
MONOGRAFIE SCIENTIFICHE
SERIE SCIENZE UMANE E SOCIALI

Istituto di Studi sulle Civiltà dell'Egeo e del Vicino Oriente

LICIA E LIDIA
PRIMA DELL'ELLENIZZAZIONE

Atti del Convegno internazionale
Roma, 11-12 ottobre 1999

A cura di
M. GIORGIERI, M. SALVINI, M.-C. TRÉMOUILLE, P. VANNICELLI

CONSIGLIO NAZIONALE DELLE RICERCHE
ROMA 2003

(chiefly innovations). These groupings are thus not mutually exclusive. Rather, as per classical dialectology, one expects to find focus, transition, and relic areas. I will return to this issue in Section IV.

II. The Dialectal Position of Lydian

There is a general consensus on the “relatively” early isolation of Lydian from the other dialects: see e.g. Kronasser (1956: 234), Carruba (1963: 398), and Oettinger (1978: 92) – but compare the stemma in Starke (1997: 468). Opinion diverges as to its further affiliations. One viewpoint claims an especially close affinity with Hittite (with or without Palaic): cautiously Kammenhuber (1959: 12), citing Sommer (1947: 32f.); Carruba (1961: 459ff. and 1963: passim). An alternate proposal makes Lydian part of a “western Anatolian” group (again with or without Palaic): thus Oettinger (1978: 92), Gusmani (1995: 13), Starke (1997: 468).

I do not find the evidence cited for the first viewpoint compelling. Most features shared by Lydian with Hittite are retentions: the pronominal nt. nom.-acc. sg. ending in *-d* (Kammenhuber 1959: 12); the gen./dat.-loc. pl. ending *-av* = OH *-an* (Carruba 1961: 461 – cf. in any case Lycian *-ē!*); relatively less “*i*-mutation” in *a*-stems (Carruba 1961: 459). The claimed common innovations are either false or unprovable. If Hittite pronominal genitive *-ēl* is cognate with Lydian dat. sg. *-λ*, this feature is not a clear innovation, since it is *not* borrowed from Hattic *-il* (contra Sommer 1947: 33 et al.) – see rather Gusmani (1995: 14). But the equation is by no means assured: cf. Oettinger (1978: 85 after Eichner). The Lydian preterite 1st sg. ending *-v* may reflect directly **-om*, and there is no proof that it matches the innovative Hittite *hi*-ending *-ḫun*, while Lydian *-uv* is probably first plural (contra Carruba 1961: 460 & 1963: 407). Contra Carruba (1961: 459ff.) the Lydian iterated dat.-loc. plural ending *-vav* is not cognate with the Hittite pronominal gen. pl. *-enzan* (for the latter see Melchert 1994a: 121 with refs.). There is also no general contraction of **-iya-* > *-i-* in Lydian (Melchert 1994c vs. Carruba 1963: 386) – in any case Luvian shows the same syncope. In sum, I am not aware of any compelling common innovations of Hittite and Lydian. One cannot help but conclude that their alleged similarity consists essentially in that they do *not* share in several features peculiar to Luvian and Lycian.

On the other hand, there are a few solid and significant common innovations shared by Lydian with Luvian and Lycian: (1) pres. 1st sg. in **-wi* (Carruba 1963: 392; Oettinger 1978: 84); (2) new stem **duwV-* ‘place, put’ (Oettinger 1978: 89); (3) PIE **eh₁* > *ā* (Melchert 1997); (4) **yē* > *(y)i* (Oettinger 1976/77, but false for Palaic).³ Even if one accepts all of these, however, their number is modest. I believe we must cautiously concede that current evidence leaves open three scenarios.

The first possibility is that Lydian is simply one more Anatolian dialect like all the others: it has diverged from the common pre-stage Proto-Anatolian by a series of unique

³ Further examples are less assured in terms of the Lydian: a new anim. nom. pl. in **-nsi* (Melchert 1991: 138); active pret. 3rd sg. in **-tola* (Oettinger 1978: 86); 3rd pers. sg. dat. in **-tu* (Oettinger 1978: 85 after Eichner).

innovations. A few of the features it shares with other dialects are due to later developments spread areally. Its unique, aberrant appearance is an illusion due to the paucity of data and our very limited understanding of what we do have. Note that it currently seems possible to view Carian as a transition dialect between Lycian and Lydian, removing the latter from some of its isolation (cf. van den Hout 1999 et al.).

