1. It is a great pleasure to offer the following lines in modest tribute to Roberto Gusmani, whose work has enhanced our understanding of several of the "minor" Indo-European languages of Anatolia and whose Lydisches Wörterbuch remains after forty years the indispensable foundation for all study of the Lydian language. In the absence of a significant new bilingual, progress in Lydian studies is inevitably slow and incremental. We can only continue to use combinatory textual analysis together with cautious external comparison, restricting the latter as much as possible to the other Indo-European Anatolian languages most closely related to Lydian. In this process we must always bear in mind the hypothetical nature of our analyses – hence the question mark of my title.

2. Text 24 contains mutual pledges of property by Mitradašta and the supreme authority of the temenos (the šerliš šrmlisš). The pledge of Mitradašta is followed by a series of relative clauses describing potential violations of the property consigned to the šerliš šrmlisš and then curse formulas against the violator. The word fapuwerflaç occurs in line 9, in the series of relative clauses:

\[
\begin{align*}
ak &= m\lambda = i\lambda qiš \ citollad \ pitaad \\
puk &= m\lambda = i\lambda fakaršed \ qik \\
puk &= m\lambda = a[d] \ fapuwerflaç \\
puk &= m\lambda = it \ pašvasakvākid \ niwis\lambda qel\lambda = k \\
puk \ měšlid \ puk \ pidēv \ qik \ int
\end{align*}
\]

The sense of the second and fifth clauses is reasonably clear: "or cuts off from him anything for himself" and "or does any harm or damage" respectively. The syntactic structure and basic content of the first and fourth clauses must be parallel: "whoever p's (a) c. from him for himself" and "or p's (to) him for/in something evil" (see the respective lemmata in Gusmani 1964).

---

1 Unless otherwise noted, all Lydian texts are cited after Gusmani 1964. In my transliteration I follow Schürr 1999, pp. 171-173, in using s for the Lydian dental sibilant and s for the palatal(ized) sibilant (vs. previous s and s respectively), and likewise p for previous b. I use w for v (labial fricative) in order to avoid confusion with the nasal v (Greek nu). I mark morpheme boundaries within clitic sequences with =.

2 For the sense of fakaršed in combination with -iš see Melchert 1991, pp. 140-141 and for that of měšlid Innocente 1986.
The dative enclitic pronoun 

mλ, referring to the šerliš šrmliš who is the recipient of the pledged property, is in all cases a “dative of disadvantage”.

3. As already elucidated by GUSMANI 1964, p. 113, fapuwerftal must surely be a verb, the predicate of the remaining clause puk=mλ=a[d] fapuwerftal, with the frequent verbal prefix fa-. The parallelism with the surrounding clauses demands specifically a present third person (singular) verb, but it does not show the expected -dit ending. Gusmani correctly dismisses the possibility of segmenting off the final -aλ as a dative enclitic pronoun. I propose rather that -tal is formally a present third person (singular) medio-passive ending, matching Hittite -ttari. Lydian shows palatalization of s* and l*. It would not be surprising if it likewise palatalized r* before a following i*. However, a palatalized r might well have been unstable, leading to substitution by palatal(ized) λ, particularly in word-final position, after regular apocope of the final unaccented i*. 3

4. The context argues strongly for a transitive verb with the potential violator as the subject, as in the other clauses. A formally medio-passive fapuwerftal would thus have to be functioning as a deponent. Such an assumption is not problematic for an Anatolian language, as shown by examples such as Hittite present third singular medio-passive šarradda “violates” (an oath), šarrattari “divides up”. 4

5. Further analysis of the form and meaning of our verb is necessarily speculative and of decidedly secondary interest. As noted above, we may segment off the prefix fa-. Since a suffix -(e)r- is hardly conceivable, the root appears to lie in the sequence -werf-, pointing to *wer- (less likely *verw-). Any connection with Hittite warp- “to bathe” or warpa- “enclosure” seems unlikely on semantic grounds. Conceivable is a relationship to the base of Luvo-Hittite warpal- “mighty, powerful” or the like (= Akk. gašru in KUB 4.11 Ro 13). 5 A sense “or wrests it from him by force” would be suitable for our Lydian passage (cf. German sich bemächtigen “to seize” < Macht “might, force”), but this is a mere possibility. 6 I insist only that the context of fapuwerftal argues for a finite tran-

3 Lydian shows no examples of word-final r, so a final palatalized variant would also surely have been problematic. Whether any internal examples of λ in Lydian represent palatalized r is a separate question that I cannot pursue here. The present analysis requires no such assumption.

4 For the latter see KUB 24.13 III 7, referring to the placement of images. For further examples of transitive medio-passives in Hittite see NEU 1968, pp. 54-67.

