In his *A Dictionary of the Lycian Language*, Melchert cites the acc.sg.c. form of the enclitic personal pronoun of 3sg. as \(=\text{e}^\text{\~}\) and \(=\text{e}^\text{\~}\text{ne}\), as if having two allomorphs. Both forms occur, for instance, in the well-known formula with which a third of the Lycian inscriptions begin: 

\[=\text{e}^\text{\~}\text{ti}\]

**TL 3** 
\[\text{eb\text{\~}ne}: \chi\text{up\~a} : m=\text{e} \text{ti} \text{pr\~naw\~at\~e} : \text{te} \text{winez\~e}\]

‘The tomb belonging to this (monument), 4 Tewinez\~e built it.’

\[=\text{e}^\text{\~}\text{ne}\]

**TL 11** 
\[\text{eb\text{\~}ne} \text{pr\~naw\~at\~e} : m=\text{e} \text{ti} \text{pr\~naw\~at\~e} : \text{ddap\~s\~m}\]

‘The building belonging to this (monument), Ddapss\~m built it.’

\[=\text{e}^\text{\~}\text{e}\]

**TL 37** 
\[\text{eb\text{\~}ne} : \chi\text{up\~a} : m=\text{\~e} \text{ne} \text{pr\~naw\~at\~e} : \text{me} \text{de}\]

‘The tomb belonging to this (monument), Mede built it.’

**TL 53** 
\[\text{eb\text{\~}ne} : \text{pr\~naw\~u} : m=\text{\~e} \text{ne} \text{pr\~naw\~at\~e} \text{hanadaza}\]

‘The building belonging to this (monument), Hanadaza built it.’

These formulae are characterized by left-dislocation of the objects \(\text{eb\text{\~}ne} \chi\text{up\~a}\) and \(\text{eb\text{\~}ne} \text{pr\~naw\~at\~e}\), followed by the sentence-initial particle \(\text{me}\) to which the resumptive clitic pronouns are attached.

There are some problems regarding this interpretation. Apart from the fact that it is a priori quite awkward to assume that the acc.sg.c. of the enclitic pronoun has two different forms (\(=\text{e}\) and \(=\text{e}^\text{\~}\text{ne}\)) having the same function and meaning without any distribution (be it semantic, phonological, or chronological), in this case the variation between the two alleged allomorphs is not as free as usually stated. When the element \(=\text{e}\text{ti}\)—which is commonly regarded as a reflexive
particle—is used in the formula as well, we only find \(=\dot{e}\) and never \(=\dot{e}n\). When the element \(=\dot{t}\i\) is not used, we only find \(=\dot{e}n\) and never \(=\dot{e}\).

Thus, the formula only shows these two forms:

\[
\text{ebēnē \(\chi\u0101\u0101\) \(mē\i\) prēnawatē \(\text{PN}\)}
\]

\[
\text{ebēnē \(\chi\u0101\u0101\) mēnē prēnawatē \(\text{PN}\)}
\]

but never these two forms:

\[
**\text{ebēnē \(\chi\u0101\u0101\) mē prēnawatē \(\text{PN}\)}
\]

\[
**\text{ebēnē \(\chi\u0101\u0101\) mēncē prēnawatē \(\text{PN}\)}
\]

This distribution requires an explanation,\(^5\) and in the following I will therefore look more closely into the use of the particle chains \(mē\i\) and \(mēnē\).

\(mē\i\)

The particle chain \(mē\i\) is usually morphologically analyzed as consisting of the conjunction \(me\) followed by the acc.sg.c. enclitic pronoun \(=\dot{e}\) and a reflexive particle \(=\dot{t}\i\) "for himself" (vel sim.). First, it should be noted that the citation of acc.sg.c. \(=\dot{e}\) is not fully correct. In TL 126, \(\text{prddewāti} : \text{prēnawa}\{\text{te}\}\), which Melchert\(^6\) analyzes as the sentence-initial chain \(\text{prddewa} (\text{nom. sg.c.}) + =\dot{e}\) (acc.sg.c.) + \(=\dot{t}\i\) (reflexive) and which, according to this analysis, should be translated 'Prddewa built it for himself,' we see that the acc.sg.c. enclitic pronoun is not \(=\dot{e}\), but rather, it consists only of the nasalization. It may therefore be better to analyze \(mē\i\), which phonologically stands for /me\(=\dot{t}\i/\),\(^7\) on a morphological level as \(\text{me}\(=\dot{e}=\dot{t}\i\)\).

