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Hieroglyphic Luwian REL-i:PA "indeed, certainly"

H. Craig Melchert
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Googebeur (1998) has shown that Hieroglyphic Luwian has a unitary adverb REL-i:PA. Her analysis requires two modifications. First, some examples of REL-i:PA do reflect a sequence of subordinating REL-i:PA conjunctions (su, so). Second, unitary REL-i:PA is better described as an associative adverb rather than as a "focus particle". Unitary REL-i:PA is cognate with Lydian "so" and Latin "quae"—"why so?/indeed".

1. Introduction

Hieroglyphic Luwian shows a subordinating conjunction spelled REL-i, surely reflecting Hittite, the direct cognate of Hittite juk/ (formally Latin quid). Originally the neuter nom-acc. singular of the interrogative relative pronoun, Hittite juk/ like Hittite jac/ comes to function as a general subordinating conjunction (cf. etymologically also Sanskrit yah, with a general sense "in the case that", or more concretely temporal "when, as"). Could (because, since), according to context. This subordinating conjunction REL-i:PA occurs in non-initial, usually second, position in its clause.

Due to the subsequent appearance of Googebeur (1998) the manner of presentation in what follows differs somewhat from the oral version. The basic conclusions remain the same.

As cited by Googebeur (1998,214), in Melchert (1998,25-41) claimed that in at least some sentences the spelling REL-i stands for juk ("as, like"). While I will believe this is possible in orthographic terms, I now find my interpretation of the relevant passages quite uncertain, and in the absence of any compelling examples of such "shortened" spellings we should attribute all examples of REL-i to the single conjunction juk/ in case of its use.

The synchronic neuter nom-acc. singular of the pronoun REL-i:PA, which either represents *ahun:* ("*why* matching Hittite kuma/*why* and Latin quae) or a reserved form *ahun:* modeled after the thematic second. Once the thematic seems acquired "imagination" (see Stark, 1996,100), their pattern of animate nom. sg. *-sa, animate acc. sg. *-sa, or nom-acc. *-*sa could have led to *ahun:/, *ahun:/, *ahun:* REL-a: also serves as a subordinating conjunction with the meaning "because"
We also find a clause-initial REL-\(\text{\textit{pa}}\) case. Since \(\text{\textit{pa}}\) is a common marker of (contrastive) focus in Lusian and always appears in second position, we might expect that REL-\(\text{\textit{pa}}\)-conjunctions of the newly-created REL-\(\text{\textit{pa}}\)-plus-\(\text{\textit{pa}}\) pattern. Meirig (1997) consistently uses to translate REL-\(\text{\textit{pa}}\)-pa in the subordinating conjunction, but the frequent question marks betray his discomfort at the measuring this produces in many cases. In his accompanying grammar (1990:101) he implicitly acknowledges that a subordinating conjunction does not seem to fit some occurrences. Hawkins and MacGregor Davies (1978:113) flately reject any subordinating function for REL-\(\text{\textit{pa}}\), arguing that such a meaning is quite impossible for some examples. They are unusable, however, in proving that REL-\(\text{\textit{pa}}\)-pa does mean, I believe the simplest is due to two factors: first, they assume that REL-\(\text{\textit{pa}}\) in this construction is the particle -\(\text{\textit{pa}}\) and that there is thus a second REL-\(\text{\textit{pa}}\) (reading un- known) that is non-subordinating. Second, they suppose that all instances of the sequence REL-\(\text{\textit{pa}}\)-pa are the same. 

Recently Goedgebuer (1998) has demonstrated that many of the problematic examples of REL-\(\text{\textit{pa}}\)-pa must analyzed as a unitary emphasis or focus particle \(\text{\textit{pa}}\). I need not repeat here her convincing arguments for this basic interpretation but the relevant passages. I believe, however, than her analysis seems not to reveal the exact particle. For now, we assume that REL-\(\text{\textit{pa}}\)-pa is a two-word unit and focus particle. Second, \(\text{\textit{pa}}\) is better defined as an adverbial adverb rather than a focus particle. I will also add some contrastive adverb and historical considerations.

