

Festschrift for Eric P. Hamp

Volume II

Editor

Douglas Q. Adams

Journal of Indo-European Studies
Monograph Number 25
Institute for the Study of Man
1133 13th St. N.W. #C-2
Washington D.C. 20005

1997

European languages of Anatolia which are most closely related to Lydian. There is general agreement that the combinatory analysis must be given primacy in this procedure.

Certain aspects of the development of the inherited dental stops are already quite clear. Lydian shares in the Proto-Anatolian change by which a PIE word-final dental stop is generalized as *-d*: Lyd. *qid* = Hitt. *kuit* 'what' (nt. nom.-acc. sg.),² enclitic *-ad* = Hitt. *-at* 'it' (nt. nom.-acc. sg.),³ Lydian generalizing particle *-kod* = Palaic *-kuwat* 'anyhow' < **-k^wod* (formally = Hitt. *kuwat* 'why?'): see Melchert, 1994a: 85 and 338, with references. In Lydian this characteristic pronominal neuter ending was secondarily generalized to neuter nouns and adjectives as well (e.g. *mrud* 'stele').

Although the number of examples is restricted, the regular outcome of PIE **t* is clearly Lydian *t*. For initial position one may cite *tawša-* 'great, powerful' < **te/ouh_sso-*, and for medial position *kat-* 'down' < **katV*, the particle *-(i)t-* (=CLuvian *-tta* < **-te*), and the subordinating conjunction *kot*, which formally equals Hitt. *kuwatta* 'whither, wherefore' (Melchert, 1994a: 330f, with references).

Original **d* after nasals also appears as Lydian *t*. Although none of the combinations in which it appears is clear in meaning, one can hardly separate the preverb *ēt-* in *ēt-qa(ta)-* and *ēt-wers/š-* from Hitt. *anda* 'into' etc. < **énda*. See further *mēli-* 'harm' < **mend+* (cf. Lat. *mendum* 'defect' etc.) and further less certain examples cited in Melchert, 1994a: 331 and 358.

The result of intervocalic **d* is Lydian *d*: *taada-* 'father', cognate with Luvian *tāta/i-* and probably Lycian *tede/i-*, *kud* 'as' or 'where' most likely from **k^wud^(h)-V*, and present third

²I follow Heubeck (1959: 75f) and Gusmani (1964: 49) in also analyzing *qid=a* and *nāqid=a* as continuing the nt. nom.-acc. singular ending with a "generalizing" particle *-a*. The correct comparandum, however, is Hitt. *kuit=a* with non-geminating *-a*, not *kuitt=a* with geminating *-a* 'and'. I am not persuaded by the arguments of Carruba (1960: 63f), for *qida* and *nāqida* as containing the nt. plural ending. As shown by *laqrīsa...qid* in 2, 3, the pronominal form *qid* serves as both singular and plural in Lydian.

³The form *-at* is not a doublet of *-ad*, as claimed by Meriçgi (1963: 18) and Gusmani (1965: 208). A careful review of all the examples of *-at* shows that this sequence occurs **only** with verbs which take the particle *-t* (*faš[en-* and *(fa)kantrō-*). We must therefore analyze *-at* as *-ad=t*, despite the fact that this presupposes a different order from *-(a)t=av* (particle plus anim. acc. singular).

PIE Dental Stops in Lydian*

H. Craig MELCHERT
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

For reasons cited below, the role of Lydian in Anatolian and Indo-European linguistics has been decidedly modest. Nevertheless, the language has not escaped Eric Hamp's encyclopedic gaze, and I am pleased to offer the following lines as a token of appreciation for his many and varied contributions to our field.

Through the combined efforts of a number of scholars the essential grammatical structure of Lydian has been established. We can now parse most sentences with a reasonable degree of reliability. However, in the absence of any extensive bilinguals (especially Lydian-Greek) our grasp of the lexical content of the texts remains vague. We thus have a surplus of lexemes for 'stele', parts of a grave, 'dedicate/give', 'establish/erect/build', 'harm/damage' and the like.

This limitation on the synchronic analysis has prevented investigators from discovering more than a handful of compelling root etymologies. Since only a limited number of phonemes occur in the well-established grammatical morphemes, the lack of solid root etymologies has in turn severely restricted our understanding of Lydian historical phonology.¹ The typical situation is to find apparently equally plausible etymologies with mutually exclusive phonological implications: e.g. *tam-* 'build' < **dem-* (Gusmani, 1964: 208) with initial **d* > *t* versus *dā-* 'give' < **deh₃-* (Gusmani, 1964: 96f) with initial **d* > *d*.

