

The Opening Formula of Lycian Funerary Inscriptions: *mēti* vs. *mēne**

Alwin Kloekhorst

In his *A Dictionary of the Lycian Language*, Melchert (2004: 19-20) cites the acc.sg.c. form of the enclitic personal pronoun of 3sg. as =*ē* and =*ēne*¹, as if having two allomorphs. Both forms occur for instance in the well known formula with which a third of the Lycian inscriptions begin:

=*ē*:²

TL 3 *ebēñnē : χupā : m=ē=ti prñnawatē : telwinezēi*

‘The tomb belonging to this (monument),³ Tewinezēi built **it**’

TL 11 *ebēñnē prñnawā : m=ē=ti prñnawatē : ddapssĩmma*

‘The building belonging to this (monument), Ddapssĩmma built **it**’

=*ēne*

TL 37 *ebēñnē : χulpā : m=ēne prñnawatē : melde*

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

TL 53 *ebēñnē : prñnawu : m=ēne | prñnawatē hanadaza*

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

These formulae are characterized by left-dislocation of the objects *ebēñnē xupā* and *ebēñnē prñnawā*, followed by the sentence-initial particle *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. form of the enclitic pronoun shows two different forms (=ē and =ēne) that have 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 in the formula the element =*ti*, which is commonly regarded as a reflexive particle, is used as well, we only find =ē and never =ēne. When the element =*ti* is not used, we only find =ēne and never =ē.

Thus, the formula only shows these two forms:

ebēñnē xupā mēti prñnawatē PN

ebēñnē xupā mēne prñnawatē PN

but never these two forms:

***ebēñnē xupā mē prñnawatē* PN

***ebēñnē xupā mēneti prñnawatē* PN

This distribution needs to be explained,⁴ and in the following I will therefore look more closely into the use of the particle chains *mēti* and *mēne*.

mēti

The particle chain *mēti* is usually morphologically analyzed as consisting of the conjunctive *me* followed by acc.sg.c. enclitic pronoun =ē and a reflexive particle =*ti* ‘for himself (vel

sim.)'. First, it should be remarked that the citation of acc.sg.c. =*ē* is not fully correct. In TL 126 *prddewāti : prñnawa[te]*, which Melchert (2004: 19) analyzes as showing the sentence initial particle chain *prddewa* (nom.sg.c.) + =*~* (acc.sg.c.) + =*ti* (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 =*ē*, but rather consists of the nasalization only. It may therefore be better to analyze *mēti*, which phonologically stands for /meⁿti/⁵, on a morphological level as lme=n=til.⁶

The element =*ti* is usually interpreted as a reflexive particle and is etymologically compared with Luw. =*di* (refl.) and Hitt. =*z* (refl.).⁷ Yet, I have doubts whether this interpretation can be correct. From examples like TL 86 *ebēñnē : prñnawā : mēti prñnawatē : erimñnaha : l semuteh : tideimi : hrppi : atli : ehbi : se(j)=ēni : ehbi* 'The building belonging to this (monument), Erimñnaha, son of Semute built it for himself and his mother', where *hrppi : atli : ehbi* means 'for himself', it is clear that the element =*ti* cannot have the lexical meaning 'for himself', which is already expressed by *hrppi : atli : ehbi*. One could argue that =*ti* then must have a reflexive meaning, more or less grammaticalized in order to signal the self-beneficial action of the building of the grave building. Yet in e.g. TL 87 *ebēñnē : χulpā : meti | pr[ñ]nawatē : apñnātama | hrppi : ladi : e[h]bi : se tidelimi* 'The tomb belonging to this (monument), Apñnātama built it for his wife and children', the building of the tomb was not self-beneficial (it was built for Apñnātama's wife and children, but not for himself), but still we find the element =*ti*. On the contrary, in TL 37 *ebēñnē : χulpā : mēne prñnawatē : melde : epñnēni | ehbi : hm̃prāma : se(j)=atli* 'The tomb belonging to this (monument), Mede built it for his younger brother Hm̃prāma and for himself', where the building clearly was self-beneficial, we do not find =*ti*. One could perhaps argue that although =*ti* historically was a reflexive, it lost its semantic value and has become fully grammaticalized. If this were the case, I would expect to find =*ti* with every example of a given verb that uses it, however. As we have seen, this is not what we find: the verb *prñnawa-* can be used with and without =*ti* without any detectable difference in meaning.