1. REL-\(\textit{pa}\) as conjunction REL-\(\textit{pa}\)-plus-\(\textit{pa}\)

Goedgebuer presents three arguments against identifying any instances of REL-\(\textit{pa}\)-pa as a sequence of the subordinating conjunction REL-\(\textit{pa}\)-plus-particle -\(\textit{pa}\) (1998:234f). First, the attested conjunction REL-\(\textit{pa}\) never occurs clause initially, while REL-\(\textit{pa}\)-pa always does (see already Hawkins and MacGregor Davies. 1978:113, to the same argument). Second, subordinate clauses with REL-\(\textit{pa}\)-pa are followed by their main clause, while REL-\(\textit{pa}\)-pa seems to connect its clause so that precedes. Third, one of the main merits of Goedgebuer’s treatment is her systematic advocacy of the Phoenician evidence in the Karatepe bilingual. As the notes, a subordinating conjunction in the Lusian is consistently matched by a subordination in all cases where for two versions may be compared. Conversely, Luvian REL-\(\textit{pa}\)-pa is never matched by any subordinating conjunction in the Phoenician, with a single exception.

The first argument is seriously flawed by the fact that it takes much too narrow a view of the syntax of subordinating conjunctions in Lusian. As shown...
element appears in absolute initial position, its discourse prominence is often further marked by the enclitic focus particle *ra* (see the examples cited by Goedegebure, 1998:234, note 8). Like its Hitite counterpart, Luvian *ra* also marks change of topic and conjunctive, sometimes alternative meaning. Note one crucial difference from the Hitite: since the Luvian focus particle *ra* is a "Wackernagel dative", it occurs only in second position in the clause. Any element to be marked by it must therefore necessarily occur clause-initially.

We would expect, based on the Hitite parallel, that there would be at least some *ra*-s where the focus is on the entire subordinate clause. In that case the conjunction would occur clause-initially. If there is reason to focus on, especially to contrast, the subordinate clause with its main clause, we might further expect the presence of *ra*, hence precisely REL-ra. Are there any actual instances of this? I contend, contra Goedegebure, that there are.

First, there is the example where the Phoenician text of Karatepe does have a subordinating conjunctive matching H. Luvian REL-ra (*KARATEPE XXXVIII, 71; *wa-[r]-aša "CASTRUM"-Å AEDIFICARE=Mha-wa-[r]-aš (LETUS)=iv a-[r]-aša /aša-aša=MARMUS) "[wa]-aša-[r]-aša." PONEREA REL-ra *wa-[r]-aša POST-on-a (DEUΣTONTIRIUS-ša-zu-ŠA (DEUΣ) Ri-[r]-aša /aša-aša-zu-aša "CASTRUM"-Å AEDIFICARE=Mha-wa-[r]-aša /aša-aša-wa-[r]-aša; "I built this fortress, and I bestowed on it the name of Aš; REL-ra Tarhuwun and Runans were after me to build this fortress." The Phoenician text for sentence XL has k, which usually means "because", as Goedegebure concedes (1998:227). Indeed, this is the sense assigned by Laroche (1960:172) and Meriggi (1967:41). Goedegebure rejects this on the grounds that REL-ra-ša cannot be translated 'because' anywhere else. This is false, as I will show below. Furthermore, despite her evidence that Phoenician k- can also serve as an objectless particle, this does not fit well in our context. She argues that such a rendering makes the Phoenician of XL form a chiasmic unit with what follows: "Verily, Baal and Replen he sent me to build (k) and I (wa-[r]-aša) to Baal and Replen" (the Luvian unfortunately is lacking for the second clause). But it is not clear whether straightforward to follow other interpreters in supposing that Asztawiadd is saying why he built the fortress, namely because the two gods were after him to do so. In fact, the appearance of REL-ra-clauses suggests that this motivation is the very form of the purpose: "I built this fortress and the very reason was that Tarhuwun and Runans were after me..."

There is at least one other instance where, pace Goedegebure, the same meaning is at least as appropriate, if not more appropriate, than her assumption of an embellishing particle (SULTANHAN 64-47; cf. Goedegebure, 1998:234). REL-ra-ša /wa-[r]-aša /aša-wa-[r]-aša /wa-[r]-aš / CURIE-ša-wa-[r]-aša /aša-wa-[r]-aš / aša-wa-[r]-aš /AŠSAMATAS-SA /ARHA /aša-wa-[r]-aša / "While on the other hand I was..."

and the reason was that to Sarnuwani, deputy of Wasattawar, Turhanus granted these..." This is the classic very unhallowed quid pro quo mentality of the Hittite and Luvian. Goedegebure is correct in saying that in the immediately preceding context the setting up of the statue of Turhanus resulted in wealth for the country, but she reverses the sense of what follows. In gratitude for the blessings bestowed, Sarnuwani adds an additional offering. I do not exclude the possibility of her alternate view that the second offering results in further blessings, but given the preceding example from Karatepe where the Phoenician k- also argues for "because", I find the same meaning also more likely for Sultanah.