Pending the happy discovery of a new bilingual, we can only hope to make further incremental progress by continued application of that method which has produced valid results up to now: a judicious mixture of combinatory textual analysis, internal reconstruction, and comparison with the other Indo-

*For the enumeration and readings of the texts I refer the reader to Gusmani (1964) and (1986).

¹One notable exception to this pattern is the discovery of the synchronic Lydian accent by H. Eichner: see Eichner (1986ab).

person ending *-d* from a "lenited" PA third singular ending **(V)di*: see Melchert, 1994a: 338 with references.

Already in Proto-Anatolian PIE **t* had become **ts* before **y* (see Melchert, 1994a: 62). This sound becomes phonemic in Lydian due to loss of the conditioning **y*, being spelled with the letter transliterated as *τ*: e.g. *arm-τa-* 'of the moon-(god)' with the suffix **-tyo-*, as per Gusmani, 1969: 139, following Shevoroshkin, 1967: 24 & 43.

It is also certain that **d*(^h) becomes Lydian *c* (a voiced coronal affricate or fricative) before **i* and **u*: e.g. *aiw(i)-* 'god' < **diw(i)-* and *-cu(wu)*- 'place; dedicate' < **d*(^h)*u-* (see Heubeck, 1959: 52ff, and Melchert, 1994a: 334, both with references).

I would like to suggest another previously overlooked example of the same change, which has further consequences for the overall treatment of the dental stops. The noun *ta(a)c-* means 'votive tablet' or perhaps more generally 'votive offering' (Gusmani, 1964: 207). The absence of a stem vowel in the accusative singular *ta(c)/ta(a)c*n and dat.-loc. *taac*l makes an original *i*-stem likely (Gusmani, 1964: 38), although this pattern is not absolute: cf. the syncope of **o* in the preterite first singular ending *-(C)v* < **-Com*. The first vowel in *taac-* is long (so marked in two texts, significantly not verse texts). We know that one source of *c* before *i* is **d* (see *ciw-* above). This suggests a Lydian preform **tādi-* (for the accent see the rule of Eichner referred to in note 1).

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

Internal reconstruction has brought us to a pre-Lydian **tā-di-* 'votive offering' (or similar). A PIE suffix **-di-* is wholly unknown, but an abstract/action noun suffix **-ti-* is commonplace. This suffix is also attested elsewhere in Anatolian. In Hittite the usual form is an augmented *-uzzi-* < **-u-ti-* (Sturtevant-Hahn, 1951: 76), but *-zzt-* directly from **-ti-* also

occurs: **hass(u)wezzi-* 'kingship' < **hass(u)we-* 'be king' (Watkins, 1973: 78, and Oettinger, 1979: 356). Note that this example is deverbal. Starke (1985: 249ff) has further argued for **-ti-* in CLuvian/attis/'food' and/utis/'drink'.⁴ Eichner (1973: 79ff) has shown that in Proto-Anatolian voiceless stops undergo "lenition" after accented long vowels and diphthongs. We thus can and should derive the **-di-* of pre-Lydian **tā-di-* from PIE **-ti-*.⁵

The monosyllabic base points to a primary formation, and the approximate meaning 'votive offering' and phonetic shape **ta-* suggest derivation from **d*^h*eh₁-* 'put, place': (virtual) **d*^h*eh₁-ti-* (for the meaning compare Grk. *ἀνάθημα*). The development of initial **d*(^h) to Lydian *t-* has parallels: *tam-* 'build' < **dem-* cited above, and *tro(d)-* 'hand over, grant' < (virtual) **drowdye/o-* (for details see Melchert, 1992: 52f). The development of **eh₁* > *ā* would match that in Luvian and Lycian (*šā-* = *ha-* 'let go, release' < **seh₁-*): see Melchert, 1989: 38ff, with further examples. For the full-grade root compare Grk. *μῆτις* 'wisdom; plan'.

The above derivation, well-founded on both internal and external grounds, does fly in the face of two very popular Lydian etymologies. As already intimated, at least some examples of the word *dāv* have been interpreted as preterite first singular 'I gave', and the remaining occurrences (in dating formulas) as a frozen form of the same verb (Gusmani, 1960: 285ff and 1964: 96f). This analysis leads to a derivation from **deh₃-* 'give/take' and implies that PIE **d*(^h)- results in Lydian initial *d-*, in direct contradiction of the examples for **d-* > *t-* cited above. A complete reexamination of the evidence for *dāv* is necessary.

The word *dāv* occurs most often as part of the dating formulas which introduce a number of the Lydian texts. These formulas appear in two distinct forms. The first may be

⁴I personally continue to interpret these examples as second singular verb forms with Morpurgo Davies, 1980: 106²⁴, but Starke's arguments are well taken. I concede that incontrovertible evidence for a verb ending *-tis* in CLuvian is still lacking.

