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Abstract: Lycian relative clause syntax generally matches that of Hittite and other Anatolian Indo-European languages, with some minor differences due to Lycian SVO word order. One putative major contrast is that Lycian seems to have at least one example showing “overt wh-movement”. Arguments are made that opening formulas with enclitic =ti in funerary inscriptions contain a reflexive particle, not “cleft” structures with the relative pronoun.
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1. Introduction

Garrett offered a comprehensive and coherent account of Lycian relative clause syntax, but it has been shown to be based on several false premises.

First, he assumed that Lycian inherited from Proto-Anatolian (and PIE) “overt wh-movement” by which the interrogative-relative pronoun obligatorily appears in the left periphery of a clause regardless of its syntactic role. As shown by Goedegebuure in the framework of functional discourse grammar and Huggard in a minimalist model, Hittite is an “in situ wh-language”:

(i) KBo 8.23:17 (NH; CTH 209, Letter to the Queen)

nu MUNUS.LUGAL GAŠAN=YA kuit iyaši
‘What will you, the queen, my lady, do?’

(ii) KBo 6.34 i 30 and passim (MH/NS; CTH 427, Military Oath)

kt=wa kuit
‘What is this?’

---

1 I am indebted to Birgit Christiansen, Heiner Eichner, Diether Schürr, and Ilya Yakubovich for helpful comments and suggestions both at the oral presentation of this paper and afterwards. I naturally am responsible for the contents of this written version.


4 Goedegebuure 2009.

5 Huggard 2011 and 2015, 93–112.
Word order in Hittite interrogative and relative clauses is determined by considerations of focus and topicalization. The status of overt wh-movement in Lycian is thus an entirely open question.

Second, Garrett assumed that Lycian also inherited a grammaticalized contrast between “determinate” and “indeterminate” relative clauses in which only the former are marked by obligatory fronting of another full constituent to the left of the relative pronoun. In the latter the relative pronoun itself must undergo fronting and cannot be preceded by anything except sentence conjunctions plus or minus clitics. In “determinate” relative clauses the existence of the referent of the relative noun phrase is presupposed; in “indeterminate” relative clauses it is not. It is crucial to note that the latter are always equivalent to conditional clauses. Attested counterexamples for non-initial “indeterminate” (better “conditional”) relative clauses in both Hittite and Lycian now refute the claim of a grammatical contrast based strictly on word order (for Lycian see 2.1.1 below):

(iii) KBo 5.4 Ro 33–34 (NH; CTH 67, Treaty with Targasnalli)

namma ANA 4UTU-ŠI kuiš LÚ.KÚR [n=aš / tuk] LÚ.KÚR éšdu tuk=ma kuiš LÚ.KÚR ANA 4UTU-ŠI=ya=aš LÚ.KÚR

‘Furthermore, whoever is an enemy to His Majesty, [let him] be an enemy to you, while whoever is an enemy to you, he is also an enemy to His Majesty.’

(iv) KUB 23.72 Vo 27–28 (MH/MS; CTH 146, Mida of Pahhuwa)

n=ašta ANA LÚ.MEŠ ŤUKUHWA kuedani UD-ti k ū r u š m e m i a n ə ārten ašta ANA LÚ.MEŠ ŤUKUHWA kuedani UD-ti k ū r u š m e m i a n ə ārten

‘On whatever day you hear a hostile word among the men of P., on that day [ ] arrive!’

But examples of conditional relative clauses with contrastive topics (in example iii, as defined by Goedegebuure) or another constituent that precedes the relative pronoun are relatively rare (less than ten thus far). As new information whose existence is not presupposed, Hittite preposed conditional relative clauses are in “identification-information” focus and are accordingly “fronted” and appear mostly clause-initially:

(v) KBo 2.2 iii 33–34 (NH; CTH 577, oracular inquiry)

kuiš IKRIBU šarninkuwaš n=an šarninkanzi

‘Whatever votive offering is to be made in restitution, they will give it in restitution.’

