



»dat ih dir it nu bi huldi gibu«

Linguistische, germanistische und indogermanistische Studien
Rosemarie Lühr gewidmet

Herausgegeben von Sergio Neri, Roland Schuhmann
und Susanne Zeilfelder

unter Mitarbeit von Satoko Hisatsugi

WIESBADEN 2016
DR. LUDWIG REICHERT VERLAG

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation
in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten
sind im Internet über <http://dnb.dnb.de> abrufbar.

© 2016 Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag Wiesbaden
ISBN: 978-3-95490-169-2
www.reichert-verlag.de

Das Werk einschließlich aller seiner Teile ist urheberrechtlich geschützt.
Jede Verwertung außerhalb der engen Grenzen des Urheberrechtsgesetzes ist ohne
Zustimmung des Verlages unzulässig und strafbar.

Das gilt insbesondere für Vervielfältigungen, Übersetzungen, Mikroverfilmungen
und die Speicherung und Verarbeitung in elektronischen Systemen.
Gedruckt auf säurefreiem Papier (alterungsbeständig pH7 –, neutral)

Printed in Germany

Inhaltsverzeichnis

Vorwort	1
Publikationsliste von Rosemarie Lühr	3
<i>Katrin Axel-Tober</i> Satzadverbiale im Deutschen: synchrone und diachrone Fragen bei einem ‚scheints‘ alten Thema	23
<i>Irene Balles</i> Zu den Adjektivabstrakta des Kymrischen	35
<i>Wolfgang Beck</i> Zur Glossierung im Leipziger Heliand-Fragment	57
<i>Bettina Bock</i> Tugenden in Sprichwörtern	63
<i>Bela Brogyanyi</i> συνεκδρομή und Analogie bei Friedrich Mehlhorn (1792–1852) Zur Geschichte des Analogie-Begriffs in der historisch-vergleichenden Sprachwissenschaft	73
<i>Anja Busse</i> Zur Höflichkeit im Hethitischen	79
<i>Ulrike Ertel</i> Metaphors Greeks lived by – θυμός und Lakoffs CMT	89
<i>Gisella Ferraresi</i> Wandel im aspektuellen System des Cimbro	101
<i>Bernhard Forssman</i> ἐκόν: Bemerkungen zu einem alten Partizip	113
<i>Peter Gallmann</i> Endungslos ist nicht immer merkmалlos	119
<i>José Virgilio García Trabazo</i> Zu germ. *fel(e)s ‚Fels‘, ai. pāṣāṇa- ‚Stein‘ und heth. palša- ‚Weg, Pfad‘ im Lichte idg. schamanistischer Vorstellungen	129
<i>Jost Gippert</i> Zum werden-Passiv im Gotischen	135

<i>Olav Hackstein</i> Altgriechisch νόθος ‚keiner, nichtiger, unechter‘, hethitisch <i>natta</i> ‚nicht‘ und urindogermanisch * <i>noth₂o-</i> ‚kein, nichtig‘	147
<i>Jón Axel Harðarson</i> Bemerkungen zur Singularflexion der indogermanischen <i>o</i> -Stämme	151
<i>Satoko Hisatsugi</i> Hundskamille und Hundssamurai	161
<i>Ute Holtze</i> <i>Viola jacea</i> . Zur botanischen Fachsprache in der Renaissance	175
<i>Agnes Jäger</i> Vergleichskasus im Althochdeutschen	193
<i>Maria Kozianka</i> Aus der Arbeit am „Etymologischen Wörterbuch des Althochdeutschen“ – das Lehnsuffix <i>-āri</i>	209
<i>Thomas Krisch</i> The application of centering theory and generative syntax to Homeric Greek	215
<i>Peter Kuhlmann</i> Konzepte von „Etymologie“ in der Antike von Platon bis zu Isidor von Sevilla	227
<i>Reiner Lipp</i> Zur Etymologie des germanischen Runen-Wortes	239
<i>Stefan Lotze</i> Thüringer Klöse: ß-Schreibung bei neutralisierter Artikulation der s-Laute	257
<i>André Maslo</i> Ein neuer Stammbaum der „Habichtslehren“	267
<i>Joachim Matzinger</i> Das altalbanische Wortbildungsmuster auf <i>-ësi</i> und <i>malësi</i> ‚Bergbewohner; Gebirge‘	281
<i>H. Craig Melchert</i> Relative Clauses in Anatolian	287
<i>Natalia Mull</i> Zur Übertragung des lateinischen <i>Ablativus absolutus</i> in den Werken des Althochdeutschen	297

