

ANDREW GARRETT

### The Lycian Nasalized Preterite\*

1. The Lycian verbal system has a well-known alternation between preterites ending in a nasalized vowel and those ending in a non-nasalized vowel. Altogether some two dozen distinct nasalized preterites and almost three dozen distinct non-nasalized preterites are attested: minimal pairs include 1sg. *axā* and *axa* 'made', 3sg. *adē* and *ade* 'made', 3sg. *prñawatē* and *prñawate* 'built', and 3pl. *pijētē* and *pijēte* 'gave'. This paper will propose a synchronic analysis of the distribution of nasalized and non-nasalized preterites and an account of the nasalized preterite's origin. Two uncontroversial working assumptions should first be noted. It should go without saying that the Lycian corpus provides minimal pairs of the type cited for only a few verbs. This is certainly an accident of attestation, and it may be assumed, first, that all Lycian verbs could form both nasalized and non-nasalized preterites in the appropriate contexts. Second, whatever its origin, it is not necessary to assume that nasalization was always restricted to the preterite, since almost all present verbs end in high vowels, and Lycian has no nasalized high vowels. The account developed below will in fact require that this restriction is secondary.

Several scholars have tried to make sense of the alternation between nasalized and non-nasalized preterites, but the most successful descriptive account is still that of J. IMBERT, *MSL* 9 (1898) 217, based on a survey of the very common type of (1a-b):

- (1a) *ebēñnē prñawā m=ē=ti prñawatē Xluwānimi hrppi ladi ehbi se tideime ehbije ēnē Periklehe xñtawata* (TL 67)  
 'This building, Xluwānimi built it for his wife and his children under the rule of Perikle'

---

\* For discussion and comments on earlier versions of this paper I am grateful to Mark HALE, Günter NEUMANN, Calvert WATKINS, and especially Craig MELCHERT.

- (1b) *ebēñnē prñawā m=ē=ti prñawatē Xisterija Xzzbāzeh tideimi hrppi ladi ehbi se tideime* (TL 19)  
 'This building, Xisterija, child of Xzzbāze, built it for his wife and children'

These are examples of the Lycian 'topic construction', in which clitic-doubling is obligatory whenever a definite object precedes the particle *me*<sup>1</sup>. IMBERT noticed a contrast between sentences like (1a-b) and those like (2a-b):

- (2a) *Pajawa Manaxine prñawate prñawā ebēñnē* (TL 40a = 40b)  
 'Pajawa Manaxine built this building'  
 (2b) *Purihimeti=ti prñawate Masasah tideimi xupā ebēñnē hrppi atli ehbi se tideime ehbiye* (TL 99)  
 'Purihimeti, child of Masasa, built this tomb for himself and his children'

According to 'IMBERT's Rule', recast in modern terms, if a sentence has the word order Preterite Verb + Subject it will have both a nasalized preterite and direct object clitic-doubling, as in (1a-b), while if it has the word order Subject + Preterite Verb, as in (2a-b), it will have neither clitic-doubling nor a nasalized preterite. This description is in fact remarkably accurate, although there are now counter-examples in (4c-d) and (6) below. Its real defect is that it does not fully describe the conditioning for either clitic-doubling or preterite nasalization; it does so only for sentences with overt subjects. Since neither clitic-doubling nor a nasalized preterite requires an overt subject, however, subject position itself cannot solely determine either phenomenon.

Other treatments are less satisfactory. P. MERIGGI, *IF* 46 (1928) 151ff, explains nasalization by assuming that the Lycian preterite continues a non-finite form which agreed with a preceding lexical direct object, somewhat like a Romance past participle. This account is obviously untenable today, and in any case leaves far too many unexplained preterites, both nasalized and non-nasalized. Likewise there is no support for the view of V. THOMSEN, *Bulletin de l'Academie royale des sciences et des lettres de Danemark* (1899) 33f = *Samlede Afhandlinger* (1922) 3.394, that the nasalized preterite has any aspectual function, while E. LAROCHE's statement, *Fouilles de Xanthos* 6 (1979) 87f, that the alternation between nasalized and non-nasalized preterites is purely

<sup>1</sup> See A. GARRETT, 'Topics in Lycian Syntax', to appear in HS.

graphic is clearly an act of desperation. Finally, a recent attempt by O. CAR-RUBA, SMEA 24 (1984) 65, to connect Lycian preterite nasalization to other Luvo-Lycian nasalization proceeds from the explicit assumption that nasalized and non-nasalized preterites in Lycian are isofunctional; as I will show, they are not.

