



Lycian Relative Clauses


H. Craig Melchert*

* – Carrboro, NC. Email: melchert@humnet.ucla.edu

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.

Keywords: clefts, Lycian, reflexive particle, relative clauses

Cite as Melchert, H. C. 2021: Lycian Relative Clauses. *Hungarian Assyriological Review* 2: 65–75. <https://doi.org/10.52093/hara-202101-00013-000>

 This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

1. Introduction¹

Garrett offered a comprehensive and coherent account of Lycian relative clause syntax,² 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.³ As shown by Goedegebuure in the framework of functional discourse grammar⁴ and Huggard in a minimalist model,⁵ 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)

kī=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.

² Garrett 1994.

³ Garrett 1994, 51–55, after Hale 1987.

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.⁶ 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):⁷

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

namma ANA ^dUTU-ŠI *kuiš* LÚ.KÚR [*n=aš / tuk*] LÚ.KÚR *ēšdu tuk=ma kuiš* LÚ.KÚR *ANA* ^dUTU-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 ^{URU}*Pahhuwa kuedani UD-ti kūruraš memian anda ištamašteni nu apēdan[i UD-ti ...] arten*

‘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 Goedegebuure⁸) 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” focus⁹ and are accordingly “fronted”¹⁰ 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,¹¹ but both exist.¹²

The discussion of Lycian relative clauses by Kloekhorst¹³ is ancillary to the main topic and neither comprehensive nor descriptively adequate (*cf.* below, 2.1.2 and 3). Likewise Eichner¹⁴ 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.

⁶ Garrett 1994, 44–47, following Held 1957 and Hale 1987.

⁷ See Melchert 2016 and for Hittite, Huggard 2015, 134–138.

⁸ Goedegebuure 2014, 476–479.

⁹ Goedegebuure 2009.

¹⁰ *Per* Huggard 2011, 98, to “SpecCP.”

¹¹ Garrett 1994.

¹² See Melchert 2016 with references to Probert 2006 and Huggard 2015.

¹³ Kloekhorst 2011, 15–18.

¹⁴ Eichner 2017, 285–286.

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 ti edi: tike: mētē: m=ene qasttu: ēni: qlahi: ebijehi: se wedri: wehñtezi

‘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 μνημα)

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 ñtepi tāti: za[h]āmā: se: ladā: se: tideimis: ehbi[s] kbi: tike: ti ñtepi tadi: a[t]la[h]i: tibe: kbijehi tibe=te: ala[h]adi ti: m=ene: mǎ[h]āi: tubeiti wed[rēñ]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=ene ñte: tāti tdi isbazi: me=ije: ni hr[ppi] tātu: tike:

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

(4) N320.25–27

me=ije=sitēni=ti: hlñ mipijata m=ede=te=wē: kumezidi: nuredi: nuredi: arā: kumehedi:

‘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 Kloekhorst¹⁵ 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

ebēññē xupu se=i hri=ti ñtipa m=e=ti adē uhetēi ebehi ñtatā

‘As for *this* tomb and the ñ. 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

me=kumezidi: seimija: se=de: seimijaje: xuwati=ti:

‘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

me=i=pñ: pudē: ti ñte 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

se=wa(j)=aitē: kumaha: ēti sttali: ppuweti: kñmē: ebehi: xñtawataha: xbidēñnaha: 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.

¹⁷ Cf. Garrett 1994, 55–56.

¹⁸ Garrett 1994, 53.

¹⁹ Thus with Garrett 1994, 59 against Melchert 2004, 65.

²⁰ See Melchert 2016, 292–294.