As noted above, REL-ra also has a temporal meaning 'when', 'as'. If we add conative *ra*, we would only expect the combination to mean 'while (on the other hand)'. This fits several examples of REL-ra perfectly, as already seen by Meriggi (1967:41). These are cases notably not discussed in detail by Goedegebure. The clearest of these is KARATEPE XXX-X XXXI, Hu (Meriggi, 1967:79), has correctly 'mener invece': INFRA-ta-as-aša / (SOLUM) aša-wa-[r]-aša /DEUSORENS-ša ZUSUM / aša-wa-[r]-aša / PINIRENS-ša-wa-[r]-aša REL-ra-ša / "Aša-wa-[r]-aša / aša-wa-[r]-aša /AŠSAMATAS-SA /ARHA / "I also settled them (deported residents of the place) on the east in my boundary territories, which I held on the other hand I settled the Asztawiads from here (here they were)." Note that an emphasizing sense for REL-ra-ša makes no sense here. The second sentence does not reinforce the first; it complements it. Asztawiads is practicing the well-known re-settlement technique of exchanging the places of conquered peoples, to accomplish two goals at once: protecting boundary territories while at the same time reducing the chances of rebellion by placing people in new, unfamiliar locations. Since the REL-ra-ša clause contrasts with the other, it unsurprisingly follows.2

In KARATEPE XI the contrast is between actions that are overtly positive and those which consist in removing negatives ('I added horse upon horse, I added armor upon armor, I added shield upon shield, all through Turhanus and the gods,' REL-ra-ša / "SULTANHAN 64-47; cf. Goedegebure, 1998:234, note 28). Since the two final actions are in fact simply additions to the first three, simple connective ra/wa/[r]-aša to be sufficient.

2 Since there is a contrast between the other parts and the Asztawiads, the framing of idealism in the Phoenician noted by Goedegebure is also not unexpected.
The clearest evidence for REL-iṣa as REL-i plus "pa comes from a case where it is overtly contrasted with simple REL-i." In Topada, 8 we find mwa REL-iṣa REL-iṣa-IPA POST-RÁREL-CAPUT-IPA [wa]. In this case he is a king (the god punish them). But in the case he is a lesser person (let them punish him) [wa]. Note that simple REL-i has undergone some change and occurs in initial position care for the opening nostrable particle and enclitic pronoun, but has not been fronted to initial position, in spite of it not the focus of the clause. In the second sentence, however, which is a new pointing overtly contrasted with the first, REL-i is fronted and marked with the focus particle "pa." There can be no doubt in this instance that the REL-iṣa of REL-iṣa is the same as the preceding simple REL-i.

Predictably, there are several occurrences where the REL-iṣa clause may be read either as a reference of the example in the REL-iṣa or as complementing/contrasting with it (REL-iṣa). E.g., SULTANIAN 540-47 MUNA-IPA sa-ma-sama-IPA sa-ma-IPA ([CORNU]kiipa-IPA [ma] ma-sa-da-IPA [REL]-IPA [sa] ma-sa-ma-IPA [DEUS]-IPA sa-ma-ma-IPA sa-ma-IPA ma-sa-ma-IPA "The . . ."). This example should be placed here.

3. The function of REL-iṣa - approach

Goedgebeure (1998:224) assigns REL-iṣa to the class of "focus particle." As she shows in her preceding discussion, there are various other syntactic and prosodic devices to mark "focus" in addition to the use of overt particles. They often are used in combination. The effect in all cases is indeed considered to focus on some particular element in the discourse. For example when KARATOPA XXVIII HUNU amanna-wamwam-IPA [wa].

This crucial example was overlooked by Goedgebeure and by me in my oral presentation of this paper.

 Clock the usual contrastive series of clauses with muna-IPA and ma-ma-IPA, as in CARACHEMIH A2, 54: ma-ma-IPA ma-ma-IPA [REX-IPA ma-ma-IPA REG-DOMINUS-IPA ma-ma-IPA] [wa]. If he is a king, or it he is a lord, or if he is a . . .

