H. Craig Melchert

THE LYDIAN EMPHASIZING AND REFLEXIVE PARTICLE
-ś/-iś*

1. Emphasizing -ś

Among the many puzzling features of Lydian stands the final -ś of the words artakśassaλś (2,1) and mitridastaλś (24,17). The complete parallelism of borlλ ... artakśassaλś qaλmλuλ dãv in 2,1 – 2 with borlλ ... arta[kśass]aλ qaλmλuλ dãv of 41,1 – 2 demands that we take both as dative-locative singular, as per Gusmani, Lyd.Wb. 62. Furthermore, a dative-locative is also required, not merely possible, for 24,17: serli=k srmlis ãnτẽt nak amu mitridastaλś katosv faow 'The supreme authority of the temenos also proclaims: "I too f. (verb) a k. (noun) for M."' Gusmani properly rejects any interpretation of -λś as a special genitive ending.[1]

The only other attempted explanation known to me is that of Vetter, SBÖAW 232/3, 1959, 13 & 60, who claims that the -ś is an animate nominative singular pronoun. This must be rejected as totally improbable. First of all, we now have reason to believe that other alleged examples of pronominal -ś belong to the reflexive particle instead (see below). The only form of the animate nominative singular enclitic

---

[1] The proposal of Georgiev, Ling. Balk. 27/1, 1984, 6 – 9, that Lyd. -λ (and hence -λś) has a genitival function is anything but persuasive, pace Hamp, HS 101, 1988, 89. That the Aramaic translation(!) of the dating formula in text 1 has a genitive of the ruler's name proves absolutely nothing for the Lydian. As already indicated by Gusmani, there is also no merit in the idea of a connection with Etruscan -iś.

pronoun in Lydian is *-aś* with constant *a*. Second, even if a reduced animate pronoun *-ś* existed, it would have no place in either of the sentences containing the 'ending' *-λś*. In 2,1 in particular it is absurd to think that a proleptic pronoun referring to *eśś wãnaś* 'this tomb' would be inserted into the middle of the opening dating formula.

The *-ś* in *artakśassaλś* and *mitradastaλś* has three defining features. First, it is attached to already inflected words. This fact means that the *-ś* itself cannot be an ending, but must be a particle of some kind. Second, its appearance is essentially optional: as already stressed by Gusmani, it is difficult to see any real difference in meaning between *artakśassaλ* without *-ś* in 41,1—2 and with it in 2,1. Third, the particle may be attached to a word occurring anywhere in the sentence. That is, it is not limited to second position in the sentence by 'Wackernagel's Law' like most enclitic elements in Lydian.

I know of only one kind of morpheme which can show this combination of features: an emphasizing particle. Lydian *-ś* is the functional equivalent of Hitt. *-pat*, for the features of which see Hart, TPS 1971, 105 ff. An emphasizing function fits the occurrence in 24,17 perfectly. This text begins with a declaration of Mitradastas in which he pledges his property to the supreme authority of the temenos (*serlis srmlis*). In 24,16 ff. the latter makes a reciprocal declaration in favor of Mitradastas (see the text above): 'I too f. (verb) a k. (noun) for Mitradastas' (and for no one else!).

The optionality of the particle in the dating formula also makes sense with an emphasizing interpretation. Obviously, the author could choose to emphasize the ruler's name or not, with no real difference in meaning.

If *-ś* is an independent particle with a defined function, we would not expect it to be restricted to the dative-locative singular. It ought to be able to occur with any case form. A re-examination of the Lydian corpus shows that other examples of the particle do indeed exist.

Given the existence of a particle *-ś*, we may now explain the previously problematic word *karolaś* of 2,9 (see Gusmani's discussion, Lyd.Wb. 144 f.). The full sentence reads: *qis=k dctdid ist esλ wãnaλ karolλ sabλalλ karola=ś śfẽndav arwol*. The last word *arwol* is surely an infinitive depending on the main verb *dctdid*, which must thus mean something like 'tries', or 'dares'. In view of *ararm-* 'self' and *arlilli-* 'one's own', the verb stem *arwo-*, which here marks a hostile act, must have the sense of 'to appropriate'. The word *śfẽndav* is either animate accusative singular or dative-locative plural meaning 'one's own (things)', i. e. 'property, belongings' (for all of this see already Heubeck, Orbis 12, 1963, 546).