‘Whoever arranges inside (this tomb) someone on top or whoever places inside (this tomb) someone on top, they will pay eight(?) goats(?) as a fine.’

Similarly in e.g. TL 56, where we find *me* to which the acc.sg.c. form of the enclitic pronoun is attached:

TL 56 *se=ije t̄i edi tike mēṭē m=ene¹² qasttu ṅni qlahi ebijehi*

‘Whoever does any harm to this (tomb), him the Mother of the local precinct will destroy’.

The difference between the two constructions is in my view that in the latter two examples, i.e. in the constructions where the resumptive clause contains the conjunction *me*, the relative clause is indeterminate, which means that the relative pronoun can be translated with ‘who(ever)’, whereas in the former example, i.e. the construction where the resumptive clause does not contain any conjunction, the relative clause is determinate, which means that the relative pronoun can be translated with ‘(the one) who’.

Because of the absence of a sentence conjunction in the construction *mēṭi pr̄ṅnawatē padrāma* ‘(the one) who built it is Padrāma’, we are effectively dealing with an embedded relative clause, which means that the relative clause *mēṭi pr̄ṅnawatē* can be interpreted as functioning as the subject of the (nominal) sentence *X ... padrāma* ‘X is Padrāma’.¹³ Constructions of this pattern, ‘The one who X is Y’, are also called pseudo-clefts, which constitute a variant of clefts (‘It’s X who Y’), which we will see below as well.¹⁴

mēne

The particle chain *mēne* is usually interpreted as consisting of the conjunctive *me* followed by acc.sg.c. enclitic pronoun =*ēne*, the longer variant of =*ē*. As said above, it is unlikely that one grammatical form has two formal variants, and I therefore want to propose a new analysis.

I am aware of the fact that the use of an enclitic pronoun to express the subject of a transitive verb is systematically absent in the other Anatolian languages (so-called Watkins-Garrett's Law¹⁷), 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.¹⁸

Function

The question now arises, why do these two constructions exist? I think the answer lies in different ways of emphasizing. The neutral variant of the formula 'X built Y' can be found in TL 40a = TL 40b:

pajawa : manaxine : prñnawate : prñnawã : ebẽñnẽ

'Pajawa the *manaxine* built the appertaining building.'

Note that the word order is SVO in this sentence, which is the normal word order in Lycian.¹⁹

If the builder wants to stress his own name, he can use a construction with the relative pronoun *ti*-:

TL 99 *purihimeti=ti : prñnawate : masasah : tideimi | χupã :: ebẽñnẽ*

'(It is) Purihimeti, the son of Masasa, who built the appertaining tomb.'²⁰

Note that this is a cleft construction, i.e. it contains the pattern 'It's X who Y'. Therewith it differs from normal postposed relative sentences, where the relative pronoun *ti* follows the verb.²¹

Since the inscriptions are inscribed onto the grave monuments to which the *χupa*-s, *prñnawa*-s, 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 conjunctive *me*. This apparently inherently causes right-dislocation of the subject as well as nasalization of the verb²²:

TL 80 *ebēñnē χupā me=n=e prñnawatē 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 *ebēñnē χupā me=n=ti prñnawatē padrāma*

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

‘The appertaining tomb, it is by Padrāma that it was built.’

