

## Lycian Conditional Constructions in the Light of Typology: A Cognate of Greek εἰ + ὅτι in a Minor Anatolian Language?

### §1 Lycian<sup>1</sup>: overview

- Minor Anatolian language, attested in the 6<sup>th</sup>–4<sup>th</sup> c. BCE.
- Approx. 330 inscriptions, many of which are curse formulae on tombs.

#### (1) Typical funerary inscription (TL 59)

1	ebēñnē: this.ACC.SG	xupā: tomb.ACC.SG	m CONN	=e =3SG.ACC <sup>2</sup>	ti REFL <sup>3</sup>
	prñnawātē: build.3SG.PST.ACT	qñturahi: Kondorasas.NOM.SG		hrppidubeh: (PN).GEN.SG	
2	tideimi child.NOM.SG	zimasttrah: (PN).GEN.SG		tuhes: grandson.NOM.SG	
	<u>mei(j)</u>	adi do.3SG.NPST.ACT		tike: INDEF.ACC(?).SG <sup>4</sup>	tihe of.any.kind
3	<u>zuñm[ē/ā]</u> harm.ACC.SG	m CONN	=ene =3SG.ACC	tu]beiti: strike.down.3PL.NPST.ACT	muhāi: god.NOM.PL
	huwedri: <sup>5</sup> all.NOM.PL				

‘This tomb, Kondorasas, the son of Hrppidube, the grandson of Zimasttra, built it. (If) one causes any harm of any kind, all gods will strike him/her down.’

→ **How is conditionality marked in Lycian?**  
**How should we interpret *mei~mej*?**

### §2 Conditional marker in Lycian (or lack thereof)

- Traditional view: *ē* as a conditional marker

#### (2) TL 89

2 ...	adi do.3SG.NPST.ACT	<b>mej</b>	<b>ē:</b> <b>if</b>
-------	------------------------	------------	------------------------

<sup>1</sup> All the transcriptions and glosses on this handout are based on Melchert (2001) and *eDiAna*, respectively, unless otherwise indicated. All the translations are mine unless otherwise indicated.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Kloekhorst (2011).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Melchert (2021) for the interpretation of this morpheme as a reflexive particle.

<sup>4</sup> The indefinite pronoun *tike* is ambiguous between NOM.SG and ACC.SG, and *eDiAna* interprets this as NOM.SG. Its precise interpretation is not crucial to the present discussion.

<sup>5</sup> Other possible interpretations of *huwedri* that have been proposed so far include: ‘föderiert’, ‘bündisch’, ‘confederate’, ‘zur Gemeinde gehörend’ (cf. Neumann 2007: 107 with references).

3      tik#e:                      xttbã:                      tisñke:                      ...  
        INDEF.ACC(?).SG<sup>6</sup>      harm.ACC.SG<sup>7</sup>      of.whatever.kind.ACC.SG

‘If one causes any harm of any kind...’

↔ Majority: semantically conditional clauses *without* *ẽ*

(3) TL 57

8 ...      hrppije                      **mei**:                      tadi:                      tike:  
              therein<sup>8</sup>                      put.3SG.NPST.ACT                      INDEF.ACC.SG

             m                      =ene:                      tubeiti:                      mähãi  
              CONN                      =3SG.ACC                      strike.down.3PL.NPST.ACT                      god.NOM.PL

9      huwedri:                      se                      itlehi:                      trñmili:                      .....  
        all.NOM.PL                      and                      (god or official).NOM.PL                      Lycian.NOM.PL

‘(If) one puts someone (else) therein, all gods and Lycian *itlehi*-s will strike him/her down.’

### §3 Previous analyses

- *mei* = *me* (connective; equivalent to Hitt. *nu*) + *=i* ‘3SG.DAT-LOC; adv. therein/thereon’  
     - Garrett (1992: 206): *hrppije me=i* as an instance of clitic doubling<sup>9</sup>; *=i* resumes *hrppije*.

- Laroche (1979)

- *mei* = single word meaning ‘if’, not *me* + *=i*
- Lyc. *mei* : Luw./Hitt. *mān* (cf. Melchert 1992: 49 with references)

- Melchert (1992: 49)

- Problems with Laroche’s view:

(i) Phonologically: *\*Vn > Lyc. Vi* = unlikely

(ii) Semantically: *mei* also occurs in imperative sentences (cf. §6)

→ “[M]ost conditional sentences in the Lycian tomb inscriptions are marked only by word order: the combination *me-i* ‘and therein’ is placed in non-initial position.”

<sup>6</sup> NOM.SG according to *eDiAna* (cf. footnote 4).

<sup>7</sup> As per Melchert (2004: 85).

<sup>8</sup> As per Melchert (1992: 49).

