

Rendu furieux par la piqûre de l'Abeille, il devient un dieu meurtrier, massacrant les hommes et les animaux en provoquant des inondations et des tremblements de terre. Un rituel de naissance où Télipinu est désigné comme le « terrifiant (*ḫadugašaz*) Télipinu », c'est qu'il est doté sans doute d'une force redoutable qui inspire l'effroi à ses adversaires, mais qu'il peut mettre volontiers aux services des humains ; au service du nouveau-né, par exemple, comme dans le texte où se trouve cette expression, ou encore au service du souverain, comme dans la *Prière de Muršili II à Télipinu*, évoquée plus haut. Dans ce texte, le roi évoque Télipinu plaçant les ennemis du roi sous son pied. Mais inversement, il peut être également une divinité sanguinaire qui n'hésite pas à répandre la mort autour de lui, ainsi qu'il apparaît dans son *Mythe*. La force impressionnante de Télipinu et l'effroi qu'on éprouve à son approche expliquent que son père, le dieu de l'Orage, n'hésite pas à recourir à lui dans les situations extrêmes. C'est Télipinu que le dieu de l'Orage envoie lorsque le Soleil disparaît, faisant courir un risque mortel à toute vie sur la terre, comme on le voit dans le *Mythe de Télipinu et de la fille de l'Océan* ou dans le *Mythe de la Disparition du Soleil*. Dans ce dernier *Mythe* le fait que Télipinu intervienne après le dieu LAMMA de la campagne et le dieu du combat Zababa semble confirmer le caractère protecteur de Télipinu. Il semble que la force impressionnante de Télipinu dérive de sa fonction de fondateur. Dans le *Mythe de Télipinu*, on constate que le dieu fait preuve d'une relative clémence tant qu'il est doté de sa seule fonction agraire, c'est-à-dire au moment de son départ ; il devient violent et terrifiant au moment de son réveil. Il est doté alors de sa nouvelle fonction de fondateur, renversant notamment les fondations des maisons (Version 3, KUB XXXIII 10, II 12).

¹³ Sur cette question, voir MAZOYER, M., *La vie quotidienne*, pp. 92-138.

SECOND THOUGHTS ON *Y AND H₂ IN LYDIAN

It is a pleasure to offer to René Lebrun, in recognition of his contributions to our understanding of the ancient Indo-European languages of Western Anatolia, the following reconsiderations of problems in Lydian historical phonology. What follows was directly inspired by the recent *Mémoire* of Raphaël Gérard, completed under the direction of Professor René Lebrun¹. Our honoree will readily appreciate that my analyses are offered in the spirit of a continuing dialogue and that they make no claim to the status of « solutions ».

1. *y > d in Lydian

In 1994 I argued that PIE *y appears in Lydian as *d* intervocally and probably word-initially before vowel². I did not then address the question of the fate of *y in syllable-final position. Elsewhere I did take note of the absence of any compelling examples for reflexes of diphthongs in *Vy in Lydian³. I now believe this lack is due to the fact that such sequences also led to *Vd* in Lydian.

As a first example of this development I cite the relative pronoun *qed*. I have previously followed others in assigning this word to an alternate stem *qe-* of the relative-interrogative *qi-*, but there is in fact no other evidence for such an alleged stem⁴. Descriptively, we simply find *qed* as an

alternative to neuter nominative-accusative *qid*. The latter, the quite regular reflex of neuter nom.-acc. singular **k^wid* and direct cognate of Hittite *kuit*, notably serves synchronically for both singular and plural⁵. I now suggest that Lydian *qed* is likewise the cognate of Hittite neuter nom.-acc. plural *kue*. With the loss of contrast between singular and plural in the pronouns in Lydian, *qid* and *qed* became mere formal variants with no contrast in function.

The source of the *-e* of Hittite neuter (collective) nom.-acc. plural *kue* has long presented a problem⁶. Whatever the origin of the non-direct case endings, all other forms of the nominative and accusative of the interrogative-relative pronoun in Hittite point to an *i*-stem (*kuiš*, *kuiñ*, *kuit*, *kuiēš*, *kuiuš*), and no evidence from the other Anatolian languages argues against projecting this situation back to Proto-Anatolian. We thus may reasonably expect an *i*-stem source for *kue*, but it clearly does not reflect **-ih₂*⁷. I propose with due reserve that Hittite *kue* and Lydian *qed* continue a more archaic type of *i*-stem collective, a « hysterokinetic » **k^wēy*. Compare Hittite *udnē*, *udni*- « land » < **udnēy*/**udni-* and *kulēi* « fallow land » < **k^wlēy*⁸.