⁵The fact that the suffix appears to be *-c-* (< **-d_i-*) consistently in Lydian does not, of course, force us to assume that all examples had an original preceding accented long vowel. The lenited form may easily have been generalized, just as *-uzzi-* is the only productive form in Hittite.

person verb forms (on the alleged preterite first singular *wicy* see below). Gusmani's attempt (1960: 286f) to read *dāv* as 'I gave' is clearly forced. Note that the word order is quite consistent with a postposition (thus already Vetter): 'from Artemis of the Sardians, the holy(?) a.'. While this analysis is by no means assured, it is also worth adding that the above phrase with *dāv* is coordinated with the word *qaλmλad*, which Meriggi (1936: 2.285) takes as an ablative 'from the king'.

The crucial instances of *dāv* are those in 23,6 and 24,4, where we find *amudāv*. Note that this phrase is written as a single word in both cases, suggesting a single accented unit *amudāv*. This fact strongly supports the interpretation of *dāv* as a postposition, not a verb. The example in 23,6 is compatible with either 'I have given' or 'from me': *aitolś buk aʃaris qa dēt amudāv* 'The c. or the descendant(?) to whom I have given property/to whom (there) is property from me (=who has property from me).'⁷

In 24,4, however, 'I have given' is impossible. The full context reads: *ak=it nāqid serlś srmłś amu fadīfl buk=f=ad amudāv fak[.]nal buk=mλ=ad amu bitocv bidv qad=k=mλ aλad ʃitamvidv*. The structure and approximate sense of the first, third, and fourth sentences have been elucidated by Vetter (1959: 44f) and Gusmani (1960: 286). In the first sentence the subject is clearly the 'supreme authority of the temenos' (*serlś srmłś*), and *amu* is 'me' (dative). In the third and fourth sentences the subject is in the first person. This is confirmed by the presence of *-mλ* 'to/for him' (dative).

The form *fak[.]nal* in the second sentence also appears to be preterite third person (thus Vetter), eliminating 'I gave' for *amudāv*. However, since there are other forms in *-l* which seem

⁷The received interpretation for *aʃari* is 'Schenkungsurkunde' (e.g. Gusmani, 1961: 178), which leads to a similar sense for the coordinated *aitolś*. This requires that the dative *qa* mean 'in which', which is quite conceivable, but unparalleled in Lydian. Furthermore, it is contextually more likely that a document about property settlement would refer to the people involved and their responsibilities than to the niceties of documentation. I suggest that *aʃar(i)* is 'descendant', a substantivization of **ʃpara/i* 'later; younger', attested in HLUvian **apara/i* (POST-RA/I). The sense of *aitolś* would be in the same sphere. Given the disjunctive *buk*, the figura *braʃfisis braʃflū* in the next sentence surely expresses reciprocity. I therefore interpret the passage of 23,6-8: (*aitolś...awv*) as: 'The or descendant who has property from me—the one shall safeguard it (*-av*) for the other, as I have declared'.

illustrated by 2,1-2: *[b]orū X III II oraλ cuwellū artakśassaλ=ś [q]aλmλū dāv*. This type also occurs in 16,2-3, 41,1-2, 42,1-2 and 50,1-3. In this type we always find the word for 'year' in the dat.-loc. **singular** with a numeral, followed optionally by the name of a month in the same case, then the name of the ruler and the title *qaλmλu*, likewise in the dative, and finally *dāv*.

The second less frequent type consists of the dat.-loc. plural of 'year' with a numeral followed directly by *dāv*, and then optionally the name of the month, as in 43,1-3: *bruāv II dāv oraλ kanlelāλ wartralū*. This type also occurs in 23,5 as *bruāv(v)=ś III II dāv*, with the emphasizing particle *-ś* (see Melchert, 1991: 133f).

Notice the consistent differences in the two types. In the first, 'year' is in the singular, and *dāv* always follows the ruler's title and name; in the second, 'year' is in the plural, and *dāv* follows it directly.⁶ The singular number of 'year' in the first type argues that the numeral is to be read as an ordinal: 'in the Xth year (in the month of Y) King Z *dāv*'. The plural *bruāv* requires rather a cardinal: 'X years *dāv* (in the month of Y)'.

The explanation of *dāv* as a frozen verb form 'I have given' in the sense *datum* (Gusmani, 1964: 97) cannot account for the syntactic differences in the two formulas. What is required to give a consistent unitary interpretation is a postposition meaning 'from, since': 'in the Xth year (in the month of Y) since King Z' and 'since X years (in the month of Y)'. In the second type the point of reference is unstated, but it was undoubtedly clear enough to the writer and his intended audience (just as 1988 means "C.E." to us).