<i>Sergio Neri</i> Lat. <i>Plestia</i> und umbr. <i>pletinas</i>	307
<i>Andreas Nievergelt & Elvira Glaser</i> Hapax legomena in den althochdeutschen Griffelglossen	317
<i>Norbert Oettinger</i> Zu vedisch <i>yóni-</i> und avestisch „ <i>vaðre.yaona</i> “	335
<i>Matthias Benjamin Passer</i> Tracking the Lost: Information Structure and Object Deletion in Older Indo-European Languages	341
<i>Daniela Prutscher</i> Getrennt- und Zusammenschreibung von Substantivkomposita in Briefen des frühen 17. Jahrhunderts	363
<i>Hans Ulrich Schmid</i> <i>Was nit ertz ist, heißt alles berg.</i> Zur frühen Fachsprache des Bergbaus	373
<i>Susanne Schnaus</i> Neuer Versuch zu <i>cakránná</i> in RV X 95	393
<i>Claudia Schneider</i> <i>vae vobis!</i> Zum altlateinischen Umfeld einer Fluchformel	399
<i>Roland Schuhmann</i> Zur Endung der 3.Sg.Ind.Prät. der schwachen Verben in den Runeninschriften im älteren Futhark	407
<i>Luisa Steinhäuser</i> Bemerkungen zur Lautstruktur einiger Onomatopoetika im Germanischen	419
<i>Anita Steube</i> Laute, Buchstaben, Phoneme und Grapheme in der Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft	427
<i>Patrick V. Stiles</i> Eine Bemerkung zu Benennungsmotiven	443
<i>Laura Sturm</i> Die Lex Siebs und ihre Gültigkeit	447
<i>Christiane Thim-Mabrey</i> Modalität von Modalverben und das Wissen in den Wissenschaften	459

<i>Johann Tischler</i> Hethitische Kleinigkeiten IV	471
<i>Roman Trültzsch</i> <i>RINIO</i> oder „Übervater <i>RHEIN</i> “	475
<i>Carlotta Viti</i> Contrastive syntax of argument marking in Latin and in Ancient Greek	477
<i>Esther-Miriam Wagner & Henrike Kühnert</i> Codeswitching in Yiddish and Judaeo-Arabic	495
<i>Helmut Weiß</i> <i>So welih wib so wari</i> . Zur Genese freier w-Relativsätze im Deutschen	505
<i>Pauline Weiß</i> Präpositionswiederholung im Armenischen	517
<i>Susanne Zeilfelder</i> <i>Allmähd na!</i> – Zum Vokativ im Hethitischen	527
<i>Sabine Ziegler</i> Altirisch <i>cophur</i> ‚Gestaltwandel‘	535
E-Mail-Adressen der Autoren	541

Relative Clauses in Anatolian

H. Craig Melchert

Introduction

Our honorand's many research interests include syntax, and she has done much to promote modern approaches to its study. I therefore offer as a token of friendship and esteem the following overview of relative clause syntax in Anatolian. Its aim is purely descriptive: to call attention to the great variety of relative clause types in Anatolian, including languages beyond Hittite, some of which are not found in the handbooks. Limitations of space and of my own expertise do not permit a serious formal analysis, which must be left to others.¹

Preposed Correlative Relative Clauses

Since this type is widely recognized, I give only a few examples that falsify some major claims that have been made regarding their syntax.²

Hittite (KBo 5.4 Ro 33–4; NH)

namma ANA ^dUTU-ŠI *kuiš* LÚ.KÚR [*n=aš* / *tuk*] LÚ.KÚR *ēšdu*
further HisMajesty.DSg REL-NSg enemy CONJ=3NSg 2DSg enemy be.Imv3Sg
'Further, whoever is an enemy to His Majesty, let him be an enemy to you!'

Hieroglyphic Luvian (SULTANHAN, §34)

|*a-wa/i* |*za-ti-i* |*tu-wa/i+ra/i-si-i* |MALUS-*za* |REL-*sa* |*á-pa+ra/i-ta* |*á-sa₅-za-i*
CONJ=QUOT this vineyard.D-LSg evil.N-ASg REL-NSg afterwards utter.Pr3Sg
'And whoever afterwards utters evil against this vineyard...'

Lycian (TL 101, 3–5; Limyra)

kbi: tike: ti ñtepi tadi: a[t]la[h]i: tibe: kbijehi tibe=te:
other some.ASg REL-NSg in put.Pr3Sg his own or another's.ASg or=PTC
ala[h]adi ti: m=ene: mā[h]āi: tubeiti wed[rēñ]ni
inter.Pr3Sg REL-NSg CONJ=3ASg god.NPI strike.Pr3PI w.NPI
'Whoever puts someone else inside, his own or another's, or whoever makes an interment, the w. gods shall strike him!'

Lydian (Text 45, line 5)

ak=it esλ taacλ qis fēnslibid
CONJ=PTC this votive-object.D-LSg REL-Nsg violate.Pr3Sg
'Whoever violates this votive object...'