As shown by *udnē*, the phonological development to Hittite *kue* is straightforward. Lydian *qed* requires some comment. Since original long **ē* probably yields Lydian *i*⁹, I assume pre-Lydian shortening of tautosyllabic **ēy* to **ey*, leading to *ed*¹⁰. Lydian *kawe*- « priest » < **kowēy*-, with lengthened grade generalized from the nominative singular to the rest of the paradigm (cf. Avestan nom. sg. *kauuā*) supports this development, but one then asks why *kawe*- shows no trace of the *d* < **y*. This may be attributed to simplification of the nom. sg. **kawed+s* to attested *kawes* from which a stem *kawe*- was generalized. Attested sequences of nom. sg. *-dš* in *edš*, *kaḡladš*, and *patnēdš* (NB with palatal sibilant !) do not argue against such a reduction of pre-Lydian **-ds*, since they may reflect recent syncope of an *i*-stem nom. sg. ending **-diš*¹¹.

As a second candidate for *d* from syllable-final **y* I offer the noun (*kat*)-*šadmē*-. It has long been established that *katšadmē*- is a compound of *šadmē*- plus the preverb *kat*- (cf. Hittite *katta* « down »)¹². The two words occur together in 10,8-9 : *ak cēnal nārs qλ šers ciwvališ katšadmēs f=ak=m=it ēnud išt katowall šadmēλ*. The suggested meaning « Unterschrift » for *katšadmē*- (i.e. the lower part of the inscription)¹³ is very unlikely given the modifying adjective *ciwvališ* « divine ». It seems reasonably certain that *katowall šadmēλ* refers to the text itself, most of which is a first-person verbal declaration of Katovas. This conclusion is supported by the other occurrences of *šadmē*- in text 26, which likewise appear to refer to the inscription on the stele or its contents. If we ask what the likely difference is between a divine and human declaration of some kind, one answer is that the former is imposed from above (i.e. downwards, hence the further specification by *kat*-). Simple *šadmē*- would be something like « injunction, instruction, bidding » (of an individual), while *katšadmē*- would be « edict, decree » (of some higher authority).

A sense « decree » is also very compatible with the context of the verb *katṭi*-, which appears repeatedly in text 22. As established by D. Schürr¹⁴, text 22 deals with declarations made by the inhabitants of Sardis regarding a group of persons designated by the word *mlimn*-. Despite our very imperfect understanding of the specifics, D. Schürr is surely correct in supposing that the basic subject matter is the legal status of the *mlimn*-, probably with particular attention to property. I therefore suggest that the verb *katṭi*- « decree » contains not only the same prefix as the noun *katšadmē*- but also the same root : **ši*- beside *šad*-. The forms **ši*- and *šad*- reflect ablaut variants **si*- and **soy*-. An Anatolian verbal root with suitable semantics is not hard to find : **sh₂ei*- « bind », among whose derivatives is Hittite *išḫiul*-, with a range of meanings that includes « injunction, instruction, statute »¹⁵.

We may thus revise our preforms to **sh₂i-* and **sh₂oy*. We have no hope of recovering the pre-Lyidian inflection of the verb¹⁶, but *šadmē-* « binding » > « injunction, instruction » may be analyzed as a *men*-stem of the type of Greek ποιμήν « shepherd », from a virtual **sh₂oy-mén*¹⁷. This would have led by regular developments to Lydian **šadmē-*, which was trivially altered to *šadmē-* under the influence of the corresponding verb, where **si-* < **sh₂i-* was regularly palatalized to **ši-* after loss of the laryngeal between consonant and vowel¹⁸.

Whether any other cases of syllable-final *d* in Lydian reflect **y* must be left as an open question (*wardetal* in 11,5 remains opaque to me)¹⁹.

2. **h₂* > Lydian *k* ?