<sup>9</sup> Clitic doubling, whereby a left-dislocated constituent (which moves to the left of the sentence connective) is resumed by an enclitic pronoun attached to the connective, is frequently observed in Lycian:

*ebẽññẽ prñnawã m=ẽ=ti prñnawãtẽ Xluwãnimi...*

‘Xluwãnimi built **this building**...’ (Garrett 1992: 200, emphasis mine)

It must however be noted that *mei* occurs in many clauses with no left-dislocation of *hrppije* or any other constituent that could be resumed by a DAT-LOC pronoun; cf. (1) and (2) above.

## §4 Conditionality marked by word order?—two problems

### §4.1 Lack of typological parallels

- Conditionality marked by fronting of *any* constituent: typologically unlikely.

\*Germanic “V1 conditionals” marked by the I-to-C movement of the finite verb:

e.g. *Had I known, I would not have gone.* (Bhatt & Pancheva 2006: 644)

- Links (2019: 161): V1 conditionals “seem to have emerged out of other verb-fronting structures” in languages in which the same I-to-C movement of finite verbs is observed in polar questions and other non-declarative sentences.

↔ Lycian: no known fronting process to form non-declarative sentences that could have given rise to conditionals.

### §4.2 Counterexamples

- Clauses that are conditional but have *mei* in the absolute initial position.

(4) TL 59 (repeated from [1])

1	ebēñnē: this.ACC.SG	xupā: tomb.ACC.SG	m CONN	=e =3SG.ACC	ti REFL
	prñnawatē: build.3SG.PST.ACT	qñturahi: Kondorasas.NOM.SG		hrppidubeh: (PN).GEN.SG	
2	tideimi child.NOM.SG	zimasttrah: (PN).GEN.SG		<b>tuhes:</b> grandson.NOM.SG	
	<u>mei(j)</u>	adi do.3SG.NPST.ACT		tike: INDEF.ACC.SG	tihe of.any.kind
3	<u>zuñm[ē/ā]</u> harm.ACC.SG	m CONN	=ene =3SG.ACC	tu]beiti: strike.down.3PL.NPST.ACT	
	muhāi: god.NOM.PL	huwedri: all.NOM.PL			

‘This tomb, Kondorasas, the son of Hrppidube, the **grandson** of Zimasttra, built it. (If) one causes any harm of any kind, all gods will strike him/her down.’

- In line 2, *mei(j)* is immediately preceded by *tuhes* ‘grandson’, which clearly belongs to the preceding sentence.

## §5 New proposal

**Proposal: *me* (connective) + *=i* ‘if’**

- *=i* as a conditional marker, a cognate of Greek *εἰ*

- *mei* = sentence connective + conditional marker

→ *me* + *=i* or *m-* + *=ei* ?<sup>10</sup>

- Gk. *εἰ* < PIE *\*e<sub>i</sub>*, LOC.SG.MASC of pronominal *\*e-* (Dunkel 2014: 183, 186)

- PIE *\*e<sub>i</sub>* > PA *\*/e:/* > */i/* (Melchert 1994: 56, 292; 2019: 263-264)

cf. PIE *\*néyh<sub>1</sub>so-* ‘turn’ > PA *\*nēho-* > *\*nē<sub>o</sub>-* > OH *nēa-*  
PA *\*kē-* > Lyc. *si-* ‘to lie’; cf. Hitt. *ki-*, Skt. *śāye*, Gk. *κεῖμαι* ‘to lie’<sup>11</sup>

→ This would entail that the conditional marker is a homophone of the 3SG.DAT-LOC pronoun *=i*.

- Advantages:

(i) It makes it unnecessary to assume any typologically unlikely way of forming conditionals.

(ii) It provides a clear explanation of *=i* in conditional sentences in which neither a 3SG.DAT-LOC pronoun nor an adverb ‘therein/thereon’ seems to fit the semantic context.

- < *mei* > in elliptical conditional

(5) TL 80

2	se and	=i =3SG.DAT-LOC	ni NEG	ñtepi into	tātu put.3PL.IMPV.ACT	tike INDEF.ACC.SG
	<u>ne</u> NEG	=de =PTCL	xuwati belong.3SG.NPST.ACT	<u>ti</u> REL.NOM.SG	<u>ne</u> NEG	
	<u>me</u> CONN	=i =if	m CONN	=ene =3SG.ACC		
3	[trq]as Storm-god.NOM.SG	tubidi strike.down.3SG.NPST.ACT	se and	maliya Maliya.NOM.SG		
	hrixuwama overseer.NOM.SG					

‘And let them not put anyone inside who is not closely related. (If) not, the Storm-god and Maliya the overseer shall strike him.’

