

## TWO NOTES ON LYDIAN

*(Supplementum Epigraphicum Mediterraneum 38)*

Fred C. Woudhuizen

*In the relevant textbooks, the Lydian language is considered a separate entity within the Indo-European Anatolian language family. Sometimes affinities with Hittite, at other times relationships with Luwian are proposed, but its independent position within the Indo-European group of languages remains an item of faith. In my opinion, this is due to the fact that three signs of the Lydian alphabet, the Phoenician yod, the Cypro-Minoan ti, and secondary sign no. 24 in form of +, are attributed with a wrong value. As soon as these mistaken values are eliminated and the, as far as the first two examples are concerned, historically most feasible are plugged in, we are confronted with a straightforward Luwian dialect, most closely related to Luwian hieroglyphic and Lycian – and, if colonial offshoots may be included, Etruscan.*

## 1. A LYDIAN DEDICATORY FORMULA

In my earliest contribution to *Talanta* (Woudhuizen 1982-83, 112-114), I have dedicated an appendix to a Lydian inscription on an only partly preserved terracotta boat from a chamber tomb in the necropolis of Sardis (Littmann 1916, 56-57; Buckler 1924, 52-54; Pl. XII). This inscription, which is catalogued by Roberto Gusmani 1964 as number 30, I have then identified as a maker-formula on the basis of the wrong etymological connection of the verb *fabil* with the root of Latin *fabrica* (< PIE \**d<sup>h</sup>ab<sup>h</sup>*- “to make”; note that PIE \**[d<sup>h</sup>]* > *[f]* is a typical Italic phonetic development). In fact, however, the correct analysis of the verb is given by Gusmani as a compound of the preverb *fa-* with the root *bi-* “to give” (< Luwian *piya-* of the same meaning) (Gusmani 1964, 262). Accordingly, we are evidently dealing with a dedicatory inscription.

The inscription, which runs in boustrophedon and is assigned to the period of *ca.* 600-550 BC, reads as follows: *Titis-in ēmi<sub>1</sub> ti-Sardi<sub>1</sub> fabil Atal Kitval*. In this transcription, the typical Lydian variant of the Phoenician *yod*, which occurs

alongside the straight *iota*, is rendered by  $i_1^1$ . Moreover, the likewise typical Lydian secondary *lambda*, which ultimately originates from Cretan Linear *ru* or *lu*, is transliterated, in accordance to common practice, as  $\lambda$  (Woudhuizen 1984-85, 98). Finally, the secondary *epsilon*, represented by a sign which originally expressed the value *khi* (= secondary sign no. 26 of the Greek and Phrygian alphabet), is, in accordance to common practice, again, transcribed as  $\tilde{\epsilon}$  (Woudhuizen 1984-85, 101-102). The individual words or combinations are distinguished as such by a word-divider in the form of two dots in columnar arrangement.

As far as the contents are concerned, the first entity is likely to be analyzed as a personal name in the nominative singular communal gender in *-s* with an enclitic attached to it. This enclitic probably consists of the accusativus singular of the communal gender of the pronoun of the 3rd person (cf. Hittite and Luwian *-an*) (Meriggi 1980, 317-318, §§ 134-136), used proleptically in anticipation of the object. The overall plausibility of the given analysis is emphasized by the attestation of *Titis* in Anatolian inscriptions as a female personal name (Zgusta 1964, s.v.). Next, the object is expressed by the accusative of the pronoun of the first person singular,  $\tilde{e}mi_1$  “me”. The presence of this form of the pronoun assigns our text to the general class of “redende Inschriften”, comparable to Greek ones characterized by the combination *m'anetheke* “(s)he has dedicated me” (Jeffery 1990, 90 [= pl. 7, 1]) or similar Etruscan ones which show the expression *mini mulu-vanece* “(s)he has offered me as a vow” (Rix 1991, Veii 3.11). Accordingly, the expression runs as follows: “Titis has dedicated it, (viz.) me, (...)”<sup>2</sup>.

The third entity is not, as generally assumed, a noun in the accusative singular of the communal gender corresponding with the immediately preceding pronoun – an interpretation based on the mistaken identification of the Lydian variant of the Phoenician *yod* as a secondary *n*, transcribed by  $\nu$  (= Greek *nu*) –, but a combination of the prefix *ti-* with the locative singular in *-di\_1* (cf. Luwian hieroglyphic *-ti*) of the place-name *Sar(d)-* “Sardis” (Meriggi 1980, 275, § 5). In texts of later date, the place-name in question occurs as *Šfar(d)-* (Gusmani 1964, s.v.). The prefix *ti-* in combination with a place-name is strikingly paralleled for the formation *ti-Smurna* in a cuneiform text from Kültepe-Kanesh (ca. 1910-1780 BC), which bears testimony of the TN *Smurna* (Akurgal 1983, 12). From an Indo-European point of view, it may perhaps be suggested that our prefix *ti-* is related to Dutch *t(e)-* as in *t(e)huis* “at home” and *thans* (< *te hants*) “directly, now (lit.: at hand)” (de Vries 1992, s.v. *thans*). At any rate, the translation of *ti-Sardi\_1* as “in Sardis” seems almost self-evident.