2. Following a suggestion of Craig MELCHERT (pers. comm.), I will argue here that preterite nasalization is a reflex of the accusative common-gender clitic pronoun *\*om* > *ē*. Formally, Lycian nasalized preterites continue Verb + Object Clitic sequences, reanalyzed as complex verbs with object agreement of the sort found in many non-Indo-European languages: e.g. *hātē* 'they released' is as it were *\*hāte* + *ē*. This is a common mechanism for the creation of object agreement systems, just as the univerbation of Verb + Subject Clitic sequences is a typical source for subject agreement of the familiar Indo-European type. But while formally straightforward and in principle possible functionally, this account can only be justified on the basis of the synchronic distribution of nasalized and non-nasalized preterites in Lycian. In §§2-4 I will show that the Lycian nasalized preterite indeed has a function which can reasonably be explained by reference to a formal origin in Verb + Object Clitic sequences. With two systematic exceptions to be discussed in §2.2, preterite nasality marks verbs with non-lexical – that is, clitic or null – direct objects.

2.1. If this is correct, then nasalized preterites and clitic direct object pronouns should have a similar distribution, and indeed the two commonly co-occur, as IMBERT saw. The topic construction illustrated in (1a-b) is the most common realization of this pattern: as noted above, clitic-doubling is obligatory with definite object topics, and, as predicted, every preterite with a direct object topic is nasalized; there are over a hundred in all. Object clitics of course occur in other constructions as well, and there too nasalized preterites appear, as in (3a-c):

- (3a) *s=ē pijētē Wazijeje sej ēni* (TL 52.1-2)  
'And they gave it to Wazije and (his) mother'
- (3b) *se=i=ne epñ puñtē* (TL 114.2)  
'And afterwards they engraved (?) it for him'
- (3c) *s=ed adē atli hrzzē ispazijē* (TL 84.2)  
'He made it for himself, (namely) the upper *ispazije*'

The sentence in (3c) is interesting for two reasons. First, it illustrates the use of the nasalized preterite with a neuter object clitic. Since nasalization can only directly reflect an accusative common-gender pronoun, this use must be a secondary development postdating the univerbation of verb and object clitic. Second, it illustrates clitic-doubling. In "The Syntax of Anatolian Pronominal Clitics" (1990 Harvard dissertation) 229ff, I have argued that, except in the topic construction, Lycian allows clitic-doubling only of elements positioned at the right of their sentence, as in the case of *hrzzē ispazijē* 'the upper *ispazijē*' in (3c), and that this syntactic rule continues one found elsewhere in Anatolian. Strictly speaking, however, the reason for clitic-doubling in sentences like (3c) is irrelevant to the problem at hand: the point is that clitic-doubling and a nasalized preterite co-occur.

Just as nasalized preterites regularly occur in sentences with clitic objects, non-nasalized preterites regularly occur in those without such objects. There are over forty sentences of this type:

- (4a) *se tideimi Padrñmahe Xudiwazade epenētijatte Padrñma* (TL 48.6-8)  
'And Xudiwazade, child of Padrñma, acted as sales agent for Padrñma'
- (4b) *prñnawate=ti ñtatā atli ehbi* (TL 150.3-4)  
'... who built the sarcophagus for himself'
- (4c) *ēke Trñmisñ xssabrapazate Pigesere Katamlah tideimi* (N 320.1-2)  
'When Pigesere, child of Katamla, ruled Lycia ...'
- (4d) *ēti atrā pude Erb[bina]* (Arbinas II 3, cited by E. LAROCHE, Fouilles de Xanthos 6 [1979] 71)  
'Erbbina engraved (?) the image above'

In addition, although none of the three present verbs ending in a non-high vowel are nasalized, they pattern like non-nasalized preterites: *pije* 'he will pay' in TL 9 has an overt object *alaladahali* 'the burial fee'; and *ube* 'dedicates' at TL 44c.13 and *erije* at TL 29.7, both in unclear contexts, lack clitic objects. It cannot now be determined whether the Lycian of our inscriptions has an unattested nasalized present or had instead previously eliminated any such form.