As Vetter (1959: 13f) had already seen independently, the analysis of *dāv* as a postposition is supported by the remaining occurrences outside the dating formulas, which we must now review. The example in 11,9 *ʃarda(v)=k artimul dāv caqr-lal aʃtrkaλ* will not detain us long. This poetic text with its unusual word order continues to defy systematic analysis. I will only point out that both the immediate context (line 8 *qis labtānal* and line 10 *f=ak=it est inal*) and the entire text show only **third**

⁶It is true that in 3,1 we find *bruāv III II aλihsāntrul dāv*, with the plural *bruāv* and also the ruler's name. However, the absence of the title *qaλmλū* (only here!) betrays the fact that this example represents an erroneous conflation of the two types. The writer began with the second type and only then tried belatedly (but incompletely) to change to the first.

develops to Lydian *ç*, while the variant **wed^heh₁-* > *wici-* also assumes **eh₁* > Lydian *z*. I omit phonological and morphological arguments regarding these words as irrelevant, since the meanings traditionally assigned them, which apparently have never been questioned, are totally unsupported by the texts, pace Gusmani (1964).

We may begin with *ca-* and its derivatives. The assigned meaning 'set (up), dedicate' implies that *ca-* is a transitive verb. We therefore expect it to take a direct object (such as 'stele, votive offering' or the like) and probably an indirect object (the name of a god or person). In actual fact, the one occurrence of *ca-* in 11,6 has no verbal complements at all: *kot=as cat!* The context assures us that the sentence is complete: subordinating conjunction *kot*, enclitic subject pronoun *-as*, and present third person verb *cat*.⁹ Gusmani (1964: 204, sub *šfato-*) translates: 'wie er (fest)setzt, bestimmt'.

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

Likewise the compound verb *dacal* in 10,4 occurs in a sentence with no direct object. The context of *kancat* in 13,10 is ambiguous. The extended stem *çēv-* has no apparent direct object in 10,20 and definitely has none in 10,8. The analysis of *çēvā* and its context in 22,8 is hopeless. The form *çēvisiv* (pret. 1st sg.) in 13,1 has no direct object. The stem *facasi-* (if it indeed belongs here) may have an object in 10,15-16. Of all the forms of *ca-*, only the compound *çēvca-* is clearly transitive: 50,3-

⁹Carruba (1960: 51) argues that enclitic *-as* also functions as animate accusative plural 'them', but there is no compelling evidence for this. In any case, such an interpretation is impossible here, for there is no plausible plural antecedent.

to function as infinitives (cf. *ifrol* cited below), this argument is not compelling. Gusmani translates 'or I gave it to/for *iuḡ*'. What he overlooks is the evidence of the enclitic pronouns. If *amudāv* meant 'I gave', we would expect *-mā* 'to him'. The dative pronoun marking the recipient is never omitted in Lydian (cf. the next two sentences!). Furthermore, *-ṭ-* is now to be analyzed with Gusmani himself (1969: 136ff and 1982: 93 & 104) as particle *-t* plus the reflexive particle *š-* (see in detail Melchert, 1991: 135). Obviously, the reflexive pronoun cannot be reconciled with 'I gave it (to him) to'. We must therefore interpret: 'Whatever the high priest demanded of/imposed on me, whether he took it from me for himself, or I gave it to him as a gift, and whatever else I assigned to him...'

The remaining instance of *dāv* is in the broken and obscure context of 14,8: *dāv(y)=k=um est siqr[...]* *saralā tahtod*. The position of *dāv(y)* suggests that it is functioning here as a conjunction 'since, after' would, of course, be trivial.

Lydian *dāv* is thus in all its uses a postposition meaning 'from, since' and has nothing to do with **deh₃-* 'give, take'.⁸ Its true source remains obscure, but it cannot be used as evidence against a rule PIE **d^(h)-* > Lydian *t-*, as I assume for *tam-*, *tro(d)-* and *ta(a)c-*. Note in particular that the evidence of *amudāv* raises the very real possibility that the *d-* of *dāv* represents the medial treatment of whatever sound is represented here.

My suggested derivation of *taa(-c)-* from **d^heh₁-* 'put, place' is also in conflict with the suggestion that Lydian *ca-* (and derivatives) is the direct representative of this PIE root (Gusmani, 1964: 87f, with references). A further problem is presented by the interpretation of Lydian *wic(i)-* (in *da-wāc-* and *wicv*) as 'build, erect' and its equation with Hittite *wete/ a-* 'build' < **wed^h-* or **wed^heh₁-* (Heubeck, 1959: 53f; van Brock, 1968: 120; Oettinger, 1979: 130; Shevoroshkin, 1982: 213). Both of these etymologies imply that the initial **d^(h)-* of **d^heh₁-*

⁸This result reached internally agrees with the external evidence. As discussed in Melchert, 1989: 44f, following Benveniste, the PIE verbs for reciprocal 'giving' and 'taking' **ai-* and **deh₃-* were both specialized to 'take' in Anatolian, and a new oppositional **pe-ai-* was created for 'give'. Lydian *bi(d)-* 'give' shows that Lydian shared in the second of these developments. It is therefore highly unlikely that it did not share in the first. The meaning 'take' for **deh₃-* is surely Proto-Anatolian.