Finally, Garrett does not recognize postposed restrictive relative clauses or any kind of embedded relative clauses for Hittite, but both exist. The discussion of Lycian relative clauses by Kloekhorst is ancillary to the main topic and neither comprehensive nor descriptively adequate (cf. below, 2.1.2 and 3). Likewise Eichner treats only one aspect of the problem, with no attempt to ground his analysis in a coherent account of the rest of Lycian relative clause syntax.

---

8 Goedegebuure 2014, 476–479.
9 Goedegebuure 2009.
10 Per Huggard 2011, 98, to “SpecCP.”
12 See Melchert 2016 with references to Probert 2006 and Huggard 2015.
13 Kloekhorst 2011, 15–18.
The entire topic requires reexamination. The presentation here is intended only as a first step. I have restricted the data base to assured examples in complete contexts with clear interpretations, except for one partially restored passage whose syntactic analysis is decisive for the question of whether Lycian has “overt wh- movement”. Debatable forms of the relative pronoun such as *tija*, *tijāi* and *tijēi* have been excluded for now.

2. Attested types of relative clauses in Lycian

2.1 Preposed adjoined relative clauses with resumptive main clauses

2.1.1 Indeterminate (= conditional)

(1) TL 56.3–4

\[se=ije \ tē i: \ edē: \ mē: =ene qasttu: ēni: \ qlahi: \ ebījēhi: \ se \ wedrē: \ wehītezi\]

‘And whoever does any harm to it, let the mother of the local sanctuary—and the w. w.—slay him!’ (= ἐὰν δέ τις ἀδικήσῃ ἢ ἀγοράσῃ τὸ μνήμα)

Further examples with the relative pronoun preceded only by a clausal conjunction with or without enclitics are: TL 6.2, 94.3, 102.2 (first example), 111.2, 128.2, 131.2 and 3, 139.3 (plus less certain cases).

(2) TL 101.2–5

\[me \ ūtepi \ tātē: \ za[h]āmā: \ se: \ ladā: \ se: \ tideimīs: \ ebbi[s] \ tīkē: \ ti \ ūtepi \ tādi: \ a[t]la[h]: \ tībē: \ kbījēhi \ tībe=te: \ ala[h]adē \ tī: \ m=enē: \ mā[h]ādā: \ tūbēti \ wed[rēn]ni\]

‘And they shall put inside Z. and wife and his children. *Whoever puts inside someone else, his own or of someone else, or whoever performs a burial service*, the w. gods shall strike him.’

Other passages illustrating topic shift marked by a constituent to the left of the relative pronoun are: TL 57.9, 106.2, N314b.1–3. Note that all such examples are as predicted equivalent to conditional clauses (as confirmed by the Greek translation of the first example cited).

2.1.2 Determinate

(3) TL 75.2–3

\[s=enē ūte: tātē \ tē \ tōbzei: \ me=ījē: \ ni \ hr[p]pīj \ tātē: \ tīkē: \]

‘And the bench/couch into which they put him, *therein* they shall put no one else in addition.’

(4) N320.25–27

\[me=ījē=siṭēni=tī: \ hīm \ mipijata \ m=ede=te=wē: \ kumēzīdī: \ nuredī: \ nuredī: \ arā: \ kumēhezi: \]

‘And the income-gift that lies therein (accrues thereto), one shall sacrifice it as a rite monthly with a sheep…’

These examples show that against the claim of Kloekhorst\(^{15}\) preposed determinate relative clauses are also resumed by main clauses with the conjunction *me*.

In sum, available evidence argues that in Lycian, as in Hittite, the relative pronoun in indeterminate (conditional) relative clauses, since it stands in identification-information focus, generally appears initial in its clause, but other constituents may appear to its left. Hieroglyphic Luwian preferentially topicalizes some other constituent, but also has examples with the focused relative

\(^{15}\) Kloekhorst 2011, 16.
pronoun clause-initial. The grammar is thus the same in all three languages, the difference being one of diction. Thus far, Lycian preposed determinate relative clauses appear only with other constituents (sometimes multiple) in focus and thus to the left of the relative pronoun. One should note, however, that Lycian, unlike Hittite, preferentially “fronts” the finite verb,16 a fact surely related to the overall frequency of verb “fronting” in Lycian.17

2.2 Clearly embedded relative clauses

2.2.1 Coordinated as a noun phrase with another noun phrase

2.2.1.1 Internally headed

(5) TL 124.1–8  
\[\text{ebēnē nuxpu } \text{se=i hri=ti } \text{ntipa } \text{m=e ti } \text{adē uhetēi ebehi } \text{ntatā} \]
‘As for this tomb and the ň that is on top of it, U. made himself them as his burial chamber.’

