

## „Lydian: Late Hittite or Neo-Luwian?“

Ladies and gentlemen!

The language of ancient Lydia has raised unsolvable questions for languages historians for a long time. It is therefore no coincidence that the number of publications on Lydian is only a fraction of the publications on the other Indo-European languages of Anatolia. Now a trend reversal seems to be apparent: At the conference „Licia e Lidia prima dell' ellenizzazione" (Lycia and Lydia before the Hellenization) held in Rome in August 1988 two lectures treated the today's subject: the question where Lydian is to be placed within the languages of ancient Anatolia.

It is not surprising that Lydian is moving into the center of interest. For in recent years the historical investigation of the Anatolian languages has made great progress. This puts us into a better position to tackle the question of Lydian and its origins again. Particularly I want to stress one fact that has become clear in recent years. We now know that several Anatolian languages share significant linguistic features and can therefore be taken as a dialectal subgroup of the Anatolian language tree (1). This subgroup is termed „Luwian". This Luwian subgroup comprises ...

- ... first Cuneiform Luwian from the 16th to the 13th century B.C.
- ... second Hieroglyphic Luwian as a link between the second and the first millennium B.C.
- ... third the Neo-Luwian languages Carian, Lycian, Mylian, Sidetic and Pisidian. These Neo-Luwian languages are attested from the middle of the seventh century B.C. to the third century B.C. Pisidian is even attested beyond the first century A.D.

Outside this genealogical unity of the Luwian languages there are Hittite and Palaic (both attested since the 16th century B.C.) as well as Lydian from the sixth to the fourth century B.C. The position of Hittite is clear: it forms the other dialectal pole opposed to Luwian. The genealogical prehistory of Palaic is not yet certain which is not surprising considering the scarcity of the textual remains. In contrast to Palaic however one could expect greater progress with Lydian. For in the meantime more than 100 inscriptions have been found, some of them of considerable length. The case of the neighbouring Luwian languages Lycian and Carian which are attested in comparable quantity shows that the extent and quality of the Lydian

corpus would principally allow concrete conclusions – conclusions concerning the position of Lydian within the Anatolian language tree.

I shall attempt today to present you at least in a nutshell some of these concrete results. Unfortunately I have to disappoint those of you who expect a final answer to the question asked in the title. For this question was meant as a provocation. Today I shall neither side with colleagues like Carruba or Neumann who position Lydian genealogically near Hittite nor with colleagues like Gusmani and Oettinger who classify Lydian as a Luwian language. Instead I shall try to arrive at a fair compromise which corresponds with my Swiss mentality. My arguments aim at showing that Lydian has a position of its own between Hittite and Luwian within the Anatolian tree.

Before we enter into discussion of the dialectological position of Lydian I shall to clarify two more basic questions in today's lecture (2):

- First: What are the specific reasons that the nature and the genealogical position of Lydian is unclear to the present day?
- Second: What methodological improvements have to be made to guarantee better results in tackling the Lydian question again?

We shall see in the third part of this lecture that the discussion of the causes and the method is the prerequisite to solve the key question – the genealogical position of Lydian.

Let us start with the question why our knowledge of Lydian lacks behind the knowledge of the other Anatolian languages. First I want to mention an extralinguistic factor: Lydian and the Lydians are in a fringe position in Asia Minor during the Bronze Age and thus seem to be isolated. I wish to illustrate this statement with an excursion into the geography and history of Western Anatolia. In the last fifteen years spectacular findings have provided exact data on the geographical situation in Western Anatolia in the late Bronze Age. Consult point (3) on your hand-out and simultaneously your map on (4) of the handout:

- Significant progress has been made through the discovery of a Hittite Bronze tablet from Bogazköi which was published in 1988. The text goes back to the Hittite king Tuthaliya IV who flourished around 1250 B.C. This tablet gives us the exact borders of the Late Bronze Age kingdom Tarḫuntašša which could not be localized before. Its western borders follow the river Kestros (cuneiform *Ka-aš-ta-ra-ia*) and cross the Pamphylian city Perge

(cuneiform *Par-ḫa*). To the west of this border lies the territory of the enemy, more precisely the land of *Lukkā* (cuneiform *Lu-uk-ka-a*). Thus it became clear that Bronze Age *Lukkā* comprises at least Lycia of classical times. At the same time it becomes highly plausible that the territory of *Kar-ki-ša/Ka-ri-ia* which is always mentioned together with *Lukkā* is identical with ancient Caria.

- The hieroglyphic-Luwian inscription of Yalburt which was only published in 1992 connects directly to the Hittite Bronze table from Bagazköi. It also goes back to Tudhalija IV and it tells of his campaigns against *Lukkā*. The place names of the land *Lukkā* mentioned in the Yalburt inscription are spectacular: places like *á-ḫa/i-ra/i-na-* (REGIO), *pi-na-\**416 (URBS) or *TALA-ḫa/i* directly reflect the classical place names Ἄρνα/lyc. *Arīna*, Πίναρα/lyc. *Pinale* or Τλωῶς/lyc. *Tlawā*. These correspondencies do not only confirm the equation *Lukkā* identical Lycia on the Bronze table. In addition they show that there was continuity in Lycia between the second and the first millennium B.C.
- Let us move a last step in the direction of north-west. In 1997 David Hawkins managed to read the hieroglyphic Luwian inscription which is incised in the relief of Karabel. Karabel is situated on the connecting road between Ephesos in the Cayster valley and the Hermos valley. Hawkins now reads in the inscription the words *REX TARKASNA-ḫa/i REX mi-ra/i-a* „Tarkasnaḫa, king of Mira”. The land of Mira was so far known as one of the most prominent of the so-called *Arzawa*-lands. Furthermore it was known that Mira bordered in the east on the kingdom of Hatti in the area around Afyon. Karabel now proves that Mira extended as far as to the Aegaeon Sea in the west and that its capital *Apaša* can be identified with the classical Ἐφέσος.

These discoveries have two important consequences:

- First: on the basis of toponyms, anthroponyms and indirect evidence we have already known that the regions in question were Luwian-speaking in the second millennium B.C. These latest findings confirm that the Luwian-speaking regions bordered each other. We are now justified in talking of a Luwian belt in Southern and Western Anatolia.

- Second: After determining Lycian and Carian as Luwian languages and on the basis of continuity of toponymy there is no doubt: The Luwian belt continues to exist in the first millennium B.C. That means that there must have been also linguistic continuity.

What about Lydia and Lydian (4)? I refer to the map on your handout. The northern neighbour of the land of *Mira/Arzawa* in the 2nd millennium B.C. was the so-called *Šeḫa*-river-land. In the light of the new geographical data the *Šeḫa*-river-land can be identified with the Hermos valley. It is exactly from this region that the majority of our Lydian corpus originates.

The identification of the Lydian language area with the *Šeḫa*-river-land is also suggested by a further consideration: In cuneiform sources the *Šeḫa*-river-land always shows a keen interest in *La-az-pa*, which can be taken as the island of Λέσβος. We can therefore conclude that the *Šeḫa*-river-land extended into the Caicos valley and comprised also the southern part of Mysia beside the northern part of classical Lydia. Mysia as part of the *Šeḫa*-river-land is an important keyword. For the term „Mysian” derived from the toponym Μυσία may be the name that the Lydian gave themselves. This can be concluded from the hieroglyphic-Luwian inscription Karkamiš A 6 dating from the eighth century. In this inscription a princeregent by the name of Iariris praises his fame in the following words: *zi-i-pa-ḫa/i-’ Mu-sá-za<sup>URBS</sup> Mu-sá-ka-za<sup>URBS</sup> Su+ra/i-za-ḫa<sup>URBS</sup> AUDIRE-ti-i-ta* „And my name was heard with the Musa, the Muska and the Sura.” It has been suspected for a long time, that the term Musa designates the Lydians – beside the Phrygians (Muska) and the Phenicians (Sura).

From these new data we can conclude that the ancestors of the Lydians are to be situated in northern Lydia/southern Mysia or the *Šeḫa*-river-land respectively. In linguistic terms the *Šeḫa*-river-land was a Terra incognita in the second millennium B.C. There is no linguistic evidence that it was part of the Luwian belt. The linguistic material known are the names of its king *Muḫa*-UR.MAH and his son *Manapa-ḫu*. Either name cannot be attributed with certainty to a linguistic group.

Thus we can give one answer to the question why our knowledge of Lydian is not on the same level as our knowledge of the other languages of Asia Minor. It is the peripheral position of Lydian which makes our work more difficult. In the case of Lydian the linguist has to work totally on his own without having access to any external data.