2.3 Postposed (or embedded?) relative clauses

2.3.1 Non-restrictive relative clauses

(9) TL 150.1–4

ebeli: me sijēni: xssēñzija: xñtlapah: tideimi: mutleh: prñnezijehi: prñnawate=ti: ñtatā: atli: ehbi:

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

(10) N310.1–3

ebēññē: xup[ā m=]jēne: prñnawatē xlasitili: magabatah: tideimi xali: gehñnite=ti: ebēññē:

‘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 tātu 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 clauses²¹

(12) TL 93.1–2

e[b]ēññ[ē x]upā m=ē=t[i p]rñn[a]watē upazi musxxah tideimi hrppi ladi: ehbi: se tideime: sttati=ti

‘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=sñ mati: xddazas: epi=de arawa: hāti kñmētis: me=i=pibiti: sixlas:

‘And they shall oblige as many slaves as they release into freedom that they give shekels (i.e., one each).’²²

2.3.4 Free relatives

(14) N320.11–12

se=i pijētē: arawā: ehbijē: esi=ti:

‘And they gave him freedom (for) that which is his.’

(15) N320.41²³

me=hriqla: asñne: pzziti=ti

‘And the supreme temenos is to carry out what he (Pixodaros) decrees/decides.’

²¹ See for the definition Garrett 1994, 47–48.

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,²⁴ followed by Samuels,²⁵ 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: tãti tdi isbazi: me=ije: ni hr[ppi] tãtu: tike: ñmẽ: ladã ti=(i)je hrppi: latĩ
hrppi=[(i)je 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 *latĩ* belongs to *la-* ‘to allow’ see Christiansen.²⁶ The standard interpretation ‘who dies’²⁷ 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.²⁸ 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.²⁹

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 predicative 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 *ñmẽ: ladã* 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.

²⁵ Samuels 2005, 286–287.

²⁶ Christiansen 2019, 232.

²⁷ See Hajnal 1995, 110 n. 100; Melchert 2004, 34; and Neumann 2007, 180.

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 *ñmẽ* (‘except which wife...’) or with a postposed relative clause with an external domain noun (‘except the wife, whom...’).

(17) TL 99.1–2

purihimeti=ti: prñnawate: masasah: tideimi xupā: ebēñnē hrppi: atli: ehbi: se tideime: ehbi:
 ‘P., son of M., built himself this tomb for him(self) and his children.’

(18) TL 105.1–2

ebēñnē: xupu m=ē=ti: prñnawatē 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

ebēñnē: xupā: m=ēne prñnawatē: mede: epññēni ehbi: hñ prāma: 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=ē=ti: prñnawatē esete: muleseh* is “the core sentence” and that *m=ē=ti: prñnawatē* 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

³⁰ Eichner *apud* Borchhardt *et al.* 1997–1999, 62–63 and Eichner 2017, 285–286.

³¹ Tekoğlu *apud* Seyer – Tekoğlu 2009, 222 with n. 12.

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.

³⁹ Kloekhorst 2011, 17 and Eichner 2017, 285.

⁴⁰ Garrett 1994, 30–36; Samuels 2005 and Daues 2009, 550.

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[a]n[ax]jine: prñnawate: prñnawā ebēñnē:

‘P. m. built this grave-house.’

(21) TL 70.1–3

ebēñnē: xupā m=ene prñnawatē 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,⁴² a sentence like (17), repeated here for convenience, is a “cleft sentence”:

(17) TL 99.1–2

purihimeti=ti: prñnawate: masasah: tideimi xupā: ebēñnē hrppi: atli: ehbi: se tideime: ehbi:

‘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...’_S [(It is) P.]_S [*ti prñnawate:...*]_S. Alternatively, one may with Eichner⁴³ analyze the structure as ‘Purihimeti is the one who built...’:_S [P. (is)]_{NP} [*ti prñnawate:...*]_{NP}_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)

[n]amma=za=kan šu[m]ēš kuiēš 3 LÚ.MEŠ ELLU

‘Furthermore, it is you who are the three free men.’⁴⁴ or

‘Furthermore, you are the ones who are three free men.’⁴⁵

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=~ne: 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:

⁴² Kloekhorst 2011, 16.

⁴³ Eichner 2017, 286.

⁴⁴ Beckman 1996, 76.

⁴⁵ See similarly KUB 19.76+21.1+ iii 31 (NH; CTH 76.A, Treaty with Alaksandu).