The first key in understanding this sentence is to recognize the syntax: we have here the Lydian continuant of the PIE 'double dative' construction with an infinitive. That is, *śfẽndav* is dat.-loc. plural, functioning as the direct object of the infinitive *arwol*.[2] The second key is the important discovery of Starke, Fs Neumann 1982, 408 f., that many adjectives in Lydian, as in Luvian and Lycian, show a 'motion-*i*': they inflect with *-i-* in the animate nominative and accusative, but without *-i-* in the neuter and oblique cases (cf. the remark of Gusmani, ASNP III, VIII, 1978, 844). The so-called 'endingless' forms like *atraśtal* 'of Adrastas' (Gusmani, Lyd.Wb. 94 f.) thus show the perfectly regular neuter nom.-acc. singular of adjectives in *-l(i)-*.[3] Compare also anim. nom. sg. *śfardẽtis* but dat.-loc. plural *śfardẽtav*.

This means that the expected dat.-loc. plural of the possessive adjective *karol(i)-* 'of Karos' would be precisely *karolav*. I assert that this is in fact attested in *karola=ś śfẽndav* 'the belongings of Karos', with regular loss of final *-v* before *ś*.[4] The *-ś* is the emphasizing particle, which is quite in place here: '... whoever dares to appropriate from this tomb of Karos, son of Sablas, Karos' own belongings ...'.

Another instance of emphasizing *-ś* with a dative-locative plural is in 23,4—5: *brwã=ś* III II *dãv*. Contra Gusmani, Lyd.Wb. 85 f., we do not have an unexpected nominative singular *brwãś*, but the regular dative-locative plural *brwãv*, as in all other instances of the dating formula which lack a ruler's name, plus the emphasizing particle and again loss of final *-v* before consonant. Contrary to the usual practice, inscription 23 begins with a description of the monument and a curse formula, followed by the dating formula. The latter is marked (only here) with emphasizing *-ś* to highlight the beginning of the inscription proper: 'Five years after indeed, Mitradastas, son of Mitratas, proclaims ...'.[5] Naturally, the emphasis is not on the word 'years' but on

---

[2] We now have continuants of the 'double dative' construction in Hittite, HLuvian, Lycian and Lydian. Its absence in Palaic and CLuvian is surely due only to the limited corpora. The survival of the construction (alongside the expected renewal by the accusative) is noteworthy in view of the different infinitival formations of the individual Anatolian languages.

[3] The longer form of the nt. nom.-acc. singular in *-lid* is a trivial analogical creation on the model of *-ad*, *-ud*, etc.

[4] The consonant transliterated *v*, whose only clear source is original final *-m* or *-n*, never occurs before a consonant: see Gusmani, ASNP III, 8,842 ff.

[5] Literally 'since five years' with an unstated reference point. I will discuss the details of *dãv* 'since, from' elsewhere, but for the correct analysis as a postposition see already Vetter, SBÖAW 232/3.13 f.

the entire phrase, but the enclitic -*ś* could hardly be attached to the numerals written as figures.

Emphasizing -*ś* is not limited to the dative-locative. As already seen by Meriggi, RHA 3, 1935, 95, note 48 (and by others), in the beginning of text 22, *est mrud śfardẽnτ* ..., the word *śfardẽnτ* 'Sardian' must agree with *est mrud* 'this stele' (pace Gusmani, RIL 94.293). The problem, of course, is the ending of the adjective, which does not look like a nom.-acc. singular neuter. However, as per Starke's discovery cited above, we now know that the neuter form would have had no -*i*-. As argued by Neumann, Gnomon 37, 1965, 273, the nom.-acc. singular neuter of an **nt*-stem would surely have lost its original final **t*, whence **śfardẽv*. However, Lydian at some point generalized the ending -*d* of the pronouns to nouns and adjectives (see Lyd.Wb. 36).

The regular nom.-acc. singular neuter would thus be **śfardẽd*. Compare the attested word *amẽd*, which in my view is the nom.-acc. singular neuter of an *n*-stem adjective beside the nom. singular animate *amãś*. What if we now add to **śfardẽd* the emphasizing particle -*ś*? The latter would fit the context well: 'This stele is S a r d i a n !'.