This example is erroneously listed as a preposed relative clause by Garrett,18 but it clearly is part of a topicalized direct object consisting of two coordinated noun phrases.

2.2.1.2 Free relative (with no antecedent/domain noun)

(6) N320.29–30  
\[\text{me=kumezidi: seimija: se=de: seimijaje: xuwati=tį;} \]
‘And S. shall serve as priest, and one who stands near (is related to) S.’

2.2.2 Embedded within the main clause (both examples are free relatives)

(7) TL 87.4–5  
\[\text{me=i=pñ: pudẽ: ti } \text{xahba: [eh]bi: wazzije: kbatra} \]
‘And afterwards his grandchild, the daughter of W., engraved on it who/what is inside.’19

(8) N320.22–25  
\[\text{se=wa(j)=aitẽ: kumaha: ēti sttali: ppuweti: kānme: ebehi: xňtawataha: xbindēnaha: se=rKKazumaha;} \]
‘And they made sacred as belonging to the King of Kaunos and Arkesima as much as they write on this stele.’

I emphasize that the word order in the second example cannot be attributed to influence from the Greek version, where the relative clause is embedded as the clause-initial subject of the main clause with a passive verb. Against previous claims, both types (embedded relative clauses coordinated with another noun phrase and relative clauses embedded within the main clause) also exist in Hittite.20

---

16 See already descriptively Gusmani 1962.
18 Garrett 1994, 53.
2.3 Postposed (or embedded?) relative clauses

2.3.1 Non-restrictive relative clauses

(9) TL 150.1–4

‘Here lies X., son of X., household member of M., who built the burial chamber for himself.’

(10) N310.1–3

ebēñnē: xup[ã m=]ène: prñnawatẽ xlasitili: magabatah: tideimi xali: qeñnite=ti: ebēñnē:
‘As for this tomb, X., son of M. built it, who q-ed this temenos(?)’

2.3.2 Restrictive relative clauses

(11) TL 80.2

se=i=ni ñtepi tãtu tike ne=de xuwati=ti
‘And let them not put in it anyone who does not stand near (is not related).’

2.3.3 “Indefinite” relative clauses

(12) TL 93.1–2

e[eb]ēñn[ẽ x]upã m=ẽ=t[i p]rñn[ã]watẽ upazi musxxah tideimi hrppi ladi: ebhi: se tideime: 
‘As for this tomb, U., son of M., built himself it for his wife and (any) children who remain.’

(13) TL N320.20–22

se=sm̃ mati: xddazas: epi=de arawa: hāti kṛn mētis: me=i=pibiti: sixlas:
‘And they shall oblige as many slaves as they release into freedom that they give shekels (i.e., one each).’

2.3.4 Free relatives

(14) N320.11–12

se=i pijētẽ: arawã: ehbijẽ: esi=tĩ:
‘And they gave him freedom (for) that which is his.’

(15) N320.41

me=hrīqa: ašñe: pzziti=tĩ
‘And the supreme temenos is to carry out what he (Pixodaros) decrees/decides.’

---


22 Both (12) and (13) thus with Garrett 1994, 58, against Samuels 2005, 287–288 with arbitrary and implausible syntactic analyses.

23 See Melchert 1999 for the interpretation.
Garrett tentatively takes all of these examples as embedded, followed by Samuels, who gives an explicit syntactic analysis. Note that all but the free relatives would by this analysis be externally headed. But Garrett concedes that only free relatives are unambiguously attested as embedded (see examples (7) and (8) above), and that in Lycian, which is not SOV (like Hittite), one cannot easily tell whether examples (9)–(15) are embedded or postposed. At least one example seems to point to postposing:

(16) TL 75.2–4
s=ene ñte: tāti tdi isbazi: me=ije: ni hr[ppi] tātu: tike: ŭmē: ladā=[(ije hrppi: lati
hrppi]=[ije me]=i: tadi: tike: kbi:

‘And the bench/couch into which they put him, therein they shall put no one else in addition, except the wife, whom they shall allow therein in addition. If one puts anyone else in addition therein…’ or ‘…except a wife whom they shall allow therein in addition…’

For the suggestion that the verb lati belongs to la- ‘to allow’ see Christiansen. The standard interpretation ‘who dies’ is very hard to motivate in the presence of ije ‘therein’. A reading either as a non-restrictive relative clause or as an indefinite relative clause is contextually possible.