5 Contra MELCHERT 1993, p. 265, Hieroglyphic Luvian (*273) wašl- is išu means something like “virtue, skill”, as per HAWKINS and MORPURGO DAVIES 1986, pp. 76-77. Derivation of such a sense from a base *war-p- “might” presupposed by warpal- is quite possible, as shown by the evolution of meaning of OE creft from “power, might” (= German Kraft) to “skill, art”.

6 The remaining -pu of fapuwerf- is problematic. Since a sequence *wu (i.e. [wu]) is nowhere attested in Lydian, we are permitted to suppose thatockuwmutation, but *uwuwerf- can hardly be viewed as reduplication. One could assume a preverb *u- matching Hittite ū-
itive verb and that Lydian phonology and Anatolian morphology are compatible with its analysis as a deponent medio-passive.

6. As shown by Schürr 1997, text 22 describes mutual provisions made by the Sardians and a group of people designated by the word _mлимns(a)_-. Among the many important implications of Schürr’s analysis for Lydian grammar are reaffirmation of earlier proposals that _ms_ is the third person plural dative pronoun corresponding to Cuneiform Luvian -mmaš and Hittite -šmaš (Carruba 1969, pp. 69ff. and 81) and that some words ending in -(V)s are nominative or accusative animate plurals (cf. Carruba 1969 43 and 75).  

7. Text 22 contains three clauses with likely verb forms in -tλ. Lines 5-6 read: ᵈᵃqid=ᵃ _mлимns_ ʾ=iš sfarλ iiṭλ ak=ms ʾalidad wisiyy kattīw. In lines 7-11 we find: ᵃṭros=ⁿ=ms ʾaqes šcɛntλ _mлимnas_ ʾaww sfardēṭaw ak=ms=ad šwralmiš arīmul kattīr ᵈ=k ṣykilīš ʾarrāt=ⁿ=k qid=ᵃ iiṭλ _mлимns_ iši sfarλ ak=ms _irduv_ šwralmiš arīmul kattīr. Schürr 1997, 204 with n. 8, claims that the clauses with iiṭλ and cɛntλ contain no verb, but (q)сид=ᵃ is neuter nom.-acc. singular, while by his own analysis _mлимns_ must be animate nominative plural. This mismatch makes a nominal sentence extremely unlikely: “Whatever the M’s (are)…” As for cɛntλ, it cannot credibly be separated from the clear verb forms ʾcɛnu and ʾcɛnal (cf. Gusmani 1964, p. 89).

8. Schürr 1997, p. 209, argues for an animate accusative plural in -as versus nominative singular and nominative plural in just -s, but the basis for such a consistent distinction is extremely dubious. The form _alarmas_ “self” in 13.1 next to preterite first singular _çɛnsdv_ is clearly nominative singular and cannot possibly be accusative plural (contra Schürr 1997, p. 202 n. 3). I continue to take _mлимnas/mлимns_ as variants of the same form, just like _alarmas/alarmas_ and _inallin_ (thus with Gusmani 1964, p. 31). Current evidence suggests that in Lydian animate a-stems the ending -(a)s was nominative singular, nominative plural, and accusative plural.  

< *au- and then a hiatus-filling *-w-: *fa-u-werf- > *fa-wu-werf- > fpwuwerf-. But this string of unverifiable hypotheses is virtually worthless.

7 These findings supersede the claim in Melchert 1991, pp. 138-139, for -aš as an animate nominative and accusative plural ending in Lydian, which is hereby withdrawn. As per Schürr 1997, p. 202 n. 3, _aš_ in text 13.1 is surely the subject of its clause.

8 Schürr 1997, p. 207, translates “Was auch (immer) mлимma- bei sfar- (sind)”, assuming real gender-number incongruence. In our current state of knowledge of Lydian I find such an assumption unacceptably ad hoc.

9 Against Gusmani, however, the variants with -a- are original, and we are dealing with syncope. An original consonant stem is not remotely credible in the case of _alarmas_ and very unlikely in the case of _mлимma_. For _ina-_ compare _ини_.

10 The fact that this ambiguity causes us very serious problems in interpreting Lydian texts is
9. Everything points to nāqid = a mālimns išt sfarλ iiτλ/qid = a iiτλ mālimns išt sfarλ as “Whatever _s the Mālimna’s from/in Sardis.” I follow SCHÜRR 1997, p. 205, in taking -ms in the respective following clauses as third person dative plural (referring back to mālimns) and šiwrālmiš artimul as nominative plural. I modify his analysis by interpreting kārtiwiw as preterite first plural (see MELCHERT 1994, p. 336, with refs.) and kārtiš as preterite third plural (MELCHERT 2004, p. 147). In the first instance the Sarians are speaking: “whatever _s the Mālimna’s from/in Sardis, we have decreed an alidad wiswid for them.” This appears to be a reciprocal act versus that of line 3: mālimns alidad kārtiš “the Mālimna’s have decreed an alidad wiswid.”

