\)ta\(\ddot{a}\).

Lyd. ensar\(\ddot{b}\)t\(\ddot{a}\)t has been explained as preverb e\(\ddot{en}\)-, verbal stem (and presumably root) sar\(\ddot{b}\)-, plus a medial ending which corresponds to Hittite -\(\ddot{t}i\)\(\ddot{at}\)(i): see Lyd. Wb. p.106 with references. This equation is impossible, however, because the sec-

ond stop of the Hittite ending is always single -\(t\)-, which could only be matched by -\(d\)- in Lydian. This means that the verb stem is disyllabic sar\(\ddot{b}\)ta- with a medial stop cluster. We cannot tell whether there has been a syncope or not, but either sar\(\ddot{b}\)ta- or \(*\ddot{s}ar\ddot{b}V\)ta- would once again surely be denominative.

We thus have denominative verbal stems in -\(ta\), for one of which we have the corresponding nominal base in -\(ta\). I propose that these are denominatives in \(*\ddot{t}\)eh\(\ddot{t}\) to nominal stems in \(*\ddot{t}\)o-. In other words, they match in formal terms the type of Latin cant\(\ddot{a}\)r\(\ddot{e}\). The verb \(\ddot{b}\)it\(\ddot{a}\)t may be formed the same way (\(\ddot{b}\)i\(-\)t\(\ddot{a}\)-), but one could also segment \(\ddot{b}\)i\(-\)a\(-\)t\(-\) and assume a nominal base in -\(\ddot{a}\)- to a root \(*\ddot{P}\)\(\ddot{e}\)\ddot{t}\)-. The verb would be a denominative in \(*\ddot{e}\)h\(\ddot{t}\) in either case. Note that we would expect the unelided \(*\ddot{t}\)i ending in this class: cf. Lyc. pr\(\ddot{r}\)n\(\ddot{a}\)w\(\ddot{a}\)t\(\ddot{e}\) (\(\ddot{b}\)\(\ddot{u}\)l\(\ddot{t}\)-) pr\(\ddot{r}\)n\(\ddot{a}\)w\(\ddot{a}\)- 'house' with unelided ending.

Just as in the case of the Latin first conjugation, not all Lydian verbs in -\(at\) are necessarily denominatives in \(*\ddot{e}\)h\(\ddot{t}\)-. A full discussion of the philological evidence for the verb ca- is not possible here, but one thing is clear: the verb cannot mean 'consecrate, dedicate' and be derived from \(*\ddot{d}\)\(\ddot{e}\)h\(\ddot{t}\)- (pace Gusmani, Lyd. Wb. p.87). A meaning 'dedicate' implies a "two-place" verb, but neither ca- nor its compound da-ca- even take a direct object, let alone a second complement.