\(^5\) Philo H. J. Houwink ten Cate, *The Luwian Population Groups of Lycia and Cilicia Aspra during the Hellenistic Period* (Leiden, 1961), 18–19, states that the variant \(=\dot{e}n\) represents an original *\(=\dot{en}\) plus a prop-vowel \(=\dot{e}\), "since without it the final \(n\) would be discarded after a vowel" (followed by Melchert, *Dictionary of the Lycian Language*, 200). This would then explain why the prop-vowel is not found in \(mē\i\), since here the element \(=\dot{e}\) is not found in final position. Apart from the fact that a final \(\text{-}\) would not be discarded after a word-final \(=\dot{e}\) (which would just yield nasalization, \(\text{-}\)), we do find cases of the variant \(=\dot{e}n\) in final position; for example, in TL 52 \(\text{ebē}[\text{n}]\dot{e}\) \(\chi\u0101\u0101\) \(=\dot{e}=\dot{t}\i\) \(=\dot{e}n\) \(=\dot{e}\) \(=\dot{e}\) \(=\dot{t}\i\) \(=\dot{t}\i\) \(=\dot{e}\) The appertaining tomb, Krehēnube made it, and gave it to Wazije and (his) mother; the \(=\dot{e}\) in \(\text{-}\) is word-final but is nevertheless not followed by a prop-vowel.


\(^8\) In n. 21 we will come across a form \(\text{upazije} \dot{e}\), which will be analyzed as \(\text{upaz} + \text{acc. sg.c. } \text{=en}\) \(+ =\dot{e}\), showing a form \(\text{=en}\). I regard this as a later variant of original \(=\dot{t}\i\), probably on the analogy of the enclitic nom.sg.c. \(=\dot{e}\) and nom.-acc.sg.n. \(=\dot{e}d\).

The element \(=\dot{t}\i\) is usually interpreted as a reflexive particle, compared etymologically with Luw. \(=\dot{di}\) (refl.) and Hitt. \(=\dot{z}\) (refl.).\(^9\) Yet, I have doubts whether this interpretation can be correct. From examples like:

TL 86 \(\text{ebēnē} : \text{prēnawā} \cdot \text{mē} \text{prēnawatē} : \text{erimnēnaha} \cdot : \text{semute} : \text{tideimī} : \text{hrppi} : \text{atli} : \text{ebī} : \text{se(j)=ēni} : \text{ebī} \) 'The building belonging to this (monument), Erimnēnaha, son of Semute, built it for himself and his mother,' it is clear that the element \(=\dot{t}\i\) cannot have the lexical meaning 'for himself,' because this is already expressed by \(\text{hrppi} : \text{atli} : \text{ebī}\). One could argue that \(=\dot{t}\i\) then must have a reflexive meaning, more or less grammaticalized in order to signal the self-beneficial action of the construction of the grave building. Yet, for example, in TL 87 \(\text{ebēnē} : \chi\u0101\u0101 : \text{mē prēnawatē} \cdot \text{PN}\)

\[**\text{ebēnē \(\chi\u0101\u0101\) mē prēnawatē \(\text{PN}\)}
\]

\[**\text{ebēnē \(\chi\u0101\u0101\) mēncē prēnawatē \(\text{PN}\)}\]