¹ I am grateful to Anthony Yates and especially to Mattyas Huggard for valuable discussion and references. All views not expressly attributed are my own.

² See Hoffner & Melchert 2008: xvii–xviii for citation conventions of Hittite texts. Cuneiform Luvian texts follow Starke 1985, and Hieroglyphic Luvian Hawkins 2000, unless noted otherwise. For Palaic see Carruba 1970, for Lycian Kalinka 1901 and Neumann 1979, and for Lydian Gusmani 1964.

Palaic (Text 3.A, KUB 35.165 Vo 9–10)³

*gāni*¹=*du*=*tta* *kuiš* *anitti* *maš*=*ta* *anīyaši*
 thus=2DSg=PTC REL-NSg carry-out.Pr3Sg as-much=PTC carry-out.Pr2Sg
aniya=*ku*=*an*=*ta* *tabarnani*^{MUNUS} *tawanani*
 carry-out.Imv2Sg=also=3ASg=PTC *t*.DSg *t*.DSg

‘Whoever carries out in this way for you, as much as you (can) carry out, carry it out also for the *tabarna* and *tawananna*! (the Hittite king and queen)’

All of the examples given are “indeterminate” or “conditional” relative clauses equivalent to a conditional clause “if someone...” which do not establish the existence of the referent or reality of the action. According to an analysis widely accepted for more than half a century, in Hittite relative clauses of this type the relative pronoun must be first in its clause, i.e., not preceded by any fully accented constituent (see, e.g., Hoffner & Melchert 2008: 424–5, following Held 1957, Hale 1987, and Garrett 1994). The cited examples clearly falsify this claim, not only for Hittite, but also for other Anatolian languages. Contra Garrett (1994: 50–3) the Lycian example cannot be explained away by topicalization, since true topicalization is marked in Lycian by left dislocation with *me* (as per Garrett himself 1992 and 1994: 36). It is true that the relative pronoun does frequently appear first in its clause in indeterminate relatives in Hittite, Lycian, Lydian, and Palaic, but in the extant Hieroglyphic Luvian texts it is regularly preceded by at least one accented constituent (in the example above by two).

Goedegebuure (2009) and Huggard (2011 and 2015: 93–112) have also refuted the attendant claim that Hittite shows “overt wh-movement”. The order of constituents in both interrogative and relative wh-clauses is determined by considerations of focus and topicalization. These factors are thus far only partially understood, but it is clear that the Hittite example involves contrast between the indirect objects, ‘His Majesty’ and the safely restored ‘you’. Likewise, the phrase *kbi tike* in the Lycian has been fronted in contrastive focus to the object of the preceding clause, which indicates the persons who *are* to be buried in the tomb, and the fronting of the verb *alahadi* is likely also due to contrast with *ñtepi tadi*.⁴ In the Hieroglyphic Luvian and Lydian examples the focus unsurprisingly lies on the potential object of the violation. I can find no such obvious motivation for the fronted position of the direct object ‘evil’ in the Hieroglyphic Luvian. In the languages other than Hieroglyphic Luvian the frequent appearance of the relative pronoun clause-initially reflects that it is the potential violator who is in focus.⁵ For whatever reason, the *diction* in the Hieroglyphic Luvian inscriptions differs from that of the other languages in focusing for the most part on the object violated (only rarely on the violator), but available evidence argues that the *grammar* is the same in all of the Anatolian languages.

³ Given the second person verbs in the preceding clauses (see Yakubovich 2006: 119), the =*du* in our first clause must be second person dative singular, contra Carruba 1970: 75.

⁴ Unless we have here in Lycian the same use of the bare wh-pronoun when weakly accented as an *indefinite*, as is well attested in Hittite (see now in detail Huggard 2015: 50–82). The second clause would thus read: ‘or enters anyone’ (*ti* = INDEF-ASg), with the weakly accented or unaccented *ti* enclitic to the verb.

⁵ Huggard (2015: 114–52) argues that preposed indeterminate/conditional relative clauses actually are “bare” *conditional* clauses with indefinite pronouns, but without an overt subordinating conjunction. Pending critical scholarly response to this analysis, I for the present retain the standard characterization as preposed relatives.

Postposed Restrictive and Non-Restrictive Relative Clauses

Garrett (1994: 47) recognizes the existence of postposed relative clauses in Hittite, but limits them to non-restrictive and indefinite types. However, there are actually also postposed restrictive relative clauses, although they seem somewhat less common than the non-restrictive type. I cite first evidence for the restrictives:

Hittite (KUB 26.17 i 5-6; MH/MS)
māḥḥan LÚ.KÜR-aš aki kūrur kuiš ḥarzi
 when enemy.NSg die.Pr3Sg enmity.N-ASg REL-NSg hold.Pr3Sg
 ‘When the enemy who is hostile dies...’