---

20 For \(*\ddot{e}na\)c regularly to Hittite an\(\ddot{c}\) compare \(*\ddot{e}ndo\) > anda, among many examples. I cannot accept the views of Kimball, If 91 (1986) p.83ff.
21 One may also perhaps compare the attested \(\ddot{c}\)\(\ddot{e}\)\(n\)d\(\ddot{v}\), but the -\(s\)- is mysterious.
22 The reading w\(\ddot{in}\)ta\(\ddot{i}\) considerably clarifies the syntax. This word is now a predicate nominative agreeing with s\(\ddot{r}\)m\(\ddot{a}\): this temenos has been established (\(\ddot{d}\)\(\ddot{a}\)\(\ddot{ru}\)\(\ddot{v}\)\(\ddot{e}\)\(l\)-) as a w\(\ddot{in}\)ta- for Artemis and Qidan.
23 For the Anatolian medial ending -\(d\)\(\ddot{e}\) from the reflexive particle -\(t\)- see Neu, StBo T.6 (1966) p.145. For the phonology (tenition by Eichner's second law) see Melchert, HS. (1993, to appear).
24 The equation of Lyd. \(\ddot{b}\)\(\ddot{u}\)\(\ddot{t}\)(a)\(-\) with Hitt. \(\ddot{p}\)\(\ddot{e}\)\(\ddot{d}\)- (e.g. Carruba, Athenaeum 38, p.584) is phonologically impossible, since -\(t\)- here between non-nasal vowels can only continue CA. \(*\ddot{t}\).
25 Simplex ca- occurs once in the very short clause k\(\ddot{e}\)\(\ddot{m}\)\(\ddot{a}\)\(\ddot{s}\) \(\ddot{c}\)\(\ddot{a}\)t (11,6). The subject pronoun \(-\ddot{a}\)\(-\) proves that the verb cannot be transitive. As demonstrated by Andrew Garett, The Syntax of Anatolian Pronominal Clitics (Harvard Ph.D. diss., 1990), transitive verbs never cooccur with enclitic subject pronouns in Hittite. See already the remarks of Watkins, Etudes Celtiques 12 (1968) p.93. I have confirmed the same facts for both forms of Luvian. Carruba, Athenaeum 38, p.51, argues for the existence of a Lydian anim. acc. plural -\(d\)- 'them', but there is no word in the preceding context of 11,6 which can be plausibly taken as an animate plural antecedent, so his interpretation is not possible here.
Phonologically, cat can only reflect a pre-Lyrian *d*y\textsuperscript{h}y\textsuperscript{h}t. If we accept the change of *yedi to -id (see below), then a *-ye/o- stem is unlikely, as already suggested by the preterite first singular in -cav, whose a cannot reflect *-yom. The likeliest preform is a virtual *d*y\textsuperscript{h}y\textsuperscript{h}t, and I find attractive the suggestion of C. Watkins (pers. comm.) of a comparison with Grk. σήμα/σήμα ‘sign’. I cannot pursue this etymology here and insist only that the previous derivation of cat from *d*\textsuperscript{h}éht\textsuperscript{h}t and any consequences there of are false.

We may therefore derive most verbs in -t from well-established PIE. and CA. stem types via independently motivated pre-Lyrian sound changes. Given our current knowledge of Lydian, *étol\textsuperscript{t}\textsuperscript{t} could in principle be the preverb *ét- plus an old root present or aorist *wél(H)y\textsuperscript{h}t(i), but the meaning is too obscure for this to be of any value. The verb *fédavol, with its bizarre phonology (virtually unique internal *\textepersianwidth{ed}-, internal v, and sequence *\textepersianwidth{al}C\textsuperscript{h}) is totally obscure. I will discuss presents in *ot below in connection with those in *-od.

We may begin our treatment of verbs in -id with *fakarsed. This verb has already been compared with Hitt. karš- ‘cut’ (Lyd. Wb. p. 119 w/refs.), but only on the basis of phonetic resemblance and the fact that the one occurrence refers to a hostile act. We can now be much more precise. I will soon present elsewhere evidence that the particle *-is is merely an allomorph of the reflexive particle *-s established by Meriggi (see for the latter Guisman, Erg.3, p. 92 with refs.). The sentence *bukol *-is *fakarsed *gik* means ‘or cuts off anything from him for himself’ referring to property assigned to the chief of the temenos). The root equation with Hitt. karš- is thus quite solid.

Lyd. *karsed* is most easily derived in formal terms from a preform *korséyedi, of the same class as Hitt. wwas\textepersianwidth{ez}zi ‘clothes’ or lukkizzi ‘kindles’ (see Melchert, Phon. p. 31 ff.). The crucial point is that Eichner’s second “elenition” rule this verb would have had the voiced ending *-d\textepersianwidth{i} in CA. (Hittite has completely eliminated the results of this rule for initial consonants of verb endings). The rest of the derivation is regular by independently motivated changes: *korséyedi > *korséyedi

(see below) > *korséidi > *korséid > *korsédd > -karsed. For accented short *ê > Lyd. e before non-nasal compare *sérl- ‘high’ > serl- ‘chief’ and probably *h,wéswó ‘living’ > wes\textsuperscript{h}a- (see Guisman, Erg.3, p. 140).

The compound verb kava\textsuperscript{h}red (kat\textsuperscript{h}-\textsuperscript{h}ared) may be analyzed in a completely parallel fashion: -sared < (virtual) CA. *sor\textsuperscript{h}éyedi < *sor\textsuperscript{h}éyet\textsuperscript{h}t, which means something like ‘protector, patron’ < *ser-\textsuperscript{h}ño- or the like. Given the meaning and the presence of the preverb kat- ‘down’, I would compare Av. (n\textsuperscript{h})\textsuperscript{h}ar- ‘watch over, guard’ < PIE. *ser-.