In any case, the distribution of nasalized and non-nasalized preterites exactly follows the stated generalization in some one hundred and fifty cases. Two systematic exceptional patterns where non-nasalized preterites co-occur with object clitics will be discussed in §2.2, while two patterns where nasalized

preterites occur without overt object clitics will be discussed in §2.3. These cases all support rather than challenge the above account.

2.2. The major class of apparent counter-evidence to my analysis of the Lycian nasalized preterite contains a dozen sentences of the following type<sup>2</sup>:

- (5a) *Mēxisttē* = < *n̄* > *n* = *ē* *ep*[*i*] *tuwete atli ehbi Sxxulijah tideimi sa ladi ehbi Merimawaj[e] Petēnēneh tideimi se tideimi ehbi Sxxulije* (TL 27)  
 'Mexistte erected it for them, (namely) for himself, the child of Sxxulija, for his wife Merimawa, daughter of Petēnēne, and for his child Sxxulija'
- (5b) *Upazij* = *ēne pr̄nawate hrppi pr̄nezi ehbi* (TL 31.1-2)  
 'Upazi built it for his household'
- (5c) [*Erb*] *binaj* = *ēne ubete xruwata Ertēmi* (N 311.1)  
 'Erbbina dedicated it as an offering to Artemis'

In each sentence a non-nasalized preterite unexpectedly has a clitic direct object; in addition, each object clitic follows a sentence-initial subject. This pattern is systematic: nasalized preterites are never immediately preceded by sentence-initial subjects.

Rather than calling the proposed account into question, these facts illuminate some of its details. There are two likely contexts for the Verb + Object Clitic sequences which this account posits as the source of the nasalized preterite: verb-initial sentences, where clitics follow the verb as usual by Wackernagel's Law; and sentences where unstressed pronouns are verbal rather than second-position clitics. Sentences of the latter type are attested in Indo-Iranian, where they have been argued to be an important archaism by M. HALE, "Studies in the Comparative Syntax of the Indo-Iranian Languages" (1987 Harvard dissertation) 70ff, and Lycian would provide an important comparandum if they underlie its nasalized preterite. However, the pattern in (5a-c) can easily be explained only by means of the first Verb + Object Clitic context. This requires an assumption for which there is no independent evidence, unfortunately, but which is nonetheless plausible: at some stage of pre-Lycian, a sentence-initial word order Subject + Verb was at least fairly common. As in any archaic Indo-European language, the subject would have been optional and in most cases omitted; the verb would then have been sentence-initial and followed by any clitics. Such

<sup>2</sup> The dative plural clitic pronoun *n̄n(e)* in (5a), (6), (10a-b), and (13) has been identified by H.C. MELCHERT, 'The Middle Voice in Lycian', to appear in HS.

sentence-initial verbs followed by the accusative clitic *\*om > ē* were the original locus for the creation of the nasalized preterite. However, in sentences with an overt subject the Wackernagel's Law clitics would have followed the first word and not the verb. The pattern in (5a-c) is a synchronically unmotivated archaism in Lycian reflecting this fact about the original distribution of the accusative clitic.

There is a similar problem in (6), where a non-nasalized preterite co-occurs with a clitic direct object pronoun:

- (6) [p<sub>i</sub>jet]e=ñn=ē Pixe[s]ere Kat[amla]h Arñna se Tlawā se P[inal]e se Xadawāti (TL 45.1-3)  
 'Pixesere, (child) of Katamla, gave it to them, (namely) to Xanthos and Tlos and Pinara and Kadyanda'

Here too the apparently problematic sequence, *p<sub>i</sub>jete=ñn=ē* 'he gave it to them', is in fact expected historically. If the nasalized preterite reflects a Verb + Object Clitic sequence, it should originally have been improper whenever another clitic interrupted that sequence. In most cases this was impossible, but, as in (5a), the dative plural clitic regularly appeared before any direct object clitic (cf. note 8). The sequence Verb + Dative Plural Clitic + Accusative Clitic in (6) would therefore not have led directly to the nasalized preterite, and, as a synchronically unmotivated archaism, still does not occur with nasalized preterites.