The verb *fabil*, the root of which we have already discussed above, is characterized by the typical Lydian ending in *-l* of the 3rd person singular of the past tense. Probably this ending originates from Luwian *-ta* for the same function on the

<sup>1</sup> Woudhuizen 1984-85, 92 ff.; Woudhuizen 1990, 92-94; cf. Gusmani 1995, 12: “ $\nu$  vielleicht direkt aus dem phönikischen, wo es *yod* bezeichnet”.

<sup>2</sup> For a similar proleptic use of the A(m/f) sg. *-n* of the enclitic pronoun of the 3rd person, cf. Etruscan *e-n mini pi kapi* “do not give (or) take it, (viz.) me, (away)” (Rix 1991, Clusium 2.4).

analogy of the d/l-change frequently attested for other Lydian forms (e.g. the GN *Levś* < PIE \**diyēw-* “sky-god”). The two names at the end of our text both show the Lydian dative singular in *-(a)λ*, and therefore evidently denote the beneficiary, indicated by the praenomen *Atas* and the patronymic *Kidvas*. In sum, the entire phrase, which runs as follows: “Titis has dedicated it, (viz.) me, in Sardis to Atas, (the son) of Kidys”, is very close to Greek dedicatory inscriptions of the type *Mantiklos m’anetheke Vekaboloī* or, not conducted in the first person singular, *Deini[s] tad’anetheke khari[n] Velenai Menelavo* (Jeffery 1990, 90 [= pl. 7, 1]; Catling/Cavanagh 1976). Note, however, that in the Lydian variant of the dedicatory formula the beneficiary, contrary to the given Greek examples, is not obviously of divine stature<sup>3</sup>.

### Additional note

The Sardian inscription discussed in the above is not the only instance of the class of “redende Inschriften” attested for the Lydian language. Other examples of this class are provided by Lyd. no. 56: *Maneli-m* “I (am) of Manes”, Lyd. no. 75: *Sivāmlī-m Atelis* “I (am) of Sivams, the son of Ates”, and Lyd. no. 104 (2nd half of the 6th century BC): *Artymali-m* “I (am) of Artymas”. According to Roberto Gusmani (1980), the enclitic element *-m* in these inscriptions should be taken for a reflex of Proto-Indo-European (= PIE) \**esmi* “I am”, in which he was no doubt inspired by Greek legends of the type *MN in the genitive + eimi*. As opposed to this, Heiner Eichner (1981) suggested that the enclitic element *-m* is rather to be taken for a reflex of the enclitic pronoun of the 1st person singular \**-mi*, most closely paralleled in Luwian hieroglyphic by the D sg. of this pronoun or its reflexive variant *-mi*. In his reaction to this suggestion, Gusmani (1983) pointed out that the nominative singular ending *-s* should be maintained before *-m* and that the stressed pronoun *amu* should be expected rather than its enclitic variant *-mi*. Considering the fact that the first argument also rules out a reflex of *asmi* and in the light of Etruscan formulaic expressions of the type *mi + MN in the genitive*, however, I am inclined to side with Eichner and take the enclitic *-m* for a reflex of the enclitic pronoun of the 1st person singular *-mi*.

## 2. LYDIAN & LUWIAN

For the relationship between Lydian and Luwian it is first of all relevant to note that the Bronze Age forerunner of the kingdom of Lydia, that of Arzawa or Mira, is included in the distribution zone of Luwian hieroglyphic inscriptions. The texts involved are not confined to the legends of the famous “Tarkondemos-seal” and

<sup>3</sup> Note that the same verdict also applies to Etruscan counterparts like *mi(ni) Aranθ Ramuθasi Vestricinala mulvanice* “Arnth has offered me as a vow to Ramtha Vestiricinas” (Rix 1991, Caere 2.3) in which particular case, however, the roles are inversed in the sense that the dedicator is male and the recipient female.