(translation by Macedo 2021: 247, following Melchert 2016: 289; emphasis mine)

<sup>10</sup> *me* becomes *m-* when followed by another vowel: *me* + *=ene* ‘3SG.ACC’ → *m=ene* (cf. also *m=e ti* in [4]).

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Kloekhorst (2008: 474).

- *ne me=i*: exact parallel of Gk. εἰ δέ μή ‘if not.’
- *ne=de xuwati ti* ‘who is not closely related’: no NP that could be resumed by a DAT-LOC pronoun.
- Could *=i* refer back to *=i + ñtepi* ‘into it’ (cf. §6) or mean ‘therein/thereon’, i.e., “if [someone does] not [put anyone] inside it/therein”?

→ Contradicts the overall sense of the passage (It is the one who *does* put someone illegally that will be struck by the Storm-god and Maliya).

## §6 Possible counterexamples

- *=i* occurring in non-conditional sentences in which a 3SG.DAT-LOC pronoun is unexpected.
- *mei* in imperative clauses (Melchert 1992)

(6) TL 88

3 ...	kbi	tike	me	=i	ni	=pe
	another.ACC.SG	INDEF.ACC.SG	CONN	=3SG.DAT-LOC	NEG	=indeed(?)
	<u>ñtepi</u>	tātu				
	into	put.3PL.IMPV.ACT				

‘Let them not put anyone else into it.’

→ *=i* indicating location, cooccurring with *ñtepi* ‘into’

- Similar cases (*=i* with adverbs/preverbs of location): *ñte* ‘in, inside’; *epñ* ‘beside; afterwards’ (cf. also TL 80 above).

- With *hlñmi*

(a) *hlñmi* = ‘top’ (*eDiAna*) or (b) ‘illicit addition to tombs’ (Melchert 2004: 24)<sup>12</sup>.

(7) Text 88 (cont’d)

4	tibe	=i	ni	=pe	<b>hlñmi</b>	tuwetu
	or	?	NEG	=indeed(?)		set.up.3SG.IMPV.ACT
	<b>hlñmi</b>		me	=i	tuwetu	tike
			CONN	?	set.up.3SG.NPST.ACT	INDEF.ACC.SG
						...

‘(This grave-house, Ddaqasa, the son of Sttule, built it for his wife and children. And after Ddaqasa dies, they will put him and his wife into *ñtipatezi*. And let them not put anyone else into it) or set up **hlñmi**. (If?) one sets up (someone) **hlñmi**...’

(a) another instance of locative *=i* occurring with a word indicating location:  
[*=i + hlñmi*] ‘on top of it’

<sup>12</sup> Other possible interpretations of *hlñmi* that have been proposed so far include: ‘Urne’, ‘un objet neutre, tel que pierre, table commémorative ou quelque chose de semblable’, ‘sepulkraler Gegenstand’, ‘Tribut’, ‘(adj.) additional’ (cf. Neumann 2007: 94 with references).

or

(b)' =i functioning as a DAT.SG pronoun:

[*tuwe-* + *hl̥m̥mi* (ACC) + *x* (DAT)] 'place (an illicit addition) onto *x*'

→ =i in conjunction with another morpheme; contrary to previous analyses, =i alone does not seem to signify 'therein/thereon'<sup>13</sup>.

## §7 Future research: on the origin of *ẽ*—cognate of Gk. *ἄν*?

- *ẽ* cooccurs with =i or =j in all but one passage containing it (cf. [2]).

→ Lyc. =i=*ẽ* : Gk. *ἐἰ* + *ἄν*?

- Melchert (1992, 2004) & Neumann (2007): *ẽ* as functionally equivalent to Gk. *ἄν*.
- Dunkel (2014: 28, 221-222):

Gk. *ἄν* < \**án* 'auf der anderen Seite; im anderen Fall; möglicherweise'  
(> Hitt. *man* [optative particle]?)  
vs.

Lyc. *ẽ* < \**én* 'in, drinnen; hinein'? (> Hitt. *andurza* 'drin')

-Phonologically possible: Lyc. *ẽ* < \*/eN/ or \*/oN/ (Melchert 1994: 311)  
↔ semantically unlikely (cf. Traugott [1985])

- \*/an/ > *ẽ* in Lycian?

- In polysyllabic words: PA \*/aN/ > *ẽ* due to umlaut, e.g., \**ánna-* 'mother' > *ẽne/i-*<sup>14</sup>  
(Melchert 1994: 311).

→ Influence on monosyllabic \**án*, followed by generalisation? Cf. PIE \**h<sub>1</sub>(e)n* > PIt. \**en* > Lat. *in* in unstressed positions and before certain consonants, which was then generalised to other environments (de Vaan 2008: 300). In fact, four out of the five clear attestations of *ẽ* occur in a position where it would have undergone umlaut had the process applied across word boundaries as well; e.g., TL 89/N320 *me=j ẽ iike*.

