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Are Correlative Pronouns Always Overt in Lydian?

PHILOMEN PROBERT

1 Introduction

Many surviving Lydian relative sentences begin with the relative clause, as in (1): 1

(1) ak-it ešl širmaq qyṣ
    CONJ-PTC DEM.DAT.SG temple.DAT.SG REL.NOM.SG.ANIM
    ūnṣ hipid niwiscy
    do-harm.3SG.PRES/FUT injustices.DAT.PL.(?)
    fak-mal-it-in qadāns tawsas
    CONJ-him.DAT/LOC.SG-PTC-PTC Qadans NOM.SG. mighty.NOM.SG.ANIM
    artimu-k īpsišši karšarlokid
    Artemis.NOM.SG-CONJ Ephesian. NOM.SG. do-harm.3SG.PRES/FUT (23.2–4)

And whoever does harm to this temple with injustices(?), # to him mighty Qidans and Ephesian Artemis will do harm. 2

1 I am honoured to offer this tentative effort to Brent Vine, with heartfelt thanks for his kind and scholarly example. This paper is indebted to a graduate seminar on Lydian led by John Penney in 2009; I am very grateful to John in particular and to the other participants. I am further grateful to Craig Melchert, John Penney, Eleanor Dickey, and the editors of this volume for extremely helpful critique of draft versions. And whoever blames them for any shortcomings, Ephesian Artemis will have a word with him or her.

2 Lydian texts are quoted on the basis of H.C. Melchert's corpus, which is based on Guamaní's (1964, 1980–6) and is available at http://linguistics.ucla.edu/people/Melchert/webpage/lydiancorpus.pdf. I almost always follow Melchert on readings and the location of clitic boundaries, indicated by the sign '#'. A dot under a letter indicates an uncertain letter, triangular brackets an emendation, and * an incomplete word. I follow Melchert's corpus in writing w rather than v, and adopt the practices of writing s for the dental sibilant, t for the palatal one, and p rather than b (so e.g. Melchert 2006, after Schürer 1999:171–3). In the translations given in this paper, # marks the presence of a clause-combining conjunction # or fak. English 'and' or 'well then' is given in addition where appropriate in English. In numbered examples and translations, underlining indicates a relative clause. If an example contains more than one relative clause, underlining is used only for the one on which the argument focuses at that point. A clause-combining conjunction occurring at the boundary between underlined relative clause and what follows is shown in bold, as is a correlative pronoun "picking up" an underlined relative clause. Where the status of a particular pronoun is under discussion—is it a correlative pronoun or not?—bold will not be used but the pronoun will be shaded.

363
Philomen Probert

Structurally, example (1) is clearly a correlative sentence: a sentence-initial relative clause is adjoined to a structurally complete main clause, which contains a pronoun ‘picking up’ the relative clause (a ‘correlative pronoun’). The relative clause has the distribution of a noun phrase in a topic (or ‘left-dislocated’) position, and the structure can be represented informally as shown in (2).

(2)

```
NP
  RELATIVE CLAUSE
    ak-it eššū širmal qyš fēndīpīd
    niwiscy
  ‘# And whoever does harm to this temple with injustices?’
  MAIN CLAUSE
    fak-mla-it-in qldans tawsas
    aritimu k ipsimši katišrlokid
    ‘# to him mighty Qldans and Ephesian Artemis will do harm’
```

More formal ways of labelling the nodes of this tree would be available, but the important point is that the relative clause is adjoined to the main clause, not a constituent of it. Two features of our example make this particularly clear. Firstly, the clause boundary between relative clause and main clause is clearly marked by the clause-combining conjunction fak. Secondly, the overt correlative pronoun ml makes it clear that the relative clause is not itself the indirect object of katišrlokid in the main clause: the syntactic slot for an indirect object is taken in that clause by ml. Some twenty-seven examples (including our example (1)) with a clearly-marked clause boundary and overt correlative pronoun can be identified with some confidence, even if translations can be given only tentatively. A list of these examples is given in the appendix.

This paper asks whether Lydian correlative sentences always contain an overt correlative pronoun, as in example (1), or whether we also find sentences with the same basic structure but with the correlative pronoun implicit rather than overt. If we could answer this question with confidence, the answer ought to help us narrow down the number of possible interpretations of difficult texts. As it is we will not be able to offer a definite answer, but posing the question in the first place may provide a new angle from which to grapple with difficult passages.

that niwiscy could be accusative singular, which would account for the form more easily than a dative plural, if in this passage the word is an internal accusative with fēndīpīd.

1Compare Garrett 1994:41–57, on similar structures in Lydian and Hittite.

2The conjunction ab connects the whole correlative sentence to what precedes. As such, it should strictly speaking be shown outside the relative clause, but I simplify this matter to avoid overcomplicating the diagram; so also in the diagram under (4) below.
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To approach our question we consider potential candidates for the status of correlative sentence with non-overt correlative pronoun. We shall find that some candidate sentences have at least one possible analysis with an overt correlative pronoun, and the others may not be correlative sentences at all.

2 Correlative pronoun or some other pronoun?

In example (3) we have one relative sentence nested inside another. As shown under (4), both the larger and the smaller relative sentence begin with the relative clause, and have a clause-combining conjunction (\(\text{ak or fak}\)) marking the boundary between relative clause and what follows.

For present purposes it is the larger relative sentence that is of particular interest, and the relative clause of this larger relative sentence is underlined below. This relative clause is followed by the conjunction \(\text{ak}\) (shown in bold), and then the relative clause of the smaller relative sentence—which at the same time begins the ‘main clause’ of the larger relative sentence. This second relative clause contains five verb phrases coordinated using \(\text{puk or} \; \text{fak}\), the first four of these containing the third person enclitic singular correlative pronoun form \(m\lambda\) (relevant instances are shaded below), and the third verb phrase also including the neuter accusative -\(\text{ad} \; \text{it}\).