the rock-relief at Karabel, both attributable to the late 13th century BC ruler of Mira called *Tarku(ntimu)was* (Hawkins 1998), but also include seals from earlier periods. Worthy of mention in this connection is Louvre 20.138, which originates from the Middle Bronze Age, when it received its legend on the cylinder side, reading *ÁMU TARKU-KURUNT* “I (am) Tarku(ku)runtas”, whereas it was re-used during the 15th century BC, of which fact the sequence *á-su-wi* “Assuwiya” on its stamp side bears testimony (the Assuwiyan-league is a short-lived coalition of forces in western Anatolia, headed by the royal house of Arzawa) (Woudhuizen 2006-7). Yet another Luwian hieroglyphic seal attributable to Arzawa or Assuwa has come to light at Thebes in Boiotia (Thebes no. 25). According to its legend it once belonged to the otherwise unattested great kings *Tarhüntamuwas* and *Tarhüntawalwas* (that Arzawa was ruled by great kings during the 15th and 14th century BC is historically ascertained by the case of *Tarhundaradus* in the well-known Amarna-letters) (Woudhuizen 2009, 204-212).

Against this background it comes as a surprise that the Lydian language, as attested for alphabetic inscriptions dating from the 7th to the 4th century BC, is generally considered a separate branch within the Indo-European Anatolian language group, perhaps most closely related to Hittite. This point of view even induced the Dutch Indo-Europeanist Robert S.P. Beekes to the view that the ancestors of the Lydians are colonists from the Hellespontine region, who settled in Lydia in the period of the upheavals of Sea Peoples at the end of the Bronze Age (Beekes 2002). As a matter of fact, however, all this is based on the misreading of three Lydian signs: the Phoenician *yod* as a secondary *n* (transcription *v* [= Greek *nu*]) instead of *i*<sub>1</sub>, the Cypro-Minoan *ti*-sign as something in between *t* and *s* (transcription *c*) instead of *t*<sub>1</sub>, and complementary sign no. 24 as *q* instead of *p*<sup>4</sup>.

For our present purposes, especially the proper identification of the *yod*-sign is of relevance as it features prominently in endings. When transcribed correctly as *i*<sub>1</sub>, grammatical difficulties disappear like snow before the sun, and we are confronted with the N-A(n) in *-i*<sub>1</sub> (*eś(i*<sub>1</sub>*) vānai*<sub>1</sub> “this grave” in Lyd. no. 18, line 1), corresponding to Luwian hieroglyphic *-ī* for the same function (cf. *ī wanāī* “this stele”, and, for the demonstrative pronoun, *ási-* “the aforesaid”), the N(m/f) pl. in *-i*<sub>1</sub> (*Artimui*<sub>1</sub> “the Artemisses” in Lyd. no. 2, line 10), corresponding to Luwian hieroglyphic and Lycian *-i* for the same function, the D pl. in *-ai*<sub>1</sub> (*esi*<sub>1</sub>*ai*<sub>1</sub> *lapiri-sai*<sub>1</sub> “to these rulings” in Lyd. no 1, lines 4-5<sup>5</sup>; *esi*<sub>1</sub>*ai*<sub>1</sub> *m̄lvēndai*<sub>1</sub> “to these thank-

<sup>4</sup> Woudhuizen 1984-85; Woudhuizen 2005, 119-145. For the Lydian texts and their traditional transcription, see Gusmani 1964. For Luwian hieroglyphic comparisons, see Woudhuizen 2004, 2005, and 2011 (appendix II).

<sup>5</sup> Working from my friend and colleague Jorrit Kelder’s suggestion (see *Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires* 2011 n° 2 [juin], 44-45) that *lap(i)risa-* might refer to the inscription itself (which, however, would collide with the fact that it occurs in the plural), I propose to analyze it as an adjectival derivative in *-s-* of Luwian *t/lapar-* “to rule”, referring to the rulings as verbalized in the inscription.

offerings” in Lyd. no. 2, line 5), corresponding to Luwian hieroglyphic *-aī* for the same function (cf. *maluwa-* “thank-offering” for the root of the second noun), and the G pl. in *-ai<sub>1</sub>* (*Ibsimi<sub>1</sub>ai<sub>1</sub> Kulumi<sub>1</sub>a(i<sub>1</sub>)-k* “of the Ephesians and Koloans” in Lyd. no. 2, line 10), corresponding to Luwian hieroglyphic *-aī* and Lycian *-āi* for the same function.