The phonological shape of q\textsuperscript{h}red makes it unlikely that this is a primary verb in R(o)-\textsuperscript{h}ye\textsuperscript{h}. I suggest that it is instead a derivative in *\textepersianwidth{e}-\textsuperscript{h}ye\textsuperscript{h}, probably to a *\textepersianwidth{ro}- stem, which has been assimilated to the primary type in terms of both accent and ending. Such interaction between these two types is well-known from other IE. languages: cf. the retraction of accent of denominatives in -a-\textsuperscript{h}á- in Sanskrit after the type in -\textsuperscript{h}áya-. The pret. 1st singular q\textsuperscript{h}red\textsuperscript{h}v confirms derivation from a stem *\textepersianwidth{e}-\textsuperscript{h}ye\textsuperscript{h}, since the -d\textsuperscript{-e} of -ed\textsuperscript{h}v reflects intervocalic *\textepersianwidth{e}-: *\textepersianwidth{e}yom > *\textepersianwidth{e}dom > *-ed\textsuperscript{h}v\textsuperscript{h}. The likely present 2nd singular kar\textsuperscript{h}al\textsuperscript{h}res (ka\textsuperscript{h}al\textsuperscript{h}res), as per Heubeck, Lydiaka p. 60 f., would show the same structure: *s\textsuperscript{h}el(V)\textsuperscript{h}reye\textsuperscript{h}- to a virtual *s\textsuperscript{h}el(V)\textsuperscript{h}ro\textsuperscript{h}.

Oettinger, KZ. 92, p. 87, has already suggested that the large class of Lydian verbs in -id represent *\textepersianwidth{e}-ye/o- stems, based largely on comparison of Lyd. -\textsuperscript{h}ám\textsuperscript{h}id with Hitt. w\textsuperscript{h}em\textsuperscript{h}ez\textsuperscript{h}zi and Lyd. -\textsuperscript{h}or\textsuperscript{h}id with Hitt. kar\textsuperscript{h}(\textepersianwidth{i})\textsuperscript{h}ez\textsuperscript{h}zi. I believe these equations are in fact valid, but the semantic interpretation of the Lydian verbs cannot be independently supported, so I prefer to motivate the derivation from *\textepersianwidth{e}-ye/o- on internal grounds.

This is not difficult. When one finds a verb saw\textsuperscript{h}ar\textsuperscript{h}id ‘guards, protects’ besides the clearly nominal saw\textsuperscript{h}ar\textsuperscript{h}id, one can hardly avoid the conclusion that the former is derivative from the latter (Gusmani, Lyd. Wb. p. 193). Likewise, the apparently

\textsuperscript{24} For q\textsuperscript{h}red\textsuperscript{h}v as pret. 1st singular note the -(i)m- of the following ni-m-ti, which is surely dative ‘me’, and s\textsuperscript{h}of, which is best taken with Bossert, Heth. Kûn. p. 125, as pres.-fut. 1st sg. for *s\textsuperscript{h}ow (cf. faow).
productive class of verbs in -okid (kahrdao-ki and war-biokid) is surely based on the nominal suffix -ok(a)- seen in saroka- and alloka-. Note that once again the argument here is structural: it matters little that of all these only katsarlokid has a determinable meaning (‘brings humiliation to’ or similar). Likewise, if mētrid/mētrid is a verb, it is surely denominative to a stem in *-ro- or *-ri-. Unfortunately, pace Gusmani, Lyd. Wb. p. 164, these forms are at least as likely, if not more likely, to be nt. nom.–acc. singular of a noun. 27

Even leaving the last example aside, we have sufficient internal evidence for denominatives in -id. It is difficult to see any likely source for these other than the ubiquitous PIE. (and CA.) denominative suffix *-yēti. One would expect rather *-it. The solution to this problem lies in the examples (fa-kat-) wāmid and (fa-) kor-fid, whose contexts permit (though they do not prove) the respective meanings ‘meets with’ and ‘tries, attempts’, which are reconcilable with the presently cited equations with Hitt. wēmyēzzi ‘finds’ and karp(i)yezzi ‘lifts; performs’. As per Oettinger, Stammbildung p. 344, wēmyēzzi belongs to a small class of apparently primary stems with accented e-grade of the root plus *-ye/o-. The crucial point, of course, is that pre-Anatolian *wēmyēti would become CA. *wēmyēti by Eichener’s second linition rule. Contra Oettinger I would also derive karp(i)yezzi and -kor-fid from a corresponding *kēp(i)yezzi. 28