Conclusion

As we have seen, the particle chains *mēne* and *mēti* as found in the well-known formulae *ebēñnē χupā mēne prñnawatē* PN and *ebēñnē χupā mēti prñnawatē* PN cannot be regarded as functionally identical, the former consisting of *me* and the ‘long’ acc.sg.c. enclitic pronoun =*ēne* and the latter consisting of *me* and the ‘short’ acc.sg.c. enclitic pronoun =*ē*, to which the optional reflexive particle =*ti* is attached. Instead, *mēne* must be morphologically analyzed as |me=n=e|, in which the acc.sg.c. enclitic pronoun |n| resumptively refers to the left-dislocated object (*ebēñnē χupā*) and the nom.sg.c. enclitic pronoun |e| proleptically refers to the right-dislocated subject (PN). The chain *mēti* must be morphologically analyzed as |me=n=ti|, in

which the acc.sg.c. enclitic pronoun =n resumptively refers to the left-dislocated object (*ebēñnē xpā*) and the nom.sg.c. relative pronoun =til refers to the right-dislocated subject (PN). The sentences with *mēne* must be regarded as semantically neutral (apart from the fact that the object has been topicalized), whereas the sentences with *mēti* must be regarded as sentences in which, apart from the topicalization 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.

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 3pl. *prñawātē*):

TL 6 *ebēñnē ñtatā* me=n=e *prñawātē* *pulnjda mullijeseh se dapara pulnjdah*

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

Moreover, we find the sequence *mēne*, as well as *sēne*, also in other contexts 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:

TL 56 *seije ti edi tike mētē* me=n=e *qasttu* *ēni qlahi ebijehi se wedri wehñtezi*

‘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)=ije me=i tadi tike* me=n=e *tubeiti* *māhāi huwedri se itlehi trñmili*

‘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 tubidi q[l]a[(j)]eb[i s]e malija se t[asa] miñtaha*
| |

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

TL 83 ... me=n=e tubidi *trqqas se itlehi trñmili huwedri*
| |

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

TL 139 *ti hrppi tãti tike me=n=e tubidi h[p]pñter[us] mähãi se marazija miñtaha*
| |

‘Whoever place someone on top, him he will strike, the *hppñterus* of the gods and the court of the miñti.’

TL 150 *hrpp(i)=ije me=i tã[t]i me=n=e qastti malija wedrēñni se itlehi trñmili huwedri*
| |

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

N314b *χupa ebehi t(i)=i(j)=adi tike zuñmē tihe me=n=e tubidi eti ebehē*
| |

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

We see that in all these inscriptions the deities or institutions that will perform 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 95 ... *mēne itlehi qañt[i] trm̃mili h[u]we[dri]*

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

The word *itlehi* ‘league’ precedes the verb *qañt[i]* ‘will destroy’, and therewith does not seem to be right-dislocated, which would make the presence of the enclitic pronoun =*e* in *mēne* superfluous and therewith could be used as an argument against my interpretation of *mēne* as lme=n=e. Yet, it is remarkable that *itlehi* is only the first member of the word group *itlehi trm̃mili huwedri* ‘all the Lycian league’ that constitutes the subject of the verb, and that the other two words, *trm̃mili huwedri*, follow the verb. In fact, this is the case in all inscriptions where we at first seem to not be dealing with right-dislocation:

TL 84 ... *mene q̄la [q]a[s]tt(i)=ebi surezi*

‘..., him, the local precinct (authority) of Sura will destroy.’

TL 84 ... *mene pddē q̄la s̃mmati ebi surezi*

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

TL 88 ... *mene itlehi tubeiti trm̃mili huwedri se trqqas se m̃hāi huwedri*

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

TL 89 ... *mēne* *i[t]lehi qāti tr̃mili*

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

TL 90 ... *me[n]e* *itlehi qānti tr̃mili*

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

TL 95 ... *mēne* *itlehi qānt[i] tr̃mili h[u]we[dri]*

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

TL 101 ... *mene* *mā[h]āi tubeiti wed[rēn]ni*

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

TL 134 ... *sene* *perepñ itlehi qānti tr̃mili*

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

TL 135 ... *sene* *teseti tubeiti tr̃mili s[e ma]r[az]i[ja] miñt[ah]a*

‘..., him, the Lycian oath-gods and the court of the Mīnti will strike.’