2.3. The generalization above requires nasalized preterites not just with clitic objects but with any non-lexical objects, that is, with null objects as well. There are two attested contexts where nasalized preterites have such objects, and both involve sentential subordination. Most sentences of this type include nasalized preterites with postposed or embedded relative clauses:

- (7a) *me=i pñ pudē ti ñte xahba [eh]bi Wazzije kbatra* (TL 87.4-5)  
 'Afterwards his grandchild, daughter of Wazzije, engraved (?) here what (is) inside'<sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup> In this sentence *pñ* is the (occasionally attested) syncopated form of *epñ* 'afterwards'. The syncope is certainly due to the phonological phrasing also responsible for the absence of a word divider between *me=i* and *pñ*, but, in the absence of a general account of Lycian prosody and its relation to syntax, this in turn remains mysterious. Compare the sequence *se=i=ne epñ* in (3b), where there is a word divider before *epñ*.

- (7b) *se=i pijētē arawā ehbijē esi=ti* (N 320.11-12)  
'And they gave him freely what is his'
- (7c) *me xbaitē zā ese Xesñtedi qñtati se Pigrēi* (N 320.14-15)<sup>4</sup>  
'They irrigated (?) the allotment both Xesñtedi and Pigrēi till'
- (7d) *se=waj aitē kumaha ēti stali ppuweti kñmē ebehi xñtawataha Xbideñna-*  
*ha se RKKazumaha* (N 320.22-25)  
'And they made sacred to the lord of Kaunos and to ArKKazuma however  
much they engrave (?) on this stele'

The understood object of each verb here is inside the relative clause – *ti* 'what' in (7a-b), *zā* 'the allotment' in (7c), and *kñme* 'however much' in (7d) – but in each instance its syntactic object, an expected object clitic in the correlative clause, is gapped. Together with the sentences in (10b) and at N 320.29-30, (8) confirms that such correlative pronouns may be omitted:

- (8) *Pigesereje me=ij eseri hhati me hriqla asñne pzziti=ti* (N 320.40-41)  
'They will leave to Pigesere that which the acropolis decides to do', i.e.  
'they will let Pigesere do what the acropolis orders'<sup>5</sup>

Nasalized preterites which continue Verb + Object Clitic sequences would not originally have been appropriate in the context of (7a-d), and must have been secondarily extended to this function.

There is also one nasalized preterite whose complement is clearly sentential *stricto sensu* rather than embedded in a relative clause, but, like the nasalized preterites of (7a-d), it lacks an overt object<sup>6</sup>:

<sup>4</sup> I take this sentence to contain either haplology for *qñtati=ti* or a null relative pronoun, as in the English gloss.

<sup>5</sup> I do not understand why the sentence-introductory particle *me* appears here, in *me hriqla asñne pzziti=ti* 'that which the acropolis (*hriqla*) decides to do', but not in (7a-d).

<sup>6</sup> Some lexical uncertainty is associated with an otherwise apparently similar case at TL 115.1-2 (cf. TL 114.1-2): *Esedeplēmeje mej adē tesi miñti awahai xupa ebehi* 'for Esedeplēmi one has made (it) an oath to the miñti *awahai* in this tomb', where *awahai xupa ebehi* 'awahai in this tomb' is evidently the substance of the oath. For (9), the Greek text reads *ἔδοξε δὴ Ξανθίοις καὶ τοῖς περιοίκοις ἰδρύσασθαι βωμὸν βασιλεῖ Καυνίῳ καὶ Ἀρκεσίμῳ* 'the Xanthians and *perioikoi* decided to dedicate an altar to the king of Kaunos and to Arkesima'. The verb *tube-* occurs only in (9) and at Arbinas II 13 (cited by E. LAROCHE, *Fouilles de Xanthos* 6 [1979] 62), where it must be transitive, since a clitic direct

- (9) *me=hñti tubedē Arus sej epewētlñmēi Arñāi ñmaitē kumeziyē θθē xñtawati Xbidēñni sej ArKKazuma xñtawati* (N 320.5-9)  
 'Xanthos and the *perioikoi* of Xanthos decided they would make sacred an altar to the lord of Kaunos and lord ArKKazuma'

3. There are some exceptions to the proposed synchronic account of nasalized and non-nasalized preterites for which no systematic explanation can be given. Rather these must be examined case by case, to see whether alternative interpretations are possible: to the extent that they are unavailable, the account must be regarded as provisional.