Hittite (KUB 2.1 vi 1–3; OH/NS)
ŠA KUR^{URU} Ḥatti ḤUR.SAG.ḪI.A ḥūmantaš .KUR-eaš .ḥūmantaš .^dUTU=ŠI
 of land Hatti mountains all.D-LPl land.D-LPl all.D-LPl His Majesty
^m*Tuḥaliyaš kuēš laḥḥiyaiškezzi*
 T.NSg REL-API travel.IterPr3Sg
 ‘To all the mountains (and) all the lands of Hatti which His Majesty Tuthaliya travels.’

Hieroglyphic Luvian (ANCOZ 7, §§5–6)
ni-pa-ta[?] REL+ra/i hu+ra/i-x-x INFRA ... || FINES-hi-zi .REL-sa
 or=PTC somehow ... below boundaries.API REL-NSg
|za-la-na PONERE-wa/i-i mu-wa/i PURUS.FONS.MI REL-zi |pi-ya-ha
 z. (adv.) put.Pr3Sg 1NSg=QUOT Suppiluliuma REL-API give.Pret1Sg
 ‘Or who in any way...puts z. the boundaries that I, Suppiluliuma, made...’

Lycian (TL 80, 2)
se=i=ni ṇtepi tātu .tike ne=de xuwati=ti
 and=PTC=PROHIB in put.Imv3Pl INDEF-ASg NEG=PTC stand-near.Pr3Sg=REL-NSg
 ‘And let them not put anyone inside who is not closely related.’

There can be little question that the relative clauses in the Hittite examples are restrictive, identifying uniquely which enemy and which places are meant.⁶ The incomplete status of the Hieroglyphic Luvian relative clause leaves some room for doubt, but since the word order makes it unlikely that the missing words qualify the noun ‘boundaries’, a restrictive clause identifying them as the ones made by Suppiluliuma seems probable. The relative clause clearly is required in the Lycian to identify the intended referent.

Postposed non-restrictive relative clauses are also securely attested in all of the Anatolian languages, though they are decidedly less frequent than preposed relatives in our attested corpora (a reasonably thorough survey of Hittite has found less than thirty, a number of which are in translation literature, and besides the one example (in multiple variants) cited below I am aware of only one other example in Hieroglyphic Luvian, suspect as being calqued:

Hittite (KUB 21.19+KBo 52.17 i 6–10; NH)
kuin=kan^dUTU^{URU} Arinna GAŠAN=YA LUGAL MUNUS.LUGAL ŠA KUR^{URU} Ḥatti
 REL-ASg=PTC Sun-goddess of A. my=lady king.ASg queen.ASg of Hatti
anda autti n=aš tuetaz IŠTU ŠA^dUTU^{URU} PÚ-na ZAG-išzi
 at look.Pr3Sg CONJ=3NSg 2ABL by Sun-goddess of A. succeed.Pr3Sg

⁶ The second Hittite example is one of a series of postposed restrictive clauses identifying lands and mountains that are to receive offerings. See CHD § 341 for the extended context.

šarā kuiš daškeši arḫa kuiš piššiškeši
 up REL-NSg take.Pr2Sg away REL-NSg throw.Pr2Sg
 ‘Whichever King and Queen of Hatti you, Sun-goddess of Arinna, My Lady, have regard for,
 s/he succeeds through you, the Sun-goddess of Arinna, you who choose and who abandon.’⁷

Hieroglyphic Luvian (HAMA 2, §§2–3)

a-wa/i á-mu AEDIFICARE+MI-ha za-’ (“CASTRUM”)ha+ra/i-ni-sà-za
 CONJ=QUOT 1NSg buildPret1Sg thisN-ASg fortress-N-ASg
la-ka-wa/i-ni-sà-ha-wa/i(REGIO) FLUMEN.REGIO-tà-i-sà || REL-za i-zi-i-tà
 of LakaNSg=also=QUOT of river landNSg RELN-ASg makePret3Sg
 ‘I built this fortress, which the one of the Laka river land also made.’

Lycian (TL 150, 1–4)

ebeli: me sijēni: .xssēñzija: xñtlapah: tideimi: mutleh: prñnezijehi:
 here CONJ lie.Pr3Sg X.NSg X.GSg son.NSg M.GSg household member.NSg
prñnawate=ti: ñtatā: atli: ehbi:
 build=REL-Nsg chamber.ASg person.DSg his.DSg
 ‘Here lies Xssenzija, son of Xñtlapa, household member of Mutle, who built the chamber for himself.’