A consensus appears to have developed that Lydian shows no direct trace of the PIE « laryngeals », including **h₂*²⁰. The general dearth of assured etymologies for Lydian does mean that this conclusion is based on very restricted evidence. Even if we are generous in including all remotely plausible examples, we are limited to cases in postconsonantal or word-initial position: e.g. *aara-* « courtyard, property » < **h₁órh₂-* (if cognate with Hittite *arḫ(a)-* « border, territory »), *esa-* « child, offspring » < **h₂ónso*²¹, *wesfa-* « living » < virtual **h₂wéswo-*. Notably lacking here is evidence for intervocalic **h₂*²².

As I have suggested elsewhere²³, Lydian *šarēta-* means something like « protector, patron », and a sense « shall watch over, protect » is also suitable for the compound verb *katared* in 11,2. The presence of the preverb *kat-* « down » in the latter led me to compare Avestan *ni-har-* « watch over, guard ». A meaning « protection » likewise fits well the context of the noun *šaroka-* in 24,14-15: *artimuλ=k=in ētweršn*

šaroka=k nikumēk šawēnt « He (the violator) also shall not in any way experience *ē*. and protection from/on the part of Artemis »²⁴.

We may thus isolate a Lydian suffix *-oka-* that forms abstract nouns. It appears also in the nouns *altokad* (10,14) and *atrokl* (11,8)²⁵ and indirectly in the denominative verbs *kaprdoki-* « steal », *katšarloki-* « bring defeat, demotion », and *warptoki-* « ensnare » (?)²⁶. Lydian *atrok(a)-* recalls CLuvian *atrahit-*, but the meaning of both words is too uncertain to assert with confidence that they are related²⁷. Nevertheless, the formal resemblance emboldens me to suggest that Lydian *-oka-* reflects a secondary « thematization » of the same abstract suffix as that seen in CLuvian *-aḫ-it-* and also indirectly in Hittite *-ātar*²⁸.

For the secondary treatment as *-a-* stems compare the similar development in Hittite *maniyahḫa-* « portion, share »²⁹. We should also probably assume synchronic stems **alwanzahḫa-* « witchcraft » (attested in the instrumental *alwanzahḫit* and ablative *alwanzahḫaz*) and **manninkuwahḫa-* « vicinity » (attested in the dat.-loc. singular *manninkuwahḫi*). I assume a similar development in Lydian nouns in *-oka-*. The apparent discrepancy in gender between Hittite *maniyahḫaš* and Lydian *altokad* is not a serious obstacle, since the treatment as *a*-stems would surely have been independent.

The appearance of **h₂* as a dorsal stop is paralleled in Lycian, where there is widespread agreement that it appears under at least some conditions as *q* or *x*³⁰. The preservation of **h₂* intervocalically versus its loss word-initially before vowel is admittedly surprising, but hardly impossible. A far more serious issue is the *o*-vocalism of *-oka-* allegedly from **-eh₂V-* (i.e. **[-aHV-]*). A complete reassessment of the problem of *a* and *o* vocalism in Lydian is not possible here, and I restrict myself to the following remarks. First of all, Lydian *o* likely represents a relatively open vowel [ɔ] or [â]³¹. Second, prehistoric short **a* and **o* merge (together with **e*) as *ē* and *ā*

in accented position before nasal in closed and open syllables respectively, and short **a*, **o* and **e* also merge as *a* in unaccented position³². Third, other than in the alleged environment in question, **-áHV-*, we unfortunately have no secure reflexes of accented short **a* in Lydian³³. Finally, while accented short **o* other than before nasal clearly yields Lydian *a* in some environments, we have no evidence for many others, including notably **-óHV-*³⁴. It is highly unlikely that all cases of attested *o* in Lydian may be attributed to the presence of an adjacent prehistoric **w* or labiovelar³⁵.

Under these circumstances I do not see that a partial or even complete merger of prehistoric short **a* and **o* can be excluded. Current evidence would permit either a complete merger of short **a* and **o* to *o* (i.e. [ɔ] or [â]) versus long **ā* and **ō* to *a* (cf. Slavic), with a secondary conditioned split of the new *o* into *o* and *a* under conditions to be determined, or merely a partial conditioned merger of prehistoric short **a* with **o* as *o* ([ɔ]). Obviously, pending a successful determination of such conditioning or the discovery of new evidence the account proposed here of *-oka-* as a reflex of **-eh₂(V)* must remain hypothetical.

