H. CRAIG MELCHERT

Medio-Passive Forms in Lydian?

1. It is a great pleasure to offer the following lines in modest tribute to Roberto Gusmani, whose work has enhanced our understanding of several of the "minor" Indo-European languages of Anatolia and whose *Lydisches Wörterbuch* remains after forty years the indispensable foundation for all study of the Lydian language. In the absence of a significant new bilingual, progress in Lydian studies is inevitably slow and incremental. We can only continue to use combinatory textual analysis together with cautious external comparison, restricting the latter as much as possible to the other Indo-European Anatolian languages most closely related to Lydian. In this process we must always bear in mind the hypothetical nature of our analyses – hence the question mark of my title.

2. Text 24 contains mutual pledges of property by Mitradašta and the supreme authority of the temenos (the *šerliš šrmliš*).[1] The pledge of Mitradašta is followed by a series of relative clauses describing potential violations of the property consigned to the *šerliš šrmliš* and then curse formulas against the violator. The word *fapuwerftaλ* occurs in line 9, in the series of relative clauses:

ak=mλ=iš qiš citollad pitaad
puk=mλ=iš fakaršed qik
puk=mλ=a[d] fapuwerftaλ
puk=mλ=it pašvsakvākid niwislλ qelλ=k
puk mētlid puk pidēv qik int

The sense of the second and fifth clauses is reasonably clear: "or cuts off from him anything for himself" and "or does any harm or *damage*" respectively.[2] The syntactic structure and basic content of the first and fourth clauses must be parallel: "whoever *p*'s (a) *c.* from him for himself" and "or *p*'s (to) him for/in something evil" (see the respective lemmata in GUSMANI 1964).

The dative enclitic pronoun -*mλ*, referring to the *šerliš šrmliš* who is the recipient of the pledged property, is in all cases a "dative of disadvantage".

3. As already elucidated by GUSMANI 1964, p. 113, *fapuwerftaλ* must surely be a verb, the predicate of the remaining clause *puk=mλ=a[d] fapuwerftaλ*, with the frequent verbal prefix *fa-*. The parallelism with the surrounding clauses demands specifically a present third person (singular) verb, but it does not show the expected -*d/t* ending. Gusmani correctly dismisses the possibility of segmenting off the final -*aλ* as a dative enclitic pronoun. I propose rather that -*taλ* is formally a present third person (singular) medio-passive ending, matching Hittite -*ttari*. Lydian shows palatalization of **s* and **l*. It would not be surprising if it likewise palatalized **r* before a following **i*. However, a palatalized *r* might well have been unstable, leading to substitution by palatal(ized) *λ*, particularly in word-final position, after regular apocope of the final unaccented **-i*.[3]

4. The context argues strongly for a transitive verb with the potential violator as the subject, as in the other clauses. A formally medio-passive *fapuwerftaλ* would thus have to be functioning as a deponent. Such an assumption is not problematic for an Anatolian language, as shown by examples such as Hittite present third singular medio-passive *šarradda* "violates" (an oath), *šarrattari* "divides up".[4]

5. Further analysis of the form and meaning of our verb is necessarily speculative and of decidedly secondary interest. As noted above, we may segment off the prefix *fa-*. Since a suffix -*(e)rf-* is hardly conceivable, the root appears to lie in the sequence -*werf-*, pointing to **werP-* (less likely **werw-*). Any connection with Hittite *warp-* "to bathe" or *warpa-* "enclosure" seems unlikely on semantic grounds. Conceivable is a relationship to the base of Luvo-Hittite *warpalli-* "mighty, powerful" or the like (= Akk. *gašru* in KUB 4.11 Ro 13).[5] A sense "or wrests it from him by force" would be suitable for our Lydian passage (cf. German *sich bemächtigen* "to seize" < *Macht* "might, force"), but this is a mere possibility.[6] I insist only that the context of *fapuwerftaλ* argues for a finite tran-

---

[3] Lydian shows no examples of word-final -*r*, so a final palatalized variant would also surely have been problematic. Whether any *internal* examples of *λ* in Lydian represent palatalized **r* is a separate question that I cannot pursue here. The present analysis requires no such assumption.

[4] For the latter see KUB 24.13 III 7, referring to the placement of images. For further examples of transitive medio-passives in Hittite see NEU 1968, pp. 54-67.

[5] Contra MELCHERT 1993, p. 265, Hieroglyphic Luvian (*273) *wa/i+ra/i-pi-* means something like "virtue, skill", as per HAWKINS and MORPURGO DAVIES 1986, pp. 76-77. Derivation of such a sense from a base **warp-* "might" presupposed by *warpalli-* is quite possible, as shown by the evolution of meaning of OE *cræft* from "power, might" (= German *Kraft*) to "skill, art".