(3) ak-it nāqidi šerli šrmiš amu fāsil puk-\(\tau\)-ad amudāv fak'[-]\(\tau\)nal puk-m\(\lambda\)-ad amu pitoč pidv qed-k-m\(\lambda\) ak šēmāvāy ak-m\(\lambda\)-is qis citollad pitaad puk-m\(\lambda\)-is fakāsāv qis-k puk m\(\lambda\)-a[d] fapuwerfta puk-m\(\lambda\)-it paśsakāvāk niwisā qel\(\lambda\)-k puk mettīd puk pīdēv qis-k int fak-m\(\lambda\)-it ārtimus īpsimśi šartālokūd pā pūl\(\lambda\)-k arlś qirāl (24,3–14)

'\# Whatever the šerli of the temple required of me, whether he fak… nal it from me for himself or I gave it to him as a pledge, and whatever else I assigned to him, \# well then whoever citollad pitaad m\(\lambda\) or cuts off anything

I work with the traditional view that nāqī (and occasional nāl… qī, with the two parts in tmesis) is a derived relative pronoun of some sort (see Giorgi 1964:190). Sidelnikov and Yalunovitch (2016) have recently suggested that nāqī means ‘if anyone’ rather than ‘whoever’. Some such diachronic source would explain the possibility of tmesis, but if nāqī clauses were conditional clauses in synchronic terms we might expect them to be picked up less regularly than qi-clauses by what looks like an overt correlative pronoun. (To put this differently, a sentence-initial relative clause such as ‘(He) who damages it’ or ‘Whoever damages it is likely to be picked up by a pronoun in the main clause, e.g. ‘Artemis will punish him’, whereas a sentence-initial conditional clause such as ‘If anyone damages it’ could just as well be followed by e.g. ‘Artemis will take revenge.’) The sentences considered in this paper do not suggest any such difference between nāqī and qi-. Of the 37 correlative sentences with clear correlative pronouns listed in the appendix, 9 (24%) are introduced by nāqī- (examples (13), (19), (21), (22), (23), (24), (25)). Of the 7 candidates for possible correlative sentences without correlative pronouns considered in this paper (examples (3), (4), (6), (7), (8), (9), (19), (20)), 3 (29%) are likewise introduced by nāqī- (examples (3) and (5); in example (3) we also find qi-, co-ordinated with nāqī). The proportion of sentences introduced by nāqī- is thus very similar for the instances with a clear correlative pronoun and for the more doubtful cases; synchronically speaking this similarity supports the traditional interpretation of nāqī- as a relative pronoun. The pronouns nāqī- and qi- probably differed in meaning, but the difference may well have been subtle and (like Greek ἕν and ἧ) both pronouns are usable in conditional relative clauses.
For present purposes we would like to know whether any of the shaded instances of *mλ, or indeed anything else, is actually a correlative pronoun—that is to say, a pronoun 'picking up' (and coreferential with) the underlined relative clause.

All four shaded instances of *mλ are usually taken to refer to the σερλις of the temple,7 and so to pick up the subject of the underlined relative clause, not the whole relative clause. On this view the only pronoun picking up the relative clause itself would be the *ad *it in *puk-mλ-α[α]* ἡμερασιαλ or ἡμερασιαλ *it mλ*. If we ask

7For the idea that *puk...puk...* in the underlined relative clause means 'whether...or', see Melchert 1997:38. Alternatively, I find it possible that the meaning here is 'or...or' (as per Gasmann 1960:286), if Lydian relative clauses of the type 'whatever he required and/or requisitioned' allow the second conjunct to contain an anaphoric pronoun in the syntactic slot that the relative pronoun occupies in the first one (i.e. if in Lydian one could say 'whatever he required and/or requisitioned it'). At least at first sight, we find a similar structure at 34.2-5, in our example (7): *nλ-and tλ ἐφιείν *puk-nλ *θελαλθήλ *and whoever destroys it or (the) *θελαλθήλ (see also example (3)). Since *nλ in this instance is a subject pronoun, it may be due to the rule (likely to obtain in Lydian as well as Hittite and Luwian; see Melchert 1997:39) requiring an overt subject with a subset of infinitival verbs. On the other hand it is not clear to me whether this rule need give rise to the *nλ in *puk-nλ *θελαλθήλ, or whether the subject relative pronoun *tλ could in principle have fulfilled the requirement to have an overt subject with the second verb.

8So e.g. Melchert (2003:161-2), taking all instances as derive of disadvantage and translating the first, second, and fourth instances in their contexts as 'whoever pλ (a) c. from him for himself'; 'or cuts off from him anything for himself'; or pλ (to) him for something evil'.
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whether there is an overt correlative pronoun, *-ad* here hardly fits the bill: in the examples listed in the appendix, all the enclitic correlative pronouns occur in the particle chain attached to the first clause-combining conjunction after the relative clause.