TL 149 ... *sēne* *tesēti qānti tr̃milijēti*

‘... , him, the Lycian oath-gods will destroy.’

N306 ... *sene itlehi qāñti trñmili huwedri*

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

N309d ... *sene itlehi qāñ[ti] trñmili huw[edri]*

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

N317 [... *me*]ne *māhāi tubeiti sum[...]āi*

‘... , 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 to be a phenomenon that requires a separate explanation and does not have bearing on my interpretation of *mēne* and *sēne* as |Ce=n=e|. ^{23 24}
There is also a group of inscriptions that use *mēne* where the =e does not seem to refer to an overtly expressed right-dislocated subject:

TL 88 *se ēke lati ddaqasa | mēne ñtepi tāti ñtipa tezi se ladā ehbi*

‘and when he dies, Ddaqasa, him they will place inside, in the sarcophagus, and his wife.’

TL 94 *ebēññē : prñna[w]ā : meti : prñnawatē : hurttuw[e]ti : hrppi ladi : ehbi : me[n]e
ñtepi tāti hrzzi : prñnawi : se ladā : | ehbi : se haḡānā*

‘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 Haḫāna.’

TL 102 *ebēñnē : ḫupā : mēti prīnawatē : sḫḫutrazi mēne : ñtepi tēti : sḫḫutrazi : se ladu : ehbi | se tideimis : ehbis*

‘The appertaining tomb, it was Sḫḫutrazi who built it, and him they will place inside, Sḫḫutrazi and his wife and his children.’

TL 112 *me : ñke : lat[i] : mīnuhe : mene ñtep[i] | tāti*

‘And when he dies, Mīnuhe, him they will place inside.’

N306 *ebēñ[n]ē : prīnaw[ā] : mēti prīnawatē : piñteusi : tewinaza : idazzalah : tideimi : hrppi : ladi : | ehbi : se tideime : ehbi : [m]ene : ñtepi tāti : hrzi : prīnawi : piñteusi : se ladā : ehbi*

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

N309b *ebēñnē : ḫupā : mēti prīnawatē : ddepñnewe : hrppi : ladi | ehbi : ḫatmāje : mene ñtepi tāti : ḫatmā : se sidi : | ehbi : kbijētezi : huzetēi*

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

N317 *ebēññē : χupā mene : prñn[awātē :] zuwiqeli : se [....] | lehi lada ehbi : se
h[.] e mene ñtepi tāt[i ...] | ēni : 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 is *ñtepi ta-* ‘to place inside’. As we see, the enclitic acc.sg.c. pronoun *l=nl* refers to the overtly expressed objects that are to be placed inside,²⁵ but the enclitic pronoun *=e* does not have an overtly expressed counterpart. In my view, this could well be due to the fact that we are dealing with impersonal expressions here.

Two problematic cases remain, however:

TL 7 *ebēññē : χupā : mene prñnawatē | trijē[tezi] : sene pijet[ē] | ladi : eh[b]i se tideime*

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

TL 8 *ebēññē : χupā mene prñnawatē : | trijētezi : sene pijetē | nēne : ehbi : se tuhe*

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

For both inscriptions it goes that although in the first sentence the name of the builder, Trijētezi, is right-dislocated, and therefore the use of *mene* is justified, in the second sentence the name is not right-dislocated, which makes the presence of *sene* awkward. Especially if we compare the following inscription where a similar construction can be found:

TL 52 *ebēñ[n]ē : χupā : mēn(e) adē : krehēnube : sē pijetē wazijeje | se(j) ēni*

‘The appertaining tomb, he made it, Krehēnube, and gave it to Waziye and (his) mother.’