10. Likewise in lines 7-11 we are likely dealing with some kind of reciprocal obligations: “Also (-k) whatever (qesš) darto- (is) to them (-ms) (= they have), it _s (cēntλ) for the Mālimna’s (mālimnav) to š. to/for the Sarians.” The š. of Artemis, the priest of P. and the armα- have decreed it for them. Whatever _s the Mālimna’s from/in Sardis, the š. of Artemis have decreed to i. it to them (or decreed it to be i. to them).”

11. The context argues that cēntλ is an impersonal verb with a meaning such as “behoves, is required”. Verbs of this sense can be derived from a great variety of sources, but the fact that the same verb is attested as a personal verb in the active narrows the range of possibilities. In 10,8 we find ak cēnal nārs qλ šers ciwäwiš kārtadmēš and in 10,19-20 ak epad ināniv sfarwad ak cēnu ēna=k taada=k šiwrēš šahtol. In the second instance, where our verb is preceded by “and epad I have made an oath/pledge” (for sfarwa- see GUSMANI 1975, pp. no argument against such a system. Compare the ambiguity of the Hittite ending -aš in a-stems or the Lydian ending -i in stems with “i-mutation”.

12 For kārtiš as “to decree” see MELCHERT 2004, p. 141. The boundary between clauses in lines 2-3 is not entirely clear, and it is possible that (contra SCHÜRR 1997, p. 205) we should take the preceding sfarwad osirikol mētatalod as part of the same sentence: “To the Sardinian a, as a mētatalod the M’s have decreed an alidad wiswid.” In this case the reciprocity would be explicit.

13 In view of the negated ni-qesš- (in nipesši=k dēi in the preceding clause), I provisionally retain the interpretation of qesš- as “whatever”, but the stem formation of qesš- is quite unclear. For arguments that it cannot belong to the same stem as qesš=k (thus GUSMANI 1964, p. 182) see VAN DEN HOUT forthcoming.

14 I tentatively take both šiwyv and irduv as an infinitives. For the latter see CARRUBA 1960, p. 43, n. 23 (cf. also SCHÜRR 1997, p. 202 on wiyv).
170-171), a sense “to owe, be obligated” seems reasonable: “and I am obligated, and (my) mother and father (as) š., for/to the š.” In 10,8 only civvališ karaadmēs “divine decree” is fairly clear (Melchert 2004, p. 141). An overall sense of “and the n. was obligated on whom the divine decree (was) imposed” seems possible. However, this depends on the form šers also belonging to the stem ši- “to bind upon, impose” (Melchert 2004, p. 141), which is far from assured. Merely as an example to show that such a combination of uses is possible I cite Greek ὀφείλω “I owe”, whose medio-passive form ὀφείλεται is used impersonally (alongside the more common active ὀφείλει) to mean “is required, must”. I forgo any etymological speculations.

12. For iitl the context points to a meaning such as “is due”: “whatever is due the Māīmna’s from Sardis.” Derivation from *h,e-i- “to go” is possible: cf. English “goes to” in the sense “falls to the lot of”: “the race goes to the swift.” The difference in shape between putative medio-passive iit-l and cēn-l versus fapwerg-f-tl would be due to the preceding cluster -rf- in the latter, which prevented the syncope seen in -tl.

13. Our inability to determine with any reliability the meaning of most Lydian lexical morphemes unfortunately renders our analyses even of grammatical morphemes tentative and provisional. The present account is no exception. I do hope to have shown that the internal evidence of the texts argues that fapwerp-tl, iitl, and cēnl are present third person finite verb forms. If one accepts this premise, their further analysis as formal medio-passives derived from the known Proto-Anatolian ending *-tori seems to me a plausible hypothesis.

---

15 As in Euripides, Alcestis 782: βροτος ἄναψ καθώς κεινέαν ὀφείλεται “all men must die”.
16 The widely accepted hypothesis that cēn- is an extension of ca- (e.g. Gusmani 1964, p. 89 and Melchert 1997, p. 39) is based on little more than the phonetic resemblance and carries no weight. I note here that, whereas cēn- continues to appear to be intransitive, the arguments in Melchert 1997, pp. 39-40, that ca- is intransitive must now be entirely reevaluated. In particular, in view of the findings of Schürr 1997 cited above we must again take seriously the suggestion of Carruba 1960, p. 52 et aliter, that some cases of enclitic -as are animate accusative plural.
17 Similarly in Latin: id ad me lucrum “the profit falls to me coming to me” (Plautus, Poen., 683). In view of acc. pl. māmmes instead of dat.-loc. pl. māmmav one could also think in terms of “whatever concerns the Māīmna’s on the part of Sardis.” Again derivation from “to go” is possible: cf. German angehen.
18 Naturally I do not claim that all Lydian words ending in -(a)l are third person present medio-passive verbs. For example, the contexts argue that kspētal in 11,4 and warenētal in 11,5 are dative-locative singulars.
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