On account of this absence of external data it is even more serious if the linguistic methods of investigation are not ideally chosen. Unfortunately this was often the case in the past. To illustrate in which way the position of Lydian has been investigated so far I wish to refer to the classical survey by Alfred Heubeck in the Handbuch of Orientalistik of 1969 (5). In addition to an excellent synchronous description of the Lydian language Heubeck lists four Lydian-Hittite as well as six Lydian-Luwian isoglosses. As an example I wish to point out the Lydian-Hittite isogloss given on the top of Heubecks list:

Lydian has a nominal ending in palatal  $-\lambda$  which has the function of a dative or locative singular. An example is given by inscription 1.4ff. *ak=it n[āqis]*<sup>5</sup> *esλ mruλ buk esλ vānaλ buk esvav*<sup>6</sup> *laqirisav ...*<sup>7</sup> *ak=t=in nāqis qelλ=k fēnsλifid* „whoever harms this stele, this grave chamber or these walls ... or whoever harms any part of the grave, (will be punished by Artemis)”. Heubeck connects this ending  $-\lambda$  with the Hittite genitive of the pronouns in  $-\bar{e}l$  such as in *ammēl* „by me” oder *apēl* „by him”. This suggests a relatively exclusive Lydian-Hittite isogloss and could lead to the suspicion that Lydian is more closely connected to Hittite. At the second glance however this analysis is doubtful. It is based on a etymological equation which is relatively arbitrary. If we look at the related Anatolian languages we see that the Lydian dative/locative in  $-\lambda$  can be better traced back to an adverbial formation in  $*/(V)li/$ . This formation  $*/(V)li/$  is found for example in Lycian adverbs such as *teli* „where” and *ebeli* „there” (from  $*/k^{\text{h}}\acute{o}-li/$  or  $*/ob\acute{o}-li/$ ). This connection has two advantages: First  $*/(V)li/$  is used in a function of a locative and thus justifies the function of Lydian  $-\lambda$  as a marker of dative/locative. Second  $*/(V)li/$  contains the palatal vowel which is required to explain the palatal  $-\lambda$  of the Lydian morpheme.

Which theory for the derivation of the  $\lambda$ -morpheme shall be given preference – regardless of all consequences for the question of Lydian origins? The answer is: none of them. For the question of the origin of the Lydian dative/locative-morpheme cannot be decided in that way and it cannot be taken as an isogloss either. The reason for this is of a methodological nature. Heubecks derivation as well as our derivation does not take into consideration the internal structure of the Lydian nominal paradigm. Neither of the derivations can for example conclusively explain why the Lydians should have transferred a pronominal genitive ending (according to Heubeck) or an adverbial ending (our alternative suggestion) into their

regular paradigm. Both derivations are isolated etymologies and are therefore only partially conclusive as etymologies are. Or in other words: The etymological method is not apt and successful in the diachronic decoding of a language like Lydian of which many grammatic data is unknown. That is the linguistic answer to the initial question why our knowledge about the genealogical affiliation of Lydian is deficient (6). The attempts so far undertaken to position Lydian within the Anatolian tree are based mainly on this type of etymological assumptions. Therefore they are bound to be unsatisfactory.

Now I want to turn to the second principal question which I asked at the beginning of my lecture. I now want to specify this question more precisely: Which methods are available as alternatives to the etymological method? I have already hinted at the answer in dealing with the dative/locative-morpheme. Only an internal diachronic analysis which considers the phonological and morphological structure of a language as a whole can promise success in the investigation of ill-attested languages.

This is already partially the case with the dative/locative morpheme (7). An analysis of Lydian texts shows that the genetical adjective *bili-* „his” is sometimes uninflected: see inscription 24.15 *saroka=k nikumēk savēnt ni=k*<sup>16</sup> *bis ni=k bil šfēnis* „they are not under protection, neither himself nor his relatives”. In case of a regular inflection we would expect *\*bilis šfēnis* „his relatives” as a nominative plural commune. There is a possible explanation for the lack of inflection in the pronoun *bil*. *bil* is not based on a genetical adjective *\*/b<sup>(h)</sup>ilo/i-/*, but on an old pronominal genitive *\*/ob<sup>(h)</sup>ēl/* comparable to Hittite *apēl*. If the assumption is correct, that the pronominal genitive ending *\*/-ēl/* is continued by Lydian */-il/*, the dative/locative ending *-λ* can only be traced to adverbial *\*/-li/*. An internal analysis of the Lydian nominal paradigm gives us therefore the possibility to exclude the less fitting etymology – which is a considerable progress compared to the previous fifty-fifty-situation.

The complete advantages of an internal diachronic analysis of this type I wish to illustrate with a more complex example: the case of the Lydian *a*-stems (8). The Lydian nominal inflection has a class with a stem vowel */-a-/*. Historically this */-a-/* can reflect either an old thematic vowel *\*/-o-/* or long *\*/-ā-/*. Within this inflectional class we observe that this stem vowel alternates with endings in final nasal – that is in the accusative singular and in the dative plural. In both cases there is

an „-ãv” (transcribed with a nasalized vowel „ã”) as well as an „-ēv” (transcribed with a nasalized vowel „ē”).

- The nasal vowel „ã” is for instance found in (acc.sg.) *aśaãv* „altar”, (Acc.Sg.) *aśfãv* (or *aśfã[v]-k*) „property (?)”, (Dat.Pl.) *aωλãv* „(a part of the tomb)”.
- The nasal vowel „ē” is for instance found in (Dat.Pl., adj.) *aλēv* „to the others”, (Acc.Sg.) *bidēv* „harm”, (Acc.Sg.) *tasēv* „pillar”, (Acc.Sg.) *śanēv* „insult (?)”, (Acc.Sg. adj.) *tawśēv* (*ciwv*) „powerful”.

The question of the origin of this alternation can only be answered with a view to the origin of the endings *-ēv* and *-ãv*. Some ten years ago Heiner Eichner has shown that the grapheme <ē> and <ã> always represent an accented nasal vowel (9). A review of the data of the attestations confirms Eichners hypothesis. We are now able to differentiate between nasal <ē> and <ã> in the following way:

- <ē> represents an accented vowel \*/á, é, ó/ in front of a former cluster of nasal plus stop or in front of a geminated nasal (in terminology of Anatolian linguistics in front of a „fortis-nasal”): so for instance in *ēt-* „in(to)” from \*/éndo-/, *dēt-* „(mobile) property” from \*/jónt-/ (nota bene with the characteristic change of \*/j/ to /d/!), *ēna-* „mother” from \*/áñno-/ or *ēmi-* „mine” from \*/ámmo/i-/.
- <ã> represents an accented vowel \*/á, é, ó/ in front of a simple nasal (in terminology of Anatolian linguistics in front of a „lenis-nasal”): so for instance in *kãna-* „women, wife” from \*/kãna-/ (earlier \*/g<sup>h</sup>ónã-/) or in the 3.pers.sg. pres. (*fa-kat-*)*wãmid* „he meets” from \*/χémidi/ (earlier \*/χémidi/ from \*/χémidi/ from \*/χém̃iti/).

These nasal vowels probably differ only little in pronunciation. How can their distribution be explained? I think that behind the existence of the two nasal vowels <ē> and <ã> there is a differentiated diachronic development which to place in three steps (10):

- First step: In Lydian the sequence vowel-nasal-consonant or vowel-nasal-nasal (that is a vowel in front of an ambisyllabic fortis-nasal) is simplified with nasalization of the vowel. The resulting nasal vowel in this case is always <ē> /e<sup>n</sup>/. This development is totally natural and has a parallel in Lycian. I refer to Lycian *ēne/i-* „mother” from \*/áñno/i-/ as exact correspondence to Lydian *ēna-*.

- ii. Second step: In the sequence short vowel plus fortis nasal the vowel is necessarily accented. For in Anatolian a fortis nasal is only generated after an accented short vowel. In Lydian the nasal vowel /e<sup>n</sup>/ is therefore accented in the position before nasal consonant. This being so Lydian derives the following synchronous rule. „An accented vowel in front of nasal consonant is always nasalized.”
- iii. Third step: According to Anatolian sound laws an accented long vowel can only be followed by a simple lenis-nasal which is by the way heterosyllabic. Earlier structures with an accented vowel preceding lenis-nasal therefore result in Lydian non-nasal \*/°aN°/. They contradict the rule above. Lydian solves this contradiction in a way that lies at hand. All remaining vowels which are non-nasal but accented become secondarily nasalized in front of nasal consonant. The resulting secondary nasal vowel is obviously slightly differentiated from primary nasal <ẽ>. It is therefore written with the letter we transcribe as nasal <ã>. Thus nasal vowel <ã> in *kãna-* „woman” from proto-lydian \*/g<sup>u</sup>ónã-/ (for the long vowel see Cluv. *ḡāna-*) or in (*fakat*)*wãmid* „he meets” from Proto-Lydian \*/ḡémijeti/ (for the long vowel see hitt. *ḡēmiezzī*) is completely regular. It can be noted that a comparable secondary transference of the nasal quality exists also in Lycian. An example is *nēne/i-* „brother” from Proto-Lycian \*/nãno/i-/ (for the long vowel see Cluv. adj. *nānija-*). Other than in Lydian this secondary nasalisation has never been grammaticalized in Lycian. That is the reason why non-nasalized *nene/i-* remains also attested.