This attractive analysis has a major unavoidable implication: it requires that Lycian have overt wh-movement—the direct object ti precedes both an adverb and the finite verb. While sure diagnostic examples for in situ wh-pronouns in interrogative clauses predictably are lacking in Lycian, I must underscore that there is no other positive evidence for overt wh-movement.

In the oral presentation of this paper I assumed only with great reluctance the major grammatical feature of overt wh-movement in Lycian based on a single partially restored example. I therefore was prepared to gratefully adopt with slight modification a suggestion of Ilya Yakubovich (personal communication): to restore a predicatival infinitive la(ne], for which compare example (15), and to interpret the relative clause as ‘…except the wife, who is to be allowed therein in addition’ or ‘…except a wife who is to be allowed...’. However, Birgit Christiansen has now generously shared with me a much better photo than that presented in Christiansen 2019, 231. It shows a clear reading of the preceding hrppi and an unmistakable <T> representing the t as the third letter of the verb. Traces of <E> representing the final -i are much fainter, but also seem to be present. In any case, the context calls for a present-future, not a preterite. Since the next clause is the protasis of a sanction formula, one also cannot separate the relative clause from ŭmē: ladā and construe it with what follows. While at least one further compelling example of “overt wh-movement” in Lycian would be welcome, present evidence argues that this feature is part of Lycian grammar.

3. Excursus

Before concluding, I must deal at some length with a challenge to the otherwise coherent picture of Lycian relative clause syntax just presented. Sentences like (17) and (18) are generally regarded as showing a reflexive particle =ti:

24 Garrett 1994, 60.
26 Christiansen 2019, 232.
28 I am following Christiansen 2019, 240 and passim in interpreting hrppi as an adverb meaning ‘in addition’, not physically ‘on top’.
29 Note that wh-movement of the direct object ti is unavoidable either with the relative clause embedded as the object of the preposition ŭmē (‘except which wife...’) or with a postposed relative clause with an external domain noun (‘except the wife, whom...’).
(17) TL 99.1–2
*purih*mete=t*i*: prñnawate: masasah: tideimi xupã: ebẽñnẽ hrppi: atli: ehbi: se tideime: ehbije:
‘P., son of M., built himself this tomb for him(self) and his children.’

(18) TL 105.1–2
ebẽñnẽ: xupu m=ẽ=ti: prñnawatẽ esete: muleseh atli: ehbi: se ladi: se tideime
‘As for this tomb, E., (son of) M., built himself it for him(self) and (his) wife and children.’

However, Eichner,30 Tekoğlu,31 and Kloekhorst32 have argued that such structures contain the relative pronoun ti in a “cleft” (17) or “pseudo-cleft” (18) construction.

The arguments made by Kloekhorst against the interpretation of =*ti* as a reflexive are entirely non-probative,33 being based on the erroneous premise that the reflexive must have a self-benefactive sense (and would thus be redundant in cases like (17) and contradictory in cases like (12) above). As argued by Christiansen, not all reflexives in other languages are self-benefactive (see her discussion of German examples). Likewise in at least some speakers’ English ‘I built myself this house/tomb for me’ and ‘I built myself this house/tomb for the family’ and similar sentences are entirely grammatical. The reflexives in such sentences underscore the subject’s self-interest in the actions taken, whether or not the subject is the beneficiary.34 Unlike true benefactive reflexives, they are entirely optional and may be omitted without changing the sense of the sentence (thus the absence of =*ti* in cases like (19) is also entirely expected:35

(19) TL 37.1–6
ebẽñnẽ: xupã: m=ẽne prñnawatẽ: mede: epñnẽni ehbi: hm ̃ prãma: se(j)=atli
‘As for this tomb, M. built it for his younger brother H. and himself.’