Here we only find *sē*, which indeed contains the enclitic acc.sg.c. |n|, referring to *ebēñ[n]ē χupā*, 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 inscriptions either the *sene* is copied after the *mene* of the first sentence, or 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.²⁶

Excursus: =*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 place a few remarks. Melchert (2004: 26-28) cites the following forms: =*i*¹ ‘for/to him, her’; =*i*² ‘therein, thereon’; and =*ije* ‘therein, thereon; on him/her’, stating that =*i*² and =*ije* are allomorphs. Neumann (2007: 44) cites =*i* as dat.-loc.sg. and =*ije* as 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 observed himself as well.

One of the seeming exceptions may be interpreted along the line of *mēne* vs. *mēti*, however. The sentence TL 49 *ebehi : isbazi : me¹ije sijēni : padrīma²⁷* is usually translated ‘On the bench of this (monument), thereupon lies Padrīma.’ It looks as if =*ije* refers to *ebehi isbazi* ‘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 106 *ebehi χupa : meiti sijēni : sbi: ∅:aza* ‘in the tomb of this (monument), therein lies Sbi∅aza’, in which =*ti* is usually interpreted as a reflexive particle. If we now morphologically interpret *meiti* as |me=i|til, however, consisting of the conjunctive |mel, the dat.-loc.sg. enclitic pronoun |n|

a.kloekhorst@hum.leidenuniv.nl

References

- TL = Kalinka, E., *Tituli Lyciae, lingua lycia conscripti* (= *Tituli Asiae Minoris* 1), Vienna, 1901.
- N = Neumann, G., *Neufunde lykischer Inschriften seit 1901*, Wien, 1979.
- Borchhardt, J. H. Eichner e.a. 1997-99. Archäologisch-sprachwissenschaftliches Corpus der Denkmäler mit lykischer Schrift. *Anzeiger der philosophisch-historischen Klasse* 134.2: 11-96.
- Collins, P.C. 1991, *Cleft and Pseudo-Cleft Constructions in English*, London - New York.
- Garrett, A. 1990, Hittite Enclitic Subjects and Transitive Verbs, *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 42, 227-242.
- Garrett, A. 1991. The Lycian Nasalized Preterite. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 52: 15-26.
- Garrett, A. 1992. Topics in Lycian Syntax. *Historische Sprachforschung* 105: 200-212.
- Garrett, A. 1994, Relative Clause Syntax in Lycian and Hittite, *Die Sprache* 36, 29-69.
- Gusmani, R., 1962, Zur Frage des lykischen Relativpronomen, *Indogermanische Forschungen* 67, 159-176.
- Houwink ten Cate, Ph.H.J. 1961. *The Luwian Population Groups of Lycia and Cilicia Aspera During the Hellenistic Period*. Leiden: Brill.
- Kloekhorst, A. 2008. Studies in Lycian and Carian Phonology and Morphology. *Kadmos* 47: 117-146.
- Laroche, E. 1957-58. Comparaison du louvite et du lycien. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 53: 159-197.
- Laroche, E. 1959. *Dictionnaire de la langue louvite*. Paris: Maisonneuve.

- Melchert, H.C. 2004. *A Dictionary of the Lycian Language*. Ann Arbor: Beech Stave Press.
- Neumann, G. 2007. *Glossar des Lykischen. Überarbeitet und zum Druck gebracht von Johann Tischler (= Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie 21)*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Probert, P. 2006, Clause Boundaries in Old Hittite Relative Sentences, *Transactions of the Philological Society* 104, 17-83.
- Sideltsev, A.V. fthc. Proleptic Pronouns in Middle Hittite. To appear in the Proceedings of the *53rd Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale*, Moscow - St. Petersburg.

* In this article, Lycian inscriptions are transliterated according to the standard transliteration. Line breaks are indicated by |. In syntactic analyses neither line breaks nor word dividers (:) are indicated.

¹ With =ene as a graphic variant, according to the establishment that before -n- the graphemes <e> and <ē> vary freely (see Kloekhorst 2008: 121).

² See Garrett 1992: 202f. for the fact that instead of *mēti*, we also find *meti*, which must be regarded as a denasalized variant of *mēti*.

³ For the translation of *ebēñnē* as ‘belonging to this (monument)’ or ‘appertaining’, see Kloekhorst 2008: 132-7.