4 *esn taacn timléš brduñlis fēncal* 'T, son of B, _ed this votive offering'; 54,6 *ak=ad artimul ibsimlā fēncāv* 'and I have _ed it to/for Artemis of Ephesus'.

The verb stem *ca-* (and *cēn-*) is thus inherently intransitive. The fact that one of its compounds is transitive is hardly surprising, since preverbs can often change intransitives into transitives.¹⁰ In fact, the striking contrast between *fēncā-*, which shows normal transitive syntax, and its base, which does not, strongly supports the conclusion that the latter is intransitive.

The verb *ca-* therefore cannot possibly mean 'set (up), dedicate' and be derived from **d^heh₁-*. Determining just what it does mean is difficult. The context of the one instance of the simplex *cat* in 11,6 is so obscure that nearly any intransitive meaning is possible. We can also only speculate on the sense of the examples *cēnu/ cēnal* and *cēnsidv*.

The second example of *fēncā-* cited above (54,6) refers to the mobile property of a potential tomb violator. A meaning 'dedicate' is thus appropriate for this compound if one understands 'dedicate' in the sense of 'promise, pledge': one has committed the property to Artemis, but obviously not yet delivered it.

In 10,4 we find *dum=mλ=is sellis wesfa(š)=k woraš dacal*. This sentence immediately follows the dedication of the stele by Karos to his son Katowas. We know that *sellis* means 'supreme authority' (of the religious precinct), *woraš* means 'son' and *wesfa(š)* probably 'living' (for the last see Gusmani, 1985: 110f). The enclitic *-mλ-* means 'for/to him' referring either to Karos or Katowas. I have argued (Melchert, 1991: 140ff) that *-is* is a variant of the reflexive pronoun, but this is not essential to interpreting the sentence. The exact meaning of the conjunction *dum* is not yet clear. What is important is that *dacal* refers to some action taken by the supreme religious authority and Karos' living son in regard to the dedication of the stele to Katowas. The most likely meaning for *dacal* is thus 'have assented, have given approval'.

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

¹⁰For *ēn-* in particular, compare Lat. *inēō* 'enter' beside *eō* 'go', *indīcō* 'declare, impose' beside *dīcō* 'say, speak' and similar pairs in German: (*ein*)/*gehen*, (*ein*)/*reden*.

open many possibilities for an etymology of the stem *ca-*.

Turning to the formal side of the problem, if we restrict ourselves to what is known, the only possible preform for *ca-* is **d^h(^h)yV-*, with assimilation of **d^h(^h)* before **y* (as before **i* in *aiw-* 'god') and then absorption of the **y* into the resulting affricate: compare again *arm-ta-* 'of the Moon-god' with *-ta-* < **-yo-*. Lydian *a* can have many sources, but the *ā* of the preterite first singular *fēncāv* argues for a pre-Lydian long vowel **ā* or **ō* (Melchert, 1992: 36ff and 1994a: 349). We thus arrive at a preform **d^h(^h)yā/ō-*.

Until we can determine the synchronic meaning of the simplex *ca-*, no certainty is possible, but I find attractive both formally and semantically the suggestion of C. Watkins (pers. comm.) that Lydian *ca-* reflects a **d^hyéh₂-* 'to give a sign' (especially of one's will), seen also in Greek *σημα/σάμα* 'sign'. For the meanings 'agree, assent' of *daca-* and 'promise, pledge' of *fēncā-* compare Latin *adnuō* 'approve, assent; grant, promise' < **nuō* 'nod the head' (as a sign of approval).

The above account of *ca-* and its compounds is a mere possibility. I insist only on the fact that the usage of *ca-* and *cēn-* is totally incompatible with the previously assigned meaning 'dedicate, set up' and derivation from **d^heh₁-*. This example thus cannot be used as an argument against taking *ta(a)-c-* from **d^heh₁-ti-*.

We turn now to the alleged *wic(i)-* 'build, erect'. The preterite third person *dawicil* in 13,7 has no expressed direct object, unless the reflexive *-š* contained in the initial *f=ak=ē=in* is functioning as such. Obviously, a meaning 'He built/erected himself' is impossible. To assume an unexpressed direct object pronoun 'He built (it) for himself' is entirely gratuitous, since the preceding context contains no example of any of the Lydian nouns for things that are built, such as 'house, stele, grave' or the like.