But it is worth asking whether the first, second, and fourth shaded instances of *ml* need refer to the *lerlîš* or whether they could refer instead to the property that the underlined relative clause picks out. (The third instance does refer to the *lerlîš*, because here *-ad* refers to the property. For *ml* with different antecedents in successive clauses, see our example (18) and its variant (17).) If these instances of *ml* refer to the property, the first in particular would be exactly where an overt correlative pronoun should go, and the second half of the sentence could be translated ‘# well then whoever *citollad pitaad* from it or cuts off anything from it, or *fapuwrítu*. it from him, or *paissavekúhît* to it with any injustice, or does any verbal or material damage whatsoever, # well then to him Artemis of Ephesus will do harm—to him and his own property’. If the hypothetical wrongdoer is envisaged as appropriating or removing pieces of temple property it might not be surprising to find pronouns referring to the whole from which parts are taken away. Craig Melchert points out to me that overt enclitic dative pronon forms rarely have semantically inanimate antecedents elsewhere in Anatolian, although occasional examples are found in Hittite. However, a parallel for Lydian *ml* with a semantically inanimate—albeit this time grammatically animate—antecedent can be found at 44.1-3 (es *viñas manelîš alüliš* ak-*ml*-t qîš sendîpîd ‘This tomb (is) of Mane (son) of Alu. And whoever does harm to it...’) and the variant at 44.1 (es *asišas manelîš alüliš* ak-*ml*-t qîš sendîpîd ‘This asina-(is) of Mane (son) of Alu. And whoever does harm to it...’). Lydians apparently did not feel that *ml* meant only ‘him/her’ (dative), to the exclusion of ‘it’ (dative). Given this, it would not be surprising if they also used *ml* with an antecedent that was grammatically as well as semantically inanimate, such as our underlined relative clause with coordinated relative pronouns nàqid and gäl.8

Examples (5) and (6) have sentence-initial relative clauses followed by a main clause beginning with ak-*ml*, where *ms* (shown below with shading) is a dative plural form meaning ‘to them’. This pronoun has been taken to refer to the group of people called mâmîsî. Thus, Melchert (2006:116) translates example (5) as ‘whatever _s the M'mîna's from/in Sardis, we have decreed an ališad wusîdîn for them’, while Yakubovich (2017:275-6) gives the translation ‘Whatever the mîmîna- group represent in respect to Sardis, we approved for them/you a just reform’. Melchert (2006:1164) translates example (6) as ‘Whatever _s the M'mîna's from/in Sardis,

---

8Craig Melchert (personal communication) makes a different and intriguing suggestion, that *sil* may be a local particle functionally equivalent to Hittite *-auta* (rather than a reflexive as per Melchert 1997), and that in examples (5)/(4) both instances of this particle (not the instances of *-ml*) express ‘from it (i.e. the property)’ in ak-*ml*-sil qîš citollad pitaad pub-*ml*-sil fêkarteed gî-tî. In this case we would not have a correlative pronoun as such, but we would nevertheless have an indication of the syntactic relationship between the underlined relative clause and what follows.
the ἵ. of Artemis have decreed to ἵ. it to them (or decreed it to be ἵ. to them)’, while Yakubovich (2017:280) translates this example as ‘What(ever) the μῆλιμνό group represent in respect to Sardis, the ἱστράλιμα officials of Artemis placed them/you under oath’.⁶

(5) nāgiḍa mālīmnas īś sfarā
rel.nom/acc.sg/pl.? neut Mālīmnas-nom/acc.pl prep. Sardis.dat.sg
īṭ ak ms ālīdad wiswīd
3.sg.pres/fut.mid conj-them.dat.pl acc.sg acc.sg.neut
kattīwv decrcc(?) i.pl.pret (22.5–6)
‘Whatever mālīmnas īṭ sfarā īṭl, # ṣā ḫ we have decreed(?) an ālīdad wiswīd.’

(6) qida īṭl mālīmnas
rel.nom/acc.sg/pl.? neut ? 3.sg.pres/fut.mid Mālīmnas-nom/acc.pl
īṭ sfarā ak ms īrduw ḫwālmaš arīmul
prep? Sardis.dat.sg conj-them.dat.pl gen.sg
kattīris
decrcc(?) i.pl.pret (22.10–1)
‘Whatever īṭl mālīmnas īṭ sfarā, # ṣā ḫ the ḫwālmaš of Artemis īrduw kattīris.’

If īṭl is indeed correctly interpreted as referring to the Mālīmnas, īṭl would pick up a constituent of the relative clause (mālīmnas) rather than the whole relative clause; it would not be a correlative pronoun. But it is worth asking whether īṭl could instead pick up the whole relative clause, and thus be a correlative pronoun.

⁶One might ask what, if any, syntactic role the relative clauses (or rather their implicit resumptions) are taken to play in the main clauses on the interpretations quoted here. Regarding example (5), I take it that for both Melchert and Yakubovich the relative clause sets up a topic without strictly playing any syntactic role in the main clause, i.e. ‘Whatever ἵ. is the Mālīmnas from in Sardis, in relation to that we have decreed an ālīdad wiswīd for them’ (after Melchert) or ‘Whatever the μῆλιμνό group represent in respect to Sardis, in relation to that we approved for them/you a just reform’ (after Yakubovich). Regarding example (6), Melchert’s translation clearly implies that the (implicit resumption of the) relative clause has a syntactic role in the main clause as the object of īrduw (with īrduw taken as an infinitive). I take it that Yakubovich again considers the relative clause to set up a topic without strictly playing any syntactic role in the main clause, i.e. ‘What(ever) the μῆλιμνό group represent in respect to Sardis, in relation to that the ἱστράλιμα officials of Artemis placed them/you under oath’. The alternative suggestion put forward below makes for a clear syntactic relationship between relative clause and main clause (one that can be expressed in the main clause with a dative), but a looser semantic connection is certainly possible if Lydian allows this in correlative sentences (see Probert 2006:62–3, 69–70 on similar examples in Middle and Late Hittite). Any such correlative sentences would necessarily lack an overt correlative pronoun, in the absence of a syntactic slot for the correlative pronoun to occupy.