The second possibility is that Lydian was the first Anatolian dialect to isolate itself from the others, putatively in the far west of Asia Minor. The relatively few shared innovations with the other western dialects (notably Luvian and Lycian) would be due to later contact when speakers of these languages (or rather of their prestages) moved into the area. See the remarks of Carruba (1963: 398ff.) and especially those of Starke (1997: 457ff.) on the spread of Luvian.⁴

Despite my previous strong claims to the contrary (e.g. Melchert 1994a: 5ff.), I also do not think we can entirely exclude a third possibility: Lydian is not derived from the common prestage we define as Proto-Anatolian, but is an independent IE branch in Anatolian (like the later Phrygian). What features it shares with Anatolian (most notably Luvian and Lycian) would be due entirely to convergence through contact once these languages spread into western Asia Minor.

I personally lean at present towards the second alternative, but the basis for a decision rests on relatively few common innovations (and the *apparent* absence of unique shared features with Hittite). New data and further research may either confirm or alter the current picture.

III. The Dialectal Position of Lycian

It is safe to say that the standard current opinion is that Lycian is a "Luvian" dialect: see Oettinger (1978: 92), Starke (1997: 468 and emphatically 476¹⁰⁸), and even more expressly Kammenhuber (1959: 12), who takes HLuvian, and "allem Anschein nach" also Lycian, as a continuant of CLuvian. We even find the peculiar claim of Starke (1982: 419ff.) and (1997: 468) that Milyan ("Lycian B") should be grouped with CLuvian and HLuvian *versus* Lycian!⁵ The close relationship of Lycian and Luvian has been taken as established since the work of Tritsch (1950) and Laroche (1960) and (1967). However, the claim that Lycian is a mere (late) dialect of Luvian has been challenged: see Guşmani (1960: esp. 497f.) and Melchert (1992).

That Lycian and Luvian share a very large number of isoglosses, including significant

⁴ Pursuing the ideas of Starke, Theo van den Hout at this congress has spoken of Lydian as a linguistic "enclave" (scil. relic area) in the west. I wish to emphasize that this scenario is independent of any ideas about where the speakers of the other dialects came *from* (i.e., from central Anatolia or from elsewhere). All that is crucial is the notion that the speakers of (pre)-Lydian arrived in western Asia Minor significantly earlier than the others.

⁵ Aside from the trivial retention of *s in Milyan (vs. Lycian *s > h), this bizarre claim is based entirely on the false premise that Lycian (A) does not share in the renewal of the anim. nom. plural by an ending *-nsi. As already shown by Eichner (1974: 20), the Lycian anim. nom. plural is also based on *-(i)nsi. See also Melchert (1994a: 317f.). Whatever one decides about the dialectal position of Lycian, Lycian A and B (= Milyan) are *incontrovertibly* closely related dialects of a *single* language!

common innovations, is undeniable (see Section IV below). There are, however, also crucial divergences. As pointed out by Gusmani (1960) and others, Lycian shows a gen. plural in $-\tilde{e} < *-om$ and dat.-loc. pl. $-e < *-os$ versus the total loss of the genitive plural and a renewed dat.-loc. plural in $-anz(a)$ in Luvian. The Lycian four-vowel system /a/, /e/, /i/, /u/ also cannot be derived from the three-vowel system /a/, /i/, /u/ of Proto-Luvian. Contra Starke (1997: 476¹⁰⁸), a conditioned split of *short* $*\check{a} > \text{Lyc. } e$ is not possible – NB pret. 1st sg. $*-h_2a > -\chi/ga$. The arguments of Melchert (1992) and Rasmussen (1992) for a merger of Proto-Anatolian $*\check{\delta}$ with $\check{\delta}$ in Lycian versus its merger with \check{d} in Luvian has not won universal acceptance, but no genuine arguments against their analysis have been presented. Indeed, the critical review of Hajnal (1995: 91ff.) upholds the basic claim. I must in any case insist on the absence of any demonstration that the Lycian vowel system can be derived from that of Luvian. I may add here as another divergence the use of *me* as the fundamental conjunction of Lycian versus its total absence in Luvian.