One must then assume that the accent and lenited ending of the primary type was generalized in Lydian to the denominatives. Note in support of this assumption that according to

Eichener’s accent rules most of the Lydian verbs in -id (including the clearly denominative class in -okid) must be accent on the nominal base synchronically, and all except the bizarre dactid may be. We thus have independent evidence to suggest that nowhere in the pre-history of Lydian the accent of denominatives in *-ye/o- was retracted onto the base. Given the demonstrated retraction of the accent, I see no serious difficulty with assuming also generalization of the lenited ending -id.

The precise phonological development of these verbs requires further discussion. It might seem that one could derive -wāmid directly from *-wēmyēti via apocope and then syncope of the unaccented e, leading to syllabification of the y to i (*-wēmyēti > *-wēmīd). The accented ā before nasal in an open syllable would then yield the desired ā. However, this derivation requires an impossible relative chronology, namely that the rule governing the outcome of nasalized vowels follow syncope (which here produces the open syllable). But the nasalized vowel rule must precede the loss of *n before stop (because the e of ēt- etc. requires a closed syllable, which can only be due to the *n), and loss of *n must in turn precede syncope (to account for the difference between preserved -nt- < *-nVT- and -νt- < original *-nT). We must therefore derive -id some other way.

Oettinger, KZ.92, p. 77, suggests that *-ye- becomes *-yī- in Lydian, a change he also claims for Luvian and Palaic. The latter facts may be interpreted otherwise (as syncope, e.g.), and there is no direct support for such a change in Lydian. However, in the case of -id we are dealing specifically with *-yēdi, with preceding *y and following -i. While evidence for “ụmb-laut” in Lydian is not compelling, it is suggestive: cf. probably wisṣi- ‘good’ < *wēsī- + secondary “motion-i”, i.e. *wēswi-. 29

Nothing therefore stands in the way of assuming a direct change *Cyēdi > *Cyīdi > *Cīdi, whence with apocope -Cid. One immediately asks, of course, why the i is not then syncopated. However, as indicated above, the syncope rule was surely sensitive to Lydian phonotactic constraints, and a look at the list of verbs in -id shows that not a single one of the clusters that would have resulted from syncope of the -i- is attested in word-final position in Lydian. Or more simply put,
Lydian shows no word-final clusters -Cd. Thus we may derive Lydian third singular -id regularly from *-yedi.

We come next to the class of verbs in -ad, most of which must be taken as denominatives purely on phonotactic grounds. While I can point to no specific nominal bases for any of them, the necessary nominal suffixes do exist in Lydian. The stems *silawa- and *(fa)-siwa- (which may be variants of each other, as per Gusmani, Erg.3, p.54), as well as arş-mawad (if it is a verb), presuppose nominal bases in *(o)-wo-, for which compare Lyd. širwa- ‘oath, vow’ (Gusmani, Sprache 21, 1975, p.171 f.). The stems kibra- and tarbra- suggest a base in *tyro-, for which compare arma- ‘of the Moon-god’ cited above. For a similar formal relationship within Anatolian compare Hitt. arāwa- ‘free’: arāwaḥḥ- ‘set free’ and šarazziya- ‘upper’: šarazziyaḥḥ- ‘give the upper hand to’.

However, as we have seen above, denominatives in *-ehz- corresponding to Hitt. -ahž- are surely continued in Lydian as verbs in -at, with the expected unelided ending. What is the source of a second denominative class in -ad? The most likely possibility seems to me to be *-ehz-ye/o-; the ultimate source of Hittite denominative verbs in -āzzi/-ānzi (Melchert, Phon. p.39 f., w/refs.).

The only serious obstacle to this derivation lies in the lened form of the ending. One way to account for this would be to assume that already in CA. (before Eichner’s second lention rule) these stems were accented *-ehz-ye/o- (presumably after the closely related unextended stems in *-ehz-).