⁷Correlative pronouns are sometimes thought of as ‘picking up’ the relative pronoun in particular (rather than the whole relative clause). On this conception one may say that correlative pronouns do pick up a constituent of the relative clause (namely the relative pronoun or the relativised constituent). For our purposes what is important is that in examples (5) and (6) μῆλιμνό is not the relativised constituent but some other constituent of the relative clause. Note in addition that as a common-gender noun, μῆλιμνό is not only a distinct item from the relative pronoun but also cannot form a constituent with it.
A question that arises in this connection is whether the forms nāqida and qida should be taken as singulars or plurals, because if a relative clause is picked up by a plural pronoun form (such as -ms), we would normally expect its relative pronoun to be a plural too. The forms nāqida and qida are usually taken as the relative pronoun forms nāqid and gid (normally nominative/accusative neuter singular) plus a generalising particle -a. However, it is often thought that the form gid functions as both singular and plural, and we might expect the same to be true for extended nāqida and qida. Moreover, two of the three occurrences of (nā)qida occur precisely here, where -ms follows in the main clause, and the third appears in a context where a plural relative pronoun form is easier than a singular: ἔχων χιλιον qida tamv 'all these parts which I have built' (2.5–6, in our example (13)). On the basis of the latter example, Sideltsev and Yakubovich revive a suggestion of Carruba’s that (nā)qida is a marked nominative/accusative neuter plural form, innovated by adding the neuter plural ending -a to the basic neuter nominative/accusative form (nā)qid. Tentatively, we might suspect that the co-occurrence of (nā)qida with -ms in our examples (5) and (6) is no accident, but also reflects the status of (nā)qida as a nominative/accusative neuter plural form. This suggestion opens up the possibility that in (5) and (6) we once again have correlative pronouns: ‘Whatever items māṃms it sār₃ it₃, # for them (i.e. for those items) we have decreed(? an αἰδιάδ wisωid,’ ‘Whatever items it₁ it₃ māṃms it sār₃, # for them (i.e. for those items) the iswāltis of Artemis ἵρα τέρπεις’.

The suggestion made here is challenged by Yakubovich’s (2017) recent analysis of the whole of text 22 (building on that of Schürr (1997)), according to which the Sardians are the narrators for the main central portion of the text (including our examples (5) and (6)) and -ms always refers to the Māṃma’s in that portion of the text. On the other hand, the possibility put forward here is compatible with the overall structure and sense for which Yakubovich argues: our instances of -ms would refer to items closely connected to the Māṃma’s, even if not to the Māṃma’s themselves.

The proposal made here would involve two further instances of an overt enclitic dative pronoun form (-ms) with a semantically as well as grammatically inanimate antecedent. The idea that this was a serious possibility in Lydian has been mooted above, but of course remains uncertain.

3 Non-overt nominative or overt dative?

The overall structure of example (7) has received widely divergent analyses. On one view, gid ἱσθανυν πυκ-νας ψεδανοις is the relative clause and fisk-τιδ is the main
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clause. On a different view, the relative clause ends with karpodokid and the "main clause" (with another probable relative sentence nested inside it) begins with nā-mā qa-g det. In order to leave both possibilities open, the Lydian text is presented here without the use of underlining or bold, and with two alternative translations. (In the translations, relative clauses are underlined as usual. Only the second analysis involves an overt correlative pronoun in the Lydian; in the second translation the English rendering of this pronoun is accordingly shown in bold.)

(7) ak-ād qaša fisqānt
CONJ-ACC.SG.NEUT REL-ION.SG.ANIM destroy.3SG.PRES/FUT
pul-ās fēdanālā fak-t-ād
or-RC.NOM.SG 3SG.PRES/FUT CONJ-REFL-ACC.SG.NEUT
karpodokid nā-mā
restore(?)/steal(?).3SG.PRES/FUT ever-him.DAT.SG
qā-g det
REL.NOM.SG.NEUT-CONJ(?) movable property.NOM.SG
nā-k-mā [...]clā ak-ād arītimā
ever(?)-CONJ-him.DAT.SG.3DAT.SG CONJ-ACC.SG.NEUT Artemis.DAT.SG
ipsīmā fēncā
Ephesian.DAT.SG dedicate.1SG.PRET (34.2–6)

? `And whoever destroys it or fēdanālā, # he shall restore it. Whatever movable property (there is) to him (i.e. whatever movable property he has) and … # I have dedicated it to Ephesian Artemis'.

? `And whoever destroys it or fēdanālā, # and steals it for himself, well then whatever movable property (there is) to him (i.e. whatever movable property he has) and … # I have dedicated it to Ephesian Artemis'.

On the first interpretation, the beginning of the main clause is clearly marked by the conjunction fak, and we would have a correlative sentence with non-overt correlative pronoun. If this is the correct interpretation one could argue that a non-overt correlative pronoun is to be expected in this instance, since nominative -ās is

12So Melchert 1991:116. A third view again is that of Payne and Wintjes (2016:83–4), according to whom the clause formulae beginning at ak-ād qaš fisqānt continues up to nā-k-mā [...]clā, at which point it breaks off without ever coming to a main clause. They give the translation 'And who destroys it or he (who) does evil, and he steals it for himself. (If) there is anything to him and … (to/for) him. I have dedicated it to Artemis of Ephesos', and comment, 'Given that structure and content of such formulaic texts would have been widely known, one might assume that any reader would have understood the implicit apologia.' For a language we understand as poorly as Lydian such structures should usually be an explanation of last resort, but they can certainly occur in any language. Should Payne and Wintjes' analysis be correct, example (7) would have nothing to contribute to the main concern of this paper; in the absence of a main clause, we could not sensibly ask whether the main clause contains an overt correlative pronoun.
13For the idea that karpodokid means 'steals' see Oettinger 1993:45i, reporting a personal communication from Melchert.
unexpected with a transitive verb (see Melchert 1997:39), and the direct object *ad makes clear that kapros-kid is indeed a transitive verb. However, a stressed subject pronoun could have been used, as in example (23). On the other hand, few of the overt correlative pronouns of the examples in the appendix are in the nominative (but see (24) as well as (23)), and subjects can be left implicit in other contexts: Lydian is a pro-drop language.