In sum, it is quite impossible to derive all the features of Luvian and Lycian from a single prestage that one could define as “Proto-Luvian”, a common prestage distinguished from Proto-Anatolian by a series of common innovations *and* retentions that would justify a separate “node” in a stemma model. We should rather speak of a “southwestern” dialect group comprising at least Luvian, Lycian, and Carian, probably also Sidetic and Pisidian.⁶ The group is defined by a significant set of shared innovations (see Section IV below), but by the tenets of classical dialectology (as opposed to a rigid stemma model) this in no way precludes that some members of the group may also share innovative isoglosses with other Anatolian dialects (Luvian with Hittite and Palaic, and Carian *perhaps* with Lydian).⁷ I submit that it is beyond our capabilities and therefore useless to try to decide whether the situation we observe is due to: (1) a period of post-Proto-Anatolian common development, then divergence with some subsequent secondary areal influence; or (2) simply divergence from Proto-Anatolian and then secondary contact.

IV. Tentative Inner-Anatolian Isoglosses and Subgroupings

The following list of isoglosses should be viewed as provisional and subject to change at any time. I have tried to indicate the source for the claimed shared feature, except for those generally accepted in the field.

⁶ The extremely sparse current evidence for the last two languages would permit them to be viewed as later manifestations of Luvian in the narrow sense, but I believe proper method demands that we make the weaker hypothesis that they are closely related dialects until such time as there is evidence for their sharing specifically Luvian innovations.

⁷ I must in any case earnestly ask even colleagues who insist on a common Luvo-Lycian prestage to desist from using the term “Luvian” for such a notion. First of all, such a usage misleads the uninitiated into inferring more than is being claimed. I cite as merely one example the statement of Bryce, *JNES* 51 (1992) 129: “The first millennium language spoken in Lycia was clearly a direct descendant of Luvian...” (even Starke (1997: 468) clearly contradicts this claim). Second, the use of the term “Luvian” in this broader sense seriously confuses the quite legitimate issue as to just how widespread geographically Luvian in the strict sense was in western Anatolia – see Starke (1997: 457ff.).

Phonology (see globally Melchert 1994a):

- (1) **eh*₁ > *ā* (Luvian, Lycian, Lydian) (Melchert 1989 & 1997)
- (2) **yě* > *(*y*)*i* (Luvian, Lycian, Lydian) (Oettinger 1976/77; but false for Palaic)
- (3) **k̄* > **ś* (or sim.) (Luvian, Lycian, Carian) (Melchert 1987&1989; for Carian see Adiego 1993: 169)
- (4) irregular **s*- > **t*- (Luvian, Lycian)
- (5) **ṽ* > *ṽ* / *_C_iV* (Luvian, Palaic, Hittite) (Kimball 1983; Eichner 1986: 13 et aliter)
- (6) **ō*, **ě* > **ō*, *ē* / *_C_i*. (Luvian, Palaic, Hittite) (Melchert 1994a: 133ff. & 146ff. with refs. to Eichner and Kimball)
- (7) **ō̃* > *ā̃* (Luvian, Palaic, Hittite)
- (8) **ḡ/g^(h)* > **y* > *Ø* / *_V*[+front] (Luvian, Lycian) (Kimball 1994)
- (9) **tn-* > *-nn-* (Hittite, Palaic) (Carruba 1970: 4, et al.)
- (10) **t/dw* > *kw* (Luvian, Lycian – A only!) (Laroche 1967: 46ff)