(18) TL 105.1–2

ebēñnē: xupu m=ē=ti: prñnawatē 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 ebēñnē atli ehbi se ladi se tideime*

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

*‘This tomb, it is E. (son of) M. who built it for himself, his wife, and children.’⁴⁶

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 analysis⁴⁷ 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: teθθiweiibi: ade mē: leθθi: qlā:

‘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

BECKMAN, G. 1996: *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*. (SBL Writings from the Ancient World 7) Atlanta.

BORCHHARDT, J. – EICHNER, H. – PESDITSCHKEK, M. – RUGGENDORFER, P. 1997–1999: Archäologisch-sprachwissenschaftliches Corpus der Denkmäler mit lykischer Schrift. *Anzeiger der philologisch-historischen Klasse, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften* 134/2, 11–96.

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. 2019: Grave Matters. Legal Provisions for a Proper Final Rest in Classical Lycia. In: ZIMMERMANN, M. (ed.): *Das Xanthostal in archaisch-klassischer Zeit. Eine archäologisch-historische Bestandsaufnahme*. (Die hellenistische Polis als Lebensform 7) Göttingen, 166–261. <https://doi.org/10.13109/9783946317616.166>
- CHRISTIANSEN, B. forthcoming: *Corpus der lykischen Inschriften I. Die ostlykischen Inschriften*.
- DAUES, A. 2009: Form und Funktion – die Wortstellung in den lykischen Grabinschriften. In: RIEKEN, E. – WIDMER, P. (eds.): *Pragmatische Kategorien. Akten der Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 24. bis 26. September 2007 in Marburg*. Wiesbaden, 53–63.
- EICHNER, H. 2017: Ein philologisch-sprachwissenschaftlicher Blick auf den Fortgang der lykischen Studien seit Emmanuel Laroche. In: MOUTON, A. (ed.): *Hittitology Today. Studies on Hittite and Neo-Hittite Anatolia in Honor of Emmanuel Laroche's 100th Birthday. L'hittitologie aujourd'hui. Études sur l'Anatolie hittite et néo-hittite à l'occasion du centenaire de la naissance d'Emmanuel Laroche. 5^{èmes} Rencontres d'archéologie de l'IFÉA, Istanbul, 21-22 novembre, 2014*. Istanbul, 277–299. <https://doi.org/10.4000/books.ifeagd.3587>
- 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.
- GOEDEGEBUURE, P. 2009: Focus Structure and Q-word Questions in Hittite. *Linguistics* 47, 945–969. <https://doi.org/10.1515/LING.2009.033>
- GOEDEGEBUURE, P. 2014: *The Hittite Demonstratives. Studies in Deixis, Topics and Focus*. (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 55) Wiesbaden. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvc16s5m>
- GOLDSTEIN, D. 2014: Object agreement in Lycian. *Historische Sprachforschung* 127, 101–124. <https://doi.org/10.13109/hisp.2014.127.1.101>
- GUSMANI, R. 1962: Zur Frage des lykischen Relativpronomens. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 67, 159–176.
- HAJNAL, I. 1995: *Der lykische Vokalismus. Methode und Erkenntnisse der vergleichenden anatolischen Sprachwissenschaft, angewandt auf das Vokalsystem einer Kleincorpussprache*. Graz.
- HALE, M. 1987: Notes on Wackernagel's Law in the Language of the Rigveda. In: WATKINS, C. (ed.): *Studies in Memory of Warren Cowgill. Papers from the Fourth East Coast Indo-European Conference, Cornell University 1985*. (Studies in Indo-European Language and Culture 3) Berlin – New York, 38–59.
- HELD, W. 1957: *The Hittite Relative Sentence*. (Language Dissertations 55) Baltimore. <https://doi.org/10.2307/522235>
- HUGGARD, M. 2011: On *Wh*-(Non)-Movement and Internal Structures of the Hittite Preposed Relative Clause. In: JAMISON, S. W. – MELCHERT, H. C. – VINE, B. (eds.): *Proceedings of the 22nd Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference. November 5th and 6th, 2010*. Bremen, 83–104.
- HUGGARD, M. 2015: *Wh-words in Hittite. A Study in Syntax-Semantics and Syntax-Phonology Interfaces*. Unpublished PhD dissertation (University of California Los Angeles). Los Angeles.
- KLOEKHORST, A. 2011: The Opening Formula of Lycian Funerary Inscriptions: *mēti* vs. *mēne*. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 70, 13–23. <https://doi.org/10.1086/658474>
- MELCHERT, H. C. 1999: Once More on the Conclusion of the Lycian Trilingual of the Létôn. *Historische Sprachforschung* 112, 75–77.
- MELCHERT, H. C. 2004: *A Dictionary of the Lycian Language*. Ann Arbor – New York.
- MELCHERT, H. C. 2016: Relative Clauses in Anatolian. In: NERI, S. – SCHUHMAN, R. – ZEILFELDER, S. (eds.): *»dat ih dir it nu bi huldi gibu« Linguistische, germanistische und indogermanistische Studien Rosemarie Lühr gewidmet*. Wiesbaden, 287–295.
- NEUMANN, G. 2007: *Glossar des Lykischen. Überarbeitet und zum Druck gebracht von Johann Tischler*. (Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie 21) Wiesbaden.