[6] The remaining -*pu-* of *fapuwerf-* is problematic. Since a sequence **wu* (i.e. [vu]) is nowhere attested in Lydian, we are *permitted* to suppose that *fapuwerf-* represents **fawuwerf-*, but **wuwerf-* can hardly be viewed as reduplication. One *could* assume a preverb **u-* matching Hittite *u-*

sitive verb and that Lydian phonology and Anatolian morphology are compatible with its analysis as a deponent medio-passive.

6. As shown by SCHÜRR 1997, text 22 describes mutual provisions made by the Sardians and a group of people designated by the word *mλimn(a)-*. Among the many important implications of Schürr's analysis for Lydian grammar are reaffirmation of earlier proposals that *-ms* is the third person plural dative pronoun corresponding to Cuneiform Luvian *-mmaš* and Hittite *-šmaš* (CARRUBA 1969, pp. 69ff. and 81) and that some words ending in *-(V)s* are nominative or accusative animate *plurals* (cf. CARRUBA 1969 43 and 75).[7]

7. Text 22 contains three clauses with likely verb forms in *-tλ*. Lines 5-6 read: *nãqid=a mλimns išt sfarλ iitλ ak=ms aλidad wiswid kaττiwv*. In lines 7-11 we find: *datros=k=ms qesiš cēntλ mλimnav šawv sfardētav ak=ms=ad šiwraλmiš artimul kaττirs kave=k pakilliš armτa=k qid=a iitλ mλimns išt sfarλ ak=ms irduv šiwraλmiš artimul kaττirs*. SCHÜRR 1997, 204 with n. 8, claims that the clauses with *iitλ* and *cēntλ* contain no verb, but *(nã)qid=a* is *neuter* nom.-acc. singular, while by his own analysis *mλimns* must be *animate* nominative plural. This mismatch makes a nominal sentence extremely unlikely: "Whatever the M's (are)...".[8] As for *cēntλ*, it cannot credibly be separated from the clear verb forms *cēnu* and *cēnal* (cf. GUSMANI 1964, p. 89).

8. SCHÜRR 1997, p. 209, argues for an animate accusative plural in *-as* versus nominative singular and nominative plural in just *-s*, but the basis for such a consistent distinction is extremely dubious. The form *alarmas* "self" in 13,1 next to preterite first singular *cēnsidv* is clearly nominative singular and cannot possibly be accusative plural (contra SCHÜRR 1997, p. 202 n. 3). I continue to take *mλimnas/mλimns* as variants of the same form, just like *alarmas/alarms* and *inal/inl* (thus with GUSMANI 1964, p. 31).[9] Current evidence suggests that in Lydian animate *a*-stems the ending *-(a)s* was nominative singular, nominative plural, and accusative plural.[10]

< *au-* and then a hiatus-filling *-w-*: *fa-u-werf-* > *fa-wu-werf-* > *fapuwerf-*. But this string of unverifiable hypotheses is virtually worthless.

[7] These findings supersede the claim in MELCHERT 1991, pp. 138-139, for *-aš* as an animate nominative and accusative plural ending in Lydian, which is hereby withdrawn. As per SCHÜRR 1997, p. 202 n. 3, *anaš* in text 13,1 is surely the subject of its clause.

[8] SCHÜRR 1997, p. 207, translates "Was auch (immer) *mλimn-* bei *sfar-* (sind)", assuming real gender-number incongruence. In our current state of knowledge of Lydian I find such an assumption unacceptably ad hoc.

[9] Against Gusmani, however, the variants with *-a-* are original, and we are dealing with syncope. An original consonant stem is not remotely credible in the case of *alarma-* and very unlikely in the case of *mλimna-*. For *ina-* compare *inãni-*.

[10] The fact that this ambiguity causes *us* very serious problems in interpreting Lydian texts is

9. Everything points to *nāqid=a mλimns išt sfarλ iitλ/qid=a iitλ mλimns išt sfarλ* as "Whatever __s the Mλlimna's from/in Sardis."[11] I follow SCHÜRR 1997, p. 205, in taking *-ms* in the respective following clauses as third person dative plural (referring back to *mλimns*) and *šiwraλmiš artimul* as nominative plural. I modify his analysis by interpreting *kaττiwv* as preterite first plural (see MELCHERT 1994, p. 336, with refs.) and *kaττirs* as preterite third plural (MELCHERT 2004, p. 147). In the first instance the Sardians are speaking: "whatever __s the Mλimna's from/in Sardis, we have decreed an *aλidad wiswid* for them." This appears to be a reciprocal act versus that of line 3: *mλimns aλidad kaττirs* "the Mλimna's have decreed an *aλidad wiswid*."[12]