Morphology/Syntax

- (11) New AnimNomPl in **-nsi* (Luvian, Lycian, prob. Lydian and Carian) (Melchert 1991: 138 for Lydian; Hajnal 1997: 147f. for Carian; NB includes Lycian A, pace Oettinger 1976/77: 131ff., Starke 1982: 419ff., et al.; correct Eichner 1974: 20!)
- (12) Generalized Pret1Sg *-h(h)a* (Luvian, Lycian, Palaic) (Carruba 1970: 4, et al.)
- (13) Synchronic Ptc. in **-omno/i-* (Luvian, Lycian, Carian, prob. Palaic)
- (14) Enclitic Dat3rdPersPron *-du* (Palaic, Luvian) (Carruba 1970: 4; Oettinger 1978: 86, adds Lydian *-λ*; arguable)
- (15) Synchronic Ptc. in **-ont-* (Palaic, Hittite) (Carruba 1970: 4, et al.)
- (16) Infinitive in *-una* (Palaic, Luvian, prob. Lycian, perh. Carian) (Carruba 1970: 4; for Lycian Laroche 1960: 173; for Carian Melchert forthcoming)
- (17) Pres1Sg **-wi* (Luvian, Lycian, Lydian) (Carruba 1963: 392; Oettinger 1978: 84)
- (18) “Ethnica” in **-wen(i)-* (Luvian, Lycian, Carian) (Laroche 1960: 171ff., but ≠ Hitt. *-uman-*!; for Carian see Adiego 1993: 212)
- (19) ActPret3Sg **-to* (Luvian, Lycian; prob. Carian) (Tritsch 1950: 506f., et al.; Oettinger 1978: 86, adds Lydian; possible; for Carian Melchert 1993: 78)
- (20) Formation of stem **duwV-* for “place, put” (Luvian, Lycian, Lydian, perh. Carian) (Oettinger 1978: 89; for Carian Melchert forthcoming)
- (21) “Relational” Adj. replaces genitive (Luvian, Lycian, Lydian, Carian)

Based on the preceding isoglosses, we may establish the following tentative subgroupings:

Luvian, Lycian, Lydian (+/- Carian): 1, 2, [11], 17, 20, [21]

Luvian, Lycian (+/- Carian): 3, 4, 8, 10, 13, 18, 19 (last *could* belong in previous!)

Luvian, Palaic, Hittite: 5, 6, 7

Luvian, Lycian, Palaic: 12, 16

Luvian, Palaic: 14 (possibly also Lydian!)

Palaic, Hittite: 9, 15 (but NB one is retention, other trivial assimilation)

I have bracketed features number 11 and 21 in the first grouping because I do not consider my arguments for the first in Lydian to be beyond doubt, while the fact that Lydian uses a different productive suffix for the genitival adjective from the rest makes it uncertain whether this usage is truly a shared innovation in the strict sense. In any case, the southwestern dialect group is obvious (combine the first two lists of shared features!), but so is a western group that includes Lydian. The status of Luvian as a transitional dialect between east and west is also clear – hardly surprising given its geographic position – but it is worth noting that the eastern connections are rather shallow, consisting entirely of phonological changes of a typologically rather trivial sort. If Starke (1997) is correct in arguing for Luvian (in the strict sense) as being relatively widespread across western and southern Anatolia, such a distribution suggests a relatively recent spread – are we then to suppose that the shared innovations with Palaic and Hittite are likewise recent phenomena? Be that as it may, one is struck by the relative conservatism of Hittite and Palaic, which share only two quite trivial isoglosses.⁸ One is left with the impression of a southwestern “focus area” of innovations away from a more stable (north)east. Some of these innovations predictably spread farther than others, while a relatively recent expansion of Luvian may have further isolated the western dialects of Lycian, Carian, and Lydian from Hittite. I must emphasize again in conclusion that the picture just presented is a snapshot, subject to change at any time with the discovery of new evidence, especially for the western dialects.

⁸ This does not, of course, mean that these languages did not undergo a significant number of innovations – they did – merely that most of these are unique to each individual dialect. We must also never forget that our knowledge of Palaic is severely limited, and more data might reveal more shared innovations, with Hittite or with the western dialects.