3.1. Two related exceptions appear in (10a-b):

- (10a) *se=ñne ñte pdehade Trñmile pdenehñmis Ijeru se Natrbbijēmi sej Arñna asaxlazu Erttimeli* (N 320.2-5)  
 'And he appointed, for the Lycians, Ijera and Natrbbijemi as deputies, and for Xanthos, Erttimeli as governor'  
 (10b) *se=ñn aite kumazu mahāna ebette Eseimiju Qñturahahñ tideimi se=de Eseimijaje xuwati=ti* (N 320.9-11)  
 'And for these gods they made priest Eseimija, child of Qñturaha, and whoever shall succeed (?) Eseimija', i.e., 'Eseimija and his successors were appointed as priests'

In (10a), *ñne* doubles *Trñmile* 'for the Lycians' as well as *Arñna* 'for Xanthos'. Both are followed by direct objects, *Trñmile* by *pdenehñmis Ijeru se Natrbbijēmi* 'Ijera and Natrbbijēmi as deputies' and *Arñna* by *asaxlazu Erttimeli* 'Erttimeli as governor'. Similarly, *ñn(e)* in (10b) doubles *mahāna ebette* 'for

---

object *ene* is present. In (9), however, it lacks an obvious object. I suggest a meaning like 'decide' and a subcategorization frame permitting either an object ('decide something') or a sentential complement ('decide that ...'). In context, what follows is clearly the Xanthian decision. I translate *ñmaitē* as 'they would make' because whatever the correct analysis — see H.C. MELCHERT, *Lycian Lexicon* (1989) 40 with references — it is likely to be a preterite third-person plural verb meaning at least approximately 'they made', and it is contextually subordinate. As a parallel to this construction with overt coordination but understood subordination cf. N 320.20-22, *se sñmati xddazas epi=de arawa hñti kñmētis me=i pibiti sixlas* 'and they shall oblige (?) however many slaves they set free to give (two) shekels' (after H.C. MELCHERT, HS 102 [1989] 39). A nasalized preterite is predicted for *ñmaitē* in (9) if, as I translate, its first object *θθē ... xñtawati* 'an altar ...' is dislocated to the right. There is no clitic-doubling of indefinite objects.



these gods', which is followed by the direct object *Eseimiju ... xuwati=ti* 'Eseimija ... and whoever succeeds Eseimija'. The problem is, of course, that the nasalized preterites *pddēhadē* 'he appointed' and *aitē* 'they made' apparently occur with stressed rather than clitic (or null) objects.

Fortunately, there are several reasons to believe that these verbs indeed have clitic objects and thus that preterite nasalization is appropriate. First, as noted in §2.1, Lycian and other Anatolian languages require that certain elements — including definite direct objects like those in (10a-b) — be clitic-doubled when dislocated to the right of their sentences. If the objects in (10a-b) are not dislocated, then the word orders Beneficiary + Direct Object in (10a) and Second Object + Beneficiary + First Object in (10b) are regular for these verbs. This would be surprising from both the Anatolian and typological perspectives. But if these objects are dislocated, clitic-doubling and hence preterite nasalization are expected. Second, (10a-b) both show the sequence *señn(e)*, with apparent nasalization of the conjunction *se*. This has been taken by E. LAROCHE, *Fouilles de Xanthos* 6 (1979) 61, as assimilation to the following nasal, a hypothesis which is certainly possible in view of similar apparent assimilations elsewhere. Assimilation of this type is hardly regular in Lycian, however, and its conditioning is not understood. In fact, there is no secure evidence that the pronoun *ñne* ever causes preceding vowel nasalization. This pronoun occurs fourteen times outside (10a-b), according to H.C. MELCHERT, *Lycian Lexicon* (1989) 43: it follows a non-nasalized vowel in thirteen instances, including *me=ñn(e)* eight times and *se=ñne* three times, but only in (5a) does it follow a nasalized vowel. As long as the conditioning for nasal assimilation is unknown, it is possible that the nasal vowel in *Mexisttē* in (5a) is the result of assimilation to  $\langle \tilde{n} \rangle n(e)$ , but it cannot be excluded that this proper name ends in a nasal vowel, like *Xssbezē* at TL 25.2<sup>7</sup>. There are thus no secure parallels for the apparent assimilatory nasalization of (10a-b).