10. Likewise in lines 7-11 we are likely dealing with some kind of reciprocal obligations: "Also (*-k*) whatever (*qesiš*) *datro-* (is) to them (*-ms*) (= they have), it __s (*cēntλ*) for the Mλimna's (*mλimnav*) to *š.* to/for the Sardians.[13] The *š.* of Artemis, the priest of P. and the *armτa-* have decreed it for them. Whatever __s the Mλimna's from/in Sardis, the *š.* of Artemis have decreed to *i.* it to them (*or* decreed it to be *i.* to them)."[14]

11. The context argues that *cēntλ* is an impersonal verb with a meaning such as "behooves, is required". Verbs of this sense can be derived from a great variety of sources, but the fact that the same verb is attested as a personal verb in the active narrows the range of possibilities. In 10,8 we find *ak cēnal nārs qλ šers ciwvališ kaττadmēs* and in 10,19-20 *ak epad inānidv sfarwad ak cēnu ēna=k taada=k šiwetτiš šantoλ*. In the second instance, where our verb is preceded by "and *epad* I have made an oath/pledge" (for *sfarwa-* see GUSMANI 1975, pp.

---

no argument against such a system. Compare the ambiguity of the Hittite ending *-aš* in *a*-stems or the Lycian ending *-i* in stems with "*i*-mutation".

[11] The word *išt* has tentatively been taken as "in" (GUSMANI 1964, p. 136 with refs.), but SCHÜRR 2000, p. 126, has argued persuasively that in text 1 the phrase *išt esλ wānaλ* refers to a location *outside* the tomb itself. This suggests that *išt* may be equivalent not to "in", but rather to Greek ἐξ "from", also sometimes "outside of". An etymological connection with ἐξ is quite possible (cf. the likely Lydian preverb *iš-*, on which see GUSMANI 1964, p. 134).

[12] For *kaττi-* as "to decree" see MELCHERT 2004, p. 141. The boundary between clauses in lines 2-3 is not entirely clear, and it is possible that (contra SCHÜRR 1997, p. 205) we should take the preceding *sfardētλ astrkoλ mλatalad* as part of the same sentence: "To the Sardian *a.* as a *mλatalad* the M's have decreed an *aλidad wiswid*." In this case the reciprocity would be explicit.

[13] In view of the negated *ni-qesi-* (in *niqesi(d)=k dēt* in the preceding clause), I provisionally retain the interpretation of *qesi-* as "whatever", but the stem formation of *qesi-* is quite unclear. For arguments that it cannot belong to the same stem as *qeλ=k* (thus GUSMANI 1964, p. 182) see VAN DEN HOUT forthcoming.

[14] I tentatively take both *šawv* and *irduv* as an infinitives. For the latter see CARRUBA 1960, p. 43, n. 23 (cf. also SCHÜRR 1997, p. 202 on *wicv*).

170-171), a sense "to owe, be obligated" seems reasonable: "and I am obligated, and (my) mother and father (as) *š.*, for/to the *š.*" In 10,8 only *ciwvališ kattadmẽs* "divine decree" is fairly clear (MELCHERT 2004, p. 141). An overall sense of "and the *n.* was obligated on whom the divine decree (was) imposed" seems possible. However, this depends on the form *šers* also belonging to the stem *ši-* "to bind upon, impose" (MELCHERT 2004, p. 141), which is far from assured. Merely as an example to show that such a combination of uses is possible I cite Greek ὀφείλω "I owe", whose medio-passive form ὀφείλεται is used impersonally (alongside the more common active ὀφείλει) to mean "is required, must".[15] I forgo any etymological speculations.[16]

12. For *iitλ* the context points to a meaning such as "is due": "whatever is due the Mλimna's from Sardis." Derivation from **h,ei-* "to go" is possible: cf. English "goes to" in the sense "falls to the lot of": "the race goes to the swift."[17] The difference in shape between putative medio-passive *ii-tλ* and *cẽn-tλ* versus *fapuwerf-taλ* would be due to the preceding cluster *-rf-* in the latter, which prevented the syncope seen in *-tλ*.[18]

13. Our inability to determine with any reliability the meaning of most Lydian lexical morphemes unfortunately renders our analyses even of grammatical morphemes tentative and provisional. The present account is no exception. I do hope to have shown that the *internal* evidence of the texts argues that *fapuwerftaλ*, *iitλ*, and *cẽntλ* are present third person finite verb forms. If one accepts this premise, their further analysis as formal medio-passives derived from the known Proto-Anatolian ending **-tori* seems to me a plausible hypothesis.

