

Indo-European Perspectives

Edited by:
Mark R. V. Southern

Journal of Indo-European Studies
Monograph No. 43.
Washington D.C.

2002

- Ms 2 (To appear) The Syntax of Style: A Typology of Word and Morpheme-Level Repetition in the Rigveda. In: *Papers of the Würzburger Arbeitsstagung: Indogermanische Syntax*.
- Ms 3 (To appear) Patterns of Verb Repetition in the Rigveda. In: *Gedenkschrift für Edgar Polomé*.
- Ms 4 (To appear) Responsion in the Rigveda. In: *JAOS*.

Hieroglyphic Luvian REL-*ipa* 'indeed, certainly'

H. Craig Melchert
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Goedegebuure (1998) has shown that Hieroglyphic Luvian has a unitary adverb REL-*ipa*. Her analysis requires two modifications. First, some examples of REL-*ipa* do reflect a sequence of subordinating REL-*i* plus conjunction *pa*. Second, unitary REL-*ipa* is better described as an asseverative adverb rather than as a "focus particle". Unitary REL-*ipa* is cognate with Lycian *tbe* 'or' and Latin *quippe* 'why so?/indeed'.

1. Introduction

Hieroglyphic Luvian shows a subordinating conjunction spelled REL-*i*, surely reflecting /*kwi*/, the direct cognate of Hittite *kuit* (and formally Latin *quid*).¹ Originally the neuter nom.-acc. singular of the interrogative-relative pronoun, HLuvian /*kwi*/, like Hittite *kuit*, comes to function as a general subordinating conjunction (cf. typologically also Sanskrit *yād*), with a general sense 'in the case that', or more concretely temporal ('when, as'), or causal ('because, since'), according to context.² This subordinating conjunction REL-*i* occurs in non-initial, usually second, position in its clause.

* Due to the subsequent appearance of Goedegebuure (1998) the manner of presentation in what follows differs from the oral version. The basic conclusions remain the same.
¹ As cited by Goedegebuure (1998:234), in Melchert (1988:39-40) I claimed that in at least one instance the spelling REL-*i* stands for /*kwad*/r/, 'as, like'. While I still 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 /*kwi*/ in one of its uses.
² The synchronic neuter nom.-acc. singular of the pronoun is REL-(a)-*za*, which either represents /*kwat-sa*/ (< **kʷód*), matching Hittite *kuwat* 'why?' and Latin *quod*) or a renewed form /*kwan-tsa*/ modeled after the thematic neuters. Once the thematic stems acquired "i-mutation" (see Starke, 1990:54ff.), their pattern of animate nom. sg. -*is*, animate acc. sg. -*in*, nt. nom.-acc. -*an-za* could have led to /*kwis*/, /*kwin*/, → /*kwan-tsa*/. REL-*za* also serves as a subordinating conjunction with the meaning 'because'.

We also find a clause-initial REL-*(i)-pa*. Since *-pa* is a common marker of (contrastive) focus in Luwian and always appears in second position, we might expect that REL-*i-pa* consists of the subordinating REL-*i* plus *-pa*. Meriggá (1967) consistently tries to translate REL-*i-pa* as the subordinating conjunction, but the frequent question marks betray his discomfort at the meaning this produces in many cases. In his accompanying grammar (1966:101) he explicitly acknowledges that a subordinating sense does not seem to fit some occurrences. Hawkins and Morpurgo Davies (1978:113) flatly reject any subordinating function for REL-*i-pa*, arguing that such a meaning is quite impossible for some examples. They are unable, however, to provide a unitary explanation for what REL-*i-pa* does mean. I believe this failure is due to two factors: first, they assume that *-pa* in this combination is the particle *-pa* and that there is thus a second REL-*i* (reading unknown) that is non-subordinating. Second, they suppose that all instances of the sequence REL-*i-pa* are the same.

Recently Goedegebuure (1998) has demonstrated that many of the problematic examples of REL-*i-pa* must be analyzed as a unitary emphasizing or focus particle /*kwipa*/. I need not repeat here her convincing arguments for this basic interpretation nor the relevant passages.³ I believe, however, that her analysis requires two revisions. First, I am not persuaded that all examples of REL-*i-pa* can and should be taken as unitary /*kwipa*/. Second, /*kwipa*/ is better defined as an asseverative adverb rather than a focus particle. I will also add some comparative and historical considerations.

2. REL-*i-pa* as conjunction REL-*i* plus *-pa*

Goedegebuure presents three arguments against identifying any instances of REL-*i-pa* as a sequence of the subordinating conjunction REL-*i* plus particle *-pa* (1998:234f.). First, the attested conjunction REL-*i* never occurs clause initially, while REL-*i-pa* always does (see already Hawkins and Morpurgo Davies, 1978:113, for the same argument). Second, subordinate clauses with REL-*i* are followed by their main clause, while REL-*i-pa* usually seems to connect its clause to what precedes. Third, one of the great merits of Goedegebuure's treatment is her systematic adducing of the Phoenician evidence in the Karatepe Bilingual. As she notes, a subordinate conjunction in the Luwian is consistently matched by a subordinate conjunction in the Phoenician (in all cases where the two versions may be compared). Conversely, Luwian REL-*i-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 Anatolian. As shown

by Held (1957), Hale (1987), and Garrett (1994), relative (and interrogative) pronouns undergo "wh-movement" in Hittite (and in the IE languages of Anatolian generally). As described in detail by Garrett (1994:43ff.), following Held, in proposed *determinate* relative clauses some element is obligatorily fronted to the left of the relative pronoun, which thus appears in second position in the clause. In *indeterminate* relative clauses the relative pronoun itself is fronted and appears clause-initially.⁴