As for *wicv*, it is not a verb at all, pace Gusmani, 1960: 285, and Eichner, 1993: 126. The first occurrence is in 11,1-2: *est mruwaad saristrosλ šfarwad aštrkoλ wāntaš wicv areλ ka-tared=k=mš iskoš*. The structure of the first clause is clear enough: 'This stele (is) a vow to S. A.'. The third clause begins with a present third person verb *katared* to which *iskoš* is probably the nominative singular subject 'everyone'. Tentatively accepting the suggestion of Carruba (1969: 70ff) that *-mš* is dative plural of

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

The structure of *wāntās wicv arel* must be parallel to that of *est mruwaad saristrosla šfarwad ástrkoal*, with "gapping" of the predicate noun: 'This stele (is) a vow to S.A., the *w.* to Ares'. The presence of nominative singular *wāntās* precludes *wicv* being preterite first singular of a verb, meaning 'I built' or anything else. As already seen by Carruba, 1960: 47, the word *wicv* is rather a case form of a noun in *-c* (see above) functioning as an adverb, like *nwiššev* 'for/in evil'. As often in Lydian, the range of possible meanings is wide: 'likewise, in turn, on the other hand'.

The other example of *wicv* can hardly be a first person preterite verb form either: 22,1 *est mruud šfardēnt facveris mlimnas wicv*. Gusmani (1960: 285) translates: '(1), Mlimnas, *facveri*-of Sardis, built this stele'. Once again, however, it is striking that not a single first person verb form occurs in the entire remainder of the text! Even more telling is the fact that *Mlimna*-is consistently treated as third person in the rest of the inscription.

As already suggested by Meriggi, 1935: 95, note 48, the word *šfardēnt* must modify *mruud*. If it were modifying *facveris* as per Gusmani, it would have to be *šfardētis* (cf. 22,13). For *šfardēnt* as neuter nominative-accusative singular **šfardēd* plus emphasizing *-š* see Melchert, 1991: 134. This forms a complete nominal sentence with *mruud*: 'This stele is Sardian!'.¹¹

The structure of this first sentence and the presence of emphasizing *-š* suggest that once again the phrase with *wicv* is a contrasting sentence with parallel structure: 'The *f.* in turn/on the other hand (is) Mlimnas'. The crucial point is that the

the third person enclitic pronoun, we may venture 'And everyone shall watch over them'.¹¹ In any case, the remaining *wāntās wicv arel* must form a complete clause, whose interpretation depends crucially on *wāntās*.

The suggestion of Gusmani (1964: 233) that *wānta-* is an introductory particle is impossible in view of the other occurrence of the word in 11,11-12: *wānta=k=t esvav ifrol qis fakorfid katofn buk mruwaal f=ak=ml=at=av wiššis waars nid kantrōd*. The essentials of the last sentence are clear: 'Let the *w.* not grant it (*-av*, animate singular!) to him'. In the preceding sentence *qis* is the subject 'the one who', *fakorfid* is the finite verb (third person present). Given the demonstrative the finite verb (third person present). Given the demonstrative *esvav* and the conjunction *buk* 'or', the word *katofn* must be dative-locative plural conjoined with *mruwaal*. The remaining *ifrol* must be an infinitive depending on *fakorfid*. We thus arrive at: 'The one who tries/dares to seize(?)...from these *k.* or the stele'.

Note first of all that *esvav...katofn* is plural, while *mruwaal* is neuter. Thus far, then, we have no antecedent for the animate accusative singular *-av* 'it' of the following sentence. Second, there is no direct object for the preceding sentence. This missing element can only be located in the initial *wānta=k=t*. Since we must have an animate antecedent, we must analyze *wānta(v)=k=t* (with usual loss of *-v* before consonant). The stem *wānta-* is thus an animate *a*-stem noun, which we may interpret as a substantivized adjective in *-ta*- from *wāna*- 'tomb' in its more original meaning of 'rock-face' or the like (cf. CLuvian *wān(iya)*- 'of a rock-face, cliff' and HLUvian *wa/i-ni(t)-'stele'*).

Eichner (1993: 126) arrives at a similar analysis, except that he joins *esvav* with *wānta(v)* as dative-locative plural parallel to *mruwaal*, taking *katofn* as the animate direct object. This is also quite possible: 'Whoever dares/tries to seize(?) the *k.* from these stone-works or the stele'.¹²

¹¹For *katāre* (= *kat-sare*) 'watch over; guard' see Melchert, 1992: 47, with a comparison to Avestan *nī+kar-* 'idem'.