---

[15] As in Euripides, *Alcestis* 782: βροτοῖς ἅπασι κατθανεῖν ὀφείλεται "all men must die".

[16] The widely accepted hypothesis that *cẽn-* is an extension of *ca-* (e.g. GUSMANI 1964, p. 89 and MELCHERT 1997, p. 39) is based on little more than the phonetic resemblance and carries no weight. I note here that, whereas *cẽn-* continues to appear to be intransitive, the arguments in MELCHERT 1997, pp. 39-40, that *ca-* is intransitive must now be entirely reevaluated. In particular, in view of the findings of SCHÜRR 1997 cited above we must again take seriously the suggestion of CARRUBA 1960, p. 52 et aliter, that some cases of enclitic *-as* are animate accusative plural.

[17] Similarly in Latin: *it ad me lucrum* "the profit falls/is coming to me" (Plautus, *Poen.* 683). In view of acc. pl. *mλimns* instead of dat.-loc. pl. *mλimnav* one could also think in terms of "whatever concerns the Mλimna's on the part of Sardis." Again derivation from "to go" is possible: cf. German *angehen*.

[18] Naturally I do not claim that all Lydian words ending in *-t(a)λ* are third person present medio-passive verbs. For example, the contexts argue that *kspλtaλ* in 11,4 and *waredtaλ* in 11,5 are dative-locative singulars.

Bibliography

CARRUBA 1960 = O. CARRUBA, *Studi sul verbo lidio*, "Athenaeum" NS 38 (1960), pp. 26-64.

CARRUBA 1969 = O. CARRUBA, *Zur Grammatik des Lydischen*, "Athenaeum" NS 47 (1969), pp. 39-83.

GUSMANI 1964 = R. GUSMANI, *Lydisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg 1964.

GUSMANI 1975 = R. GUSMANI, *Zum Wandel *sw > śf im Lydischen*, "Sprache" 21 (1975), pp. 167-174.

HAWKINS and MORPURGO DAVIES 1986 = J.D. HAWKINS and A. MORPURGO DAVIES, *Studies in Hieroglyphic Luwian*, in *Kaniššuwar. A Tribute to Hans G. Güterbock on his Seventy-Fifth Birthday*, edited by H. HOFFNER and G. BECKMAN, Chicago 1986, pp. 69-81.

van den HOUT forthcoming = T. van den HOUT, *Lydian qeśi-, qelλk and Lycian tihe*, in *Festschrift for Joseph J.S. Weitenberg*, edited by T. VAN LINT.

INNOCENTE 1986 = L. INNOCENTE, *Licio mẽtẽ, lidio mẽtlid: una concordanza lessicale anatolica*, "Incontri linguistici" 12 (1986), pp. 111-122.

MELCHERT 1991 = H. C. MELCHERT, *The Lydian Emphasizing and Reflexive Particle -ś/-is*, "Kadmos" 30 (1991), pp. 131-142.

MELCHERT 1993 = H. C. MELCHERT, *Cuneiform Luvian Lexicon*, Chapel Hill 1993.

MELCHERT 1994 = H. C. MELCHERT, *Anatolian Historical Phonology*, Amsterdam/Atlanta 1994.

MELCHERT 1997 = H. C. MELCHERT, *PIE Dental Stops in Lycian*, in *Festschrift for Eric P. Hamp*, edited by D. ADAMS, Vol. II, pp. 32-47.

MELCHERT 2004 = H. C. MELCHERT, *Second Thoughts on *y and *h_2 in Lydian*, in *Studia Anatolica et Varia. Mélanges offerts au Professeur René Lebrun* (volume II), edited by M. MAZOYER and O. CASABONNE, Paris 2004, pp. 139-150.

NEU 1968 = E. NEU, *Das hethitische Mediopassiv und seine indogermanischen Grundlagen*, Wiesbaden 1968.

SCHÜRR 1997 = D. SCHÜRR, *Lydisches IV: Zur Grammatik der Inschrift Nr. 22 (Sardes)*, "Sprache" 39/2 (1997), pp. 201-212.

SCHÜRR 1999 = D. SCHÜRR, *Lydisches I: Zur Doppelinschrift von Pergamon*, "Kadmos" 38 (1999), pp. 163-174.

SCHÜRR 2000 = D. SCHÜRR, *Drei lydische Komposita*, "Incontri linguistici" 23 (2000), pp. 123-129.