Kloekhorst claims that in examples like (18) *m=ẽ=ti*: prñnawatẽ esete: muleseh is “the core sentence” and that *m=ẽ=ti*: prñnawatẽ is an embedded relative clause, the subject of a nominal sentence ‘The one who built it (is) E., (son of) M.’.36 But by his own analysis,37 (18) is a derived topicalized structure, formed from an underlying structure like that in (17) by left dislocation of the direct object and a resumptive pronoun, which appears only as the result of left-dislocation of the direct object noun phrase.38 As per Kloekhorst and Eichner,39 against Garrett, Samuels, and Daues,40 the synchronically unmarked word order in Lycian is SVO, as shown by (20), from which structure (21) is derived by the same process as that of (18) from (17):41

---

32 Kloekhorst 2011, 14–18.
33 Thus also Christiansen *forthcoming* ad TL 98.
34 There are also non-standard dialects in which the non-reflexive pronoun is used in this function: ‘I built me this house/tomb for myself/for the family.’
35 Against Kloekhorst 2011, 14.
36 Kloekhorst 2011, 15–16.
37 See also Kloekhorst 2011, 18.
38 See similarly Garrett 1992; Samuels 2005, 278–279; Goldstein 2014, 102 with n. 4; Eichner 2017, 283 and Daues 2009, 54–55, who also stresses that ebe ‘this’ has undergone contrastive focus within the topicalized noun phrase.
41 Note, however, against Kloekhorst that the word order Verb Subject in (21) must be due to verb fronting, not right dislocation of the subject noun phrase, which is precluded by examples like (5) and (19), where the subject is followed by non-dislocated constituents of the verb phrase.
(20) TL 40b.1–3 (identical to 40a)
pajawa m[aj]n[ax]ine: prñnawate: prñnawā ebēñe
‘P. m. built this grave-house.’

(21) TL 70.1–3
ebēñe: xupā m=ene prñnawatẽ sbikaza xñtanubeh tideimi temusemutah tuhes
‘As for this tomb, S., son of X., cousin of T., built it.’

There is no basis whatsoever for assuming fronting of the subject in (20). See also for unmarked SVO order TL 31.3–4, 104a, and 104b (both clauses!). Per Kloekhorst, a sentence like (17), repeated here for convenience, is a “cleft sentence”:

(17) TL 99.1–2
‘P., son of M., built himself this tomb for him(self) and his children.’

A cleft reading of this sentence requires that purihimeti be part of the main clause (a nominal sentence), and thus the antecedent of an externally headed relative clause: ‘It is P. who built…’ Alternatively, one may with Eichner analyze the structure as ‘Purihimeti is the one who built…’: P. (is) NP[ [ti prñnawate…] ]S, with the relative clause embedded as the predicate noun phrase of the main clause. Contrary to my claim in the oral presentation of this paper, Hittite likely shows similar structures:

(vii) KBo 4.13 iv 20 (NH; CTH 68.C, Treaty with Kupanta-Kuruntiya)
[ŋ]amma=za=kan šu[m]ēš kuiēš 3 LÚ.MEŠ ELLU
‘Furthermore, it is you who are the three free men.’ or
‘Furthermore, you are the ones who are three free men.’

My first objection to the cleft analysis thus falls. There remain, however, two problems. First, masasah: tideimi, which is clearly appositive to purihimeti in (17) would be right-dislocated into the following relative clause, an unattested process in any language to my knowledge. But real speakers famously violate syntactic constraints with some frequency. Based on “licit” cases of “heavy NP shift” as in (22) below (see also TL 51 and N 311), speakers could have produced “illicit” structures as in (17) (also in TL 62, 98, 116, 126, and 127). This point alone is thus less than probative.

(22) TL 133
xñtlapa=ʯne: prñnawate: perikleh: mahinaza: epñtibazah tideimi
‘X. built it, the m. of P., son of E.’