Let us now return to the problem of nominal inflection (11). According to the sound laws presented here we expect the following endings in the accusative singular and dative/locative plural of the Lydian *a*-stems:

- An ending <-ẽv> with nasalized <ẽ> from \*/-V̇n #/ in oxytonous nouns. The primary nasal vowel <ẽ> is justified here as word boundary counts as consonant. Nota bene: <-ẽv> reflects pure nasal vowel \*/-e<sup>n</sup> #/; the weak consonant /-ŋ #/ transcribed as „v” is clearly secondary and restituted.
- An ending <-av> with non-nasal <a> from \*/-V̇n #/ in barytonous nouns. In fact <-av> is widely attested. As an example I give the acc.sg. *vãnav* „tomb chamber” from \*/ḡãnan/. The long vowel and therefore the position of the ac-



cent as well as the lenis nasal are confirmed by Cluv. (adj.) *uḡāni(ia)-* „of a rock”.

This analysis leads to far-reaching consequences. An accusative singular- or dative/locative plural-ending „-*āv*” with a nasal <*ā*> cannot be original. It must have been introduced in the nominal inflection by a secondary process. How can this secondary nominal ending can be explained? If we look at the nouns in „-*āv*” we can note the following: In at least two cases they represent long *ā*-stems going back to old collectives or neuter plurals:

- First in *aśfa-* „wealth” with (acc.sg.) *aśfāv* from collective *\*/asḡ-ā/* „the goods” based on earlier *\*/h<sub>1</sub>ósu-/* „good” (compare hitt. *āššū-*);
- Second in *aśa-* „altar” with (acc.sg.) *aśaāv* from collective *\*/h<sub>2</sub>ossā-/* „heap of ashes” (as in hitt. *ḫaššāš* or in lyc. *χaha-*). This interpretation of *aśa-* is not in the dictionaries but it imposes itself from the context in inscription 50.3ff.: ... *esn taacn* <sup>4</sup> *timleś brdunlis fēncal* <sup>5</sup> *lefś=tλ fataḡ raval ak=mλ* <sup>6</sup> *[?]aśaāv bill ak=mλ lefś* <sup>7</sup> *sarētaś* „Timleś, son of Brduns, made this stele. It is Zeus to whom he offered the *fata-*, and he made an *aśa-* = altar for him. Zeus is his protector.”

The fact that old collectives in long *\*/-ā/* have a secondary accusative singular ending */-a<sup>n</sup>ḡ #/* „-*āv*” proves the following (12): The class of singular *ā*-stems has risen in Lydian only later. The first step in the development of an *ā*-class is obviously the formation of an accusative singular. This formation is based on the uninflected collective ending *\*/-ā/* – a nominative/accusative plural of the neutrum in descriptive terms – which becomes extended to a individual singular form *\*/-ā + -ḡ/*.

This hypothesis that a class of *ā*-stems is only coming into being in Lydian seems surprising with regard to the other Indo-European languages. However this hypothesis correlates well with additional facts in Lydian grammar of which I want to mention only one: Lydian *a*-stems are treated as neuter on synchronous level. Look at the passage in inscription 54.1ff.: *[e]s anlola atraštal* <sup>2</sup> *śakardal ak=ad qis fisqānt* <sup>3</sup> *buk=aś fēdanoλt fak=v=ad* <sup>4</sup> *kabrdokid* ... „This gravestone belongs to Atraštal, son of a kardal. Whoever destroys it oder damages it or steals it ...”. The subject of the first nominal clause is the *a*-stem *anlola* „gravestone”. The possessive adjectives *atraštal* and *śakardal* show a neuter form on */-l #/* with a zero ending which we shall discuss below. The anaphoric pronoun *-ad* referring to the *a*-stem *anlola* represents an older *\*/-od/* and therefore the neuter-form. It is by the way common in the Anatolian languages that singular *\*/-od/* refers to collectives or

neuter plurals. Compare for instance hitt. *kē-ia-ya* É DINGIR<sup>LIM</sup> ... *ukturi* QATAMMA *paḥḥašnuanda ešdu nu-uar-at-šan* ... *ukturi ešdu* (KBo IV 1 I 9f.) „also these temples shall be protected and they shall be firm.”

Our hypothesis is further confirmed by Lycian. The Lycian noun *wawa-/uwa-* „piece of cattle” is an *a*-stem *\*/gʷóu-ā/* and has the expected final nasal *-ā* from *\*/-ān/* in the accusative singular. Compare for instance TL 44b.44f. *kumez*<sup>45</sup>*[e]jine : uhazata : wawā : trisñni* „as annual tribute to sacrifice a *trisñni* cattle”. In this passage *wawā* is by the way congruent with a collective *uha-zata* „tribute” which formally is still an accusative plural of a neuter. Likewise the accusative plural of „cattle” is still inflected as the neuters and appears as *uwa*: compare the Lycian inscription TL 131.3f. *me ttliidi : ēni qlahi : ebijehi nuñtāta : <sup>4</sup> añm[ā]ma : uwa* „and he pays nine faultless pieces of cattle to the mother of this sanctuary”. Therefore also Lycian points to a secondary genesis of the class of *a*-stems

Conclusion (13): An internal diachronic analysis of the Lydian nominal inflection shows ...

- ... first that Lydian has a class of singular *a*-stems.
- ... and second that this class of *a*-stems must have arisen from old collectives and neuter plurals only in the time of Anatolian individual languages as their singular inflection clearly shows a secondary character.

Remember: In discussing the Lydian *a*-stems I wanted to exemplify what I mean by an internal diachronic analysis. I hope I have been able to convince you that this method – rather than an atomistic etymological method – leads to success in an ill-attested language like Lydian. By the way we have come to a result that is attractive far beyond Lydian: If my conclusions concerning Lydian are correct this means that the common Indo-European Proto-language cannot have had a grammaticalized feminine gender. As the individual languages do not have inherited a class of *ā*-stems with a complete inflection. This solves several contradictions: for instance the contradiction, that on the one hand an Indo-European accusative singular ending *\*-ab<sub>2</sub>m* is represented in *ab<sub>2</sub>*-stems in all individual languages as a monosyllabic *\*/-ām/* with acute intonation; but that on the other hand the same ending *\*-ab<sub>2</sub>m* in old root nouns is syllabized as bisyllabic *\*-ab<sub>2</sub>m* which is attested for instance in Vedic */-st<sup>(h)</sup>a(H)am/* from *\*-stah<sub>2</sub>m*. Here Lydian gives the right answer: The bisyllabic ending of root nouns is old and regular, the ending of the *ā*-stems has been formed secondarily in the individual languages.

I do not wish to get sidetracked by the question of the feminine but wish to return to the central theme of my lecture. We have explained the methodological basis of our procedure and we wish to apply our method to answering the central question: Where is Lydian to be placed within the Anatolian tree? I now wish to show you with a further example taken from Lydian nominal inflection how complex this question is when we go to details. To state it more precisely: To show you how difficult it is to evaluate isoglosses of Lydian with other Anatolian languages.

The example I have chosen is the so-called *i*-mutation (14). This is a feature known from the Luwian languages and in particular from cuneiform Luwian, hieroglyphic Luwian and Lycian. *i*-mutation designates a particular phenomenon: substantives as well as adjectives get an *i*-addition to their stem in the nominative and accusative singular and plural. This *i*-addition is restricted to nomina communia. Neuters stay unchanged. To illustrate the *i*-mutation I give the following examples:

- from Lycian (nom.sg.) *tideimi* „son” from \*/-is/, (acc.sg.) *tideimi* from \*/-in/ with *i*-mutation, but (gen.pl.) *tideimē* from \*/-ōn/, (dat.pl.) *tideime* from \*/-os/ showing the original thematic stem formation without *i*-mutation.
- from cuneiform Luwian (nom.sg.) <*i-iš-ša-ri-iš*> /*issris*/ „hand” from \*/-is/, (acc.sg.) <*iš-ša-ri-in*> /*issrin*/ from \*/-in/ with *i*-mutation, but (coll. = ntr.pl.) <*i-iš-ša-ra*> /*issr-a*/ from \*/-ā/, (dat./loc.pl.) <*iš-ša-ra-za*> /*issr-ant*<sup>s</sup>/ from \*/-ons/ showing the original consonant stem formation without *i*-mutation.

With some surprise we can see that also Lydian has clear traces of this *i*-mutation (15). Attestations for this change in the stem are for example ...

- ... (nom.sg.) *šfardēti-k* 22.13 „inhabitant of Sardes” from \*/-ont-i-s/ versus (gen.pl.) *šfardētav* 22.8 from \*/-ont-ōn/;
- ... or (nom.sg.) *šfēnis* 24.16 „relative” from \*/*syen-i-s*/ versus (dat./loc.pl.) *šfēnav* 42.5 < \*/*syen-ōn*/.

As in the other Luwian languages *a*-stems are without *i*-mutation: for instance nom.sg. *kāna-k* 41.6+ „woman” from \*/*g<sup>u</sup>onā*/.

At first glance we are tempted to see a closer connection between Lydian and Luwian on account of the mutual existence of this *i*-mutation in both languages. For after all Hittite does not have any productive *i*-mutation. But we should not give in to this temptation. For the nucleus of this *i*-mutation can be shown to go back to Common-Anatolian times and has left traces in all Anatolian languages. In Hittite beginnings of *i*-mutation are found in the enclitic possessive pronouns. For e-

example in the first person hitt. (nom.sg. comm.) *-miš* versus (acc.sg. comm.) old-hitt. *-man*, middle/neohitt. *-min* versus (gen.pl.) *-man*; The hitt. stem formation interchanges between *-ma-* and *-mi-*. *-mi-* shows *i*-mutation, *-ma-* is the inherited form continuing Indo-European *\*h<sub>1</sub>emó-*.