Confirmation for this CA. retraction comes from Lydian verbs in -Ca-(a)-gi-ti/-Ca-a-ti. Contra Oettinger, Stammbildung p.559, and Melchert, KZ.97, p.38-34 this type cannot reflect *-ehz-ti (with the -g- showing a weakened reflex of *h₂ such as [ŋ]), because the Palaic ending shows consistently “lenited” single -t. As already indicated above, the type of Lyc. prīnawati/e ‘builds/built’ with -t- shows that the loss of *h₂ before stop with compensatory lengthening must have taken place after Eichner’s first lention rule. Given Pal. ahu-‘drink’ < *-eg⁵-, it is also unlikely that a weak velar or postvelar fricative would be spelled with -g. Finally, if the -g- reflects the *h₂, what is the source of the long vowel preceding it?

We must return to the formulation of Watkins, Flexion u. Wortbildung p.373, and derive -Ca-a-ga-ti < CA. *-âHye-di (< *-éh_ye-ti, with retraction before lention between unaccented vowels). Palaic has generalized o- or perhaps already a-vocalism (cf. Hitt. -ya- for -ye-). The -g- must be a special reflex of the combination *-Hy-. The likeliest result is a voiced palatal fricative /ʒ/ combining the features of the *H and *y. This rather unstable phoneme is then subject to loss, whence -Ca-(a)-ti. For the spelling of a voiced palatal fricative with -g- compare Hitt. ši-ga-at-ta-ra-ya- once for ši-ra-at-ta-ra-ya- as already cited by Carruba, StBoT.10, p.39. Note that the long vowel preceding the /ʒ/ need not be due to compensatory lengthening (strictly speaking, the laryngeal is not lost), but may be due to the regular lengthening of accented vowel in open syllable in Palaic: cf. wāšu- ‘good’ < *wōšu-.

Assuming CA. *-éh_ye-di with the support of the Palaic evidence, we can derive the attested shape of the Lydian type straightforwardly: *-âyedi > *-âdedi > *-âded (with syncope and simplification of the geminate). Independent support for deriving verbs in -ad from stems in *-âde/o- may be found in unadv (10,18). In view of the clear example inâniat of the next clause, we should probably also take unadv as preverb. 1st singular, despite the problematic *his, which appears to be nom. singular ‘he’. The ending -adv would reflect *-âyom via *-âdom.

We come finally to the largest class of Lydian verbs, those in -od. Unfortunately, it is also the most obscure, due to our lack of understanding of the prehistory of Lydian o. As indicated above in note 1, the only certain source of o is the sequence *ke-o-. It is also very likely that dental stop plus *wo/ʌ leads to Lydian /do/-: antio/a/-: anto/a- (part of or the contents of the
grave) may well represent a virtual CA. *end'weh,šulo- ‘human’, as per Gusmanli, Erg.1.31. The compound verb fa-do- ‘put in’ (or sim.) probably also contains a syncopated form *dWV of the stem *dWV ‘put, place’ seen in (da-)cuw(e). I know of no other solid sources of Lydian o, but we cannot exclude the possibility that at least some u-diphthongs also yield o.

Oettinger, who believes in o from syncopated -nwV (see above note 1), derives verbs which end in -nod or -vod from “thematized” nu-verbs: *nuwa > -no (see KZ.92, p.89). He reasonably compares the type of CLuv. ārlanuwa or Lyc. gânwet. However, in addition to the problematic status of the assumed syncope, there is another difficulty with this account: the comparanda have precisely unilenited endings. The lenited ending in Lydian therefore needs to be independently motivated. One possibility is to derive -nod directly from *nêuti, which by Eichner’s first rule would have become CA. *nêutl. As noted, I know of no solid evidence against *eu > Lyd. o. Unfortunately, none of the verb stems in -no/-vo has a reasonable etymology. The palatal s of the example kasnod and the very alternation between -no- and -vo- also require explanation. Thus, while I do not rule out the derivation of this group from CA. *-neur, I find this account far from assured.