On the second interpretation there is again a clear clause-boundary, although this is marked only by the position of the second-position enclitic *ml, as also in example (37). This time there is an overt correlative pronoun in *ml ‘to him’. Without deciding which interpretation is right we can say only that this example has a non-overt correlative pronoun in the nominative (i.e. the first interpretation) or an overt one in the dative (i.e. the second interpretation).

4 Examples that may not be correlative sentences at all

The overall structure of example (8) has been taken in two quite different ways. On one analysis, datros-kms gesi ml miimne swa swrditav is the relative clause and the main clause begins with ak-ma-ad siwramisi artimul. Taking the overall sentence structure in this way, Yakubovich (2017:278–9) gives the translation ‘but whatever datros(i)-payment is due to(ward) them/you, toward the Sardian miimne-, the siwramisi-officials of Artemis approved that for them/you, as well as the priests of Bacchus and the prophet’. On this interpretation we would have a clear correlative sentence with marked clause boundary and correlative pronoun *ad. The mismatch in gender between the relative pronoun form gesi and the neuter correlative pronoun form *ad would be unexpected (although hardly impossible as a constructio ad sensum), and on this basis we might tentatively prefer the second analysis, on which only datros-kms gesi is the relative clause while cml miimne swa swrditav is the main clause. Taking the overall structure in this way, Melchert (2006:1164) offers the translation ‘Also (-k) whatever (gesi) datros- (is) to them (-ms) (= they have), it _s (cml) for the Miimna’s (miimnai) to s. to for the Sardians. The f. of Artemis, the priest of P. and the armes- have decreed it for them’. On this second analysis (which is reflected in the underlining and the translation given below), our sentence provides a candidate for a sentence-initial relative clause followed by neither clause-combining conjunction nor correlative pronoun:’

*More difficult to make sense of as candidates are 11.3 (gid-ad swa wrrns arxhîs baqtad, rendered by Schürer (2003:118) as ‘Das was wir ... ten fir wrrns, ... ten sie bahtad’), and 11.6–7 (gap-k-vid gisad wrrns baktad unmid, rendered by Schürer (2003:119) as ‘und hier das, was er ... t ... te er umwad’. If gid is really the relative pronoun form in both places, it is difficult to see what *ad is doing in either. Unless typological parallels can be found, we might hesitate to see *ad as either a pronominal head for the relative clause (can an enclitic hosted by the relative pronoun really fulfill this role?) or a correlative pronoun belonging functionally to the main clause. Alternatively *gidad has been taken as an extended form of gid or as a form meaning ‘because’; see Guzman 1964:386–7, with bibliography.
(8) datros-:kms qesiš cēntλ
?:NOM.sg=CONJ-them.DAT.pl REL.NOM.sg=ANIM ?:3SG.PRES/FUT.MID
mēmināv šawv sfardētāv akms-ad
mēminā-.DAT.pl ? Sardian.DAT.pl CONJ-them.DAT.pl-IE'acc.sg=neut
šwraλmiš artimul kattīs kaw-e-k
?:NOM.pl Artemis.gen.sg decree(?) 3PL.PRET priest.NOM.sg/pl=conJ
pakiliš armta-k
of-Bacchus.nom.sg/pl=anim ?:nom.sg/pl=anim=conj (22.7-10)
?
‘And whatever is datros to them cēntλ mēmināv šawv sfardētāv. And the
šwraλmiš of Artemis and the priest(s) of Bacchus and the armta have
decreed(?) it for them...’

In sentence (9) we have a relative clause headed by a demonstrative pronoun, again
apparently followed by neither clause-combining conjunction nor correlative pro-
noun:

(9) cet-it qid trodv šēswad
DEm.acc(?) sg=neut=ptc REL.acc.sg=neut gravel.isg.pret ?:acc(?) sg
qistoridy kastāv
?:isg.pret ? (10.5)

‘This šēswad which I granted I qistori'ed kastāv’.17

In principle, both examples (8) and (9) may be correlative sentences with unmarked
clause boundary and non-overt correlative pronoun. But it is not clear that we have
correlative structures here at all, because the underlined material could be an actual
constituent of the main clause: in (8) perhaps the subject, and in (9) the object.
On this analysis there is no overt marking of a clause boundary because there is no
clause boundary, and no correlative pronoun because the relative clause itself (plus
its pronominal head in (9)) occupies the relevant syntactic slot of the main clause.
The more difficult example (10) is sometimes taken to consist of a relative clause
qet-m piš ētannw unadd followed by a main clause ak epad inišidī sfirwad. Alternatively,
the sequence qet-m piš ētannw unadd is taken to comprise the whole relative sen-
tence, with a new sentence then beginning with ak epad. Thus Gusmani (1964:180)
translates qet-m piš ētannw unadd as ‘was er (als) Bestimmung vorschreibt’, while Bach-
varova (2004:243) translates the same sequence as ‘And whatever (it is?), as a desig-
nation he will write it’. To leave both possibilities open the Lydian text is presented
here without the use of underlining, and with two alternative translations as with
example (7).