Further indeterminate examples are found in PALINGA 2 and SULTANIAN 7.

LITUITU-IPA = wa-IPA mwa-IPA [wa]. 54: amanna-wa-IPA ma-ma-IPA [wa]. "Would that indeed even a little something become tight/constraining for him!" A closer examination shows that, in a sense, this is an accusative particle with scop-IPA over the whole clause, stands normally immediately in front of the verb (or personal nominative). Like the negative, it can also occur before the preverb (see below). Its occurrence after the negative in this position is merely a function of the fact that muna and amanna share the same basic distribution. Like any other sentence-movement, amanna may also undergo focus or emphasis and appear in one of the three usual positions for this function: topicalized or fronted or more rarely extracted to the right of the verb. Where amanna is concerned, another element may be topicalized in its left and further marked with the focus particle "pa-IPA [wa] (cf. note 8), giving the superficial appearance that amanna is emphasizing that element, but that function is filled by the real focus particle and the topicalization itself. Likewise in the case of amanna with the relative pronoun I had to try to explain away examples where the amanna preceded the relative (1985:1981). These fall out naturally from the true distribution put forth here. In sum, amanna is an accusative particle, not a focus particle.

As Goedgebeure concudes (1998:74), she cannot demonstrate that REL-iṣa highlights any particular element either. It is, of course, conceivable that it might mark focus on the entire clause, but it is so unusual that it would happen to do so in every instance. She herself terms REL-iṣa "emphasizing" or "reinforcing" (1998:234). I believe that this characteristic is the correct one. A sense "indeed, certainly, yes!" fits all occurrences of unitary REL-iṣa (Goedgebeure herself uses 'yes' for some passages, 1998:244).

As per above, Hinna-immu = wa-IPA ma-ma-IPA, the emphatic personal pronoun immu, its fronted position, and the use of "pa-IPA all place the focus on T (Antwara, gas, and no one else). Goedgebeure compares REL-iṣa as a focus particle with Hinna-IPA = wa-IPA, and with Hinna-immu = wa-IPA as well as with Hinna-immu.

The status of immu is another matter. I showed in Miclehert (1983) that Hinna and Hinna-immu is an accusative adverb that insists on the truth of the clause that contains it. It is true that I also argued that the focus of the "existence" is on the element immediately preceding the immu, aside from a few examples where the focus is the entire clause. However, maintenance of this claim forced me into several rather strained interpretations (see especially: 1983:138, 1984:4, 1985:8, 1986:14).

"Would that indeed even a little something become tight/constraining for him!" A closer examination shows that, in a sense, this is an accusative particle with scop-IPA over the whole clause, stands normally immediately in front of the verb (or personal nominative). Like the negative, it can also occur before the preverb (see below). Its occurrence after the negative in this position is merely a function of the fact that muna and amanna share the same basic distribution. Like any other sentence-movement, amanna may also undergo focus or emphasis and appear in one of the three usual positions for this function: topicalized or fronted or more rarely extracted to the right of the verb.
4. The source of assessorive /t̪wipa/ ‘indeed, certainly’

Some readers will have already noticed that HLavian /twp/ thus matches both formally and functionally Latin quippe /tro/, seeing that, certainly, indeed < *t̪lp/pe. The question then becomes whether this is merely a typological parallel, resulting from independent creation, or a case of cognates reflecting a common protoform. HLavian twp is formally ambiguous. Since inherited /p/ in the particle /p/ is spelled in CLovian regularly as -ppa, the HLuvian surely has a geminate /pp/ whether it reflects inherited *t̪lp/pe with assimilation or merely synchronic /twp/ plus the particle. The presence of -ppa as a synchronically productive particle in Latin might suggest that /twp/ is a new creation, but the existence of the former probably is irrelevant to the issue. Hittite has synchronically productive -ma, but this has nothing to do with *t̪lp/ (see Ehrlich, 1981:64; false Melchert, 1985:202f.), as shown by the fact that -ma is also found in Latin, where -ma does not exist.