H. Craig MELCHERT
University of North Carolina
at Chapel Hill

¹ GÉRARD, R., *Phonétique et morphologie de la langue lydienne*, Louvain, 2001. I am much indebted to the author for generously making a copy of this most stimulating work available to me in advance of its formal publication. I

am, of course, solely responsible for the views expressed here. I follow D. SCHÜRR, *Kadmos* 38, 1999, pp.171ff. *et aliter*, in transliterating the Lydian bilabial stop as *p* instead of *b* and the dental and palatal(ized) sibilants as *s* and *š* instead of *s̥* and *s* respectively. I also use *w* for *v* to avoid confusion with the nasal *v* (nu).

² MELCHERT, C., « PIE **y* > Lydian *d* », in P. Vavroušek (ed.), *Iranian and Indo-European Studies. Memorial Volume of Otakar Klíma*, Prague, 1994, pp.181-187.

³ MELCHERT, C., *Anatolian Historical Phonology* (henceforth *AHP*), Amsterdam-Atlanta, 1994, p.370.

⁴ VAN DEN HOUT, TH., « Lydian *qesi-*, *qellk* and Lycian *tihē* », in Theo van Lint (ed.), *Festschrift for Joseph J. S. Weitenberg* (to appear), argues that dative-locative singular *qell*=*k* belongs to the stem of a genitival adjective *qeli*-(*k*), not to *qesi*-(*k*), as assumed by GUSMANI, R., *Lydisches Wörterbuch* (henceforth *LW*), Heidelberg, 1964, p.182, and others. The stem *qeli-* may well reflect simply **k^wēli-*. The morphology and hence the vocalism of *qesi-* is quite unclear. Neither derivative establishes a base stem *qe-* for the interrogative-relative itself. GÉRARD, R., *op.cit.*, p.53 with note 201 and p.109, argues cogently against the existence of a second stem **k^wey-* in Lydian, as suggested by GUSMANI, R., *LW*, p.181, and followed by MELCHERT, C., *AHP*, p.345.

⁵ See 2,6 : *ešvav mlwēndav iškon qid=a tamv* « all these *m*. which I built » and GUSMANI, R., *LW*, p.44.

⁶ I see nothing to recommend derivation from a dual ending **-o-ih₁*, as suggested e.g. by EICHNER, H., *MSS* 31, 1973, p.79. His alternative suggestion of a plural ending **-ei-h₂* would represent a more archaic version of the **-ēy* presented here. A preform **k^wéy* without final laryngeal (JASANOFF, J. pers. comm.) is also possible. However, given the presence of other examples in Hittite of lengthened-grade collective plurals to stems in sonorant (e.g. *hašduēr* « brush(wood) »), I prefer to assume likewise already **k^wéy* for Proto-Anatolian. The older comparison with Latin *quae* (e.g. STURTEVANT, E. H., *A Comparative Grammar of the Hittite Language*, Revised edition, New Haven, 1951, p.36) is no longer viable. Latin *quae* surely reflects **-eh₂-ī*: see

SIHLER, A., *New Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*, New York, 1995, p.386, and cf. MEISER, G., *Historische Laut- und Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache*, Darmstadt, 1998, pp.162 and 166. Despite the claim of A. Sihler, *loc.cit.*, an ending *-eh₂-ī would appear in Hittite as -ahhi, not -e : see WATKINS, C., in Helmut Rix (ed.), *Flexion und Wortbildung*, Akten der 5. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Wiesbaden, 1975, pp.368ff.

⁷ For a preform *^wih₂ elsewhere see e.g. RIX, H., *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen*, Darmstadt, 1976, p.187, and SCHRIJVER, P., *The Reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Latin*, Amsterdam-Atlanta, 1991, pp.81-84.

⁸ See OETTINGER, N., « Griech. ὁστεῖον, heth. kulēi und ein neues Kollektivsuffix », in H. Hettrich *et al.* (ed.), *Verba et Structurae, Festschrift für Klaus Strunk zum 65. Geburtstag*, Innsbruck, 1995, pp.211-228 (esp. p.220) and cf. PINAULT, G.-J., *BSL* 96, 2001, p.200.

⁹ Cf. *bira*- « house » with secondary *a*-stem from original **pér* cognate with Hittite *per* and see MELCHERT, C., *AHP*, p.367.