17Compare Gusmani (1961:184), who comments on the parallel positions of the syntactically parallel verb
forms qistorid and ētannw. Bachvarova (2004:243) translates ‘This s, which I handed over, I q-ed to k. (inf?)’.
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(10) qed-m piš čt\_m
REL.NOM(?) SG.NEUT-PTC HC NOM SG ANIM regulation(?) ACC SG
unad\_v ak epad in\_n\_d\_v
prescribe(?) write(?) ISG.PRET/3SG.PRES/FUT? CONJ? make ISG.PRET
sf\o\r\wad
? ACC SG (10.18-9)

'What he prescribes as a regulation, I have epad made as a sf\o\r\wad'.

'And whatever (it is), he will prescribe (it) as a regulation. And I have epad made as a sf\o\r\wad'.

Both analyses run into a problem. The form unad\_v looks like a first-person singular preterite, not a third-person form, and the next clause has a clear first-person singular in\_n\_d\_v. Yet piš 'he' can hardly fit in unless unad\_v is a third-person form. Attempts to take qed-m piš čt\_m unad\_v as an entire sentence face a second problem too. The word piš 'he' does not look as if it can belong to the relative clause, given the mismatch in gender between qed and piš, and so we would seem to be left with a one-word (plus particle) relative clause qed-m. Can this really mean 'whatever (it is)'?18 In passing, Melchert (1992:51) suggests that the form piš is the real problem in this sentence.19 Could piš here mean something other than 'he'?

Since enclitic -\_mλ 'to him' exists beside -\_ms 'to them', the stressed pronoun piš 'he', with dative singular πλ 'to him', conceivably has a dative plural πει 'to them'. Such a form could have been created within Lydian via the following proportion:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>enclitic DAT SG</th>
<th>enclitic DAT PL</th>
<th>stressed DAT SG</th>
<th>stressed DAT PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>=_mλ</td>
<td>=_ms</td>
<td>*πλ (&gt; ρλ) 20</td>
<td>*πει (&gt; πει) 21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We do not see many stressed pronouns in Lydian relative sentences, but one reason for a stressed form here might be precisely to avoid a relative clause whose only stressed word is the relative pronoun. (If the relative pronoun normally carries topic intonation or the like, the clause may need a word to carry focus intonation.) If so, while Lydians say datros-λ:ms gesi 'whatever is datros to them' (i.e. whatever datros

18 Cf. Probert and Dickey 2011:121 with n. 21 for the rarity of Greek relative clauses so elliptical that the only overt material is the relative pronoun.

19 In view of the clear example in\_n\_d\_v of the next clause, we should probably also take unad\_v as pret. 1st singular, despite the problematic bit, which appears to be nom. singular 'he'.

20 For the stressed dative singular form we should probably assume a preform *πδλ. (On the stem see e.g. Melchert 1994:7. The -\_ in the nominative singular is not due to Anatolian -\_ mutation, in which case it would not appear in the dative.) The development of *πδλ to πλ must then have occurred, but not simply by the loss of unstressed vowels in final syllables (on which see Melchert 1994:373-4), as the form is stressed. Kloeckner (2012:166) apparently accepts a more general sound change *λ > λ. Be this as it may, since λ-stems regularly have a dative singular in λ rather than -λ (see Kloeckner ibid.), the asterisked form *πδλ can probably be considered a synchronic underlying form, so that our analogy need not have taken place at a time when πλ was still *πδλ.

21 For the palatalisation of -\_ by a preceding i see Melchert 1994:360-4. The asterisked form *πει can be considered a synchronic underlying form, so that our analogy need not have occurred before this palatalisation.
they have), as in (8), they say qed-m piš ‘whatever is to them’ (i.e. whatever they have). This explanation implies that qed-m piš is indeed the entire relative clause: qed-m piš ikšqin unadv ‘whatever there is to them I wrote as (some kind of document)’. (The referent of piš may be the people to whom something is revealed in example (23), from the same text.) We would have neither overt correlative pronoun nor marked clause boundary. Once again we need not have a correlative sentence in structural terms, since qed-m piš could itself function as the direct object of unadv. All this is highly speculative, but it remains difficult to see any plausible syntactic structure if piš is a nominative singular here.

5 Conclusion

We set out to find out whether correlative pronouns are always overt in Lydian. No definite answer has been offered, but we have not seen any instance in which the only plausible analysis involves a non-overt correlative pronoun. I have previously argued that Old Hittite relative sentences with sentence-initial relative clauses fall into two types: a correlative type in which there is an overt correlative pronoun (except in rare examples with the conjunction ta), and a type in which the relative clause is an actual constituent of the main clause. Our investigations raise the possibility of a similar situation for Lydian. More cannot be said, but asking the question may have opened up one or two new possibilities for the understanding of difficult passages. If others can advance our understanding by refuting them, this paper will have served its purpose.

Appendix: Relative sentences with clearly-marked clause boundary and overt correlative pronoun (all translations are tentative)\(^2\)

(11) = (1) ak-it ešā ʃirmal qaš ʃenšašid niwisc faš-mal-ša in qaläns tawsas arišmu-k ipsisšis kätšarlokid ‘# And whoever does harm to this temple with injustices?’, # to him mighty Qidans and Ephesian Artemis will do harm’ (23.2-4).

(12) (A “false start” type structure: a long and digressive relative clause introduced by ak-it n[ʔiqiš] breaks off in favour of a new beginning, introduced by ak-t-in nāqiš; so Craig Melchert, personal communication.) (2) ak-it n[aqis] eša mtruša puk ešu wànaša puk ešu laqiršu šav puk-it kud ist eša wànaša pılarwop[u] ak-t-in nāqiš qell-k šenšašid faš-maš arišmuš ipsisšis arimulu-k kulumšis aarál

\(^{22}\) Probert 2006.