¹²My tentative interpretation of *ifrol* as 'seize' is based on the context and a possible connection with Hitt. *ēp-* 'take, seize'. However, one must also entertain the alternate possibility envisioned by Eichner that *ifrol...katofn* refers to a harmful act against the grave installation: 'the one who tries/dares to *i. a. k.* against these stone-works and the stele'.

overall context of 22,1 gives no support for *wicv* as a preterite first singular verb, while in 11,1-2 we have seen that such an interpretation is impossible. Current evidence suggests that *wicv* is a case form (accusative singular or dative-locative plural) of a nominal stem. The verb *da-wicil* (note the *-i-*) may be a perfectly regular denominative stem in **-ye/o-* from *wic(i)*. The immediate context of *dawicil* in any case excludes a meaning 'built'.

There is thus no philological basis for the widely quoted *ca-* 'dedicate, set up' and *(da)wic(i)-* 'build, erect' nor for the etymologies and other diachronic conclusions based on them. Therefore nothing stands in the way of the proposed derivation of *ta(a)c-* 'votive offering' from a virtual **d^heh₁-ti-* with Proto-Anatolian lenition to **-di-* by Eichner's rule and regular Lydian developments.

We may now return to the overall problem of the representation of dental stops in Lydian. The evidence of *tam* < **dem-*, *tro(d)* < **drowāye-* and *ta(a)c-* < **d^heh₁ti-* cited above argues for a general rule by which initial **d-* was devoiced to *t*. There are nevertheless a few Lydian morphemes which begin with *d-*: *dēt-* 'mobile property', *dāv* 'from, since', *dum(m)-* (a subordinating conjunction), and the preverb *da-* (in *da-cu(we)*, *da-tro-*, and *da-wic-*). This fact is in itself not a compelling argument against the supposed rule. There is even stronger evidence for such a development in Lycian, but the latter language also shows a few examples of initial *d(d)*, of as yet unknown secondary origin: see Melchert, 1994a: 301f and 309. I have presented elsewhere arguments that the *d-* of Lydian *dēt-* 'mobile property' reflects original **y-* (= Hitt. *(i)yant-* 'sheep' < **yōnt-* 'walking'); see Melchert, 1994b. As already noted, the *d-* of *dāv* may easily reflect a medial treatment in a postposition. A secondary origin for the *d-* of *da-* and *dum(m)* is thus quite possible. Our current very limited knowledge of Lydian makes further speculation pointless.

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

- (1) A final dental stop appears as Lydian *-d* (a Proto-Anatolian change): *-ad*, *qid₁*, *-kod*.
- (2) The Proto-Anatolian affricate **ts* resulting from **t* before **y* is represented by Lydian *τ*, which is now phonemic

due to loss of the conditioning **y*: *arm-ta-*, *wān-ta-*.

(3) PIE **t* is regularly preserved in Lydian: *tauśa-*, *kat-*, *-(i)t-*, pres. 3rd person *-t*, *dēt-*, *šfardēt(i)*.

(4) PIE **d* and **d^h* become Lydian *c* before **i*, **u* and **y*: *ciw-*, *-cu(we)*, *taac-*, and probably *ca-*.

(5) Intervocalic PA **d* (< PIE **d* and **d^h* and lenited **t*) is continued by Lydian *d*: *taada-*, pres. 3rd person *-d*, and probably *kud*.

(6) Otherwise, PIE **d^h* becomes Lydian *t* initially and after nasal: *tam*, *tro(d)*, *ta(a)c-*, *taada-*, *ēt-*.

(7) Lydian *dāv* is a postposition 'from, since' and has nothing to do with **deh₃-* 'give, take'. Whatever their precise meaning and derivation, *ca-* and *(da)-wic(i)-* must also be separated from **d^heh₁-* 'put, place'.

As to the synchronic realization of these sounds, Lydian *t* regularly represents a voiceless stop (note the glosses *tauś* and *tauśaś* for *tauśa-*). However, in favorable voicing environments it was probably realized as [d]: note *aliksāntru-* = *Ἀλέξανδρος*, *atraśta-* = *Ἀδράστης*. The same spelling for *ēt* < **endo* suggests that voiceless and voiced stops had merged in this environment, as in Lycian: see Melchert, 1994a: 282 and 329 with references.

If *t* equals both [t] and conditionally [d], then *d* must represent something other than a voiced dental stop. The borrowing of *Δεύς* as *lew/š* and *Δαμάτρη* as *lamētru-* also argues that Lydian has no initial voiced dental stop: initial *d-* must be something else. It is therefore likely that *d* stands for a voiced interdental fricative [ð], as in Lycian: see already Littmann (1916: 11&63) and Cuny (1921: 3), among others. Gusmani expresses reservations about this claim (1964: 32) and (1965: 209), but later also tentatively adopts this view (1978: 842). The overall facts of Lydian seem to me to support this conclusion.