This goes back to Emmanuel Laroche, "Comparaison du lou­vite et du lycien," *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 53 (1957–58), 171–72; cf. Melchert, *Dictionary of the Lycian Lan­guage*, 65 and Günter Neumann, *Glossar des Lykischen: Überarbeitet und zum Druck gebracht von Johann Tischler*, Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie 21 (Wiesbaden, 2007), 356–57. Note that the single spelling of \(=\) in Cluw. \(=\dot{t}\i\) and the rhotacism of HLuw. \(=\dot{z}\) shows that the Luwian reflexive in fact was \(=/\dot{di}/\), namely, it contains a lenis /\(\dot{d}\)/, with which it differs from Lycian \(=\dot{t}\i\), which contains a fortis /\(\dot{t}\)/. The hypothesis that in this case Lycian would correspond to Hitrite—which has the reflexive \(=\dot{z}\) that goes back to *\(=\dot{t}\i\) containing a fortis /\(\dot{t}\)/ as well—rather than to Luwian is already a priori less attractive.
they find it better to interpret "=ti here as the nom.sg.c. of the relative pronoun ti- "who."\(^{10}\) A sentence like TL 48 \(\text{ebēnēn} \text{xupā} \text{me=n}=\text{ti} \text{prūna\text{w}atē} \text{padrāma}\) should then be translated as: ‘The tomb belonging to this (monument), (the one) who built it (is) Padrāma.’ According to Borchhardt et al., the reason for using this construction is “Hervorhebung des Subjektworts, das den Graberbauer bezeichnet, durch die Einbettung in eine Relativsatzkonstruktion.”

This interpretation seems fully convincing to me. It is interesting to see that if we apply this idea to a syntactical analysis of these sentences, we arrive at the structure shown in figure 1. It seems that \(\text{mēti} \text{prūna\text{w}atē}\) must be regarded as the core sentence, and not only has the object of the sentence been left-dislocated and is referred to by an enclitic pronoun, but also, the subject of the sentence has been dislocated out of the sentence, namely to the right of it, and is referred to by a relative pronoun. Literally, the sentence can now be translated:

‘The appertaining tomb, well, it, (the one) who built it,\(^{11}\) (is) Padrāma.’

It is interesting to note that this structure differs from normal preposed relative clauses\(^{12}\) like the one found in TL 102 (fig. 2), where the resumptive clause is introduced by the conjunction \(\text{me}\) to which the nom.pl.c. form\(^{13}\) of the enclitic pronoun \(\text{=}\text{e}\) is attached. Similarly in TL 56 (fig. 3), where we find \(\text{me}\) to which the acc.sg.c. form of the enclitic pronoun is attached. As will be explained in detail below, the particle chain \(\text{mene}\) in fact consists of the conjunction \(\text{me}\)...

\(^{10}\) Jürgen Borchhardt et al., “Archäologisch-sprachwissenschaftliches Corpus der Denkmäler mit lykischer Schrift,” Anzeiger der philo­ sophisch-historischen Klasse 134.2 (1997–99), 62–63. They even go so far as to state that all cases where "=ti has been interpreted as a reflexive should instead be regarded as containing the relative pronoun ti-; “wonach das anatolische Reflexivum im Lykischen völlig unbelegt bleibt: es könnte sogar überhaupt ausgestorben sein.”

\(^{11}\) The translation ‘it’ is used to render the verb’s nasalization, \(\text{prūna\text{w}atē}\), for which Andrew Garrett (“The Lycian Nasalized Pret­ erite,” Münchner Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft 52 [1991], 15–26) showed that it historically must be identical with the acc.sg.c. enclitic pronoun \(\text{=}\text{n}\).


\(^{13}\) Cf. the treatment of TL 6 below for the existence of nom. pl.c. \(\text{=}\text{e}.\)
The difference between the two constructions is that in the latter two examples, (in the constructions where the resumptive clause contains the conjunction me), the relative clause is indeterminate, which means the relative pronoun can be translated as ‘who(ever),’ whereas in the former example (the construction where the resumptive clause does not contain any conjunction), the relative clause is determinate, which means the relative pronoun can be translated as ‘(the one) who.’

Because of the absence of a sentence conjunction in the construction meti prînawatê padrâma ‘(the one) who built it is Padrâma,’ we are effectively dealing with an embedded relative clause, and the relative clause meti prînawatê can be interpreted as functioning as the subject of the (nominal) sentence X . . . padrâma ‘X is Padrâma’.14 Constructions of this pattern, ‘The one who X is Y,’ are also called pseudo-cLEFTs, which constitute a variant of cLEFTs (‘It is X who Y’), which we will see below as well.15

mêne

The particle chain mêne is usually interpreted as consisting of the conjunction me followed by the acc.