\(^{23}\) The relative sentences at 9.3-10, 17.1-3, 26.2-4, 43.5, and 108.4-6 are excluded from this list because we lack the parts of the inscriptions that would contain the clause-combining conjunction and the correlative pronoun, although comparable curse formulae make it likely that these elements were present. At 80.11-3 we may well have a further correlative sentence with both these elements present (so Schür 2006:1571), but the fragmentary state of the text leaves room for uncertainty. There may be a further example with both elements present at 54.4-6 (nested in what may be the main clause of our example (11)), but there is room for uncertainty because of the incomplete state of line 5, and because it is uncertain whether mà ... ʃaqiš is indefinite or relative.
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pirâl-k kîlîl-k koñûl-k qîral qe17-k pi1l- wcpâqênt '# And whoever at this stèle or this tomb or these laqirîl's, or where in this tomb (there is?) pi1tarâvul —# whoever does harm to anything(?)#, # Ephesians Artemis and Koloan Artemis will do damage to his estate and house, earth and water, any(?) property of his (1.4—9).24

(13) (Two conjoined relative clauses share a main clause.) ak-t-in nâtîq ênîslîpit ęsâv mîlînêndav ışkân qida25 tamî pu11 kâna11 ešîl p1u11k mrûl pu11k plâsôl ęsîl pu11k laqîsâv pu11k-r sîtîaw ısîs-k dektîd ısîs ešîl wâna11 karonî șapîlîl karonî-s sîndaw arwol ak-môl ărtîmu11 insipîmaw kulunmîâ-k șîwânîm [in]ânum # And whoever does harm to all these works which I have built—either to this stèle or to the stèle or to this plâsôl or to the laqîsâl’s, or to other objects, and whoever tries(?) to appropriate the property of Karos26 in this tomb of Karos son of Șapîlî in Argos, # against him I invoke Artemis of the Ephesians and of the Koloans (in the person of) the college of priests(/?) (2.4—11).

(14) ak-t-in nâtîq ênîslîpit fak-1t-aw e1pâd [...] ra pi1tarâv ăsîlîb ăsîrîs sîndaw (k)-mlâ-in [...] ăpugîd # And whoever does harm, # him e1pâd ... ra pi1tarâv ăsîlîb ăsîrîs and his property ... ăpugîd27 (2.11—3).

(15) ak qis ûsred fakas șîlawad hast id nâtîq ênîslîpit ak-môl lews šârâtas '# And whoever takes care(?) # and (he) behaves well(?) # and does not do harm, # to him Zeus (will be) well-disposed' (3.3—4).

(16) qis-it ênîslîpit ešîl wâna11 pu11k ešîl, mrûl fak-môl lews wcpâqênt 'Whoever does harm to this tomb or to this stèle, # to him Zeus will do damage' (3.4—5).

(17) ak-môl-t qis ênîslîpit pu11k e1sâv anlo1lû pu11k ešîl karonî fak-môl-s ântsâs kufâw-k mariwda-ênîslîpit[ild] '# And whoever does harm to it or to these anlo1lû's or to this karonî, # to him Sanda, Kubaba, and Mariwda will do harm' (4.1—5).

(18) ak-môl-t qis ênîslîpit fak-môl-t qidân1s ărtîmu11k wcpâqênt 'And whoever does harm to it, # to him Qidans and Artemis will do damage' (4.2—3).

(19) ak nâtîq êmîl kânâl ki1l-k pu11k êmînaw csaw cîtal1l-fad1nt fak-môl ărtîmu11 qîral qe17-k wcpâqênt '# And whoever does harm to my wife Kile or my descendants, # Artemis will do damage to any property of his28 (5.3—5).

24 For qe17-k as the dative of a word meaning 'anything' and/or 'whatever' see Gusmani 1964:181-4; Sidellsey and Yakhoviovich 2016:100 n. 51.
25 For the idea that qida may be a plural counterpart of qid, see §2.
26 On karonî/s see Meichetti 1997:112-3.
27 For suggestions on the main clause see Gusmani 1964:196; Schütt 1997:206.
28 On this inscription see Gusmani 1985.
(20) ak-it qiš ešš wānāl puč eššāv antolav puč eššāv laqrīšāv fēnēlābid fāk-av wissiš niwāscu warkotkiš '#And whoever does harm to this tomb or these antola’s or these laqrīšā’s, # him Justice(?) will punish for injustices(?)' (6.2–6).

(21) ak-it nāqiš ešš wānāl puč [k] laqrīšāv puč qēlāl fēnēlābid fāk-av wissiš niwāscu warkotkiš '# And whoever does harm to this tomb or the laqrīšā’s or the land, # him Justice(?) will punish for injustices(?)' (7.3–6).

(22) ak-it nāqiš fēnēlābid ešš wānāl puč ešš mbaru puč eššāv laqrīšāv kud-k-it ešš wānāl pātaruud fāk-av wissiš niwāscu warkotkiš '# And whoever does harm to this tomb or this stele or these laqrīšā’s, wherever in this tomb (there is?) pātaruud, # him Justice(?) will punish for injustices(?)' (8.6–12).

(23) ak-un nāqiš koll fāk-mi-it el edši wastūnaši qašas '# Whatever he has revealed(?)', # this is hereditary property99 (10.12–3).

(24) nā-m qid kot altokad ak-m-ād sācād qirat 'Whatever he reveals(?) altokad, # it is steadfast(?) property to him'100 (10.14–5).

(25) eššēt mri qiš fēnēlābid ak-av wissiš niwāscu warkot 'Whoever does harm to this stele, # him Justice(?) will punish for injustices(?)' (10.23–4).