It is remarkable that Lydian treats the inherited patterns of the *i*-mutation in a individual way. In comparison to the Luwian languages we note the following divergencies:

- Stems with *i*-mutation are inflected in Lydian following the type (nom.sg.) *ēmīs* 13.2 „my” versus (dat./loc.sg.) *ēmλ* 5.4. At a first glance this points to an alternation (Nom.Sg.) *\*/āmm-i-s/* versus (dat.Sg.) *\*/āmmo-li/*. But there are serious doubts whether the dative/locative singular in */-C-* / as in *ēmλ* really stands for *\*/-oli/* if we analyze the data more closely. For *\*/-oli/* should result in Lydian *\*/-ali/* or *\*/-a /* which is never syncopated as shown by *vānal* „in/to the grave” from */uānoli/*. The ending */-C-* / is therefore not to be taken as *\*/-a( i)/* but as *\*/-i( i)/* with *i*-mutation in the dat./loc.sg. This means however that Lydian has made considerable changes by transferring the vowel of the *i*-mutation to further slots in the paradigm.
- These findings go together with the observation that the productive ending of the nominative/accusative singular neuter of the genetical adjectifs is */-lid/*: compare for instance inscription 1.2 *[o]raλ isλ bakillλ est mruδ eššk [vānaš]<sup>3</sup> laqrisa=k qela=k kud=k=it ist esλ vān[aλ]<sup>4</sup> bλtarvod ak=ad manelid kumlilid silukalid ...* „At the end of the month of Bacchos: this stele, this tomb, this enclosure, this ground and all that belongs to this tomb this belongs to Manes, son of Kumlis, grandson of Silukas.” As common in the Anatolian languages the singular pronoun *-ad* as well as the congruent genetical adjectives on *-lid* refer to a number of reference words. A fact that we already have noted for the purpose of our discussion of the *a*-stems above. For the purpose of our discussion it is only important that the neuter form in */-lid/* is a later change which is implied by the extension of the *i*-mutation: that means the generalisation of the stem formation in */-i-/* and the addition of the neuter ending in *\*/-d/*. Thus */-lid/* replaces *\*-lē* from *\*/-lom/* or *\*-lad* from *\*/-lod/*: These are the expected thematic forms of the neuter which originally alternated with the *i*-mutated nominative *\*/-lis/* and the accusative *\*/-lin/* of the communia.

As we have seen the question of the genealogical background of Lydian has not become clearer by our discussion of the *i*-mutation. We therefore want to go a step further. *-lid* is not the only neuter-ending of the genetical adjectives in Lydian. As we have seen above there is also a form in zero ending *-l* (16). I refer once more to inscription 54.1 [e]s *anlola atraštal*<sup>2</sup> *šakardal* „this gravestone belongs to Atraštas, son of Šakardas”. Further examples are in inscription 52 *valvel* „coin of Valves”. A parallel zero ending neuter formation is also attested in the neuter-pronoun *es* without any ending instead of *est*: look at inscription 8.1 *ešš vānaš es=k mrud es*<sup>2</sup> *laqris<a>=k kud=k=it esλ*<sup>3</sup> [vā]naλ bλtarvōd ak=a[d] ... „this tomb, this stele, this enclosure ...”.

How can we explain the existence of a neuter with zero ending? Viewing the material of the Anatolian languages brings a surprise. For in Cuneiform Luwian there exists an analogous zero ending-formation in the case of *l*-adjectives.

Look at examples as ...

- ... KUB XXXV 54 III 26 and 30 [a-]ta *ba-la-a-al a-aš-du* „let it be pure” (beside nom.sg. comm. *balāliš*).
- ... KUB XXXV 43 II 4 [ma-a-an p]u-*ua-ti-il pa-a-ri-ia-na-a-al ku-i-ḫa* „if it is anything past or future ...”

As in Lydian these neuters with zero endings can refer to collective plurals. As in Lydian they can alternate with inflected forms. See for example KUB XXXV 43 III 28 [la-la-]du-ut-ta ta-pa-a-ru ta-ta-ri-ia-am-ma-an<sup>29</sup> [ḫi-i-ru-ú(-u)]n e-ir-ḫu-u-*ua-al-li-ia-an pa-ri-it-tar-ua-al-li-ia-an*<sup>30</sup> [(x-l)]i-ia-an ḫu-u-i-it-*ua-li-ia-an pu-u-ua-ti-i-il*<sup>31</sup> [pa-a-ri-*i*]a-na-al-la ... „he shall remove *tapāru*, curse and oath by the *irḫualli-*, by the animal, ..., by the human beings, the past and the future ...”. Formally [pa-a-ri-*i*]a-na-al-la „future” is a neuter plural in /-all-a/ (referring to *tapāru*, curse and oath); functionally it is identical with *pa-a-ri-ia-na-a-al* with zero ending in the previous passage.

The development of this form with zero ending can be easily traced in Cuneiform Luwian as well as in Lydian (17). It is an analogous change based on the consonant stems which operates according to the following proportion:

nom.sg. commune \*/-nt-is/ to nom./acc.sg. ntr. \*/-nt/ identical nom.sg. comm.  
 \*/-él-is/ to **nom./acc.sg. ntr. X** (replacing original \*/-él-on/)  
 leads to a **new formation X** identical \*/-él/

The impression of an isogloss exclusive to Luwian and Lydian can hardly be avoided at this point. All the more that our proportion bases on the opposition of nom.sg. commune \*/-nt-is/ to nom./acc.sg. ntr. \*/-nt/ and therefore presupposes an advanced stage of *i*-mutation which is not given in Hittite. It therefore seems that we have one piece of evidence – an exclusive Luwo-Lydian isogloss. But what is the precise significance of this isogloss? To answer this question we have to enter into a more detailed chronological investigation:

Cuneiform Luwian graphic representations as <ḫa-la-a-al> or <pa-a-ri-ia-na-a-al> show plene vowel and thus point to long vowel-ending /-ā́l #/ from earlier \*/-ḗl #/. Following our proportion this long vowel \*/-ḗl #/ must go back to short vowel \*/-é́l #/. Vowel lengthening of accented short vowels in open syllables is well attested in the Anatolian languages. The crucial point is however that this vowel lengthening took place during or shortly after the split of Common Anatolian. As an alternative to the vowel lengthening the individual languages take the opportunity to close the open syllable by changing the following lenis-consonant to a fortis (the so-called „fortisation”). This is the reason why the individual languages and particularly Luwian and Hittite vary with regard to vowel lengthening and fortisation. Compare for example common Anatolian \*/pérom/ „before”, which gives Hitt. <pí-e-ra-an> /péran/ with vowel lengthening versus Cuneiform Luwian <pár-ra-an> /párran/ with fortisation; on the other hand \*/páḫur/ „fire”, which appears in Hittite as <pa-ab-ḫur> /páḫur/ with fortisation as opposed to Cuneiform Luwian <pa-a-ḫu-u-ur> /páḫur/ with vowel lengthening. Our relative chronology proves that the zero ending neuters in \*/-é́l #/ must have existed before any vowel lengthening or fortisation in the individual languages. This points to a very archaic date for the creation of \*/-é́l #/ – a date soon after the split of Common Anatolian.

Due to this refined chronology we can now better estimate the value of this isogloss. Sure: The case of the zero ending neuter in \*/-é́l #/ forbids us to affiliate Lydian with Hittite. But does it suggest a closer Luwo-Lydian unity? The answer is: Not on its own. For its archaic age allows no more than the assumption that Proto-Lydian and Proto-Luwian disengaged from Common Anatolian after Hittite has left. However, to prove that Lydian was a part of the Luwian language tree, more arguments are requested: so primarily some Luwo-Lydian innovations of a more recent date.

Looking for such more recent Luwo-Lyidian isoglosses we face a characteristic difficulty which I will illustrate by the example of the consonantal stops (18). Voiced stops or Anatolian lenis-consonants turn to voiceless fortis in word-initial position in Lydian. As an example for this fortisation of word initials I give *ta(a)c-* „votive tablet” from *\*/t̥ædi/* < *\*/d̥ædi/* < *\*/d<sup>b</sup>eh<sub>1</sub>-ti/* or the (1.Pers.Sg. Pret.) *tamv* „I built” < *\*/dem-on/*. The same fortisation seems to be attested for Luwian by Lycian inscriptions. Compare for example lyk. (3<sup>rd</sup> pers.sg. pres.) *tadi* „he puts < *\*/t̥ædi/* < *\*/d̥ædi/* < *\*/d<sup>b</sup>eh<sub>1</sub>-ti/*. The question is: Can this process of fortisation be seen as an Luwo-Lyidian isogloss? Unfortunately the answer is once more „no”. The reason for this negative answer is: Lydian has an affricate */t̥/* <*c*>, which in all attested cases represents a voiced dental stop preceding the vowels *\*/i, u/*. Examples are *ciw(i)-* „god” < *\*/diu(i)-/* or *(fa-)cu-ni-* with *\*cu-* „put” < *\*/d<sup>(h)</sup>uue-/*. The change of *\*/di, du/* to */t̥i, t̥u/* must therefore have been taken place before the fortisation of initial */d°/* > */t°/*. But the development of this affricata is exclusive to Lydian. Therefore word-initial fortisation must have developed independently in Lydian as in Lycian. It may be coincidence that both Lydian and Lycian shows independently the same phenomenon. But another possibility should not be ruled out: the possibility of a secondary convergent development caused by a later situation of languages in contact.