As suggested already by Littmann, Sardis 6/1, 1916, 11 & 63, and by several other scholars, Lydian *d* represents a voiced dental fricative [ð] (the reservations of Gusmani, Lyd.Wb. 32 and elsewhere, are unjustified). The only example we have of *dś* (anim. nom. sg. *edś* 'this') is not probative, since the *d* may be maintained here by analogy to the rest of the paradigm of *ed*-. In the case of the reverse sequence *śd* there is apparently a dissimilation of the two fricatives: the nt. nom.-acc. singular of *eś*- 'this' is *est* < *es-d* (i. e. [eʃð]). I do not find it implausible to suppose a similar change of *dś* to *tś*, thus **śfardẽtś*. The sequence of nasalized vowel plus [ts] then leads to epenthetic [n] and the attested *śfardẽntś* (spelled *śfardẽnτ*).[6]

There is one more possible example of emphasizing -*ś*. In text 3,2 we find: *ardẽc alarmś fadol wśtaś*. It has been clear to everyone that *ardẽc* must somehow contain the stem *ar*- 'one's own' plus a form of *dẽt*- 'property' (especially 'mobile property' as opposed to land). However, the ending in -*c* has been mysterious. The suggestion of an instrumental ending (Vetter, SBÖAW 232/3.17) is entirely ad hoc and also leaves the verb *fadol* without an object.

The only clear source of Lydian *c* is assibilation of inherited **d(^{b})* before **i* and **u*: cf. *ciw*- 'god' < **diw*- and see Heubeck, Lydiaka 51 f.

---

[6] The assumption of an epenthetic *n* here may seem ad hoc, but it is phonetically trivial in such an environment. Note that while -*V̄t*- ([V̄d]) is common, there are no sequences **-V̄τ*- ([V̄ts]).

The phonetic value is thus probably [z] or [dz]: cf. [ts] (τ) < *ty as per
Gusmani, Athenaeum 47, 139, following Shevoroshkin. As in Lycian,
Lydian *t* spells [d] after a nasal or nasalized vowel: cf. *ẽt-* < *endo* and
the spelling *Aλiksãntru-* for Alexander. 'His own property' would thus
be *ardẽt*, i. e. [arðãd]. If we add -*ś*, [-ds] with progressive assimilation
would give [-dz], which could well be spelled with -*c*. I admit that the
progressive voicing assimilation is surprising, but the fact that [nd] is
spelled *nt* suggests that the stops have merged as voiced after nasal;
i. e., **nt* has become [nd], likewise with progressive voicing assimilation.
I thus interpret the sentence as: 'He himself, (while) alive, put in his
very own property.'[7]

The last example cited for emphasizing -*ś* is only a possibility. Even
if the formal analysis is correct (*ardẽt*=*ś*), the context would also permit
a reading of the -*ś* as reflexive (note that in this case the particle is
attached to the first word in the sentence). However, I believe that the
other examples cited clearly demonstrate the existence of a Lydian
particle -*ś* whose distribution is only compatible with a synchronic
emphasizing function.

As to the source of such a particle, the most likely possibility seems
to me to be a specialized use of the reflexive particle -*ś* established by
Meriggi (see the next section below). Compare the emphatic use of the
English reflexives in '-self' and the use of French *même* to mark both
reflexives (*lui-même* 'himself') and other emphasis (*ici même* 'right here').
The underlying common denominator in these uses is the notion of
identity (compare the cogent remarks of Hart on the central meaning
of Hitt. -*pat*, TPS 1971, 105 ff.). Compare the use of French *même* also
to mean 'same' and notice that in the examples of *mitradastaλ*=*ś* and
karola=*ś* above the -*ś* could also be interpreted as 'that very same __'.
I therefore take emphasizing -*ś* as a special development of reflexive -*ś*,
on whose source see section 2 below.

2. Reflexive -*ś*/-*iś*

For many years it was assumed that Lydian had two forms of the
animate nominative singular enclitic pronoun, a full form -*aś* and a
reduced form -*ś*: see e. g. Gusmani, Lyd.Wb. 199 f. However, the

---

[7] I tentatively take *fa-do-* as containing a syncopated *-*dwa-* < *-*duwa-*, the stem for
'put, place' seen in Lyd. *da-cu(we)-* and probably *fa-cu-nil*. The adjective *wśtaś* reflects
*h₂ustó-, with regular loss of initial laryngeal and development of word-initial **u-* to
w-: cf. the preverb *wc-* < **ud(s)-*. For the meaning see already Vetter, SBÖAW 232/
3.17.

existence of the byform -*ś* depended on the assumption of some rather peculiar syntax,[8] and Meriggi, RHA 21, 1963, 23 ff., argued cogently that many examples of -*ś* make far better sense taken as a reflexive particle. Gusmani, Erg. 2.92 f., now cautiously accepts this proposal for many examples of -*ś*, but also maintains -*ś* as a by-form of the anim. nom. singular pronoun.