¹⁰ Lydian *qed* < *^wéy obviously precludes monophthongization of the long diphthong *éy already in Proto-Anatolian, against MELCHERT, C., *AHP* p.345 *et aliter*. Hittite *kulēi* besides *udnē* cited above also argues against my previous assumption. The alternative derivation from *^wéy(h₂) cited in note 6 above would likewise require preservation of the short diphthong *ey in Proto-Anatolian. Arguments for monophthongization of *ey in PA remain fragile : on this issue see MELCHERT, C., *AHP*, p.56, and GÉRARD, R., *op.cit.*, p.53 with references.

¹¹ If *patnēdš* represents a personal name (see GUSMANI, R., *LW* p.76), it is conceivable that it reflects the type seen in Lycian *Pigrēi*, etymologically < *« the splendid one », with the Anatolian « mutation-*i* » added to an *n*-stem formed with « individualizing » *-e/on- (type of Lycian *Xudalijē*, *« the nimble one »). On these types see MELCHERT, C., *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 9, 2000, p.70. A nom. sg. *-ōn+s could have led to *-ēs, whence a new stem in -ē-, which was later extended to *-ē+i-, as in Lycian. Hiatus-filling *y in Lydian gave *-ēyi- > *-ēdi- (in the nom. sg. *-ēdiš > -ēdš).

The high number of unproven assumptions and relative chronologies required obviously reduces this derivation to mere speculation.

¹² See GUSMANI, R., *LW*, p.149, with reference to W. Brandenstein.

¹³ GUSMANI, R., *loc.cit.*

¹⁴ SCHÜRR, D., « Lydisches IV : Zur Grammatik der Inschrift Nr.22 (Sardes) », *Sprache* 39/2, 1997, pp.201-212. See especially pp.206-207 and 209. SCHÜRR analyzes the ending -wv (e.g. *kattiw* v) as first plural present, -riš (e.g. *fawnēriš*) as first plural preterite, and -rs (e.g. *kattirs*) tentatively as second plural present. I prefer to take -wv as first plural preterite, and -rs and -riš as allomorphs of a single third plural preterite ending: cf. for the allomorphy in the latter that in the reflexive particle -s/-iš (see MELCHERT, C., *Kadmos* 30, 1991, p.141). This difference of opinion, however, does not affect the validity of SCHÜRR's basic insight that text 22 refers to provisions made by one group in regard to another.

¹⁵ Cf. also Akkadian *rakāsu* « bind » but also « make a binding ruling, order to do something » and the noun *riksu* « bond » but also « regulation, edict, decree » : see *The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*, Volume 14, Chicago, 1999, pp.99 and 354.

¹⁶ But conversion of an original « *hi*-verb » in -i- to an ordinary *ye/o*-stem seems likely : cf. Neo-Hittite *išhiyami* beside original *išhihhi* (see OETTINGER, N., *Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbals*, Nürnberg, 1979, p.466).

¹⁷ See most recently on this type OETTINGER, N., « Zum Anatolischen Nomen », in E. Tichy *et al.* (ed.), *Indogermanisches Nomen*, Akten der Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft/Society for Indo-European Studies/Société des Etudes Indo-européennes (Freiburg 19-22. September, 2001), Bremen, 2003, pp.147-151

¹⁸ For accented **en* > Lydian *ē* preconsonantly and unaccented **o* > Lydian *a* see MELCHERT, C., *AHP* pp.365 and 366 respectively. For palatalization of **s* see *ibid.* p.360.

¹⁹ I take this occasion to withdraw explicitly my account of the treatment of intervocalic *y in verbs in *-Vye/o- in terms of contractions, as given in MELCHERT, C., *AHP*, p.377, rightly criticized by GÉRARD, *op.cit.*, p.76.

His own solution in terms of loss of intervocalic *y before *e leaves unexplained those forms in *-Vyo- (though obviously intraparadigmatic leveling cannot be excluded). I now prefer to return to my original formulation, *IF* 97, 1992, pp.46ff., by which the change *y > d takes place intervocalically in regular fashion, followed by syncope of the vowel of the ending. Whether the change of *yē to *yī took place here may be left open. Thus e.g. pret. 1st sg. *-éyom > *-édom > -edv and *-éh₂yom > *-áyom > *-ádom > -adv, while pres. 3rd sg. *-éyedi (> *-éyidi) > *-éde/idi > -éde/id > -ed and *-áyedi > *-áde/idi > -áde/id > -ad.