This possibility of a later situation of languages in contact affecting Lydian and the neighbouring Luwian languages is supported by further Luwo-Lyidian parallels. Let us look at the endings of the nominative/accusative plural of the Communia.

These endings are in Lydian ...

- ... for the nominative plural with stems with *i*-mutation <*-is*>: compare inscr. 24.12ff. *fak=mλ=it artimus ibsimsis*<sup>13</sup> *katsarlokid bλ bilλ=k arlilλ*<sup>14</sup> *qiraλ artimuλ=k=in ētversn*<sup>15</sup> *saroka=k nikumēk savēnt*<sup>16</sup> *bis ni=k bil šfēnis* „The Ephesian Artemis withdraws her protection from him and his possession ... he and his relatives shall not thrive in any way.”
- ... for the accusative plural with stems without *i*-mutation <*-as*> or with *i*-mutation <*-is*>: compare the pronoun *ānas* „these” in inscription 13.1 *il=im ānas išas* „Iśas has made these for me” as well as in the continuation *ēmis istaminlis* „my family members” inscr. 13.1 (*il=im ānas*) *iśas kud=m=āk cēnsidv alarmas*<sup>2</sup> *amu=k nāsi=k ēmis istaminlis vstaas* „... when I myself in my lifetime consecrated myself and my family members”.

The endings of the nominative and the accusative are spelled <-Vs>. The grapheme <s> corresponds to Greek zeta and represents an old sibilant in the environment of palatal vowel \*/e, i/. Compare *serli-* „highest authority” < \*/sarli-/ < \*/serli-/ related to Anatolian \*/ser-/ „above” (as in hitt. *šēr*). In contrast ancient sibilant preceding dark vowels is represented by the grapheme <ś> corresponding to Greek San: compare the reflexive particle -ś < pronominal \*/-soj̄/. This means that underlying <-s> there must be an ending \*/-onsi/ or \*/-insi/.

Earlier stages \*/-onsi/ or \*/-insi/, later /-ont̄i/ or /-int̄i/, are also presupposed by the Luwian languages. In Cuneiform Luwian as well as in Hieroglyphic Luwian the nominative plural ends in /-Vnt̄i/: compare Cluv. *maššaninzi*, Hluv. DEUS-*ni-zi* „gods”. In Hieroglyphic Luwian /-Vnt̄i/ extended also in the accusative plural, whereas Cuneiform Luwian in that case has preserved /-Vnt̄/ from original \*/-Vns/: compare Hluv. PES-*zi* /*pata-nt̄i*/ „feet” versus Cluv. *alinza* /*alint̄*/ „waters”.

I assume that these common innovation of the plural ending-system shared by Lydian and the Luwian languages are based as in the case of initial fortisation on a convergent development caused by a secondary situation of languages in contact. The arguments for this assumption are provided by the Luwian languages themselves. Lycian for example shows a nominative plural *tideimi* versus an accusative plural *tideimis* „sons” and points to an earlier system of nominative \*/-i-ēs/ versus accusative \*/-i-ns/. It does attest a distribution which corresponds to the earliest stage. The archaism of Lycian proves, that the constitution of the nominal endings took place individually in a recent period.

The cases of initial fortisation and the endings of the plural nouns demonstrate a final difficulty: We may succeed in dating Lydian isoglosses shared with other Anatolian languages without any chronological doubt. Yet the question of the position of Lydian remains still relatively inconclusive. First we would have to exclude the possibility that these isoglosses are not caused by later language contact resulting in a convergent development – which is not easy to do in the case of the Lydian-Luwian isoglosses.

Let us come to a conclusion (20). I have proved three points in today's lecture:

- First: Historically seen Lydian is relatively isolated. It did not form part of the Luwian belt in the second millennium B.C.



- Second: An investigation of Lydian which is based on atomistic etymological equations is pointless. The promising method in analysing Lydian starts with an internal diachronic analysis. And may bring good results as in the case of the *a*-stems.
- Third: The search for isoglosses which Lydian shares with other Anatolian sister languages gives no conclusive results. It can be ruled out that Hittite is some kind of Neo-Hittite. On the other hand parallels with the Luwian tree are insignificant as long as they have their nucleus in a early Common Anatolian or at best Post Common Anatolian stage. Finally if the parallels with Luwian languages are of a more recent date then we have to reckon always with the possibility of secondary language contact.

Therefore the question how Lydian is to be positioned within Anatolian cannot be conclusively decided. However the linguistic and extralinguistic evidence discussed here makes one overall impression: the impression is, that Lydian has separated early within the Anatolian tree and taken its own path since early times. This conclusion is of major importance for the question of the linguistic situation of Northwestern Anatolia. It challenges for example the supposition that the Trojans were speakers of a Luwian language. But I shall not anticipate the ensuing discussion and I so wish to end here. I thank you for your attention!

## „Lydian: Late Hittite or Neo-Luwian?“

### Part one: Introduction

#### 1 The Anatolian language tree:

- ❖ **Luwian** languages as major sub-group („SW-Anatolian“) in the Anatolian language tree:
  - **Cuneiform Luwian:** 16<sup>a</sup>-13<sup>a</sup>.
  - **Hieroglyphic Luwian:** Early phase (Hittite empire) 14<sup>a</sup>-12<sup>a</sup>; later phase („Neo-Hittite“ states of SW-Asia Minor and northern Syria) 11<sup>a</sup>-8<sup>a</sup>.
  - **Neo-Luwian languages:** Carian (7<sup>a</sup>-3<sup>a</sup>), Sidetic (3<sup>a</sup>), Lycian/Milyan (5<sup>a</sup>-4<sup>a</sup>), Pisidian (1P!).
- ❖ **Hittite:** 16<sup>a</sup>-13<sup>a</sup>. Individual branch in the Anatolian language tree.
- ❖ **Palaic:** 16<sup>a</sup>-15<sup>a</sup>. Genealogical position not clear.
- ❖ **Lydian:** 7<sup>a</sup>-4/3<sup>a</sup>. Genealogical position not clear. Suggestions: member of a NE-Anatolian subgroup (Carruba, Neumann), member of the Luwian subgroup (Gusmani, Oettinger), individual branch (Kammenhuber, Kronasser)?

#### 2 Questions to be answered in this paper:

- 1) What are the reasons for the uncertainty about the genealogical position of Lydian?
- 2) Which methodological improvements can guarantee better results about Lydian and its genealogical position?
- 3) Which of the theories about the genealogical position of Lydian seem plausible?

### Part two: Reasons for the uncertainty about the genealogical position of Lydian

#### 3 New insights into the historical geography of SW-Anatolia in the 2<sup>nd</sup> millennium B.C:

- i. **Bronze tablet of Boğaköy** by Tudḫaliya IV (ca. 1250<sup>a</sup>): establishes the western border of the kingdom *Tarḫuntašša* following the river Κέστρος/*Ka-aš-ta-ra-ia* (mod. *Aksu*) and crossing Πέργη/*Par-ḫa* (Pamphylia). → **Lukkā-land(s)** now to be placed to the west of *Tarḫuntašša* and **to be equated with classical Lycia!** Cf. H. Otten, Die Bronzetafel aus Boğazköy. Ein Staatsvertrag Tuthalijas IV., Wiesbaden 1988.

- ii. **Stele of Yalburt** (in Luwian hieroglyphs) by Tudḫaliya IV: mentions campaign of Tudḫaliya IV against *Lukkā*-land(s) and toponyms as *á-ḡa/i-ra/i-na-* (REGIO) = Ἄρνα/Lyc. *Arñna*, *pi-na*-\*416(URBS) = Πίναρα/Lyc. *Pinale*, *TALA-ḡa/i* = Τλως/Lyc. *Tlawā*. → Exact correspondencies between toponyms of *Lukkā* (on YALBURT) and 1<sup>st</sup> century-Lycia proves **historical continuity between the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 1<sup>st</sup> millennium B.C.** Cf. M. Poetto, L'iscrizione luvio-geroglifica di Yalburt, Pavia 1993.
- iii. New reading of the **rock inscription of Karabel** (Luwian hieroglyphs; situated on the connecting road between Ephesos and the Hermos valley): *REX TARKASNA-ḡa/i REX mi-ra/i-a* „*Tarkasnaḡa*, king of *Mira*”. → *Mira* (*Arzaḡa*) extends to the Aegean Sea; its capital *Apaša* is therefore to be identified as classical Ἐφεσος. Cf. J.D. Hawkins, Karabel, „Tarkondemos” and the land of Mira. New evidence on the Hittite empire period in Western Anatolia, Würzburger Jahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft, N.F., 23(1999), 7-14.