I will not repeat here Meriggi's arguments for a reflexive function for -*ś* but will rather add additional ones. Andrew Garrett has recently demonstrated that subject enclitic pronouns never co-occur in Hittite with direct objects, whether nominal or pronominal.[9] I have confirmed the same facts for both forms of Luvian. The pronominal syntax of the Lydian curse formulas, that portion of the corpus whose structure we best control, matches that of the other Anatolian languages perfectly: see Gusmani, Lyd.Wb. 50—51. In the absence of independent evidence to the contrary, then, we should expect Lydian also to agree with the other languages in the use of subject and object clitics.

This means that if a sentence in Lydian has an expressed direct object, it cannot also have a subject enclitic pronoun. And indeed, the certain subject pronoun -*aś* n e v e r co-occurs with a direct object in Lydian. The pattern of 54,2—4 is perfectly parallel to that of Hittite or Luvian: *ak=ad qis fisqãnt buk=aś fẽdavoλt f=ak=τ=ad kabrdokid.* The first clause has a direct object pronoun and a full subject *qis* (and naturally no enclitic subject -*aś*!). The second has a subject pronoun and a verb with no complements, which thus is surely intransitive. The third clause shows again a direct object pronoun and no subject -*aś*. This means that -τ-, to be analyzed with Gusmani, Athenaeum 47, 136 ff., as particle -*t*- plus -*ś*-, cannot contain a subject pronoun. On the other hand, a reflexive would fit the context well: 'Whoever destroys them (the contents or outfittings of the tomb), or (if) he __ s, and __ s them for himself ...'.

Many alleged examples of subject -*ś* can thus be eliminated on the basis that they co-occur with direct objects: 2,2 (*qid*), 10,10 (-*ad*), 11,4 (*ẽtamv*), 11,6 (-*ad*), 11,10 (*est*), 13,10 (*kocwid*), 22,5 (*aλidad wiświd*), 22,8 (-*ad*), 22,10 (*irduv*), 24,4 (-*ad*), 46,3 (*asrav*).

---

[8] Namely, the redundant occurrence of an enclitic third-person subject pronoun with a nominal subject (or with a first-person verb), or 'proleptic' use with a following relative clause. Despite the efforts of Gusmani to defend such possible structures (Erg. 2.93), they remain highly unlikely, as he himself concedes.

[9] 'The Syntax of Anatolian Pronominal Clitics' (Harvard Ph. D. dissertation, 1990). See already the remarks of Watkins, Celtica 6, 1963, 42, and Études Celtiques 12, 1968, 93.

Most other instances of 'subject' -*ś* can be discarded on the basis argued by Meriggi: that they co-occur superfluously (and in no regular pattern!) with expressed third person subjects or with first and second person verb forms: 11,2 (*iśkoś*), 13,4 (pret. 1st pl. *ceswν*), 13,5 (pret. 1st pl. *fasiwν*), 13,6 (-*aś*),[10] 13,6 (*tarblaś*),[10] 13,11 (*wratoś*), 18,2 (pres. 1 sg. *śoſ*),[11] 22,2 (*fawnēris* either anim. nom. pl. or pres. 2nd sg. verb), 22,7 (*niqeśi=k dẽt*), 22,7 (*datroś=k qeśis*), 22,13 (-*aś*).[12]

As already admitted by Gusmani, Lyd.Wb. 200, *faś* in 10,7 may be taken as simply *f=aś* with the regular form of the subject enclitic pronoun.

In 14,11 and 15,3 we find *ãnś* immediately preceding a relative clause. Brandenstein, Caucasica 9, 1931, 29, suggested an analysis *ãn-ś qλ* 'he to whom' and *ãn-ś … qis* 'he … who', which Gusmani takes as evidence for a subject pronoun -*ś*. Brandenstein's syntactic analysis is attractive (though the overall contexts are fragmentary and obscure), but this does not require that we divide *ãnś* into *ãn* + -*ś*.