Lydian (Text 26, lines 1–2)

es=k mrud alikrelid karo[|id] anlali=k atrašt[alid]
 this.N-ASg=and stele.N-ASg of-A.N-ASg of-K.N-ASg of-A.N-ASg=and of-A.N-ASg
kaveś lamētrulis qis
 priest.NSg of L.NSg REL-NSg
 ‘And this stele is of Alikres, (son) of Karos[] and of Anlas, (son) of Atrastas, (who is) the priest of Demeter.’

Lydian (Text 2, lines 5–6)

nāqis fēnslibid esvav mlwēndav iskon qid=a tamv
 GENREL-NSg violate.Pr3Sg this.D-LPI m.D-LPI all.D-LPI REL-N-A=PTC build.Pret1Sg
 ‘Whosoever violates all these m., whatever I have built...’

It is clear that the postposed relative in the Hittite example is non-restrictive, merely adding a decorative epithet to the unique referent that is the Sun-goddess of Arinna. The Hieroglyphic Luvian example is one of five near-identical inscriptions, in which the author Uratamis insists that he built the fortress, while various other individuals respectively “made” it (see for the entire set Hawkins 2000: 413).⁸ I have chosen to cite the example from HAMA 2, where the =*ha* ‘also’ assures that the relative clause is merely adding additional information rather than identifying the fortress, whose identity would have been sufficiently defined by the deictic ‘this’ when the inscription was in its original location. As per Hawkins, the precise distinction between building the fortress and making it remains elusive.⁹ Gusmani (1964: 158) takes *Lamētrulis* in the first Lydian example as the priest’s

⁷ Contra Singer (2002: 97) the last two clauses cannot be independent sentences, since in New Hittite a nominal sentence in the second person would require the presence of the reflexive particle =*za*.

⁸ Hawkins interprets REGIO.FLUMEN-*tà-i-sa* as ‘river land’, but the noun is /xabad(i)-/, with “*i*-mutation”, and the nominative singular could only be /xabadis/. We must assume rather nominative singular of a substantivized form of the derived adjective /xabadaya-/, thus /xabaday(i)s/ ‘the one of the river land’.

⁹ For an additional non-restrictive relative see KARATEPE 1, §II, but given recent evidence for Phoenician interference in the syntax of the Luvian version (see Yakubovich 2015), we must reckon with the possibility that this example is calqued on the Phoenician. See for the passage Hawkins 2000: 48–9.

name, but his name and patronymic appear in the preceding clause. The nominal relative clause further identifies him as the priest of the deity named in line 6 of the text, in a construction that forces a definite reading of the head noun, a type well established for Anatolian. See on this construction in Carian the illuminating analysis by Hajnal (1997). However, while in Carian the construction occurs with patronymics that uniquely identify the head noun, here the relative clause is non-restrictive, adding a further attribute of the person already identified by name and patronymic. That the nominal relative clause depends on the possessive adjective *anlaid*, instead of an expected nominal genitive, may seem remarkable, but it is no more remarkable than the syntax of Hieroglyphic Luvian by which nested genitives of patronymics may depend on possessive adjectives. See on this syntax Melchert 1990: 203 and Bauer 2014: 169–86. As correctly argued by Gusmani (1964: 185), the generalizing force of the particle =*a* suggests that the relative clause in the second Lydian example is also non-restrictive.¹⁰

Postposed Free Relatives

There are also rare examples of postposed free relatives, that is without an overt antecedent or domain noun (see for the definition Garrett 1994: 41–2):

Palaic (Text 3.A, KBo 19.52 i 14–18)

aškummaūwaš hānta tīlila hāri a=ānta tabarnaš^d Zaparwā_ag¹ai
 sacra.NPl be-warm.Pr3Pl t.N-APl be-warm.Pr3Sg CONJ=therein t.NSg Z.DSg
takkuwāti kuiš=a hueri mišgašaš (var. ... *šehhann[(naš)] tabarnai*
 offer.Pr3Sg REL-NSg=PTC h.DSg m.NSg s.GSg[?] t.DSg
 MUNUS *tawanannai w_atila=kat [w_i]zzanni=kat w_izzanni=kat*
 t.DSg f.=this.N-ASg f.=this.N-ASg f.=this.N-ASg

‘The sacralized meats are warm; the *t*. (coll.) are warm. The *tabarna* offers thereof (*lit.* therein) to Zaparfa whatever is *m*. to the *h*. (Let) this *f*. (and) this *f*. (be) for the *tabarna* and the *tawanna*.’^{11,12}

Lycian (N320, 41)

me=hriqla: asñne: pzziti=ti
 CONJ=supreme-temenos.NSg/DSg do.INF *command*.Pr3Sg=REL-N-ASg

‘And the supreme temple authority is to do what he (Pixodaros) *commands*.’ (or ‘It is for the supreme temple authority to do what he *commands*.’)