- PROBERT, PH. 2006: Clause Boundaries in Old Hittite Relative Sentences. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 104, 17–83. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-968X.2006.00165.x>
- SAMUELS, B. 2005: On the Left Periphery in Anatolian. *Linguistic Analysis* 35, 275–297.
- SEYER, M. – TEKOĞLU, R. 2009: Das Felsgrab des Stamaha in Ostlykien – ein Zeugnis für die Ostpolitik des Perikle von Limyra? *Die Sprache* 48, 217–226.



HUNGARIAN ASSYRIOLOGICAL REVIEW



VOLUME 2 | ISSUE 1 | 2021



HUNGARIAN
ASSYRIOLOGICAL
REVIEW



ON THE COVER:

The pillared sarcophagus and the Harpy Tomb, Xanthos
Photo: Diether Schürr.

HUNGARIAN ASSYRIOLOGICAL REVIEW



VOLUME 2, ISSUE 1
2021



ELTE
EÖTVÖS LORÁND
TUDOMÁNYEGYETEM

Institute of Archaeological Sciences
Institute of Ancient and Classical Studies
Eötvös Loránd University
Budapest



HUNGARIAN ASSYRIOLOGICAL REVIEW

HAR – Hungarian Assyriological Review

Journal of the Institute of Archaeological Sciences and the Institute of Ancient and Classical Studies (Department of Assyriology and Hebrew Studies), Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary.

HAR is a peer-reviewed electronic journal (HU ISSN 2732-2610) published in two issues per year. The journal covers the philology and the archaeology of the Ancient Near East, publishing research articles, brief notes, and field reports.

Papers in HAR are published under the platinum open access model, which means permanent and free access in downloadable format (pdf) for readers and no publication fees for authors. The issues can be both downloaded for free and ordered as printed volumes at own cost.

For article submission guidelines, see <https://harjournal.com/author-guidelines/>

Editorial board

Editor-in-chief (*szerkesztésért felelős személy*):

Gábor Kalla, *Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest*

Associate editors:

Zsombor J. Földi, *Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, München*

Zsolt Simon, *Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, München*

Editorial board:

Tamás Dezső, *Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest*

Gábor Zólyomi, *Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest*

Technical editor:

Attila Király

Publisher (*kiadó és kiadásért felelős személy*):

Gábor Kalla, *Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest*

Registered office (*a kiadó székhelye*):

Institute of Archaeological Sciences, Múzeum krt. 4/B., 1088 Budapest, Hungary

Email address:

info@harjournal.com

Design and typesetting:

Attila Király (attila@litikum.hu)

using Noto font family by Google Inc., under the terms of the SIL Open Font License.