I propose rather that *ãnś* is the regular animate nominative singular of a stem *ãna-* 'this', seen also in the neuter nominative-accusative *ãnad* (22,4), which can hardly be segmented into *ãn-ad*, as conceded by Gusmani, Lyd.Wb. 72. For the syncope in *ãnś* compare *alarmś* 'self', which is surely a **mo*-stem.

The stem *ãna-* also appears in *il=im ãnas iśaś* in 13,1, which means 'Isas (himself) made these for me', referring to some feature of the architectural unit in which the inscription was placed.[13] For -*(i)m* as dative 'to/for me' note the pret. 1st singular *cẽnsidv* in the next clause,

---

[10] I am following Meriggi and Gusmani (Erg. 2.67 f.) in taking *koττiś* as modifying *tarblaś*, which is thus in the same clause as *ul=τ=in*.

[11] For *śoſ* as a pres.-fut. 1st singular (for **śow* like *faow*) see Bossert, Heth.Kön. 125. See note 14 below for further arguments for a first-person interpretation.

[12] Carruba, Athenaeum 38.51, argues that some cases of -*aś* represent an animate accusative plural 'them'. This seems unavoidable for 22,13, where the pret. 1st plural *wcbimwv* makes a subject -*aś* impossible. In that case, a subject enclitic is likewise excluded as per above.

[13] For a similar analysis of this sentence see already Carruba, Athenaeum 38.48. Since text 13 is in verse, I tentatively take the *alarmaś* 'himself' at the end of line 1 with *iśaś*. Compare then *iśaś il alarmś* 'Isas himself did (it)' in 12,6. Obviously, one could also take *alarmś* in 13,1 with the *amu=k* of line 2.
Gusmani, Sprache 17, 1971, 5 f., proposes that *iśa-* is not a name, but rather 'lord', matching Hitt. *iśḫa-*. This suggestion is attractive semantically: the insistence that 'The lord/master himself made these for me' would make good sense. However, it is hard to understand why the **ś* would fail to be palatalized by the preceding **i-*, whether this is inherited or prothetic. I therefore stand by the interpretation of *Iśaś* as a personal name.

reinforced by *amu=k*.[14] My interpretation allows us to retain *il* as pret. 3rd person 'made, did'. The emphatic initial position is not surprising in a verse text.

The final palatal *-s* of *ānas* has presented insurmountable difficulties for its usual interpretation as nominative singular of a personal name: see the discussion of Gusmani, Sprache 17.5. In interpreting *ānas* as animate accusative plural 'these/those', I am extending and modifying a proposal of Heubeck, Sprache 11, 1961, 78, who derives Lydian anim. nom. plural *-is* from *-ins* (for the existence of the ending see Heubeck, Orbis 12, 1963, 541 ff.). Heubeck compares, of course, CLuvian anim. nom. pl. *-nʐi*, anim. acc. pl. *-nʐ(a)* and Milyan anim. nom. pl. *-iʐ* (*masaiʐ* 'gods'). Note, however, that the nominative form in CLuvian is actually *-nʐi* with a final *-i*, and in HLuvian the nominative ending in *-nʐi* has been generalized to the accusative plural as well. I therefore take Lydian anim. nom. plural *-is* from *-insi* (= Luvian *-inʐi*) and anim. acc. pl. *-as* < *-onsi* (= Luvian *-anʐi*), with an independent generalization of the nominative to the accusative as in HLuvian.[15]

---

[14] I also see *-(i)m* 'to/for me' in the *ni=m=it* of 18,2, which is preceded by the pret. 1st singular *qisredv* and followed by the pres.-fut. 1st singular *sof* (on which see note 11). A meaning 'for/to me' is also likely for *mru(d)=m=it baal* in 14,1, where in discourse-initial position the particle *-(u)m-* (= Hitt. *-ma*) is virtually excluded. Note the first singulars *qλastānu* and *famrasidv* later in the same text. I also follow Eichner, Unters. 32 & 68 and Sprache 27, 1981, 209, in his analysis of the type of *manel=im* 'I (am) of Manes': *-(i)m* reflects an old dative *-mei* used here to mark a nominal sentence in the first person, like HLuvian *-mi*. Compare the same use of the reflexive particle *-ʐa* in Neo-Hittite, as described by Hoffner, JNES 28, 1969, 225 ff., and see my discussion of the HLuvian type, AnSt 38, 1988, 41–42. The alternative analysis of the Lydian type as containing a reduced form of the copula *hiesmi* (Gusmani, Sprache 17,1 ff.) is in and of itself impeccable, but the other evidence for dative *-(i)m* and the parallel developments in HLuvian and Hittite make Eichner's account more likely. For the possibility that some cases of *-(i)m-* represent 'me' see already Carruba, Athenaeum 47,60.