My interpretation of the Palaic passage is new, but since the relative clause cannot possibly be construed as preposed and correlated with what follows, it can only be postposed. The sequence *a-an-ta* cannot be interpreted as containing the local particle =*ta* with “irrational” nasalization (contra Carruba 1970: 71 et alibi), nor can it be analyzed as *a=an=ta* with an enclitic anaphoric pronoun =*an* (common gender accusative singular), since the only poten-

¹⁰ The correct comparandum, however, is not Hittite geminating =*a* and Luvian =*ha*, which never mark generalizing relatives (contra Gusmani 1964: 49, following Heubeck), but Hittite non-geminating =*a*.

¹¹ Text 3.B (KBo 19.53 iii 10–13) has ^d*Zaparwā_ai* for ^d*Zaparwā_ag¹ai*, [*takk*]uwagati for *takkuwāti*, and *šehhann[(naš)]* for *mišgašaš* and has in the last clause overt *ašendu* ‘let them be’ instead of dittography of *w_izzanni=kat*.

¹² The approximate sense of the relative clause must be ‘whatever is pleasing to the taste’. Despite the unexpected *e*-vocalism of the first syllable the variant *šehhannaš* likely is related to Hittite *šāh-* ‘fill up, clog’ < PIE **seh₂-*, also the source of Latin *satis* ‘enough’, and means ‘of satisfaction’.

tial antecedents are common gender plural and collective plural. I therefore interpret it as *ānta* ‘in’, used to mean ‘thereof’, referring to taking a part from the total offerings described in the preceding clause. Compare the same frequent use of *anda(n)* (usually written ŠÀ.BA) in Hittite ritual contexts. See e.g. KUB 43.30 iii 19–20 (OH/OS): [5^{DUG} HA]B.ĪAB.ĪI.A ŠÀ.BA 1 *marnuan* 1 *šīēššar* 1 *w[alhi* 1 ...] 1 GEŠTIN ‘five pitchers, thereof 1 (of) *marnuan*, 1 (of) beer, one (of) *walhi*, one [], (and) 1 (of) wine’ and Neu 1983: 272. This interpretation also fits the context: the deity Zapparfa is to be given whatever suits his desire of the meat and other offerings made, but two of the portions of meat are reserved for the royal couple.

For the interpretation of the much debated final clause of the Lycian text of the “Létōon Trilingual” see Melchert 1999: 77, modifying Neumann 1998. The subject of *pzziti=ti* must be the satrap Pixodaros mentioned in the preceding clause, so the sense of the verb can only be approximately ‘orders, commands, decrees’ or ‘wishes, requires’. The complex problems of Lycian configurational syntax leave the syntactic status of *pzziti=ti* uncertain, but in Palaic, which is undeniably verb-final, the postposed free relative seems problematic for the implication of Garrett (1994: 41–2) that free relatives are necessarily embedded. See further below for a possible solution to this problem.

Embedded Relative Clauses

These are of three types, the first of which is to my knowledge attested only in Old Hittite. Probert (2006) has demonstrated that OH examples of the following type are not, as previously supposed, preposed correlative relative clauses that just happen not to have the usual resumption and introductory conjunction in the main clause, but rather embedded relatives:

Hittite (KBo 6.2 i 57; OH/OS)
paprezzi kuiš 3 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR pāi
 be-impurePr3Sg REL-NSg 3 shekel silver give.Pr3Sg
 ‘He who is impure shall give three shekels of silver.’

Hittite (KBo 20. 33 Ro 12; OH/OS)
 [L^UKA]Š₄.E *taruḫzi kuiš 1 MA.NA KÙ.BABBAR Û 2^{NINDA} wagadaš pianzi*
 runner win.Pr3Sg REL-NSg 1 mina silver and 2 w.-bread.APl give.Pr3Pl
 ‘To the runner who wins they give one mina of silver and two *wagada*-breads.’¹³

For a full description of the syntax of these embedded relatives (which are fronted in their clause but *not* preposed) and their loss in Middle and New Hittite see Probert 2006: 71–8.

The second type of embedded relative consists of internally headed relative clauses conjoined as noun phrases with another ordinary noun phrase. Thus far I have found these only in Hittite and Lycian (for the latter see already Garrett 1994: 58–60, but with some dubious examples):

Hittite (KUB 21.29 i 6–10; NH)
kāša^m Hattušiliš LUGAL.GAL šummaš ANA LÚ.ME.EŠ^{URU} Tiliura araḫzanda=ya kuiēš
 ADV Hattusili great king 2DPl man.D-LPl of Tiliura around=also REL-NPl

¹³ It is important to note that while Probert shows that the relative clause in this example is embedded, not preposed, it is still *internally* headed, like all but a handful of Hittite relatives (for which see below). Thus ‘runner’ is nominative, the subject of its clause, not dative, as it would be if it were part of the main clause (Probert 2006: 40).