REFERENCES

- Adiego, Ignacio-Javier. 1993. *Studia Carica*. Barcelona: PPU.
- Carruba, Onofrio. 1961. "Lydisch und Hethitisch". *ZDMG* 111.458-463.
- 1963. "Lydisch und Lyder". *MIO* 8.383-408.
- 1970. *Das Palaische. Texte, Grammatik, Lexikon* (StBoT 10). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Eichner, Heiner 1974. *Untersuchungen zur hethitischen Deklination* (Diss. Teildruck). Erlangen.
- 1986. "Die Akzentuation des Lydischen". *Sprache* 32.7-21.
- Fronzaroli, Pelio. 1957. "Contributo alla definizione dialettale dell'ittita". *La Colombaria* 22.117-179.
- Garrett, Andrew. to appear. "A New Model of Indo-European Subgrouping and Dispersal". *Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistic Society* 25.
- Gusmani, Roberto. 1960. "Concordanze e discordanze nella flessione nominale del licio e del luvio". *RIL* 94.497-512.
- 1995. "Zum Stand der Erforschung der lydischen Sprache". In *Forschungen in Lydien* (ed. E. Schwertheim) (Asia Minor Studien 17), 9-19. Bonn: Habelt.
- Hajnal, Ivo. 1995. *Der lykische Vokalismus*. Graz: Leykam.
- 1997. "Die karisch-griechische Bilingue 44* aus Kaunos: ein erster Augenschein". *Kadmos* 36.141-166.
- van den Hout, Theo. 1999. "-ms(-): a Carian Enclitic Pronoun?" *Kadmos* 38.31-42.
- Kammenhuber, Annelies. 1959. "Zur hethitisch-luvischen Sprachgruppe". *KZ* 76.1-26.
- Kimball, Sara. 1983. *Hittite Plene Writing*. Univ. of Pennsylvania Ph.D. dissertation. Philadelphia.
- 1994. "Loss and retention of voiced velars in Luvian: another look". *IF* 99.75-85.
- Kronasser, Heinz. 1956. *Vergleichende Laut- und Formenlehre des Hethitischen*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Laroche, Emmanuel. 1960 and 1967. "Comparaison du louvite et du lycien". *BSL* 55.155-185, 62.46-66.
- Lazzeroni, Romano. 1960. "Considerazioni sulla cronologia di alcune isoglosse delle lingue anatoliche". *ASNP, Serie II*, 29.103-124.
- Melchert, Craig. 1987. "PIE Velars in Luvian". *Studies in Memory of Warren Cowgill* (ed. C. Watkins), 182-204. New York/Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- 1989. "New Luvo-Lycian Isoglosses". *HS* 102.23-45.
- 1991. "The Lydian Emphasizing and Reflexive Particle -s/-is". *Kadmos* 30.131-142.
- 1992. "Relative Chronology and Anatolian: the Vowel System". In *Rekonstruktion und Relative Chronologie. Akten der VIII. Fachtagung der indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Leiden* (ed. R. Beekes et al.), 41-53. Innsbruck : IBS.
- 1993. "Remarks on Some New Readings in Carian". *Kadmos* 32.77-86.
- 1994a. *Anatolian Historical Phonology*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- 1994b. "The Feminine Gender in Anatolian". In *Früh-, Mittel-, Spätindogermanisch. Akten der IX. Fachtagung der indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Zürich* (ed. George Dunkel et al.), 231-244. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

- 1994c. "PIE *y > Lydian d". In *Iranian and Indo-European Studies. Memorial Volume of Otakar Klíma* (ed. P. Vavroušek), 181-187. Prague: Enigma.
- 1997. "PIE Dental Consonants in Lydian". In *Festschrift for Eric P. Hamp* (ed. D. Adams), II.32-47. Washington: Institute for the Study of Man.
- 1998. "The dialectal position of Anatolian". In *Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistic Society 24. Special Session on Indo-European Subgrouping and Internal Relations* (ed. B. Bergen et al.), 24-31.
- Oettinger, Norbert. 1976/77. "Nochmals zum lykischen Plural". *InL* 3.131-135.
- 1978. "Die Gliederung des anatolischen Sprachgebietes". *KZ* 92.74-92.
- Rasmussen, Jens. 1992. "The Distribution of *e* and *a* in Lycian". In *Rekonstruktion und Relative Chronologie. Akten der VIII. Fachtagung der indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Leiden* (ed. R. Beekes et al.), 359-366. Innsbruck: IBS.
- Sommer, Ferdinand. 1947. *Hethiter und Hethitisch*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- Starke, Frank. "Die Kasusendungen der luwischen Sprachen". In *Serta Indogermanica. Festschrift für Günter Neumann* (ed. J. Tischler), 407-425. Innsbruck: IBS.
- 1990. *Untersuchung zur Stammbildung des keilschrift-luwischen Nomens* (StBoT 31). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- 1997. "Troia im Kontext des historisch-politischen und sprachlichen Umfeldes Kleinasiens im 2. Jahrtausend". *Studia Troica* 7.448-487.
- Tritsch, F.J. 1950. "Lycian, Luwian and Hittite". *Symbolae ad Studia Orientis Pertinentes Frederico Hrozny Dedicatae* (ed. V. Čihár et al.), 3.494-518.
- Watkins, Calvert. 1998. "La linguistique comparée en 1997: quelques réflexions". In *Proceedings of the 16th International Congress of Linguists* (ed. B. Caron). Oxford: Pergamonn.