[15] Deriving nom. pl. *-is* (and secondarily acc. pl. *-as*) from *-nsi* explains why the Lydian sibilant is palatal(ized), which Heubeck could not account for. The creation of a new animate nominative plural based on the accusative ending *-ns* would thus be a feature shared by all the western Anatolian languages. Whether this is true for Lydian or not, it certainly is for Lycian (A). Lycian *ladāi* (107a,1) is nominative plural, perfectly regular from *ladainsi* (with generalized *i*-stem ending) via *ladainhi* and *ladāihi*. For the loss of *h* here compare *eptte* for *epttehe* (121) and *miñta* for *miñtaha* (31,4). Likewise nom. pl. *māhài* 'gods' (with two nasalized vowels!): *masanainsi* > *masnainsi* > *mansainsi* > *manhainhi* > *māhài*. Compare for the generalized *i*-stem ending and for the phonology Mil. *masaiʐ* 'gods' (nom. pl. = acc. pl.) < *mansains*. For the essentially correct analysis (with differing details) see already Eichner, Unters. 1974, 62 ff. The positing of a completely unattested anim. nom. pl. ending *-i* (*ladi*, *mahani*) by Heubeck, IncLing 2, 1975, 79 f., and Oettinger, IncLing 3/2, 1977,

Since the context of *ēminaś* 'my' in 44,7 is hopelessly broken, my interpretation of *ānas* cannot at present be confirmed. Note, however, that the extended stem *ēmin(a)*- beside dative plural *ēminav* argues strongly that *ēminaś* is a plural, and an animate nominative or accusative seems the only likely possibility.[16] In any case, *ānś*, our point of departure for this discussion, is at least as likely to be a demonstrative 'this' as it is a sequence *ān=ś*.[17]

The sequence *faśqv* of 14,6 and 80,7 cannot be analyzed with Gusmani as *fa=ś=qv*, with a subject pronoun and accusative singular animate of the relative pronoun, because as already argued above a subject pronoun does not co-occur with a direct object. The context of the first occurrence makes such an analysis improbable in any case. If we take *faśqv* in 14,6 as introducing a new clause, then the only other word in the clause is *niqaaslad*, which is surely nominal. That would leave the alleged accusative *qv* with no verb. We can only conclude that *faśqv* is an animate noun of unknown meaning in the accusative singular. Compare *iśqv*, which we now know is also an animate noun in the accusative singular: see Gusmani, Erg. 2.61.

With no other evidence for the alleged 'proleptic' use with relatives, we must take the example of 23,18 *ak=ś qis ēmv ētamv uv fawcvaśod* as a clear reflexive, given the presence of both a subject *qis* and an object *ēmv ētamv*.

When we have eliminated all the cases above, there is to my knowledge only one case left of the alleged subject -*ś*. In 13,7 we find a clause *fa=k=τ=in dawicil istaminlav qiraaλ*. While the meaning of the entire sentence is quite unclear, we certainly have no expressed subject or direct object. A subject pronoun with an intransitive verb would

---

131 ff., is without foundation, and the assumed sound change of final *-*ani* to -*ãi* is contradicted by other examples, as Eichner already noted. No better is Starke's equally fictitious nom. pl. *lada*, Fs Neumann 1982, 420. The further conclusion of an isogloss grouping Milyan (-*iχ*) and Luvian (-*nχi*) a g a i n s t Lycian (*-*i*/-*a*) is wildly improbable on its face.

[16] As already cited, Carruba, Athenaeum 38.48, also takes *ānas* as anim. acc. plural. He also suggests, ibid. 53, that *ēminaś* is animate plural. However, in his entire discussion of the matter he confuses the endings -*aś* with dental sibilant and -*aś* with palatal sibilant. These obviously cannot have the same source.