Far more serious is the second problem, that structures of the type of (18), entirely grammatical with a reflexive pronoun, would require by the “cleft” analysis that the direct object noun phrase be left-dislocated out of a relative clause:
(18) TL 105.1–2

*ebẽñnẽ: xupu m=ẽ=ti: prñnawatẽ esete: muleseh atli: ehbi: se ladi: se tideime*

‘As for this tomb, E. (son of) M., built himself it for him(self) and (his) wife and children.’ vs. from an underlying

esete muleseh ti prñnawate xupu ebẽñnẽ atli ehbi se ladi se tideime

‘It is E., (son of) M., who built this tomb for himself, his wife, and children.’

That such a structure became grammaticalized seems extremely unlikely. We must conclude that a relative clause analysis of such clauses is very problematic. Expressed concerns about the reflexive analysis\(^{47}\) must also be relativized. First, there is at least one assured example of the reflexive particle outside of the opening tomb formula:

(23) TL 44b.60–61

*se=ti: teθθiweibi: ade mê: leθθi: qlã:*

‘And T. likewise made himself a precinct of Leto.’

Another very likely example appears in TL 149.14, where *me=ti mazaiti* has little chance of containing the relative pronoun. Further possible occurrences are found in *me=ti* in TL 29.3 and 14. In view of our extremely limited understanding of Lycian B it cannot be excluded that examples in its corpus have been overlooked. Finally, the total number of occurrences of the relative pronoun in Lycian (A) is modest, so the absence of co-occurrence with the reflexive may easily be due to chance.\(^{48}\) Such combinations are not overly frequent in the Hittite corpus.\(^{49}\)

4. Conclusion

Current available evidence suggests that Lycian relative clause syntax mostly matches that of Hittite. First, preposed conditional (“indeterminate”) relative clauses mostly show the relative pronoun initial in clause, but as in Hittite there are some undeniable exceptions. Second, all preposed “determinate” relative clauses attested thus far have a non-initial relative pronoun, but in Lycian this results mostly from focusing of the finite verb, which is rare in Hittite (where other constituents are topicalized or focused). Third, internally headed and free relatives may be embedded as coordinated noun phrases and within main clauses. Fourth, restrictive, non-restrictive, indefinite, and free relative clauses appear descriptively postposed to a main clause, and that is the likely, but not assuredly, correct syntactic analysis, based on the final finding: there appears to be at least one example of “overt *wh*-movement” in a postposed relative clause.

Bibliography


---

\(^{46}\) The problem is the same with Eichner’s (2017, 286) analysis: ‘E., (son) of M., is the one who built this tomb...’ > ‘*This tomb, E., (son) of M., is the one who built it...’.

\(^{47}\) Eichner 2017, 285 and after the oral presentation of this paper.

\(^{48}\) Since a reflexive with ‘give’ is unlikely, the sequence *tibe=ti=pe=wē=pijeti=tdi* in N 324.27 probably shows a double-*wh* construction: ‘Or whatever they give to whomever (= anyone)..’

\(^{49}\) Of 70 occurrences of the reflexive particle in Old Hittite/Old Script just one cooccurs with a relative pronoun, and of 170 instances in assured Middle Hittite compositions in Middle Script a modest five. The large number of duplicates makes it impossible for a rapid survey to arrive at meaningful figures for the much larger corpus of New Hittite compositions, but cooccurrence surely appears in no more than five percent of examples of the reflexive.

CHRISTIANSEN, B. forthcoming: Corpus der lykischen Inschriften I. Die ostlykischen Inschriften.
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Die Erforschung der altanatolischen Sprachen findet an der Schnittstelle zwischen Altorientalistik und Indogermanistik statt und in beiden Disziplinen gehört dieser Sprachzweig zweifellos zu den Bereichen, in denen die Forschung besonders intensiv voranschreitet.

Dies zeigen auch die Entwicklungen der letzten Jahrzehnte, innerhalb derer sich die luwische Philologie von einem Nischenthema der Hethitologie zu einer der wichtigsten Teildisziplinen der Altanatolistik entwickelt hat.


Erfreulicherweise traf unsere Einladung auf positive Resonanz und der Workshop wurde durch viele interessante Beiträge von führenden Expertinnen und Experten des Lykischen und auch aus der jüngeren Generation der Wissenschaft bereichert.