URU.DIDLI.HI.A *zik* EN KUR-TI *kuiēš maniyahḫeškeši* ANA LÚ.ME.EŠ^{URU} *Hatti*
 cities 2NSg lord of land REL-API administer.2Sg man.D-LPl of Hatti
 LÚ.ME.EŠ^{URU} *Gašga=ya išḫiūl kišan išḫiyanun*
 men of Gasga=and treaty.N-ASg thus impose.Pret1Sg
 ‘I Hattusili, the Great King, have made a treaty (*lit.* bound an obligation) as follows for you, the people of Tiliura, and (for) the cities that are round about, which you, governor of the boundary territory administer, for both Hittites and Gasgeans.’

Lycian (TL 124, 1–8)

ebēñnē xupu se=i hri=ti ṅtipa m=e=ti adē uhetēi ebehi ṅtatā
 this.ASg tomb.ASg and=PTC upon=REL-NSg n.NSg CONJ=3ASg=REFLU.NSg his n.Asg
 ‘Uhetēi made *this* tomb and the *n.* that is upon it as his burial chamber.’

The Hittite example, a good illustration of just how complex Hittite clause structure can be, has an indirect object consisting of an ordinary noun phrase ‘you, the people of Tiliura’ conjoined with an internally headed relative clause ‘the cities that are round about’, to which is added a non-restrictive postposed relative clause, and finally an apposition to everything that precedes. Garrett (1994: 53) erroneously takes the Lycian example as a preposed relative clause, but it is clearly part of a conjoined direct object noun phrase that has been topicalized.

Finally, there are several examples in Hittite for externally headed embedded relatives that *split* the main clause. Probert (2006: 53) already recognized one Old Hittite example from the Laws:

Hittite (KBo 6.2 ii 61–62; OH/OS)

nu apē[l É=SÚ] kuel=a^{GIŠ} eyan āški=šši šakuwān a[peniššan]
 CONJ 3GSg house REL-GSg=PTC yew.N-ASg gate=his.D-LSg s.N-ASg likewise
 ‘The house of him at whose gate a yew tree is *s*-ed is (treated) likewise.’¹⁴

There are at least two more examples, one indefinite and one non-restrictive:¹⁵

Hittite (KBo 5.2 ii 15–16; MH/NS)

nu 4^{NINDA} mūlatin pittalwan MUN-an kuedani ŪL išḫuwān memall=a
 CONJ 4 m.ASg plain.ASg salt.N-ASg REL-D-LSg not poured.N-ASg flour.N-ASg=and
pitallwan dāi
 plain.N-ASg take.Pr3Sg
 ‘He takes four plain *mulati*-breads into which salt has not been poured and plain flour.’

Hittite (KBo 5.3 i 14–15; MH/NS)

namma=ma=za damain BELAM kui«e»š=aš kuiš [UKU-aš]
 further=CONJ=REFL other.ASg lordASg REL-NSg=3NSg REL-NSg person.NSg
 ANA⁴ *UTU-ŠI EGIR-an arḫa lē kuinki šākti*
 His Majesty.D-LSg behind away PROHIB INDEF-ASg know.Pr2Sg
 ‘Do not recognize any other lord, whatsoever person he is, behind the back of His Majesty!’

¹⁴ As per Probert, the particle =a on *kuel=a* merely marks the relative as generalizing and does not have the force of a conjunction. The generalizing force cannot easily be rendered directly into an English. An accurate paraphrase would be: ‘The house of anyone at whose gate...’.

¹⁵ For a more complicated restrictive example involving a left-dislocated topic (KBo 5.8 ii 18–22; NH) see the discussion by Huggard (2015: 172).

We also find one example in Lycian where a *wh*-clause appears to be embedded in the middle of the main clause (this cannot be due to any influence from the Greek version, which has a very different construction):

Lycian (N320, 22–25)

se=wa(j)=aitē: *kumaha:* *ēti sttali:* *ppuweti:* *kāmē:*
 and=PTC=make.Pret3Pl sacred.N-API on stele.D-LSg write.Pr3Pl as-much.N-ASg
ebehi: *xñtawataha:* *xbidēñnaha:* *se=rKKazumaha*
 this.D-LSg of-king.N-API of-Kaunos.N-API and=of-A.N-API
 ‘And they have made sacred as belonging to the King of Kaunos and Arkesima as much as they write on this stele.’