With our present knowledge I see no other possibility but to try to motivate preforms with sequences *Cwô/u which will give the attested o. Thus far I can do this only for the stem tro- and its large group of compounds. This verb is transitive, and all of its compounds also take an indirect object. Several instances point clearly to a meaning ‘grant, concede, hand over’. The previous comparison with Hitt. tar- ‘say’ faces serious formal and semantic problems. A much better comparandum is CLuv. (pari) tarâwi(ya)-, which contra Laroché, DLL.92, also clearly means ‘hand over, deliver’. Also related are CLuvian tarâwiya- ‘control’ (noun) and the measure tarâwar/tarâur, which nearly means ‘hand/fistful’.31

While CLuvian tarâwi(ya)- is a denominative in *ye/o, I propose to analyze Lydian tro(d)- as a virtual *drowâye, i.e. as a denominative in *eh.ye/o-. The development to the third singular present in -od would be the same as for -ad given above, except that the sequence *trâw- first syncopated to *traw-, and then *wa became o after consonant.32 Note that the preterite first singular is trody, where the d is not part of the ending. I interpret this as another reflex of intervocalic *y, which supports the derivation of the verb stem from *dâye/o:- *drowâom > *drowâom > trody.33

One can quite mechanically reconstruct suitable nominal bases containing *Cw sequences for other of the verbs in -od,

31 The first extra-Anatolian comparandum to come to mind is Grk. δαχόν ‘palm of the hand’, but the divergent meaning and problematic o raise doubts. Perhaps one should compare rather the family of Grk. δαχόντας ‘seize, grasp’ and δαχή ‘handful, hand’, reflecting an extended *der-k- or *der-g-.

32 For pretonic syncope in Lydian (especially involving sequences with a sonorant), compare the adjective smali: < *simali- to sîma-. I readily admit that one immediately asks why there is no syncope in sîlawa. I can only answer that the accent in this case must be sîlawa. Unfortunately, even Eichner’s rules do not permit us to determine the place of the accent here on independent grounds. Note, however, the verb stem arwu- ‘appropriate’ (or sim.). Here the accent must be on the o per Eichner. Whether there has been syncope of a vowel before the w or not, it is hard to see any source for this stem except pre-Lydian *wâ- < *weh-. I therefore very tentatively suggest that pre-Lydian *wâr- (< *wôr- or *wôd-) becomes -wôr- under the accent, but remains -wa- when unaccented. This would imply sîlâwa, arsîmâ-wa- and râwa-, but arwu-. We obviously need more evidence to confirm this suggestion.

33 I must make explicit the fact that the present singular -trow cannot be regular by my derivation of the stem. By the rules developed above, we would expect *Câweyevow > *Câwâye/ow > *Câwâye/ow > *Câwâye/ow > *Câwâye/ow > *Câwâye/ow. However, the second singular would be *Cos and the third singular -Cod: cf. -es and -ed above from *-ês and *-êd. A levelling of the allomorph -Cos from the second and third person to the first does not seem to me surprising, whence -Cos.
but without independent support within Lydian or at least Anatolian, this is pointless. We must simply admit that most examples in -ot remain obscure.

If, as is likely but not assured, tatrot is a reduplicated form of tro- (formed after devoicing of initial *d), then the ending -ot instead of -od requires explanation. Since we appear to have assumed some examples of third person presents from old plurals, I suggest that -ot is the plural correspondent to -od, which is formally unproblematic: *-trwáyonit > *-trwádondi > *-trwádat > *-trwádat > *-tro. That this explanation is possible does not, of course, make it correct. A solid analysis of verbs in -ot will come only when we better understand the history of those in -od.

The one verb in -ud, énuud, is unclear in both its structure (preverb én- + u-?) and meaning. Mere speculation about possible preforms here would serve no useful purpose.

Our survey of Lydian third person presents is complete. Obviously, many uncertainties remain, and the dearth of solid root etymologies (the result of our imprecise grasp of the synchronous meanings), leads to a greater degree of arbitrariness in our historical analysis than we would like. Nevertheless, starting with historical phonological rules most of which are independently motivated, we have arrived at Lydian preforms whose phonological shapes suggest, although they do not prove, derivation from well-established PIE and CA. morphological types. We can also explain the distribution of -t and -d in the third person present, unmotivated synchronically, as the result of CA. lenition as established by Eichner, assuming in the case of -id and -ed analogical influence of the root-accented types on the corresponding denominatives.
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