(26) wān-ta-k-i ešš irfūl qiš fakorfiš kāfotin puč mbaru m-āt-av wissiš wārs nād kantroo 'And whoever irfūl fakorfiš kāfotin to these wānts or to the stele, # him wissiš wārs nād kantroo to it'101 (II.11–2).

(27) ak qed alīdaš tasod ak-m-ād inānt '# And whatever alteration she orders, # that he will make for her'102 (22.14–5).

(28) cītōls puč afāris qā dēt amunād ak-m-av prafriš prafriš šawarid ' (He) to whom (there is) a cītōls or afāris as movable property from me, # him the prafriš will look after for the prafriš'103 (23.6–7).

(29) (A correlative sentence with two more nested in its main clause.) ak-it qed fasēnē ak-at qā fakantron ak-m-āt-šiš cītōlād pitad fāk-m-āt-in qādān-ik artimu-k katsārkōkid puč pīl-āk aryllā qyraš '# Whatever I own, # (as for him) to whom I offer it, # whoever cītōllād pitad from him, # to him Qidans and Artemis will do harm—to him and to his own property' (23.8–11). (In English the meaning is more easily expressed without nesting correlative sentences: 'Whoever cītōllād pitad from him to whom I offer whatever I own,

100For the sentence structure cf. Carruba 1969:74.
101Cf. Eickner 1999:127; Bachmann 2009:239. Schöfer (2006:123) takes this case formula to begin at qiš (so e.g. ‘whoever fakorfiš kāfotin or to the stele, # him wissiš wārs nād kantroo to it’).
103For a different interpretation, with qā dēt amunād as a headed relative clause modifying cītōls puč afāris, see Melchert 1999:37.
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Qidan and Artemis will do harm to him—to him and to his own property.\(^4\)

(30) (The first of the correlative sentences nested in the main clause of (29), with the second nested in its own main clause.) ak-at qû fakanrow ak-mal-iš qįš cītollad pitad fak-mal-t-in qûdān-k artimus-k katšarlokid puł pilûl-k arlyllă qyrall. ‘(he) to whom I offer it, # whoever cītollad pitad from him, # to him Qidan and Artemis will do harm—to him and to his own property’ (23.8–11).

(31) (The last of the nested correlative sentences.) ak-mal-iš qįš cītollad pitad fak-mal-t-in qûdān-k artimus-k katšarlokid puł pilûl-k arlyllă qyrall. ‘# whoever cītollad pitad from him, # to him Qidan and Artemis will do harm—to him and to his own property’ (23.9–11).

(32) amû-k-ît qurð fasfenu ak-at pawafuł šelk-k kantušu ałal niq qû-k ‘Whatever I own # I give it to the sanctuary and to the authority, not to anyone else’ (23.14–16).

(33) (A correlative sentence with another one nested in its main clause; for a translation of the smaller correlative sentence that mimics the structure of the original, see (34.).) ak-s qįš čem ēṭans uv fawcasod puł in mê tôl puł pidev qį-k int ak-mal-[iš] qed ēţand ēṭams uv ak-ad arimus pifers-t ‘# And whoever uv fawcasod my order or does any verbal or material damage whatsoever, # for him Artemis pifers whatever the order ēnud uv\(^5\) (23.18–22).

(34) (The correlative sentence nested inside the main clause of (33.) qed ēţand ēṭams uv ak-ad arimus pifers-t ‘whatever the order ēnud uv, # that Artemis pifers’ (23.21–2).

(35) (A correlative sentence nested in the main clause of our example (3.),) ak-mal-iš qįš cītollad pitaad puł-mal-iš fakaršed qį-k puł-mal-a[d] fapuwerftaš puł-mal-ir pâsakvâkid niopsis qelallă qelallă puł mê tôl puł pidev qį-k int fak-mal-iš arimus ípını-siš katšarlokid puł pilûl-k arlyllă qyrall. ‘# well then whoever cītollad pitad from it(!)\(^6\) or cuts off anything from it(?!), or fapuwerftaš it from him, or pássakvâkid to it(?!?) with any injustice, or does any verbal or material damage whatsoever, # well then to him Artemis of Ephesus will do harm—to him and his own property’ (24.7–14).

\(^4\) For the likelihood that -at contains the pronoun form -ad (plus the particle -at), see Melchert 1997:31 n. 1; cf. Gérard 2005:92 n. 180. This form is distinct from the particle -at of -at-av and fak-im-š-at-av, since the pronoun forms -ad and -av do not co-occur (see Melchert 1997:39).

\(^5\) For the reading mô tôl and for the sense of the word, see Inocente 1986.

\(^6\) The interpretation of the various instances of -mal concerned us under example (3.) but has no bearing on the overall structure of the inner correlative sentence (35.) nested inside (3.).

\(^7\) On fapuwerftaš see Melchert 1997:140–1.
(36) ak-it anu nāqid fasānātu nak aarāv nak pira-k [n]ak dētv ēnv ak-at anu mitridašt[a-λ κα]weλ kantoru šawwasat.[# And whatever I own, whether estate or house or movable property of mine, # it I entrust to Mitridatas the priest šawwasat] (24.18–21).

(37) (Two lines of verse whose ends are lost; they probably comprise a single sentence with the demonstrative form edā picking up the relative pronoun form qīl. This time the main clause does not begin with a conjunction, but the second-position enclitics -t-in make the clause boundary clear.) qīl fasaknakil puk-r edā[λ - - - - ] edā-t-in niwiswa ciwš f[ - - - - - ] 'Whoever fasaknakil ed or adēš ..., to him the god will f... the injustices(?)'9(44.16–7).
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