It might be added in this connection that a variant of the apodosis of the damnation formula in which both the Phoenician *yod* and the Cypro-Minoan *ti*-sign are encountered with the new values of the signs in question reads as follows in transcription and translation: *fak-ai<sub>1</sub> viśśis niviśśt<sub>1</sub>i<sub>1</sub> varbtokid* “for these (offences) he will rule the good in hell!” (Lyd. no. 6, lines 5-6). For a proper understanding of this phrase it might be useful to specify that:

(1) the enclitic element *-ai<sub>1</sub>* attached to the introductory particle *fak* confronts us with the D pl. of the enclitic pronoun of the 3rd person, corresponding to Etruscan *-e(i)* for the same function (Woudhuizen 2008, 390);

(2) the form *viśśis* shows the A(m/f) pl. in *-is*, corresponding to Lycian *-is* for the same function, of the root *viśś-*, originating from Luwian hieroglyphic *wasu-* “good”;

(3) the form *niviśśt<sub>1</sub>i<sub>1</sub>* shows a lenited variant writing of the Loc. sg. in *-d(i<sub>1</sub>)*, corresponding to Luwian hieroglyphic *-ti* for the same function, of the stem *nivis(ś)-*, which is composed of the elements *ni-* “not, un-”, no doubt related to the Luwian hieroglyphic negative adverb *na-*, and the aforesaid *viśś-* “good”; and

(4) the verbal root *varb-* is related to Luwian hieroglyphic *warpa-*, a symbol of royal sovereignty used for the meaning “reign” in Sultanhan § 8 (Woudhuizen 2011, 236).

Although there can be little doubt that Lydian is a Luwian dialect, it must be admitted that the evidence for the loss of the voiced velars (*\*g*, *\*ġ*, *\*g<sup>w</sup>*), which typifies the other Luwian dialects cuneiform Luwian, Luwian hieroglyphic, and Lycian, is contradictory in Lydian, examples of loss like *Tiamou* (deity’s name) < PIE *\*d<sup>h</sup>eg<sup>h</sup>ōm-* “earth” and *vāmi-* “to find” < PIE *\*g<sup>w</sup>em-* “to come” occurring alongside examples of preservation like *kāna-* “woman” < PIE *\*g<sup>w</sup>enā-* and *kofu-* “water” < PIE *\*eg<sup>wh</sup>-* “to drink” (Woudhuizen 2011, 411).

The foregoing results from linguistics are in conformity with the evidence for the cult of Luwian deities in the same set of texts, like the goddess *Asii<sub>1</sub>-* “Asia” (Lyd. no. 40, line 1), corresponding to Luwian *Aššiya-*, and the divine triad *Šāntas Kufav-k Marivda-k* “Santas and Kupapa and Marutikas” (Lyd. no. 4, lines 3-4), being identical to Luwian *Šantaš, Kupapa*, and *Marutika-*. Furthermore, in derivations and onomastics we are confronted with the roots of the divine names *Arm(ā)-* and *Tivda-*, recalling the Luwian names of the moon-god, *Arma-*, and that of the sun-god, *Tiwata-*. If evidence from Greek sources is allowed, we even come across the name of the Luwian storm-god *Tarhunt-* in the form of the epiclesis of Zeus, *Targuēnos*. Notwithstanding so, it should be realized that the cult of Aegean deities like *Artimus* “Artemis” and *Pldāns* “Apollo” played a prominent role in Lydian religion.

To conclude, it deserves our attention that also Lydian royal names like *Melēs*

(Herodotos, *Histories* I, 84; cf. *Mēla-* in Lyd. no. 5, line 3), *Kandaulēs*, and *Gygēs* are of patent Luwian background, being based on the onomastic element *mala-* (as in the Luwian hieroglyphic personal name *Malazitis*), the titular expression *hantawat-* “king”, and the kinship term *huhḫa-* “grandfather” (as, with incidental loss of the initial laryngeal, in the Arzawan royal name *Uhḫazitis*), respectively (cf. Yakubovich 2010, 94-95).

## NOUN

	sg.	pl.
N(m/f)	-s, -ś	-i <sub>1</sub>
A(m/f)	-n	-is
N-A(n)	-d, -i <sub>1</sub>	-a
D	-l, -λ	-ai <sub>1</sub>
G	-l, -li-	-ai <sub>1</sub>
Abl.	-di <sub>1</sub> , -d, -λ	
Loc.	-ti <sub>1</sub> , -di <sub>1</sub>	

## PRONOUN

	sg.			pl.	
N(m/f)	-ś	<i>ēmis</i>	<i>eś(ś)</i>		
A(m/f)	-in	<i>ēmi<sub>1</sub></i>	<i>esn</i>	-is	<i>ēminas</i>
N-A(n)	-ad	<i>ēmi<sub>1</sub></i>	<i>est, esi<sub>1</sub></i>		<i>es(a?)</i>
D	-λ	<i>ēmλ</i>	<i>esλ</i>	-ai <sub>1</sub>	<i>ēminai<sub>1</sub> esi<sub>1</sub>ai<sub>1</sub></i>
G					
Abl.					