REFERENCES

- van Brock, Nadia
1968 Luvian *-š-* and Hittite *-t-*. *Glotta* 46.117-121.
- Carruba, Onofrio
1960 Studi sul verbo lidio. *Athenaeum* NS 38.26-64.
1969 Zur Grammatik des Lydischen. *Athenaeum* NS 47.39-83.

- 1994b PIE *y > Lydian d. In: *Iranian and Indo-European Studies. Memorial Volume of Otakar Klima*, ed. Petr Vavroušek. Prague: Enigma.
- Meriggi, Piero
1935 Die erste Person Singularis im Lydischen. *Revue hittite et asiatique* 3.69-116.
1936 Der Indogermanische Charakter des Lydischen. In: *Festschrift für Hermann Hirt*, ed. Helmut Arntz. Vol. 2.283-290. Heidelberg: Winter.
1963 Anatolische Satzpartikeln. *Revue hittite et asiatique* 21.1-33.
- Morpurgo Davies, Anna
1980 The personal endings of the Hieroglyphic Luwian verb. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 94.86-108.
- Oettinger, Norbert
1979 *Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbums*. Nürnberg: Hans Carl.
- Shevoroshkin, Vitalij
1967 *Liditskij Jazyk*. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo 'Nauk'.
1982 Zu den hethitisch-luwischen Konsonanten. In: *Investigationes philologicae et comparativae. Gedächtnisschrift für Heinz Kronasser*, ed. Erich Neu. Pp. 210-214. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Starke, Frank
1985 Urtidg. *h₁tí- 'Speise' im Luwischen. *Sprache* 31/2.249-255.
- Sturtevant, Edgar H. and E. Adelaide Hahn
1951 *A Comparative Grammar of the Hittite Language*, 2nd edition. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Vetter, Emil.
1959 *Zu den lydischen Inschriften* (= *Sitzungsberichte der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 232/3). Vienna.
- Watkins, Calvert
1973 Hittite and Indo-European Studies: the Denominative Statives in -ē-. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 1971.51-93.

- Cuny, Albert
1921 L'inscription lydo-araméenne de Sardes II. Partie lydienne. *Revue des Études Anciennes* 23.1-27.
- Eichner, Heiner
1973 Die Etymologie von heth. *mēhur*. *Muenchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 31.53-107.
1986a Die Akzentuation des Lydischen. *Sprache* 32.7-21.
1986b Neue Wege im Lydischen I: Vokalnasalität vor Nasalkonsonanten. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 99.203-219.
1993 Probleme von Vers und Metrum in epichorischer Dichtung Altkleinasiens. In: *Hundert Jahre Kleinasiatische Kommission der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, eds. Gerhard Dobesch and Georg Rehrenböck (ÖAW, philos.-hist. Klasse, *Denkschriften* 236). Pp. 97-169.
- Garrett, Andrew
1990 Hittite Enclitic Subjects and Transitive Verbs. *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 42.227-242.
- Gusmani, Robert
1960 Studi lidi. *Rendiconti del Istituto Lombardo di Scienze e Lettere (Classe di Lettere)* 94.275-298.
1961 Nuovi contributi lidi. *Rendiconti del Istituto Lombardo di Scienze e Lettere (Classe di Lettere)* 95.173-200.
1964 *Lydisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg: Winter.
1965 Sulle consonanti del lido. *Oriens Antiquus* 4.203-210.
1969 Sul samekh lido. *Athenaeum* NS 47.136-143.
1978 La scrittura lida. *Annali della scuola normale superiore di Pisa, Serie 3, Volume* 8.833-847.
1982 *Lydisches Wörterbuch, Ergänzungsband, Lfg. 2*. Heidelberg: Winter.
1985 *Microasiatica. 3. Lidio vesfa- e ittito huusvant. Incontri Linguistici* 10.110-112.
1986 *Lydisches Wörterbuch, Ergänzungsband, Lfg. 3*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Heubeck, Alfred
1959 *Lydiaka*. Erlangen: Universitätsbund Erlangen.
- Littmann, Enno
1916 *Lydian Inscriptions* (= *Sardis* 6/1). Leiden: American Society for Excavations in Sardis.
- Melchert, H. Craig
1989 New Luvo-Lycian Isoglosses. *Historische Sprachforschung* 102.23-45.
1991 The Lydian Emphasizing and Reflexive Particle -š/-as. *Kadmos* 30.131-142.
1992 The Third Person Present in Lydian. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 97.31-54.
1994a *Anatolian Historical Phonology*. Amsterdam-Atlanta: Rodopi.