CONTENTS

Hungarian Assyriological Review

volume 2, issue 1, 2021

Vorwort <i>Zsolt Simon</i>	9
Lycian <i>Wexssere</i> , <i>Waxssepdimi</i> and related forms <i>Ignasi-Xavier Adiego</i>	11
Palaeographic dating of Lycian inscriptions. A critical review of former studies and a new approach <i>Birgit Christiansen</i>	27
Lycian relative clauses <i>H. Craig Melchert</i>	65
The distribution of <i>-a-</i> and <i>-e-</i> in the Lycian genitival adjective suffix <i>Stefan Norbruis</i>	77
Observations on the Xanthos trilingual: syntactic structure of TL 44a, 41–55 and the Lycian terminology of art and war <i>Rostislav Oreshko</i>	95
Worttrennung in den lykischen Inschriften <i>Annick Payne</i>	145
Die Deutung von lykisch <i>terñ</i> und ihre Konsequenz für die Kriegspolitik Lykiens <i>David Sasseville</i>	161
Überlegungen zu lykischen Inschriften bei Kadyanda <i>Diether Schürr</i>	173
Once again on the etymology of the Lycian personal name <i>Trbbēnime/i-</i> <i>Matilde Serangeli</i>	183
Ḫinduwa: Kindye oder Kandyba? <i>Zsolt Simon</i>	197
Hungarian Assyriological Review author guidelines	205





Vorwort

Zsolt Simon*

* – Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München. Email: zsltsimon@gmail.com

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.

Im Schatten des Luwischen, das seine Popularität innerhalb der Forschungsgemeinschaft u.a. auch spektakulären Inschriftenfunden verdankt, steht jedoch die ebenfalls schnell voranschreitende Erforschung seiner Schwestersprache, des Lykischen (und seiner Varietäten). Um den Austausch über die zahlreichen neuen Ergebnisse zu diesem Thema innerhalb eines angemessenen Forums zu fördern und der Forschung weitere Impulse zu geben, wurde dem Lykischen im Rahmen des Wörterbuchprojekts „*The Digital Philological-Etymological Dictionary of the Minor Ancient Anatolian Corpus Languages*“ am Institut für Assyriologie und Hethitologie der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München ein zweitägiger internationaler Workshop („*Current Research on Lycian*“, 16.-17. Februar 2017) gewidmet.

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.

Diese Ausgabe der *Hungarian Assyriological Review* enthält die überarbeitete Fassung eines Großteils der Vorträge dieses Workshops (einige Vorträge wurden bzw. werden aus unterschiedlichen Gründen an anderen Stellen veröffentlicht). Wie in der Altanatolistik üblich, besprechen die Beiträge nicht nur sprachwissenschaftliche Probleme, sondern befassen sich auch mit verwandten Fragestellungen u.a. der alten Geschichte, der Prosopographie, der historischen Geographie und der Numismatik. Daher hoffen wir, dass dieser Band nicht nur innerhalb der historischen Sprachwissenschaften, sondern auch für Interessierte aus benachbarten Disziplinen eine interessante Lektüre bieten kann. Ein vielversprechender Dialog ergibt sich zudem aus dem Umstand, dass einige im Band angesprochene Forschungsthemen gleich von mehreren Autoren aus unterschiedlichen Perspektiven behandelt werden.

Schließlich möchte ich meinen aufrichtigen Dank für diejenigen ausdrücken, ohne die der Workshop und dieser Band nicht hätten zustande kommen können. Hier ist zunächst die Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft zu nennen, die durch die Finanzierung des *eDiAna*-Wörterbuchprojekts den dazugehörigen Workshop überhaupt erst ermöglicht hat. Für die Unterstützung bei der reibungslosen Organisation des Workshops danke ich außerdem meinen Kolleginnen Anja Busse und Tatiana Frühwirt sowie insbesondere der ehemaligen Institutssekretärin Regine Reichenbach. Des Weiteren bin ich meinen Mitherausgebern des *Hungarian Assyriological Review* dankbar, die freundlicherweise bereit waren, die Ergebnisse des Workshops in unserer Zeitschrift zu veröffentlichen. Nicht zuletzt gilt mein Dank allen Vortragenden und den Autorinnen und Autoren dieses Bandes, insbesondere für ihre Geduld während der langen Vorbereitungszeit vor der Veröffentlichung.