⁴ Houwink ten Cate (1965: 18-9) states that the variant =ēne represents an original *=en plus a prop-vowel -e, “since without it the final *n* would be discarded after a vowel” (followed by e.g. Melchert 2004: 200). This would then explain why the prop-vowel is not found in *mēti*, since here the element =ē is not found in final position. Apart from the fact that a final -*n* would not be discarded after a word-final -*e* at all (which would just yield nasalization, -ē), we do find cases of the variant =ē in final position, e.g. in TL 52 *ebēñ[n]ē : χupā : mēn(e)=adē : krehēnube : sē pijetē wazijeje | se(j)=ēni* ‘The appertaining tomb, Krehēnube made it, and gave it to Wazije and (his) mother’, where the =ē in *s=ē* is word-final and nevertheless not followed by a prop-vowel.

⁵ Cf. Kloekhorst 2008 for a treatment of the phonology of Lycian.

⁶ In footnote 20 we will come across a form *upazijēne*, which will be analysed as *upazi* + acc.sg.c. | =enl + =e, showing a form | =enl. I regard this as a later variant of original | =nl, probably on the analogy of the enclitic nom.sg.c. | =el and nom.-acc.sg.n. | =edel.

⁷ Going back to Laroche 1957-58: 171ff.; cf. Melchert 2004: 65 and Neumann 2007: 356-7. Note that the single spelling of -*t*- in CLuw. =*ti* and the rhotacism of HLuw. =*ti* / =*ri* shows that the Luwian

reflexive in fact was /=di/, i.e. contains a lenis /d/, with which it differs from Lycian =ti which contains a fortis /t/. The hypothesis that in this case Lycian would, instead of to Luwian, rather correspond to Hittite, which has the reflexive =z that goes back to *=ti containing a fortis /t/ as well, is already *a priori* less attractive.

⁸ They even go so far as to stating 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” (o.c.: 62).

⁹ The translation ‘it’ is used to render the verb’s nasalization, *prñawatē*, of which Garrett (1991) showed that it historically must be identical with the acc.sg.c. enclitic pronoun |=nl.

¹⁰ Cf. especially Gusmani 1962 and Garrett 1994 for relative clauses in Lycian.

¹¹ Cf. the treatment of TL 6 below for the existence of nom.pl.c. =e.

¹² As will be explained in detail below, the particle chain *mene* in fact consists of conjunction *me* + resumptive enclitic acc.sg.c. =n + proleptic enclitic nom.sg.c. =e.

¹³ Compare Probert 2006, 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.

¹⁴ For both cleft and pseudo-cleft constructions, cf. e.g. Collins 1991.

¹⁵ See Garrett 1992: 204.

¹⁶ See Houwink ten Cate 1961: 66. An example is TL 84 *ebēñnē : prñawā : meti : prñawatē : mizretije : murāzah : tuhes : mluhidaza : surezi | hrppi atli : ehbi : se ladi : se tideime : ehbi : s=ed=adē : atli : hrzzē [i]spazijē* ‘The appertaining building, he who built it is Mizretije, the nephew of Murāza, the *mluhidaza* of Sura, for himself, for his wife and for his children. And for himself he made it, the upper bench’. The nom.-acc.sg.n. pronoun =ed(e) proleptically refers to *hrzzē [i]spazijē* ‘the upper bench’. Proleptic use of enclitic pronouns is also attested in CLuwian (cf. Laroche 1959: 145), cf. KUB 35.54 iii 26 [*a=*](*a*)*ta ḥa-la-a-al a-aš-du za-a [p]ár-na-an-za* ‘May it be pure, this house’, where nom.-acc.sg.n. =*ata* proleptically refers to *zā parmanza*. Also in Hittite this phenomenon occurs, albeit that it is originally only found in texts that are translated from other languages (cf. Sideltsev fthc.): e.g. KUB 17.10 i (28) *Ú-UL=ya-r=a-an ú-e-mi-ja-nu-un ^dTe-li-pí-nu-un (29) na-ak-ki-in DINGIR^{LAM}* ‘I did not find him, Telipinu, the noble god’, where acc.sg.c. =*an* proleptically refers to ^d*Telipinun nakkin DINGIR^{LAM}*; KBo 39.8 iv (15) *tu-ya-ar-na-at-ta-ru=ya-r=a-at (16) hu-u-ma-an-da*