We must decide on other grounds. There is agreement that Latin quippe is in origin an assessorive adverb “why then/too?” (cf. quippe why not?); see Müller Erentz (1930:84f), Walde-Hoffmann (1954:40ff), et al. For the shift in meaning to an assessorive adverb compare English why as in “why so it is!” (since the 16th century). One can nicely render KARATEPE XXXV (see Goedicke, 1998:388) as: ‘why in my day(s) even women with spindle-cans walk the road!’

The likelihood that HLuvian /twp/ also began as an interrogative adverb helps decide in favor of an inheritance. In Lydian and Milyan we find the-kebe ‘or’, which is transparently from interrogative ɪ̂-k(ı) / *ɪ̂-m(ı) plus particle -be. As per Morgan Davies (1975:616), the development to a disjunctive from an interrogative is typologically commonplace: cf. Teloš ɪ̂m-t̪ə ‘either … or’ beside ɪ̂m ‘what’, Acamia ətu ‘what’ and ətu ‘and’ and the other parallels she cites there. We may thus assume a common Indo-Lycian interrogative adverb “why/what there” that developed to an assessorive adverb in Latin (cf. Latin quippe) and to a disjunctive conjunction in Lydian.

It is true that we would expect the regular outcome of a fixed *t̪lp/pe to be twp in Latin and *t̪pe in Lydian, with “unadorned” p. The attested Latin may be taken as the predicted /twp/. In Lydian the particle -pe was generalized in its limited form -be (barely attested twice in Lydian, but also present in the reinforced form of -=and=-=be also in Milyan sebe and Carian sh. For the analogical reshaping of already unitary *t̪pe as t̪pe after the particle -be compare CLovian kwat* ‘as, how’ for expected kwat = *k̪̆̂p, presumably after the productive ablative-instrumental ending -si.

HLuvian unitary /twp/ = REL-pa may thus be equated with Latin quippe as reflecting an inherited interrogative adverb *t̪lp/pe “why then?”, which in each case underwent the trivial change to an assessorive adverb.

We may add this equation to that of Hittite and Latin imma = Latin immo. Whether these two cases of word-extensions between Anatolian and Latin may be taken as common innovations in the sense of Pulley (1994) remains an open question, but the double correspondence is certainly striking.
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Some thoughts about the IE homeland

Edgar C. Polomé
University of Texas at Austin

No problem has preoccupied Indo-Europeanists more, perhaps, for decades than the question of the IE homeland. Innumerable theories have been advanced with various degrees of success. A series of arguments have been of an ecological nature, e.g. the limits of the expansion of a certain type of tree, like the beech (Fagus), or of the occurrence of a definite species of fish such as the salmon (Salmo). But since climatic changes over the millennia deeply affected the arborescent area of expansion, and because specific terms were preserved with changed meaning (for instance the IE name of the 'salmon' surviving in Tocharian as a generic term for 'fish'), eventually less importance has been accorded to faunal and vegetal arguments. Thus, the arguments some Indian scholars derive from the name of the 'lion' are invalid, as the lion was not uncommon in the Middle East and southern Europe in early times (see my article in Research). In an effort to link the expansion of the Indo-Europeans with particular archaeological cultures, vast migration theories were elaborated to bring the

1 Thus Giuliano Bottazzi, in a contribution to the Tribute to Cyril Gordon (= Boundaries of the ancient Near Eastern World Suppl. 273) to the Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, Sheffield Academic Press 1998, rejects Beeck's view of the IE homeland as situated in the Carpathian basin, according to his criticism of the famous 'beech'-argument, discussing the 'salmon'-argument in the light of Tocharian lake 'fish' and the bone sacrifice, deposing the alleged rarity of trees, and assuming the Indo-Europeans were agriculturists as reflected by the lexicon (e.g. the name of the 'plough'). He thinks the homeland was on the Baltic Sea, where even now the Germanic, Baltic and Slavic people are located; some territories in the continent, for example Bohemia, must be added.

2 See for instance Th. J. A. de Maizière, 'Die Ilirten mit dem Indogermanen', Pamphlet, Zürich, 1911. The Ilirs are known to have inhabited the area between the Danube and the Adriatic Sea, in the mountains and in the plains of Illyria. For a detailed discussion of the Ilirs, see A. M. G. Mayer, Iliria, Breslau, 1889.

3 See P. Mahaffy, Historical Geography of Europe, New York, 1908.


5 The focus here is on the Indo-European homeland, not on the homeland of the Tocharian speakers, which is to be found in the Caspian area, as this author has already indicated (ibid., p. 289).