[17] I further contend that the sequences *ēna=t* and *ēnv* do not contain an otherwise unattested sentence-initial adverb *ēn* (Gusmani, Lyd.Wb. 105), but are instead forms of a demonstrative *ēna*- 'that'. The latter matches exactly Hitt. *anna*- and Pal. *ānni*- 'that' < CA *ánno*- (cf. *ēna*- 'mother' < *ánna*-): see already Sturtevant, Lg 1, 1925, 73. CA *ánno*- reflects PIE *éno*-. Lyd. *āna*- 'this' equates to Hitt. *ana*- 'this' in *ani=śiwatti* '(from) today' < PIE *óno*-.

thus be quite in order. We know further from $ni=k=\tau=aś$ that the pronoun -*aś* follows the particle -*t*-. And in all known cases the particle -*in* is the last member in the enclitic sequence. There is thus no difficulty in assuming $fa=k=t=(a)ś=in$. The loss of the vowel of the enclitic subject pronoun -*aś* could be due to its unique position before the particle -*in*.

Since we have no attested cases of $=aś=in$, the interpretation of the -*ś* of $fa=k=\tau=in$ as a subject pronoun can thus not be excluded. However, so long as the meaning of the sentence remains undetermined, a reflexive with a transitive verb used absolutely or even with an intransitive verb is also possible.[18] Given many instances where only a reflexive reading is possible and none where a subject is required, I prefer the simpler hypothesis that Lydian -*ś* a l w a y s represents the reflexive particle (except, of course, for those instances discussed in Section 1 which are emphasizing).

There is another alleged variant of the subject enclitic pronoun -*aś*, namely -*is* (Gusmani, Lyd.Wb. 129). This interpretation may now be safely discarded, since the form co-occurs in 24,7 and 24,8 with direct objects, respectively *citollad* and $qi(d)=k$. As indicated above, a subject pronoun cannot co-occur with a direct object. In 10,3 and 12,2 a subject interpretation is also improbable, since the clauses already contain overt nominal subjects.

On the other hand, a reflexive interpretation is possible for all instances of -*is*, and at least one, 24,8, calls for such a meaning: $buk=m\lambda=is$ *fakarsed* $qi(d)=k$. As noted above, text 24 begins with Mitradastas' pledging his property to the supreme authority of the temenos. There then follows a series of relative clauses detailing possible violations of this property, which the gods are to punish. Lydian *buk* means 'or', -*mλ*- is a dative of disadvantage referring to the supreme authority, and $qi(d)=k$ is a neuter indefinite 'anything'. Several scholars have already compared the verb *fakarsed* to Hitt. *karš*- 'cut': see Gusmani, Lyd.Wb. 119 with references. However, they have attributed a rather more general meaning of 'destroy, harm' to the Lydian verb. While this is possible, the Hitt. *karš*- is often used to mean 'cut off/out' in the sense 'segregate, separate'.[19] I propose that Lydian *fakarsed*

---

[18] I insist that the meaning of the clause is quite indeterminate. Since it occurs with no expressed direct object, the meaning 'built' for *dawicil* is far from assured, pace Gusmani, Lyd.Wb. 96.

[19] See e. g. in the Laws (KBo VI 3 IV 18): *takku* ŠAḪ.TUR *kappi karaši kuiški tāyiẓẓi* 'If someone cuts out (and) steals a small piglet'. See also the prayer of Kantuzzili,

has the same meaning, reinforced by the reflexive particle -iś: 'or cuts off anything from him for himself.'

The variant -iś of reflexive -ś is phonologically conditioned. The former occurs seven times, always before consonant: 10,3; 12,2; 14,1; 14,15; 23,9; 24,7; 24,8. The form -ś occurs twenty-five times, in all but four cases before a vowel (the exceptions are in 2,2; 22,7 (twice) and 23,18).[20] This distribution shows convincingly in my view that -iś has developed from -ś by anaptyxis. Since the anaptyctic vowel in this case is -i-, it then automatically palatalizes the following sibilant: see for the latter Gusmani, Lyd.Wb. 34.