In short, the sentences in (10a-b) have unexpected nasalized preterites, show other unexplained nasal vowels, contradict the rules of Lycian clitic-doubling, and have verbal complements in a surprising order. All these problems would be resolved if the sequence *sē* beginning these sentences is (as often) *s=ē*, the conjunction *se* elided before the accusative clitic pronoun *ē*. In each sentence this pronoun doubles its direct object, and the objects in (10a-b) are thus right-dislocated; it may be assumed that *Trñmile* and *Arñna* in (10a) and *mahāna*

<sup>7</sup> Otherwise it may be significant that the letter Ñ̄ is omitted in TL 27.

*ebette* in (10b) are also (vacuously) dislocated. The resulting word order Beneficiary + Object differs from the expected one, and all these elements are clitic-doubled<sup>8</sup>.

3.2. A similar kind of analysis can be given to a number of apparently unexpected nasalized preterites of the type in (11a-b), all in formulae with the word *tesī* 'oath, pledge':

- (11a)  $s=\bar{e}=ije \bar{n}tad\bar{e} tesi mi\bar{n}ti aladaheli ada$  II (TL 42.4)  
 'And he has put them here, (namely) 2 adas, as a pledge to the miñti for the burial fee'
- (11b)  $s=e=ije \bar{n}ta t\bar{a}t\bar{e} tasa mi\bar{n}ta meleime sej aladahali ada$   
 III- (TL 31.3-6)  
 'And they have put them here, (namely) 3½ adas, as the miñti's pledges for *meleime* and for the burial fee'

On these formulae see the important treatment of T. BRYCE, *AnSt* 26 (1976) 175ff. Compare the following atypical example:

- (12)  $s=ed=i \bar{n}ta [i]ad\bar{e} tesi mi\bar{n}ti aladehali ad\bar{e}$  III (TL 4.3-5)  
 'And he has put it here, (namely) 3 adas, as a pledge to the miñti for the burial fee'

In the paper cited in note 1, I have shown that Lycian preserves an absolutive plural clitic pronoun *e* cognate to Hittite and Palaic *e*; on my analysis it is this pronoun which triggers preterite nasalization in (11a-b)<sup>9</sup>. The analysis can be justified by parallelism with (12), which has an absolutive singular *ed(e)* 'it'. In this sentence *tesī* cannot be the direct object, since it would then be doubled

<sup>8</sup> There is a potential objection. On this analysis, (10a-b) attest the clitic order  $\bar{e}=\bar{n}n(e)$ , Accusative + Dative Plural. The order attested elsewhere is  $\bar{n}n=\bar{e}$ , Dative Plural + Accusative, as in (5a) and (6). This is likely to be the inherited clitic order, in view of the discovery of H.A. HOFFNER, *Kaniššuwār: A Tribute to Hans G. Güterbock* (1986) 93-94, that Hittite subject and direct object clitics obligatorily precede dative singular clitics but follow dative plural clitics (so  $n=aš=mu$  but  $nu=naš=an$ ). But both proposed instances of the order  $\bar{e}=\bar{n}ne$ , Accusative + Dative Plural, occur in a single text and may well be the result of an innovation on the model of the regular clitic order  $ed=i$ , as in (12).

<sup>9</sup> Note that for reasons discussed in *Lg* 66 (1990) 265ff, I use the term 'absolutive' rather than 'nominative-accusative' in referring to neuter nouns.

by *ed(e)* and, as noted in §2.1, would be expected to be positioned at the right of its sentence; I therefore take it instead as translated<sup>10</sup>. Now (12) presents at the same time the only attestation of the form *adē* and the only instance in this set of formulae of the absolutive singular clitic. Craig MELCHERT (pers. comm.) suggests that the direct object of *tadē* may be *adē* III '3 adas', an absolutive singular doubled by *ed(e)*; cf. J. FRIEDRICH, *Hethitisches Elementarbuch* (21960) §194, on singular nouns with plural numerals. In just the same way *ada* II '2 adas' and *ada* III- '3½ adas' are the direct objects in (11a-b) respectively, both absolutive plural and both doubled by the appropriate clitic *e*. In all these sentences a nasalized preterite is indeed appropriate.