14 Compare Philomena Probert, “Clause Boundaries in Old Hittite Relative Sentences,” Transactions of the Philological Society 104 (2006), 17–83, who pointed out the existence of embedded relative clauses in Old Hittite, which indicates that such a syntactic construction could go back to Proto-Anatolian.

15 For both cleft and pseudo-cleft constructions, see Peter C. Collins, Cleft and Pseudo-Cleft Constructions in English (London, 1991).

16 See Andrew Garrett, “Topics in Lycian Syntax,” 204.

17 See Philo H. J. Houwink ten Cate, Luwian Population Groups, 66. An example is TL 100 ebeχupa m=e tibeija ‘This grave, it is Tibeian.’
‘The appertaining tomb, well, it, he built it, (namely) Xakkija.’

I am aware that the use of an enclitic pronoun to express the subject of a transitive verb is systematically absent in the other Anatolian languages, but this does not necessarily mean that this should be the case in Lycian as well. The syntactic rules regarding sentence-initial particles and enclitic pronouns are language specific, and each language may show its own innovations vis-à-vis the inherited Proto-Anatolian syntactic system.

**Reference:**

Sideltsev, Andrej V. “Proleptic Pronouns in Middle Hittite,” to appear in the Proceedings of the 53rd Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale [Moscow-St. Petersburg]).


18 As we saw in footnote 17, the proleptic use of enclitic pronouns is not original in Hittite, but arose due to the influence of other languages (Sideltsev, “Proleptic Pronouns”), and we therefore may assume that it was not original in Proto-Anatolian either. Nevertheless, Luwian and Lycian both demonstrate this proleptic use, and this must therefore be regarded as a Luwic innovation vis-à-vis Proto-Anatolian (whether this innovation was triggered by foreign language influence as well is not important in this case).

20 Contra Garrett, “Relative Clause Syntax,” 31–32, who claims that VSO is the basic word order in Lycian. Both his examples of VS(O) contain the proleptic enclitic pronominal nom.sg.c. form =e and are therefore in fact SV(O):

**TL 75**

mène (me=n-e) | tubidi : q[t]lu[(j)]=ēb̲i ลำิja : se n[asa] : miñiaba

‘It will strike him, the local precinct (authority) and Malija and the oaths of the miñi.’

**TL 143**


‘He gave, Mlânnazi, the appertaining chamber to Ptł and his wife Mânl̲a and to his daughter and his sons.’

A similar construction can be found in:

**TL 29**


‘(It is) Ikue, the son of Ipresida, nephew of [...]pe, who built the burial chamber, for himself, his wife and his nephews.’

Based on the following two examples (albeit that the second is rather broken), we must conclude that if the object is not overtly expressed, an enclitic acc.sg.c. is attached to the first word:

**TL 95**

[...], b̲e̲ru̲be̲ji̲e=ti : prñnawate [...]| pe[h] | tideimi [...]| addeh tubes | hr̲p̲pi(ī)=eti : ēbeñë : se tube ēbeñë

‘(It is) [...]burejije, son of [...] and nephew of [...]adde, who built it for his mother and his nephews.’

**TL 126**

pr̲dd̲ewa=ti : prñnawate=ti : zñaza : ser̲n̲ma[ij]=...]

‘(It is) Prrd̲ewa, the zñaza, [son of] Serr̲ma[ij]..., who built it [...]’

In these inscriptions, the nasalization of [...]burejije=ti and pr̲dd̲ewa=ti must represent the acc.sg.c. =n. The same analysis may then be applied for the following inscriptions, although in these the nasalization is not expressed—on the one hand because high vowels do not show nasalization, and on the other, because nasalization can be lost before -e:

**TL 62**

unu̲we̲ni=ti prñnawate | pur̲himnr̲b̲bes̲h tideimi | hr̲p̲pi : ladi se tideime

‘(It is) Unuweme, the son of Purimnhrbese, who built it for (his) wife and children.’
Note that this is a cleft construction, that is, it contains the pattern ‘It is X who Y.’ Therewith it differs from normal postposed relative sentences, where the relative pronoun *ti* follows the verb.\(^{22}\)

Since the inscriptions are inscribed onto the grave monuments to which the χυπα-ς, πρήναω-ς, etc. belong, it is logical that these are usually emphasized. This is done by dislocating these words, the objects of the sentences, to the left, using a construction with the conjunction *me*. This apparently inherently causes right-dislocation of the subject as well as nasalization of the verb\(^{23}\):

TL 80  *ebennê χυπα*  *me=n=c prënawate*  *χakbija*

lit.  ‘The appertaining tomb, well, it, he built it, (namely) Xakbija.’