- Words that could have influenced the diachronic development of hypothetical \**an*:

- *ẽke* 'when' < \**h<sub>1</sub>om* + \**=h<sub>3</sub>e* (Kloekhorst 2008: 539)
- *mẽ* 'as, likewise' < \**món*? (> Hitt. *mān* 'like, just as, if'; Kloekhorst 2008: 552)

<sup>13</sup> The assumption that morphemes such as *ñte/ñtepi* are governing =i raises the question of whether a governed (pro)noun could occur in a clitic chain, separated from the governing word. I have been unable to find any Lycian-internal evidence that that is grammatically possible, but the following sentence in Hittite may be taken to indicate that a pre/postposition in Anatolian need not occur adjacent to the governed noun.

<u>kuetašš</u>	=a	=wa	=kán	<b>ištarna</b>	[1-aš	akdu]
REL.DAT-LOC.PL	=and	=QUOT	=PTCL	between	1.NOM.SG	die.3SG.IMPV.ACT

'and between whom one must die.' (CTH 341.III.3 A i 8)

<sup>14</sup> Lycian umlaut: "V[-high] > V [α back] / \_ C<sub>0</sub> V[α back]" (cf. Melchert 2008: 50).

## References

- Bhatt, Rajesh & Roumyana Pancheva. 2006. Conditionals. In: Martin Everaert and Henk van Riemsdijk (eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax*, vol. 1, 638–687. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Dunkel, George E. 2014. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Partikeln und Pronominalstämme*. Band 2: *Lexikon*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- eDiAna = Olav Hackstein, Jared Miller, Elisabeth Rieken, and Ilya Yakubovich (eds.). Digital Philological-Etymological Dictionary of the Minor Anatolian Corpus Languages. Accessible at: <https://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de>.
- Garrett, Andrew. 1992. Topics in Lycian Syntax. *Historische Sprachforschung* 105(2): 200–212.
- Kloekhorst, Alwin. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden / Boston: Brill.
- . 2011. The Opening Formula of Lycian Funerary Inscriptions: *mēti* vs. *mēne*. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 70: 13–23.
- Laroche, Emmanuel. 1979. L'inscription lycienne. In: Henri Metzger (ed.), *La stèle trilingue du Létôon*, 49–127. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Links, Meta. 2019. Expressing conditionality in earlier English. *English Language and Linguistics* 23(1): 155–182.
- Macedo, José Marcos. 2021. Future conditionals in Lycian: A descriptive account. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 126: 229–260.
- Melchert, H. Craig. 1992. Relative Chronology and Anatolian: The Vowel System. In: Robert Beekes, Alexander Lubotsky, and Jos Weitenberg (eds.), *Rekonstruktion und relative Chronologie: Akten der VIII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Leiden, 31. August–4. September 1987*, 41–53. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- . 1994. *Anatolian Historical Phonology*. Amsterdam / Atlanta: Rodopi.
- . 2001. Lycian Corpus by H. Craig Melchert (last modified 7/6/01). Accessible at: <https://linguistics.ucla.edu/people/Melchert/lyciancorpus.pdf>.
- . 2004. *A Dictionary of the Lycian Language*. Ann Arbor: Beech Stave Press.
- . 2008. Lycian. In: Roger D. Woodard (ed.), *The Ancient Languages of Asia Minor*, 46–55. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2016. Relative clauses in Anatolian. In: Sergio Neri, Roland Schumann, and Susanne Zeilfelder (eds.), *Dat ih dir it nu bi huldi gibu. Linguistische, germanistische und indogermanische Studien Rosemarie Lühr gewidmet*, 287–295. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- . 2020. Hittite Historical Phonology after 100 Years (and after 20 Years). In: Ronald I. Kim, Jana Mynářová, and Peter Pavúk (eds.), *Hrozný and Hittite: The First Hundred Years: Proceedings of the International Conference Held at Charles University, Prague, 11–14 November 2015*, 258–276. Leiden / Boston: Brill.
- . 2021. Lycian Relative Clauses. *Hungarian Assyriological Review* 2: 65–75.

- Neumann, Günter. 2007. *Glossar des Lykischen: Überarbeitet und zum Druck gebracht von Johann Tischler*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Traugott, Elizabeth C. 1985. Conditional markers. In: John Haiman (ed.), *Iconicity in Syntax: Proceedings of a Symposium on Iconicity in Syntax, Stanford, June 24–6, 1983*, 289–307. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- de Vaan, Michiel. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the other Italic Languages*. Leiden / Boston: Brill.