Consequences for the historical geography of SW-Anatolia:

- ❖ 2<sup>nd</sup> millennium B.C: The mentioned countries (*Tarḫuntašša*, *Lukkā*, *Mira/Arzaḡa*) extend over a continuous area → so called „**Luwian belt**”.
- ❖ 1<sup>st</sup> millennium B.C: Toponyms of the 2<sup>nd</sup> millenium B.C. still are in use. Furthermore Lycian and Carian are classified as Luwian languages → „**Luwian belt**” continues to exist, a linguistic continuity is plausible.

#### 4 Lydia in the 2<sup>nd</sup> millennium B.C:

The region of classical Lydia is **identical with the „Šeḡa River-Land”** in Hittite texts. Cf. map of W-Anatolia in the 2<sup>nd</sup> millennium B.C.:



Other arguments for the equation of the „Šeḫa River-Land” with classical Lydia:

- ❖ Connections of the „Šeḫa River-Land” with *La-az-pa* = island of Λέσβος, → The „Šeḫa River-Land” also includes the Caicos valley and – additionally to northern Lydia – the southern part of Mysia/Μυσία.
- ❖ „Mysian” may be the indigenous designation of the Lydians. Cf. hlw. KARKAMIŠ A 6 (8<sup>a</sup>): *zi-i-pa-ua/i-*’ *Mu-sá-za*<sup>URBS</sup> *Mu-sá-ka-za*<sup>URBS</sup> *Su+ra/i-za-ḫa*<sup>URBS</sup> AUDIRE-*ti-i-ta* „and they hear it (my name) with the (at the place of the) *Musa*, the Muska (= Phrygians) and the Sura (= Phenicians).”

Conclusions:

- ❖ „Šeḫa River-Land” viz. Northern Lydia/Southern Mysia is linguistically „terra incognita”. Names of Šeḫa-kings as of *Muḫa*-UR.MAH or his son *Manapa*-<sup>P</sup>U do not provide any useful linguistic information.
- ❖ There is no evidence, that the „Šeḫa River-Land” viz. northern Lydia/southern Mysia take part of the „Luwian belt” in the 2<sup>nd</sup> millennium B.C.

## 5 Unsatisfactory methods in the investigation of the Lydian language.

Cf. the case of the lyd. dat./loc.sg. -λ:

- ❖ Dat./loc.sg. -λ attested e.g. in 1.4ff. *ak=it n[āqis]*<sup>5</sup> *esλ mruλ buk esλ vānaλ buk esvav*<sup>6</sup> *laqirisav ...*<sup>7</sup> *ak=t=in nāqis qelλ=k fēnslifid* „whoever harms this stele, this grave chamber or these walls ... or whoever harms any part of the grave, (will be punished by Artemis)”.
- ❖ Pure etymological solution by A. Heubeck, *Handbuch der Orientalistik*, 1. Abteilung, 2. Band, 1.-2. Abschnitt, Lieferung 2, Leiden-Köln 1969, 421ff: «Dat./loc.sg. -λ /-t/ < \*/-ēl/ as in Hitt. (gen.) *ammēl* „from me, mine” or *apēl* „from him, his”.»
- ❖ But this etymological solution is arbitrary and cannot be verified. There are better arguments to refer -λ /- t/ to \*/-(V)li/ as in Lycian adverbs *teḷi* „where” and *ebeli* „there” (< \*/k<sup>h</sup>ó-li/, \*/obó-li/). For \*/-(V)li/ is used in locative function and justifies palatal -λ /- t/!
- ❖ Conclusions: The etymological method cannot succeed in the historical explanation of an ill-attested language as Lydian.

## 6 The reasons for the uncertainty about the genealogical position of Lydian:

- ❖ Lack of any extralinguistic information and peripheral position of Lydian (cf. 4).
- ❖ Unsatisfactory etymological method in the exploration of Lydian (cf. 5).

## Part three: Methodological improvements in the investigation of Lydian

**7** Only an **internal diachronic analysis**, considering the phonological and morphological structures of Lydian, can guarantee a better comprehension of its grammar and history!

Cf. the case of the dat./loc.sg.-morpheme  $-\lambda$  sub **5**:

- Internal analysis shows zero ending in *bil* „his”: cf. 24.15f. *saroka=k nikumēk savēnt ni=k* <sup>16</sup> *bis ni=k bil šfēnis* „they are not under protection, neither himself nor his relatives.” Nota bene: *bil* instead of inflected adjective (nom.pl. comm.) *\*bilis šfēnis*.
- Solution: *bil* does not go back to a genetical adjective *\*/b<sup>(h)</sup>ilo/i-/*, but represents the old pronominal genitiv *\*/ob<sup>(h)</sup>ēl/* (cf. hitt. *apēl*).
- If Anatol. (gen.) *\*/-ēl/* > Lyd. */-il/* (as in *bil*), then dat./loc. sg.  $-\lambda$  has to stay for former *\*/-li/*!

**8** Case study for an internal diachronic analysis: **the Lydian *a*-stems**.

Lydian possesses a noun class with stem vowel */-a-/* < *\*/-o-/* or *\*/-ā-/*. This stem vowel **alternates before nasal** as in acc.sg. and dat.pl:

- „*ã*” in (acc.sg.) *ásaãv* „altar”, (acc.sg.) *ásfãv* (viz. *ásfã-k*) „property”, (dat.pl.) *αωλãv* „(a part of the tomb)” etc.
- „*ē*” in (dat.pl., adj.) *alēv* „other”, (acc.sg.) *bidēv* „harm”, (acc.sg.) *tasēv* „stele”, (acc.sg.) *sanēv* „insult (?)”, (acc.sg., adj.) *taωsēv* „powerful” etc.

**9** Alternation  $-\tilde{e}v \sim -\tilde{a}v$  can only be explained in view of the origin of the nasal vowels */e<sup>n</sup>/* < *ē*> and */a<sup>n</sup>/* < *ã*>:

- */e<sup>n</sup>/* < *\*/á, é, ó/* in *\*/°V̇N.C°/* or *\*/°V̇N.N°/* (ambisyllabic „fortis nasal”): cf. *ēt-* „in(to)” < *\*/éndo-/*, *dēt-* „(mobile) property” < *\*/iönt-/* (nota bene: *\*/i̇/* > Lyd. */d/!*), *ēna-* „mother” < *\*/áñno-/*, *ēmi-* „mine” < *\*/ámmo/i-/*.
- */a<sup>n</sup>/* ← *\*/á, é, ó/* in *\*/°V̇.N°/* (heterosyllabic „lenis-nasal”): cf. *kāna-* „woman” < *\*/kána-/* (< *\*/g<sup>h</sup>ónā-/*), (3<sup>rd</sup> pers.sg. pres.) (*fa-kat-*)*wāmid* „he meets” < *\*/x̣émidi/* (< *\*/x̣émidi/* < *\*/x̣ém̃idi/* < *\*/x̣ém̃ieti/*).

**10** Diachronic development in the system of the Lydian nasal vowels */e<sup>n</sup>/* < *ē*> and */a<sup>n</sup>/* < *ã*>:

- i. *\*/°V̇N.N°/* (fortis nasal) > *\*/°ē<sup>n</sup>N°/*. Cf. parallel development in Lyc. *ēne/i-* < *\*/áñno/i-/* ≈ Lyd. *ēna-* „mother”.

- ii.  $*/^{\circ}\check{V}N.NV^{\circ}/$  viz. Lyd.  $/^{\circ}e^{\check{r}}N^{\circ}/$  implies accented vowel (Anatol. fortis nasal  $*/^{\circ}N.N^{\circ}/$  is only permissible after accented short vowel!) → Derivation of a synchronic rule in Lydian: „**Accented vowel in front of a nasal consonant is always nasalized.**”
- iii. Non-nasal Lyd.  $*/^{\circ}áN^{\circ}/$  ( $< */^{\circ}\check{V}.N^{\circ}/$  with heterosyllabic „lenis-nasal” after accented long vowel) contradicts rule sub ii. → **Non-nasal accented vowel /á/ is secondarily nasalized to /á̃/ in front of a nasal consonant** (and is written by  $<\tilde{a}>$ ). Cf.  $<\tilde{a}>$  in *kāna-* „woman, wife”  $< */g^{\check{r}}\delta n\tilde{a}-/$  (cf. Cluw. *uāna-*) or (*fakat*)*wāmid* „he meets”  $< */\mu\check{e}m\check{i}e\tilde{t}i/$  (cf. Hitt. *uēmiezzi*).
- Nota bene: A secondary transference of a nasal quality as in iii. also exists in Lycian: cf. Lyc. *nēne/i-* „brother”  $< */n\check{a}n\check{o}/i-/$  (cf. cluw. adj. *nāniḡa-*). But opposite to Lydian this secondary nasalisation has never been grammaticalized in Lycian (cf. non-nasalized *nene/i-*).