‘The appertaining tomb was built by Xakbija.’

If the builder now wants to stress his own name, this can again be done by using the relative pronoun *ti*-, creating a pseudo-cleft:

TL 48  *ebennê χυπα*  *me=n=ti prënawate*  *padrâma*

lit.  ‘The appertaining tomb, well, it, (the one) who built it, (is) Padrâma.’

‘The appertaining tomb, it is Padrâma who built it.’

**Conclusion**

As we have seen, the particle chains *mêne* and *meti* as found in the well-known formulae *ebennê χυπα* *mêne prënawate* PN and *ebennê χυπα* *meti prënawate* PN cannot be regarded as functionally identical, the former consisting of *me* and the “long” acc.sg.c. enclitic pronoun =*ene* and the latter consisting of *me* and the “short” acc.sg.c. enclitic pronoun =*ê*, to which the optional reflexive particle =*ti* is attached. Instead, *mêne* must be morphologically analyzed as [*me=n=c*], where the acc.sg.c. enclitic pronoun [*=n*] resumptively refers to the left-dislocated object (*ebennê χυπα*) and the nom.sg.c. enclitic pronoun [*=c*] proleptically refers to the right-dislocated subject (PN). The chain *meti* must be morphologically analyzed as [*me=n=tî*], where the acc.sg.c. enclitic pronoun [*=n*] resumptively refers to the left-dislocated object (*ebennê χυπα*) and the nom.sg.c. relative pronoun [*=tî*] refers to the right-dislocated subject (PN). The sentences with *mêne* must be regarded as semantically neutral (apart from the fact that the object has been topologized), whereas the sentences with *meti* must be regarded as sentences in which, apart from the topologization of the object (namely the grave monument that has been built), the subject (namely the builder of the grave monument) is emphasized as well by embedding it into a relative sentence.

\(^{22}\) Cf. Gusmani, “Zur Frage,” 159–76, and Garrett, “Relative Clause Syntax,” 29–69 for relative clauses such as:

TL 150  *ebêli*  *m=e si:jêni*  *yssêni:jia*  :  *yštlapa:zi* : *tideimi : mutle: *: *prënecizejia* : *prënawate*:*ti* : *ši:atâ* : *ati* : *cbhí*

‘Here, he lies, Xsêni:jia, the son of Xštlapa, the household-member of Mutle, who built the burial chamber for himself.’

Excursus 1. mēne (and sēne) in other contexts

The element =e that we now have identified in the sequence mēne does not only proleptically refer to singular subjects, but in TL 6 also to a plural subject (note the use of spl. prēnawātē); see fig. 6. Moreover, we find the sequence mēne, as well as sēne, also in contexts other than the opening formula of the funerary inscriptions. In most of these, an analysis as me or se + acc.sg.c. =n + nom.sg.c. or nom.pl.c. =e works perfectly as well, for instance in the cursing formulae shown in figure 7. We see that in all these inscriptions the deities or institutions that will perform

---

TL 6  ebēnnē ūtatā  me=ⁿ=ᵉ prēnawātē  pulenjda mullijeseh se dapara pulenjda

‘The appertaining burial chamber, they built it, Pulenjda, son of Mullijese, and Dapara, son of Pulenjda.’

Figure 6

---

TL 56  seijē ti edī tike mētē  me=ⁿ=ᵉ qaṣstu  ēni glahi ehihihī se wedri wehītezi

‘Whoever does any damage to it, him she will destroy, the Mother of the local precinct and the wedri of Phellos.’

---

TL 57  hrpp(i)=i je me=i tadi tike  me=ⁿ=ᵉ tuβeiti  māhāi huwedri se itlehi trīmili

‘If (someone) places someone on top, him they will strike, all the gods and the Lycian league.’