The anaptyxis here is completely parallel to that in the particles -(i)t- and -(u)m-, for which see Carruba, Quaderni 4, 1959, 35 ff., and Heubeck, HbOr, 1969, 405. In these two cases also the synchronic distribution of the allomorphs is no longer perfectly complementary, but the original pattern is quite unmistakable.

There is also a rare form -iś. Gusmani, Erg. 2.60, accepts Meriggi's argument that this cannot be a subject pronoun. Indeed, in its only contextually clear occurrence (42,6) -iś is accompanied by both an overt subject and direct object, so an enclitic subject pronoun is excluded: es=k=iś labta qis fên[   ]. The context of the example in 80,17 is too broken to draw any conclusions, while that in 14,6 is clearly accompanied by a preterite first singular verb, a fact which again eliminates an enclitic third person subject pronoun.

Gusmani, Lyd.Wb. 264, restores the verb of 42,6 as fên[sλibid], but this is impossible, since the latter verb always takes a dative-locative complement, never a direct object. This means that the verb is unknown, and a reflexive reading for -iś is quite possible: 'and the one who __s/ed these l. for himself'. It is important to notice that all three occurrences of -iś are attached to the first word in the sentence, as we

---

KUB XXX 10 I 15, where he insists that he has never cut out for himself (kar(a)śśun) a cow or sheep from the god's stock.

[20] Carruba, Athenaeum 47.70 ff. and Satzpartikeln 44, argues that the sequence -mś should be interpreted as a unit, specifically as a dative plural 'to/for them/you'. This is particularly attractive for kaτared=k=mś in 11,2, because we do not find both -k 'also' and the particle -(u)m- in the same clause elsewhere, nor would we expect to. In my view the -mś- here would refer to the two(!) objects dedicated in the previous sentence (mruwaad and wānτa(ś)). The cluster of occurrences of -mś- in text 22 is also compatible with the overall context and the almost certain plural siwraλmis in lines 9 and 11. As Carruba points out, derivation of -mś 'to/for them/you' from CA *-smos and equation with Hitt. -śmaś and CLuv. -mmaś would be formally quite easy. If one removes -mś from the examples of -ś, then the figures are: fifteen total examples of -ś, only two before consonant.

would expect of the reflexive, and furthermore all three are before a consonant, like -*is*. No proof is possible with our current data, but I tentatively take -*iś* as a variant of the reflexive -*ś*/-*is*. If this is correct, one can only guess that the phonologically regular -*is* has had the dental sibilant restored after the form -*ś*.

While the status of -*iś* must remain uncertain, I consider Meriggi's analysis of Lydian -*ś* as a reflexive to be assured. Since most examples of -*ś* cannot be subject pronouns and none must be, I see no reason to assume a subject pronoun -*ś* for Lydian at all. The syntactic and phonological distribution of -*is* argues that it is merely a variant of reflexive -*ś*.

Gusmani, Erg. 2.93, compares Lydian reflexive -*ś* with Hittite -*za*. However, the latter reflects Common Anatolian *-*ti*, as preserved in Luvian and Lycian. We know that *t* assibilates to [ts] (τ) in Lydian before *y* (Gusmani, Athenaeum 46.139, following Shevoroshkin). I know of no good evidence that *t* assibilates to *ś* (dental!) before *i* in Lydian.[21] Even if this were true, it would be difficult to reconcile the unchanged -*t* of the present third person ending < *-*ti* with its assibilation in the particle *-*ti*. One would have to assume apocope of the final *-*i* in the verb, then assibilation, then another separate apocope of the final *-*i* in the particle.

I find it far more likely, then, that Lydian reflexive -*ś* continues CA enclitic *-*soi*, with regular loss of a final unaccented vowel. For the reflexive use, compare Pal. -*ši* in *ni=ppa=ši mušānti* 'but they are not satisfied' (see Carruba, StBoT 10 (1970) 70). It is probably no accident that *-*soi*, which means 'to/for him' in Hittite, develops a reflexive sense in Lydian and Palaic, languages where the third person singular dative pronoun is replaced by -(*m*)λ and -*tu* respectively.

---

[21] None of the examples of *t* > *ś* (NB: palatal!) before *i* cited by Haas, Sprache 8, 1962, 175, is compelling. However, since original *ś* is palatalized to Lyd. *ś* before *i* and *e*, we need some other source for attested sequences *śi*. We cannot exclude at this point that (some of) these reflect original *-*ti*.