**11** According to the sound laws presented in **10** the following endings are expected in the acc. sg. viz. dat./loc. pl. of Lydian *a*-stems:

- ❖  $<-\tilde{e}v> /-\tilde{e}^{\check{r}}\eta/ < */-\check{V}n \#/$  in oxytonous nouns (word boundary # counts as consonant). Nota bene:  $<-\tilde{e}v>$  reflects former  $*/-e^{\check{r}} \#/$  with restitution of secondary weak  $/-\eta \#/$  „-v”.
- ❖  $<-av> /-\tilde{a}\eta/ < */-\check{V}n \#/$  in barytonous nouns. Cf. (acc.sg.) *vānav* „tomb chamber”  $< */\mu\check{a}\tilde{n}an/$  (cf. Cluv. adj. *uḡāni(ḡa)-* „of a rock”).

Therefore (acc.sg., dat./loc.pl.) „-āv”  $/-\tilde{a}^{\check{r}}\eta/$  with a nasal  $<\tilde{a}>$  cannot be original! It has been introduced in the nominal inflection secondarily.

Observation: Nouns in (acc.sg., dat./loc.pl.) „-āv” represent  $\bar{a}$ -stems going back to old **collectives** or neuter plurals. Cf. ...

... *aśfa-* „wealth” with (acc.sg.) *aśfāv*  $< \text{collective } */as\check{u}-\tilde{a}/$  „the goods”  $\leftarrow */h_1\acute{o}su-/$  „good” (cf. Hitt. *āššu-*);

... *aśa-* „altar” with (acc.sg.) *aśaāv*  $< \text{collective } */\check{h}oss\tilde{a}-/$  „heap of ashes” (cf. Hitt. *ḡaššāš*, Lyc. *ḡaba-*) in 50.3ff. ... *esn taacn* <sup>4</sup> *timleś brdunlis fēncal* <sup>5</sup> *lefś=tλ fatav ravat ak=mλ* <sup>6</sup> *[?]aśaāv bill ak=mλ lefś* <sup>7</sup> *sarētaś* „Timleś, son of Brduns, made this stele. It is Zeus to whom he offered the *fata-*, and he made an altar for him. Zeus is his protector.”

**12** Hypothesis from evidence presented in **11**:

- ❖ The class of singular  $\bar{a}$ -stems has risen in Lydian only later.
- ❖ The first step in the development of an  $\bar{a}$ -class is the formation of an **accusative singular**.
- ❖ This formation is based on the uninflected collective ending  $*/-\bar{a}/$  (viz. nom./acc.pl. ntr.) which becomes extended to an individual singular form  $*/-\bar{a}-\eta/$ .

Additional internal and external evidence for this hypothesis:

- ❖ Lydian *a*-stems synchronously are treated as neuters: cf. 54.1ff.: [*e*]*s anlola atraš-tal*<sup>2</sup> *šakardal ak=ad qis fisqānt*<sup>3</sup> *buk=aš fēdano* λ*t fak=v=ad*<sup>4</sup> *kabrdokid* ... „This gravestone belongs to Atraštal, son of Šakardal. Whoever destroys it or damages it or steals it ...”. Anaphoric pronoun *-ad* < (ntr.sg.) \*/-od/ refers to an *a*-stem *anlola* as Hitt. *-at* to collectives or neuter plurals (cf. Hitt. KBo IV 1 I 9f. *kē-ia-ua É DINGIR*<sup>LIM</sup> ... *ukturi QATAMMA pahḫašnuḫanda ešdu nu-uar-at-šan* ... *ukturi ešdu* „also these temples shall be protected and they shall be firm”).
- ❖ Lycian shows an *a*-stem acc.sg. *wawā* „piece of cattle” < \*/g<sup>h</sup>óu-ān/ in TL 44b.44f. *kumez*<sup>45</sup>[*e*]ine : *uhazata* : *wawā* : *trisñni* „as annual tribute to sacrifice a *trisñni* cattle ...” in synchronic combination with a neuter acc.pl. *uwa* in TL 131.3f. *me ttliidi* : *ēni qlahi* : *ebijehi nuñtāta* : <sup>4</sup> *añm[ā]ma* : *uwa* „and he pays nine faultless pieces of cattle to the mother of this sanctuary”.

### 13 Results from an internal diachronic analysis of Lydian nominal inflection:

1. Lydian has a class of singular *a*-stems.
2. This class of *a*-stems must have arisen from old collectives and neuter plurals only at the time of the Anatolian individual languages.

Nota bene: The individual languages do not have inherited a class of *ā*-stems with a complete inflection. Therefore PIE cannot have had a grammaticalized feminine gender!

Additional argument for secondary development of inflected *ah*<sub>2</sub>-stems in IE languages: acc.sg. \*/-ām/ (monosyllabic, acute intonation!) has to be explained as secondary from \*/-ā + -m/ with regard to regular (acc.sg.) \*/-ah<sub>2</sub>m > bisyllabic /-a'am/ in old root nouns as Ved. -*sthām*.

### Part four: The position of Lydian within Anatolian – preliminary remarks

### 14 The case of „*i*-mutation” in the Luwian nominal inflection:

Nomina communia add /-i-/ to their stems in the nom./acc.sg. and pl. – Neuters stay unchanged! Cf. ...

- ... Lyc. (nom.sg.) *tideimi* „son” < \*/-i-s/, (acc.sg.) *tideimi* < \*/-i-n/ (with *i*-mutation) versus (gen.pl.) *tideimē* < \*/-ōñ/, (dat.pl.) *tideime* < \*/-os/ (without *i*-mutation).
- ... Cluw. (nom.sg.) <*i-iš-ša-ri-iš*> /*īssris*/ „hand” < \*/-i-s/, (acc.sg.) <*i-iš-ša-ri-in*> /*īssrin*/ < \*/-i-n/ (with *i*-mutation) versus (coll. = ntr.pl.) <*i-iš-ša-ra*> /*īssr-a*/ < \*/-ā/, (dat./loc.pl.) <*i-iš-ša-ra-za*> /*īssr-ant*<sup>s</sup>/ < \*/-ont<sup>s</sup>/ < \*/-ons/ (without *i*-mutation).

**15** Traces of *i*-mutation are also to be found in Lydian! Cf. ...

- ... (nom.sg.) *šfardēti-k* 22.13 „inhabitant of Sardes” < \*/-ont-*i*-s/ versus (gen.pl.) *šfardētav* 22.8 < \*/-ont-*ōn*/.
- ... (nom.sg.) *šfēnis* 24.16 „relative” < \*/*s*<sub>μ</sub>*en-i*-s/ versus (dat./loc.pl.) *šfēnav* 42.5 < \*/*s*<sub>μ</sub>*en-ōn*/.

As in Luwian Lyd. *a*-stems remain without *i*-mutation: cf. (nom.sg.) *kāna-k* 41.6+ „woman” < \*/*g*<sup>h</sup>*ōnā*-/!

Nota bene:

- ❖ The nucleus of *i*-mutation goes back to Common Anatolian as can be shown by Hitt. (nom.sg. comm.) *-miš* „my” versus (acc.sg. comm.) Old Hitt. *-man* ~ Middle/Neo-Hitt. *-min* versus (gen.pl.) *-man* < \*/*h*<sub>1</sub>*emó/i*-/.
- ❖ Lydian treats the inherited patterns of the *i*-mutation in an individual way. It transfers the vowel of the *i*-mutation to further slots in the paradigm. Cf. ...
  - ... dat./loc.sg. *ēmλ* 5.4 (to nom.sg. *ēmis* 13.2 „my”) < \*/*ā*<sub>mm</sub>*-i-li*/ with extended /-*i*-/ from „*i*-mutation” instead of †*ēm**aλ* < \*/*ā*<sub>mm</sub>*-li*/ (with expected *-aλ* without syncopation as in *vānal* < \*/*ā*<sub>n</sub>*oli*/).
  - ... nom./acc. sg. neuter of the genetical adjectives in /-*lid*/ (cf. 1.2ff. *[o]raλ isλ bakillλ est mrud eššk [vānaš]* <sup>3</sup> *laqrisa=k qela=k kud=k=it ist esλ vān[aλ]* <sup>4</sup> *bλtarvod ak=ad manelid kumlilid silukalid* „At the end of the month of Bacchos: this stele, this tomb, this enclosure, this ground and all that belongs to this tomb, this belongs to Manes, son of Kumlis, grandson of Silukas.”) < \*/-*l-i-d*/ with extended /-*i*-/ from „*i*-mutation” instead of †*-lē* < \*/-*lom*/ or †*-lad* < \*/-*lod*/.

**16** Beside *-lid* there is a zero ending *-l* in the nom./acc.sg. neuter of the genetical adjectives: cf. ...

- ... 54.1 *[e]s anlola atraštāl<sup>2</sup> šakardal* „this gravestone belongs to Atraštās, son of a kardās”.
- ... 52 *valvel* „coin of Valves”

See for zero ending neuters also *es* „this” instead of *es-t* in 8.1ff. *ešš vānaš es=k mrud es<sup>2</sup> laqris<a>=k kud=k=it esλ<sup>3</sup> [vā]naλ bλtarvod ak=a[d]* ... „this tomb, this stele, this enclosure ...”!