---

TL 75  hrpp(i)=i [je me]=i tadi tike kbi me=ⁿ=ᵉ tuβidi  q(l)[l]a(j)i [e]b[i s]e malija se t(asa) miňtaha

‘If (someone) places someone else on top, him he will strike, the local precinct (authority) and Malija and the Oaths of the miňtī.’

---

TL 83  ...  me=ⁿ=ᵉ tuβidi  trīgas se itlehi trīmili huwedri

‘..., him he will strike, the Weathergod and all the Lycian league.’

Figure 7—(continued on next page.)
the destroying or striking are right-dislocated and proleptically referred to by the enclitic pronoun =e.

There is a group of inscriptions, however, where in the cursing formula the enclitic nom.sg.c./nom.pl.c. =e seems to be superfluous because the subject does not seem to be right-dislocated. Consider for instance:

TL 139 ti hrppi tâti tike me=â=tubidi 

[ ALLOTTED ] [ ALLOTTED ]

‘Whoever place someone on top, him he will strike, the hppîterus of the gods and the court of the miîti.’

TL 150 hrpp(i)=ije me=â=tâ[t]i me=â=gastî malija wedrêñi se itlehi trîmîli huwedri

[ ALLOTTED ]

‘If (some people) place (someone) on top, him(!) he will strike, Malija of Rhodiapolis and all the Lycian league.’

N314b ̣xupa ebehi t(i)=i(f)=adi tike zuûmmê tîhe me=â=tubidi ̣eti ebehê

[ ALLOTTED ] [ ALLOTTED ]

‘The tomb belonging to this, whoever does any harm to it, him he will strike, the Father of these.’

Figure 7—(continued from previous page.)

The word itlehi ‘league’ precedes the verb qaûñt[i] ‘will destroy,’ and therewith does not seem to be right-dislocated, which would make the presence of the enclitic pronoun =e in mene as [me=ñ=c]. Yet, it is remarkable that itlehi is only the first member of the word group itlehi trîmîli huwedri ‘all the Lycian league’ that constitutes the subject of the verb, and that the other two words, trîmîli huwedri, follow the verb. In fact, this is the case in all inscriptions where we at first seem not to be dealing with right-dislocation:

TL 84 . . . mene qa[ñû]t [i] trîmîli huwedri ̣se trqqas se mãhãi huwedri

[ ALLOTTED ]

‘. . . , him, the local precinct (authority) of Sura will put to place.’

TL 88 . . . mene itlehi tubeiti trîmîli huwedri se trqqas se mãhãi huwedri

[ ALLOTTED ]

‘. . . , him, all the Lycian league and the Weathergod and all the gods will strike.’

TL 89 . . . mene âitlehi qaûñi trîmîli

[ ALLOTTED ]

‘. . . , him, the Lycian league will destroy.’

TL 90 . . . m[ê]n e itlehi qaûñi trîmîli

[ ALLOTTED ]

‘. . . , him, the Lycian league will destroy.’

TL 95 . . . mene qaûñi trîmîli huwedri ̣se ma[r]as[\i] ja ̣miîñ[abl]a

[ ALLOTTED ]

‘. . . , him, the gods of Rhodiapolis will strike.’

TL 101 . . . mene mãl blâi tubeiti wedr rûñî

[ ALLOTTED ]

‘. . . , him, the gods of Rhodiapolis will strike.’

TL 134 . . . sene perepî itlehi qaûñi trîmîli

[ ALLOTTED ]

‘. . . , him, furthermore, the Lycean league will destroy.’

TL 135 . . . sene teseti tubeiti trîmîli ̣se ma[r]as[\i] ja ̣miîñ[abl]a

[ ALLOTTED ]

‘. . . , him, the Lycean oath-gods and the court of the Miîti will strike.’
The Opening Formula of Lycian Funerary Inscriptions

TL 149 ... sene teqti qânts triqumiljéti
‘... him, the Lycian oath-gods will destroy.’

N306 ... sene itlebi qânts trumilj huwedri
‘... him, all the Lycian league will destroy.’