As rare as these structures are, one may wonder whether the Hittite examples are the source of the postposed restrictive, non-restrictive, and indefinite types presented earlier, these being derived from embedded relatives by extraposition, motivated at least in part by factors like “heavy NP shift”. Similarly, the solution to the unexpected postposed free relatives cited above might be to suppose that they are in fact underlying embedded relatives that have been extraposed (at least in the case of the Palaic example the length of the relative clause could motivate the extraposition). Further research is needed to support or refute this idea, which at present must remain speculative.

Bibliography

- Bauer, Anna H. 2014: *Morphosyntax of the Noun Phrase in Hieroglyphic Luwian*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Carruba, Onofrio 1970: *Das Palaische: Texte, Grammatik, Lexikon*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- CHD Š = Hans G. Güterbock †, Harry A. Hoffner Jr., Theo P. J. van den Hout 2002–2013: *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*. Volume Š. Chicago: The Oriental Institute.
- Crespo, Emilio, José Luis García Ramón (eds.) 1997: *Coloquio Berthold Delbrück y la sintaxis indoeuropes hoy*. Madrid/Wiesbaden: Ediciones de la UAM/Reichert.
- Garrett, Andrew 1992: Topics in Lycian Syntax. *Historische Sprachforschung* 105, 200–212.
- Garrett, Andrew 1994: Relative Clause Syntax in Lycian and Hittite. *Die Sprache* 36, 29–69.
- Goedegebuure, Petra 2009: Focus Structure and Q-word Questions in Hittite. *Linguistics* 47, 945–69.
- Gusmani, Roberto 1964: *Lydisches Wörterbuch. Mit grammatischer Skizze und Inschriftensammlung*. Winter: Heidelberg.
- Hajnal, Ivo 1997: “Indogermanische” Syntax in einer neuerschlossenen anatolischen Sprache: Die karische Partikel *-xi*. In: Crespo, García Ramón 1997, 193–217.
- Hale, Mark 1987: Notes on Wackernagel’s Law in the language of the Rigveda. In: Watkins 1987, 38–59.
- Hawkins, John David 2000: *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions*. Volume I. *Inscriptions of the Iron Age*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Held, Warren H., Jr. 1957: *The Hittite Relative Sentence*. Baltimore: Linguistic Society of America.
- Hoffner, Harry A., Jr., H. Craig Melchert 2008: *A Grammar of the Hittite Language*. Part I: *Reference Grammar*. Winona Lake IN: Eisenbrauns.
- Huggard, Mattyas 2011: On *Wh*-(Non)-Movement and Internal Structures of the Hittite Preposed Relative Clause. In Jamison, Melchert, Vine 2011, 83–104.

- Huggard, Mattyas 2015: *Wh-words in Hittite: A Study in Syntax-Semantics and Syntax-Phonology Interfaces*. Ph.D. dissertation. University of California, Los Angeles.
- Jamison, Stephanie, H. Craig Melchert, Brent Vine (eds.) 2011: *Proceedings of the 22nd Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference*. Bremen: Hempen.
- Jasanoff, Jay, H. Craig Melchert, Lisi Oliver (eds.) 1998: *Mír Curad: Studies in honor of Calvert Watkins*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- Kalinka, Ernst 1901: *Tituli Lyciae lingua, Lycia conscripti (Tituli Asiae Minoris I)*. Vienna: Hoelder-Pichler-Tempsky.
- Melchert, H. Craig 1990: Adjective Stems in *-iyo- in Anatolian. *Historische Sprachforschung* 103, 198–207.
- Melchert, H. Craig. 1999: Once More on the Conclusion of the Lycian Trilingual of the Létôon. *Historische Sprachforschung* 112, 75–7.
- Neu, Erich 1983: *Glossar zu den althethitischen Ritualtexten*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Neumann, Günter 1979: *Neufunde lykischer Inschriften seit 1901*. Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Neumann, Günter 1998: Zur Trilingue vom Letoon. Der letzte Satz der lykischen Version. In: Jasanoff, Melchert, Oliver 1998, 513–20.
- Probert, Philomen 2006: Clause Boundaries in Old Hittite Relative Sentences. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 104, 17–83.
- Singer, Itamar 2002: *Hittite Prayers*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Starke, Frank 1985: *Die keilschrift-luwischen Texte in Umschrift*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Starke, Frank 1990: *Untersuchung zur Stammbildung des keilschrift-luwischen Nomens*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Watkins, Calvert (ed.) 1987: *Studies in Memory of Warren Cowgill: Papers from the Fourth East Coast Indo-European Conference, Cornell Univ. 1985*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Yakubovich, Ilya 2006: Were Hittite Kings Divinely Anointed? A Palaic Invocation to the Sun-god and its Significance for Hittite Religion. *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions* 5, 107–37.
- Yakubovich, Ilya 2015: Phoenician and Luwian in Early Iron Age Cilicia. *Anatolian Studies* 65, 35–53.