²⁰ See e.g. MELCHERT, C., *AHP*, p.361, and GÉRARD, R., *op.cit.*, p.76. As per MELCHERT, C., *AHP*, p.65, *h₁ may well have already been lost in Proto-Anatolian. I am in any case not aware of any proposed reflexes of *h₁ as a consonant in Lydian. I know of no plausible examples that provide any evidence for the fate of *h₃. We are thus for practical purposes limited to consideration of the reflexes of *h₂.

²¹ I now accept the arguments of GÉRARD, R., *op.cit.*, pp.39-40, that Lydian *e* represents a relatively open vowel such as [ɛ] (or even [æ]) and also that *ē* does represent its nasalized counterpart, not phonetic [ã], against MELCHERT, C., *AHP* p.343 *et aliter*! For this reason I cannot accept the proposal of SCHÜRR, D., *Kadmos* 31, 1999), p.172, to transliterate *ē* as *ā*. I now assume a development *h₂ónso- > *ēsa- (for preconsonantal *ón > *ē* see MELCHERT, C., *AHP* p.365) > *esa-* with loss of nasalization in an original sequence *ns. Cf. the alternate solution of GÉRARD, R., *op.cit.*, pp.47-48.

²² The derivation of *antola-/anlola-* (part of or contents of a grave) from a PA preform *en-dwaH-ólo- « human » (MELCHERT, C., *AHP*, p.331, after GUSMANI, R.), is a mere possibility semantically and highly unlikely phonologically, since from an original sequence *end- we would expect only *ēti- if accented and *at- if unaccented (see MELCHERT, C., *AHP*, pp.348 and 343 respectively). For this reason I now reject this etymology.

²³ MELCHERT, C., *IF* 97, 1992, p.47.

²⁴ The same expression occurs with « on the part of these gods » in 23,11-13. For Lydian *šawēn-* as « see, experience » see CARRUBA, O., *Athenaeum* 47,

1969, p.51f. For a possible etymology < *sek- see MELCHERT, C., *IF* 97, 1992, p.40.

²⁵ I take attested *atrokl* as dat.-loc. singular (for -l instead of regular -λ after consonant cf. *qlādānl* in 23,1). Against SCHÜRR, D., *Incontri Linguistici* 23 (2000), p.114, the word *atrgol* (*sic*!) in 11,4 is related. No metathesis is required, merely syncope of the pretonic vowel in a derived adjective *atrokól(i)- (for the suffix -ol(i)- cf. *kumlol(i)-*) and then voicing of *k* next to *r* (a real tendency despite SCHÜRR's protestations to the contrary).

²⁶ For the unity of this set see already correctly SCHÜRR, D., *op.cit.*, p.115. Against SCHÜRR, D., *ibid.* p.116f., I retain the meaning « steals » for *kaprdokid* and derivation from a *kaprdoka- « theft, thievery » (see MELCHERT, C., *apud* OETTINGER, N., *HS* 108, 1995, p.45, after an idea of WEISS, M.). For *kat-šarlōka- « defeat » (*i.e.* the act of bringing down) cf. ultimately Luvo-Hittite *šarlā(i)-* « exalt ; cause to win ». Addition of the preverb *kat-* in Lydian reverses the meaning, making *kat-šarlōki-* the functional equivalent of Hittite *katterahh-* « downgrade; cause to lose ». I tentatively relate Lydian *warptoki-* to Hittite *warpā(i)-* « ensnare », but a meaning such as « overpower » is also possible. Cf. CLuvian *warpalla/i-* as an epithet « mighty » (*vel sim.*) of the Storm-god.

²⁷ STARKE, F., *Untersuchung zur Stammbildung des keilschrift-luwischen Nomens*, Wiesbaden, 1990, p.161, proposes « nourishment » for *atrahit-*, comparing the verb *adari(ya)-* « feed, nourish ». The connection is plausible, but hardly compelling. We can be sure of little except that the word refers to something positive. The same is true for Lydian *atrok(a)-*.

²⁸ The unextended abstract suffix *-eh₂ is preserved in Hittite *miyaḫu(wa)nt- « old man » < *mih_{1/3}-eh₂-went- « having maturity », as first seen by EICHNER, H., *MSS* 31, 1973, p.59f.