u[d-d]a-a-ar hu-ur-da-a-uš-š=a ‘May they be broken, all the words and curses!’, where nom.-acc.pl.n. =at proleptically refers to *hūmanda uddār hūrdāušš=a* (both examples from Sideltsev fthc.).

¹⁷ Garrett 1990.

¹⁸ As we saw in footnote 16, the proleptic use of enclitic pronouns is not original in Hittite, but arose due to the influence of other languages (Sideltsev fthc.), and we therefore may assume that it was not original in Proto-Anatolian either. Nevertheless, Luwian and Lycian both show 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).

¹⁹ Contra Garrett 1994: 31f., 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 therewith in fact are SV(O):

TL 75 *mēne* (me=n=e) | *tubidi* : q[l]a[(j)]=eb[i s]e *malija* : se t[asa] : *miñtaha*

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

TL 143 *s=e pij[ete :] mlā:ñnazi* : *ebēññē* : *ñtatu* : *pttlezeje* : | *se ladi e[h]bi mañmahaje* : *kbatri* : *ehbi*
: *se tideime: ehbije*

‘He gave, Mlāñnazi, the appertaining chamber to Pttleze and his wife Mañmaha and to his daughter and his sons’.

²⁰ A similar construction can be found in:

TL 29 *ikuwe=ti* : *prñnawate* : *ipresidah* : *tideimi* : [. . .]pe[h] | *tuhes* : *ñtatu* : *atli* : *se ladi* : *ehbi* :
tuhesi

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

It seems that on the basis of 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 [...] *eburehijē=ti : prñ[n]awate [..]i[.][.][.]. tide]imi [.....]addeh tuhes | hrpp(i)=ēni : ehbi : se tuhe ehbije*

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

TL 126 *prddewā=ti : prñnawa[te] : zānaza : serñmai[...]*

‘(It is) Prddewa, the zānaza, [son of] Serñmai[...], who built it [...].’

In these inscriptions, the nasalisation of [...] *eburehijē=ti* and *prddewā=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 -t-:

TL 62 *unuwēmi=ti prñnawate | purihimrbbeseh tideimi | hrppi : ladi se tideime*

‘(It is) Unuwēmi, the son of Purihimrbbese, who built it for (his) wife and children.’

TL 98 *pizzi=ti : prñnawate : ddepñneweh : tideimi : hrppi | ladi : ehbi : se tideime*

‘(It is) Pizzi, son of Ddepñnewe, who built it for his wife and children.’

TL 116 [...] *ziχle=ti prñnawate piχñmah | tideimi χelijānaχssah prñnezij[ehi]*

‘(It is) [...]ziχle, son of Piχñma, household member of Xelijānaχssa, who built it.’

TL 127 *st[.]maha=t[i prñ]nawate : epñxuça tideimi hrppi | ani[.....]e se tuhe se muneite se [ç]ahbe*

‘(It is) St[.]maha, son of Epñxuça, who built it for (his) *ani*[.....] and nephews and *muneite* and grandchildren’

TL 131 *[.....]a=ti[: pr]ñnawate : hrppi ladi : ehbi*

‘(It is) [.....]a who built it for his wife.’

All these inscriptions then represent the structure S +|=nl +|=til V, which is the variant without overtly expressed object of the cleft construction S + |=til V O. If this is correct, then the following two inscriptions may represent a similar variant of the non-cleft construction:

TL 31 *upazijêne : prñnawate | hrppi : prñezi : ehbi*

‘Upazi built it for his household.’