3.3. Another apparent exception is the first-person singular preterite middle verb *axagā* 'I became' identified by MELCHERT in the paper cited in note 2:

- (13) *me=ñ[n] emu axagā maraza* (TL 44c.3-4)  
'I became arbitrator for them'

Since this verb is intransitive, it cannot have a direct object of any kind — stressed, clitic, or null — and it should not have a nasalized preterite. As MELCHERT shows, *-xagā* is an iterated middle ending like Hittite *-ḫahat(i)*, while for its nasalization Calvert WATKINS (pers. comm.) compares the Hieroglyphic Luvian first-person preterite middle ending *-han*, shown to be singular by O. CARRUBA, *SMEA* 24 (1984) 60ff; indeed Lycian *[sī]xani* 'I lie', identified as middle by MELCHERT, must contain the expected present of *-han*. The verb *axagā* is thus not a nasalized preterite at all.

3.4. There remain some unexpected nasalized preterites for which I have no convincing explanation. Two appear in (14), where there is no evident object clitic and the word order is Direct Object + Beneficiary as expected, but the nasalized preterite *pijetē* appears twice:

- (14) *se pijetē hrzzi ñtaiā ladi ehbi se Mñnereidehe esedēñnewi ) se pijetē ētri ñtaiā prñnezi atlahi* (TL 36.5-6)  
'And he gave the upper sarcophagus to his wife and the collateral descendants of Mñnereide, and he gave the lower sarcophagus to his own household'

<sup>10</sup> This is confirmed by TL 36.3-4, where the same formula is used but the word *tasa/tesi* is omitted, as should be impossible for a direct object.

While these forms are unlikely to be conditioned as described above, it may be unnecessary to assume that this conditioning must be responsible for all preterites with final nasal vowels. For instance, since the nasal associated with some forms of the Indo-European and Anatolian middle survived in Lycian, some 'nasalized preterites' other than *axagã* may in principle be middles, even if we cannot yet identify them securely. For this reason, and in view of the numerous nasalized and non-nasalized preterites whose distribution follows precisely from my account in conjunction with independently motivated features of Lycian and Anatolian grammar, a small number of cases like (14) should not be taken as an indication that the account is essentially incorrect<sup>11</sup>.

4. In conclusion, while problems certainly remain for future resolution, the distribution of nasalized and non-nasalized preterites in Lycian is largely consistent with the proposal that the former reflect grammaticalized Verb + Object Clitic sequences. Two main diachronic events separate the nasalized preterite from its ancestor. First, after the proposed univerbation, the nasalized preterite was extended to contexts with direct objects other than common-gender singular ones. Second, at some point it was also reinterpreted as a largely redundant way of encoding the non-lexical status of a verbal object, just as a subject pronoun may over time be reinterpreted as a largely redundant marker of the features of the subject. It was this innovation which permitted the 'redundancy' of sentences like (3a-c) and (10-11), and indeed the multiple pleonasm of (1a-b). But while the nasalized preterite was generalized in this manner, it was never extended to the two contexts discussed in §2.2 where its ancestor had been impossible. The Lycian nasalized preterite is thus synchronically, like morphological categories everywhere, an idiosyncratic mix of unusual innovations and revealing archaisms.

<sup>11</sup> One unexpected nasalized preterite is at TL 44c.4, *me ubu hãtẽ kbijẽti*, where *ubu* looks like the direct object of *hãtẽ* 'they released' but could contain a compound *ubu-hãtẽ* like *pddẽ-hadẽ* at N 320.3. Another at TL 44b.51-52, *se=dde tuwetẽ kumezija rere rere Trqqũti pddãtahi* 'and it placed sacred precincts *rere rere* to the local Trqqũt', is followed by a list of precincts, which might motivate the nasalization. Other problems are *pudẽ* 'engraved (??)' (TL 78.5) and *pijẽtẽ* 'gave' (TL 57.4) in contexts where right-dislocation is possible, *aitẽ* 'they made' (N 320.30-31) in a somewhat unclear context where multiple right-dislocation may be possible, and several verbs associated with the unclear word *hrũmã*.