N309d ... sene itlebi qânts [ti] trumilj huwi [cdri]
‘... him, all the Lycian league will destroy.’

N317 ... me ne máhâi tubi eit sum[...]:âi
‘... him, the sum[...]:a gods will strike.’

Whatever be the reason underlying this remarkable fronting of only the first of the group of words that constitute the subject, it seems to me it is a phenomenon that requires a separate explanation and does not have any bearing on my interpretation of mëne and sene as [Ce=n=e].

There is also a group of inscriptions that use mëne where the =e does not seem to refer to an overtly expressed right-dislocated subject:

TL 88 se eke lati ddaqasa | mene ñtepi tãti ńtûpa te zi se ladâ ehbi
‘and when he dies, Ddaqasa, him they will place inside, his wife.’


Two more examples are the following, where, to be sure, troqas does not carry any modifiers and therefore seems to really not be right-dislocated, but where the full subject consists of [troqas se malija brjyuawanama and troqas se malâhi buwedri], respectively, and which I therefore still regard as showing the same phenomenon, namely the fronting of only the first of the group of words that constitutes the subject of the verb:

TL 80 ... me ne [troqas] tubidi se malija brjyuawanama
‘... him, the Weathergod and the super-intending(?) Malija will strike.’

TL 93 ... me ne troqas tubidi se malâhi buwedri
‘... him, the Weathergod and all the gods will strike.’

A similar fronting seems to be found in the following inscription, where instead of mene we find mëti (although here it is denasalized to meti):

TL 110 epl ut|e=sne=i tadi me tisi tise prûnavatë met(i)=eñi quanu- weti glor bi eh ti ehbi
‘Furthermore, if (someone) places (or) builds anything in there, (the one) who will cause him to be destroyed (will be) the mother of the local precinct.’

‘The appertaining building, it was Hurttuweti who built it for his wife, and him they will place inside, in the upper chamber, and his wife and Hağaâna.’

TL 102 ebënë: ñypâ : mëti prûnavatë : se leme se ñtepi tãti : ñtepi tãti : se ladu : ehbi | se tideimis : ehbi
‘The appertaining tomb, it was ñtepi who built it, and him they will place inside, ñtepi and his wife and his children.’

‘The appertaining building, it was Piñteusi, the tewinaza, son of ñtepi who built it for his wife and his children, and him they will place inside, in the upper building, Piñteusi and his wife.’

‘The appertaining tomb, it was Ddepñnewe who built it for his wife Xatrima, and her they will place inside, Xatrima and her son-in-law(?) Huzzeti of Tyinda(?).’

N317 ebënë: ñypâ me ne : prûna[wâtè]: zuwiqeli : se [. . . ] [ehbi laða ehbi : se h[. . . . . . . ] e mene ñtepi tãti [. . . ] | ēnì : ehbi
‘The appertaining tomb, Zuwiqeli and [. . . ] built it [. . . . . . . ] for his wife and H[. . . . . . . ], and him they will place inside, [. . . (and) ] his mother.’

In all these inscriptions the verb ñtepi ta- ‘to place inside.’ As we see, the enclitic acc.sg.c. pronoun =n= does not refer to the overtly expressed objects that are to be placed inside, but the enclitic pronoun =e does not have an overtly expressed counterpart. In my view,

‘The appertaining tomb, it is Zahama, son of Ddawâparta, who built it, and inside they will place Zahâma and (his) wife and his children.’

24 In not all cases where we find this construction is an enclitic acc.sg.c. pronoun =n= used, for example:

‘The appertaining tomb, it is Zahama, son of Ddawâparta, who built it, and inside they will place Zahâma and (his) wife and his children.’
this could be because we are dealing with impersonal expressions here.

Two problematic cases remain, however:

**TL 7**
\[
\text{ebenō : wupā : mene prûnawatē : trijē tezi : sene pijetē [ladi : ebhi] se tideime}
\]

'The appertaining tomb, he built it, Trijētezi, and gave it to his wife and children.'