²⁹ Attested in KUB 35.148 iii 11-13, where a puppy is held out to the Sun-god, who is then addressed: *kā[š]a maniyahḫaš=tiš nu kāš kuit memai n=at zik šakti zig=a kuit [mema]tti n=at kāš šakki* (*sic*! text has *šakti*). I assume that *maniyahḫaš=tiš* means in context « thing that is entrusted to you » and take the following specification as describing what *is to happen*: « Here is your m. What he says, you will know, while he will know what you say ». For a

different interpretation of this passage see GÜTERBOCK, H. G., and HOFFNER, H., *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, Volume L-N*, Chicago, 1980-89, p.167.

³⁰ I add further Lycian *k*, but this development is not universally accepted. See for discussion with references to divergent views MELCHERT, C., *AHP* p.305ff. See further HAJNAL, I., *Der Lykische Vokalismus*, Graz, 1995, pp.18-21 and 26-30, on both the synchronic value of *q* and *x* as stops and on their prehistoric sources.

³¹ See GÉRARD, R., *op.cit.*, p.39, correcting the grievous error of MELCHERT, *AHP*, pp.43, 343, *et aliter*. Cf. note 21 above on the similar corrective regarding Lydian *e*.

³² See MELCHERT, C., *AHP*, pp.365-366. For a somewhat different account of the first development see GÉRARD, R., *op.cit.*, pp.47-48.

³³ We cannot, of course, *guarantee* that the **ā* of **-aHV-* was accented, but that surely is the unmarked assumption. Neither of the two purported examples of accented short **a* cited in MELCHERT, C., *AHP*, p.369, is probative. If the suggested etymology of *-qa(a)s-* « possess » is correct, it likely reflects long **-ā-* (cf. Greek *πέπαμαι* « possess » and see correctly GÉRARD, *op. cit.* p.46). The « Lallwort » for « father » *taada-* can easily reflect a preform **dāda-* instead of **dāda-*.

³⁴ For Lydian *a* < **ó* see MELCHERT, C., *AHP* p.347, citing examples such as *ala-* « other » (in *alas*, *alad*, *alal*) < **alyó-*. The accent here is assured by acc. sg. *alēv*. On the Lydian accent see the fundamental work of EICHNER, H., « Die Akzentuation des Lydischen », *Sprache* 32, 1986, pp.7-21.

³⁵ See the discussions in MELCHERT, C., *AHP* pp.346 and 368, and GÉRARD, R., *op.cit.* pp.45-46 and 50, neither of which accounts for more than a fraction of the examples of *o*.

XÉNOPHANE DE COLOPHON ET LA NAISSANCE D'UNE THÉOLOGIE NOUVELLE

1. Introduction : prestiges de l'Ionie

C'est à René Lebrun que je dois d'avoir découvert pour la première fois ce fabuleux pays « de tous les temps » qu'est l'Anatolie. Aussi bien ces quelques pages veulent-elles être un témoignage de reconnaissance autant que d'estime et d'amitié. Sous la conduite éclairée de ce guide enthousiaste, notre randonnée a parcouru bien des contrées de la Turquie, laissant en réserve cependant toute la côte égéenne, digne à elle seule d'un séjour prolongé. L'heureuse fortune d'une année sabbatique m'a permis, voici cinq ans, de parfaire en partie la boucle et de visiter l'Ionie, ce foyer privilégié et précoce de la culture antique, vantée aussi par Hérodote pour la douceur de son climat et la beauté de son ciel, et à qui, aujourd'hui, on se plaît quelquefois à donner le titre de « première Grèce ». Pour ma part en tout cas, ce voyage se confondait avec un double pèlerinage aux sources. Celles de la première philosophie occidentale tout d'abord, qui est née et s'est développée à Milet, à Colophon, à Samos, à Éphèse, à Clazomènes, sous l'aiguillon de ces audacieux précurseurs que furent respectivement Thalès et ses deux disciples Anaximandre et Anaximène, Xénophane, Pythagore, Héraclite et Anaxagore. Ne mobilisait pas moins ma curiosité fervente, en connivence étroite avec la précédente, la présence de plusieurs hauts lieux que la religion grecque a fait naître dans cette même province bénie des dieux antiques. A bonne distance de la cité de Milet, mais dépendant d'elle, Didymes s'enorgueillissait de posséder