TL 133 *χñtlapãne : prñnawate : perikleh : mahinaza : epñtibazah | tideimi*

‘Xñtlapa, the *mahinaza* of Perikle, son of Epñtibaza, built it.’

These sentences, where the object is not overtly expressed, seem to show the structure S+ |=nl + |=el V (with *upazijêne* = *upazi* + |=enl + |=el, cf. footnote 6) as opposed to the construction S V O (TL 40a/b *pajawa : manaxine : prñnawate : prñnawã : ebñññ* ‘Pajawa the *manaxine* built the appertaining building.’) where the object is overtly expressed. Apparently, the use of the enclitic acc.sg.c. |=nl required the use of nom.sg.c. |=el as well. Since at least TL 133 can be dated as a relatively late inscription (it mentions the dynast Perikle, who ruled Lycia from ca. 380-362 BC) we might be dealing here with a later development comparable to the one seen in TL 7 and TL 8, below (cf. footnote 26).

²¹ Cf. Gusmani 1962 and Garrett 2004 for such relative clauses, e.g.:

TL 150 *ebeli : m=e sijēni : xssēñzija : | χñtlapah : tideimi : mutleh : | prñnezijehi : prñnawate=ti : |
ñtatā : atli : ehbi*

‘Here, he lies, Xssēñzija, the son of Xñtlapa, the householdmember of Mutle, who built the burial chamber for himself’.

²² On which see Garrett 1991.

²³ Two more examples are the following, where, to be sure, *trqqas* does not carry any modifiers and therefore seems to really not be right-dislocated, but where the full subject consists of [*trqq*]as *se malija hrixuwama* and *trqas se muhāi huwedri*, respectively, and which I therefore still regard as showing the same phenomenon, namely fronting of only the first of the group of words that constitute the subject of the verb:

TL 80 ... *mene [trqq]as tubidi se malija hrixuwama*

‘..., him, the Weathergod and the super-intending(?) Malija will strike.’

TL 93 ... *mēne trqas tubidi se muhāi huwedri*

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

²⁴ A similar fronting seems to be found in the following inscription, where instead of *mēne* we find *mēti*, however (albeit that it here is denasalized to *meti*):

TL 110 *ep[ñt]e=me=i tadi me tise tise prñnawati met(i)=ēñi qanuweti q[la]h[i] eb[ij]ehi*

‘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.’

²⁵ In not all cases where we find this construction an enclitic acc.sg.c. pronoun is used, e.g.:

TL 101 *ebēñnē : χupā : meti : prñnawatē : za[h]ama : ddawāpartah | tideimi : me ñtepi tāti :
za[h]āmā : se : ladā : se : tideimis : ehbi[s]*

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

TL 110 *ebēñnē : χupā : mēti : prñnawatē : medemudi : | se lada : ehbi : me ñtepi tāti : kñmis*

‘The appertaining tomb, it is Medemudi and his wife wo built it, and inside they will place both.’

TL 57 *hrzzi prñnawi : mei : ñtepi tāti | id[ām]axzzā : se l[adā ehbi]*

‘In the upper building, inside it they will place Idāmayzza and his wife.’

TL 145 *[ebēñnē : χupā : m]eti [p]rñnawatē hla : ñterubila : | [hrppi ladi ehbi] se tideimi mei ñtepi tāti
: hlā se lad[ā] | [se tideimi]*

‘The appertaining tomb, it is Hla the ñterubila who built it for his wife and child, and inside it they will place Hla and (his) wife and child.’

²⁶ Which could then be compared to the use of =e in TL 31 and TL 133 (cf. footnote 20).

²⁷ Note that the inscription reads *mijje*. 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 *-ñ-*, a preconsonantal *-n-* and a postconsonantal *-j-*, and therefore should not be taken into account) and since in similar contexts we find *meije* (e.g. N320, 25 *meije=sitēni=ti : hlñmipijata* ‘and which ones among the income-gifts lie therein’, cf. Kloekhorst 2008: 130), it seems justified to me to emend *mijje* to *me^lije*.