Although in the first sentence of both inscriptions the name of the builder, Trijētezi, is right-dislocated, which makes the presence of sene awkward—especially if we compare the following inscription where a similar construction can be found:

**TL 8**
\[
\text{ebenō : wupā mene prûnawatē : trijē tezi : sene pijetē [nēne : ebhi] : se tideime}
\]

'The appertaining tomb, he built it, Trijētezi, and gave it to his brothers and nephews.'

Here we only find ō, which indeed contains the enclitic acc.sg.c. =n, referring to ebenō nēwupā, but not the nom.sg.c. =e, since the subject is not overtly expressed in right-dislocation. In my view, the latter inscription shows the ‘correct’ construction, whereas in the former two, either the sene is copied after the mene of the first sentence, or it is the result of a later development due to which in every sentence that bore a resumptive accusative enclitic a proleptic nominative enclitic had to be used as well.  

**Excursus 2. =i vs. =ije**

Although this is not the place to discuss in full depth the difference between enclitic =i and =ije, I would like to make a few remarks. Melchert cites the following forms: =i1 ‘for/to him, her’; =i2 ‘therein, thereon’; and =ije ‘therein, thereon; on him/her,’ stating that =e2 and =ije are allomorphs. Neumann cites =i as the dat.-loc.sg. and =ije as the dat.-loc.pl. of the enclitic pronoun =e-. Since the concept of allomorphy is, as we saw above as well, not fully satisfactory, Neumann’s division between a singular =i and a plural =ije is at first sight attractive. Nevertheless, there are places where a singular interpretation of =ije seems obligatory, as he himself observed.

One of the seeming exceptions may be interpreted along the line of mene vs. mēi, however. The sentence TL 106 ebehī : wupā : meji sijēni : padrūma is usually translated ‘On the bench of this (monument), thereupon lies Padrūma.’ It looks as if =ije refers to ebehī isbāzi ‘the bench of this (monument),’ which is a singular noun in the dative-locative. This would show that =ije itself must be singular as well. A similar sentence is TL 108 ebehī : wupā : meiti sijēni : sibij : aza ‘in the tomb of this (monument), therein lies Sibijaza,’ in which =ti is usually interpreted as a reflexive particle. If we now morphologically interpret meiti as [me̩ =i =ti], consisting of the conjunction [me̩], the dat.-loc.sg. enclitic pronoun =i, and the nom.sg.c. relative pronoun =ti, and if we morphologically interpret meije, which must phonologically represent /meje/, as [me =e =i =e], consisting of [me], the dat.-loc.sg. enclitic

---

26 Which could then be compared to the use of =e in TL 31 and TL 133 (cf. footnote 21).
28 Neumann, Glossar des Lykischen, 44.
29 Note that the inscription reads miije. Since a sequence -ii- is not found anywhere else within the Lycian corpus (except in N323, which also contains the irregular occurrences of an intervocalic -n̪-, a preconsonantal -n̪-, and a postconsonantal -j̪-, and therefore should not be taken into account) and since in similar contexts we find meije (e.g., N320, 25 meije-sti : bli̯umipijata ‘and which ones among the income-gifts lie therein;’ see Kloekhorst, “Studies in Lycian and Carian,” 130), it seems justified to me to emend miije to meije.
pronoun |=i|, and the nom.sg.c. enclitic pronoun |=e|, we arrive at the interpretations in figure 8. Again, we see that both |=e| and |=ti| proleptically refer to the right-dislocated subject. It seems to me that TL 49, the sentence containing meije, must be regarded as the semantically neutral one (apart from topicalization of ebehi ishazi) and that TL 106, the sentence containing meiti, must be regarded as placing emphasis on the name of the person lying in this grave.

The question whether all instances of enclitic |=ije| should now be reinterpreted as |=i| + |=e|, eliminating Melchert’s interpretation of |=ije| as an allomorph of |=i| and Neumann’s interpretation of |=ije| as the plural variant of singular |=i|, can only be answered with further research on the Lycian enclitic particles.

TL 49  ebehi ishazi  me|=i|=e  sijêni  padrêma

‘On the bench of this (monument), well, on it he lies, Padrêma.’

TL 106  ebehi aupa  me|=i|=ti  sijêni  sbiôaza

‘In the tomb of this (monument), well in it, (the one) who lies (there), (is) Sbiôaza.’