## VERB

	present/future	past tense
sg. 1st person	-vi <sub>1</sub> , -v, -u	
3rd person	-d	-l
pl. 3rd person	-nt	
participle	active -nd-	middle-passive -mi-

Table 1. System of (pro)nominal inflection and verbal conjugation.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Akurgal, E. 1983: *Alt-Smyrna I: Wohnschichten und Athenatempel*, Ankara.
- Beekes, R.S.P. 2002: The Prehistory of the Lydians, the Origin of the Etruscans, Troy and Aeneas, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 59, 3/4 (mei-augustus), 205-239.
- Buckler, W.H. 1924: *Sardis VI, Part II: Lydian Inscriptions*, Leyden.
- Catling, H.W./H. Cavanagh 1976: Two inscribed bronzes from the Menelaion, Sparta, *Kadmos* 15, 145-157.
- Eichner, H. 1981: Review of Gusmani 1980, *Die Sprache* 27, 209.
- Gusmani, R. 1964: *Lydisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg.
- Gusmani, R. 1980: *Lydisches Wörterbuch, Ergänzungsband 1*, Heidelberg.
- Gusmani, R. 1983: Ein Weihrauchbrenner mit lydischer Inschrift im Metropolitan Museum, *Kadmos* 22, 56-60; Taf. I.
- Gusmani, R. 1995: Zum Stand der Erforschung der lydischen Sprache, in: *Forschungen in Lydien* (Asia Minor Studien 17) Bonn, 9-19.
- Hawkins, J.D. 1998: Tarkasnawa King of Mira, 'Tarkodemos', Boğazköy sealings and Karabel, *Anatolian Studies* 48, 1-31.
- Jeffery, L.H. 1990: *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece*, Oxford (revised edition).
- Littmann, E. 1916: *Sardis VI, Part I: Lydian Inscriptions*, Leyden.
- Meriggi, P. 1980: *Schizzo grammaticale dell'anatolico* (Atti della Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei 1980, Memorie, Classe di Scienze morali, storiche e filologiche, serie VIII, Volume 24, Fascicolo 3), Roma.
- Rix, Helmut, *et alii* 1991: *Etruskische Texte, Editio Minor, I: Einleitung, Konkordanz, Indices, II: Texte* (ScriptOralia, 23-24), Tübingen.
- Vries, J. de 1992: *Nederlands Etymologisch Woordenboek*, Leiden (derde druk).
- Woudhuizen, F.C. 1982-83: Etruscan Origins: The Epigraphic Evidence, *Talanta, Proceedings of the Dutch Archaeological and Historical Society* 14-15, 91-114.
- Woudhuizen, F.C. 1984-85: Lydian: Separated from Luwian by three signs, *Talanta, Proceedings of the Dutch Archaeological Society* 16-17, 91-113.
- Woudhuizen, F.C. 1990: The Sardis Bilingue Reconsidered, *Orpheus, Journal of Indo-European, Palaeo-Balkan and Thracian Studies* 0, 90-106.
- Woudhuizen, F.C. 2004: *Selected Luwian Hieroglyphic Texts* [1] (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft, Sonderheft 120), Innsbruck.
- Woudhuizen, F.C. 2005: *Selected Luwian Hieroglyphic Texts* 2 (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft, Sonderheft 124), Innsbruck.
- Woudhuizen, F.C. 2006-7: Two Assuwan Royal Seals, *Jaarbericht Ex Oriente Lux* 40, 125-129.
- Woudhuizen 2008: *Etruscan as a Colonial Luwian Language, Linguistica Tyrrhenica* III (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft, Sonderheft 128), Innsbruck.
- Woudhuizen, F.C. 2009: *The Earliest Cretan Scripts* 2 (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft, Sonderheft 129), Innsbruck.
- Woudhuizen F.C. 2011: *Selected Luwian Hieroglyphic Texts: The Extended Version* (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, 141), Innsbruck.
- Yakubovich, I.S. 2010: *Sociolinguistics of the Luwian Language* (Brill's Studies in Indo-European Languages & Linguistics, 2), Leiden/Boston.
- Zgusta, L. 1964: *Kleinasiatische Personennamen*, Prag.

Fred C. Woudhuizen  
 Het Hoekstuk 69  
 NL-1852 KX Heiloo  
 The Netherlands  
 fredwoudhuizen@yahoo.com