Analogous zero ending-formation in Cluv. *l*-adjectives. Cf. ...

- ... KUB XXXV 54 III 26 and 30 *[a-]ta ḫa-la-a-al a-aš-du* „let it be pure” (neuter *ḫa-la-a-al* beside nom.sg. comm. *ḫalāliš*).
- ... KUB XXXV 43 II 4 *[ma-a-an p]u-ua-ti-il pa-a-ri-ia-na-a-al ku-i-ḫa* „if it is anything past or future ...”.



Nota bene: as in Lydian Cluv. neuters with zero endings can refer to collective plurals and alternate with inflected forms: cf. ...

- ... KUB XXXV 43 III 28ff. [*la-la-]du-ut-ta ta-pa-a-ru ta-ta-ri-ia-am-ma-an*<sup>29</sup> [*hi-i-ru-ú(-u)]n e-ir-ḫu-u-ṽa-al-li-ia-an pa-ri-it-tar-ṽa-al-li-ia-an*<sup>30</sup> [(*x-l*)]*i-ia-an ḫu-u-i-it-ṽa-li-ia-an pu-u-ṽa-ti-i-il*<sup>31</sup> [*pa-a-ri-ṽa-na-al-la* ... „he shall remove *tapāru*, curse and oath by the *irḫuṽalli-*, by the animals, ..., by the human beings, the past and the future ...” with (nom./acc.pl. neuter) [*pa-a-ri-ṽa-na-al-la* „future” in /-all-a/ ≈ *pa-a-ri-ia-na-a-al*.

**17** The development of the neuter form with zero ending operates according to the following proportion:

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{nom.sg. comm.}) */-nt-is/ : (\text{nom./acc.sg. neuter}) */-nt/ = \\ (\text{nom.sg. comm.}) */-él-is/ : (\text{nom./acc.sg. neuter}) \mathbf{X} \text{ (old: */-él-on/)} \\ \rightarrow \mathbf{X} = */-él/ \end{aligned}$$

This proportion presupposes **an advanced stage of *i*-mutation** and therefore cannot apply in Hittite. → \*/-él #/ may be **an exclusive Luwo-Lydian isogloss!**

**But the significance** of this isogloss is **relatively slight**: For zero ending-neuters in \*/-él #/ must **go back to an early** period following the first steps in the disintegration of **Common Anatolian**. Cf. the following chronology:

- Cluv. <*ḫa-la-a-al*>, <*pa-a-ri-ia-na-a-al*> attest /-āl #/ < \*/-él #/ < \*/-él #/ (nota bene in opposition to nom./acc.pl. neuter [*pa-a-ri-ṽa-na-al-la* /-alla/ < \*/-élla/ < \*/-éla/).
- Vowel lengthening \*/-él #/ > \*/-él #/ is not Common Anatolian, but takes place in the individual languages **during the disintegration of Common Anatolian**. It therefore alternates with fortisation: cf. Anatol. \*/*pérom*/ „before” > Hitt. <*pí-e-ra-an*> /*péran*/ (vowel lengthening) versus Cluv. <*pár-ra-an*> /*párran*/ (fortisation), Anatol. \*/*páḫur*/ „fire” > Hitt. <*pa-aḫ-ḫur*> /*páḫhur*/ (fortisation) versus Cluv. <*pa-a-ḫu-u-ur*> /*páḫur*/ (vowel lengthening).
- Relative chronology proves that zero ending neuters in \*/-él #/ existed even **before** vowel lengthening viz. fortisation in the individual languages – and therefore in an early post-Common Anatolian period.

### Conclusions:

- The case of the zero ending-neuters in \*/-él #/ forbids the assumption of a closer Hittite-Lydian unity.
- But: The archaic age of this innovation allows no more than the assumption that Proto-Lydian and Proto-Luwian disengaged from Common Anatolian after Hittite has left.

**18** Looking for more recent Luwo-Lyidian isoglosses we face a characteristic difficulty: Cf. the case of fortisation of lenis consonants in word initial position:

- ❖ Lyd. \*/# D°/ (lenis) > \*/# T°/ (fortis): cf. *ta(a)c-* „votive tablet” < \*/dǎdi/ (< \*/d<sup>b</sup>eh<sub>1</sub>-ti/), (1<sup>st</sup> pers.sg. pret.) *tamv* „I built” < \*/dem-on/.
- ❖ The same fortisation is also attested in Lycian: cf. Lyc. (3<sup>rd</sup> pers.sg. pres.) *tadi* „he puts” < \*/dǎdi/ (< \*/d<sup>b</sup>eh<sub>1</sub>-ti/).
- ❖ Word initial fortisation cannot be seen as a Luwo-Lyidian isogloss. For fortisation must be preceded by the exclusive Lyidian sound change \*/di, du/ > /t<sup>s</sup>i, t<sup>s</sup>u/ as in *ciw(i)-* „god” < \*/diu(i)-/ or \*/cu- „put” (in *fa-cu-ni-*) < \*/d<sup>(b)</sup>uue-/.

Alternative conclusions:

- i. Word-initial fortisation developed **independently in Lydian as well as in Lycian**.
- ii. Word-initial fortisation is caused by a later situation of **languages in contact viz. by a secondary convergent development**.

**19** Suggestion (ii.) in **18** is supported by further Luwo-Lyidian parallels. Cf. the Lyd. endings of the nom./acc. pl. of the communia:

- ❖ nom.pl.comm. <-is> (stems with *i*-mutation): cf. 24.12ff. *fak=mλ=it artimus ibšimsis*<sup>13</sup> *katsarlokid bλ bilλ=k arlilλ*<sup>14</sup> *qiraλ artimuλ=k=in ētversn*<sup>15</sup> *saroka=k nikumēk savēnt*<sup>16</sup> *bis ni=k bil sfēnis* „The Ephesian Artemis withdraws her protection from him and his possession ... he and his relatives shall not thrive in any way.”
- ❖ acc.pl.comm. <-as> (stems without *i*-mutation) viz. <-is> (stems with *i*-mutation): cf. (pron.) *ānas* „these” in 13.1f. *il=im ānas isás* „Isás has made these for me” viz. *ēmis istaminlis* „my family members” in 13.1 (*il=im ānas isás kud=m=āk cēnsidv alarmas*<sup>2</sup> *amu=k nāsi=k ēmis istaminlis vstaas* „... when I myself during my lifetime consecrated myself and my family members”).

**Etymology** of the endings of the nom./acc.pl.:

- ❖ <*s*> stand for palatal /*ś*/ in front of /*e*, /*i*/ (cf. *serli-* „highest authority” < \*/serli-/ < \*/serli-/ in contrast to <*ś*> for non-palatal /*s*/ (cf. reflexive particle -*ś* < pron. \*/-soi/).
- ❖ Therefore /-*ś* #/ <-*is*, -*as*> goes back to \*/-ont<sup>s</sup>i/ viz. \*/-int<sup>s</sup>i/ (< \*/-onsi/ viz. \*/-insi/).
- ❖ \*/-ont<sup>s</sup>i/ viz. \*/-int<sup>s</sup>i/ are also presupposed by the Luwian languages:

	Cuneiform Luwian	Hieroglyphic Luwian
nom.pl.	/-Vnt <sup>s</sup> i/ ( <i>maššaninzi</i> „gods”)	/-Vnt <sup>s</sup> i/ (DEUS- <i>ni-zi</i> „gods”)
acc.pl.	/-Vnt <sup>s</sup> / ( <i>alinza /alint<sup>s</sup>/</i> „waters”)	/-Vnt <sup>s</sup> i/ (PES- <i>zi /pata-nt<sup>s</sup>i/</i> „feet”)

Assumption:

**The Innovation of the plural ending-system** shared by Lydian and Luwian is based **on a convergent development** caused by a secondary situation of languages in contact. The arguments for this assumption are provided by the Luwian languages themselves.

For the constitution of nominal endings took place individually in a recent period: cf. **Lycian** with (nom.pl.) *tideimi* versus (acc.pl.) *tideimis* „sons” < \*/-i-ēs/ versus \*/-i-ns/ which **continues to show the original distribution!**

**20** General conclusions:

- i. Historically seen **Lydian is relatively isolated**. It did not form part of the „Luwian belt” in the 2<sup>nd</sup> millennium B.C. (cf. **4**).
- ii. The successful method in investigating Lydian starts with an **internal diachronic analysis** (the case of the *a*-stems in **7 - 13**).
- iii. The search for isoglosses which Lydian shares with other Anatolian sister languages gives no conclusive results:
  - Lydian is definitely not „Late Hittite” (cf. zero ending neuters in **16 - 17**).
  - Luwo-Lydian parallels are insignificant as long as they have their **nucleus in an early Common Anatolian or post-Common Anatolian stage** (cf. *i*-mutation in **14 - 15** or zero ending neuters in **16 - 17**).
  - Later Luwo-Lydian isoglosses can be the result of secondary language contact (cf. fortisation of word initials in **18** or of the plural ending system in **19**).

→ Overall impression: **Lydian has separated early within the Anatolian tree and taken its own path since early times.**