It is clear that Hittite subordinating conjunctions such as *kuit*, *kuwapi* 'when; where', *mahḫan* 'as, how, when' also undergo wh-movement and appear either clause-initially or in second position. The difference from relative pronouns is that the fronting of some other element around them is not regulated by the determinacy of relative clauses, but purely by considerations of discourse prominence. If there is reason to focus on some other element (which is common), then it is fronted and the subordinating conjunction appears second (see the CHD L-N (1980-89) 110f. on *mahḫan*). If the focus is on the entire clause (i.e. on its subordinate status – temporal, causal, or concessive), then the conjunction itself will be in first position. The focused element, be it the conjunction or something else, will often also be marked by the Hittite focus particle *-ma ~ -a* (non-germinating), which attaches to the first accented word in the clause. It is important to note that *-ma ~ -a* not only focuses on the element to which it is attached, but also marks a change of topic, often with a contrastive or even adverbial sense (see the CHD L-N (1980-89) 91ff.).

Since we know that relative pronouns undergo wh-movement in Luwian, we would predict the same for the subordinating conjunctions built on the relative stem. Unsurprisingly, in many cases in HLuwian, as in Hittite, some particular element is focused and is fronted ahead of the subordinating conjunction REL-*i*, which thus appears non-initially (but virtually always second). When the fronted

⁴ As per Held, Hale and Garrett, the definition of "first" and "second" position here ignores certain clause-initial conjunctions. According to Garrett's overall analysis (1994:33), there is also a topic position in front of the "fronted" position, thus allowing for the possibility that two constituents may appear before the relative pronoun that has undergone wh-movement. Such cases do occur (contra Garrett, loc. cit.). They are rare, presumably because for discourse reasons one would not usually both topicalize one element and "focus" another by fronting in the same sentence. I cite here merely one of several examples as an illustration: KUB 1.1 iv 50-51 [(*nu-mu* LUGAL).MEŠ MAḪRU-*ya* | *aššawaš memiyanaš* | *kuweš ešer* (*ir-at-m*)] *u aššawaš-pat memiyanaš kššantat* 'Also the senior kings who had been on good terms with me continued to become on good terms with me.' Cf. also KBo 16.1 i 12-13 for a similar example with what are clearly two constituents before the relative pronoun. As one would predict, the same thing occurs occasionally also with interrogative and relative conjunctions, as in KUB 14.1 Ro 26 (Madduwatta): *ug-a-wa-za* | *manniḫkuwaw* | *kuit* 'because I am near'.

³ These are the examples in BOHÇA §7 and §11, KARATEPE XXIII, XXVIII, XXXV, LIIL-LIV (bis), SULTANHAN § 11.

element appears in absolute initial position, its discourse prominence is often further marked by the enclitic focus particle *-pa* (see the examples cited by Goedegebuure, 1998:234, note 8). Like its Hittite counterpart, Luvian *-pa* also marks change of topic and contrastive, sometimes adversative meaning. Note one crucial difference from the Hittite: since the Luvian focus particle *-pa* is a "Wackernagel clitic", it occurs only in second position in the clause. Any element to be marked by it as focused must therefore necessarily occur clause-initially.

We would expect, based on the Hittite parallel, that there would be at least some cases 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 *-pa*, hence precisely REL-*i-pa*. Are there any actual instances of this? I contend, contra Goedegebuure, that there are.

First, there is the one example where the Phoenician text of Karatepe does have a subordinating conjunction matching HLuvian REL-*i-pa* (KARATEPE XXXVIII-XI, Hu): *â-wa/i za "CASTRUM"-za AEDIFICARE+ML-ha wa/i-tu-ta (LITUUS)+A-za-ti-wa/i-tâ-ya-na(URBS) â-ta-ma-za-[ni]] PONERE-ha REL-*pa-wa/i-mu* POST-na | (DEUS)TONITRUS-hu-za-sâ (DEUS)Rû-za-sâ-hâ | sâ-ta | za-ti "CASTRUM"-si AEDIFICARE+MI-na 'I built this fortress, and I bestowed on it the name of A.; REL-*pa* Tarhunzas and Runzas were after me to build this fortress.' The Phoenician text for sentence XL has *k*, which usually means 'because', as Goedegebuure concedes (1998:237). Indeed, this is the sense assigned by Laroche (1960:172) and Meriggi (1967:81). Goedegebuure rejects this on the grounds that REL-*i-pa* 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 asseverative 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 Rešeph sent me to build (it) and I (re)built it thanks to Baal and Rešeph' (the Luvian unfortunately is lacking for the second clause). But it seems rather more straightforward to follow all other interpreters in supposing that Azaiwadadas is saying *why* he built the fortress, namely *because* the two gods were after him to do so. In fact, the appearance of REL-*i* clause-initially and marked by *-pa* suggests that this motivation is the very focus of the passage: 'I built this fortress ... and the very reason was that Tarhunzas and Runzas were after me....'*

There is at least one other instance where, pace Goedegebuure, the same meaning is at least as appropriate, if not more appropriate, than her assumption of an emphasizing particle (SULTANHAN §46-47; cf. Goedegebuure, 1998:243f.): | *wa/i-na-'* | *â-pi-i* | *zi-na* | "AVIS"(*ta-wa/i-na-ti-i* | ("PES")*u-pa-ha* | CURRERE-*pa-wa/i* | *sa+ra/i-wa/i-ti-wa/i-ra/i-ya-*' | *wa/i-si-SARMA-ma-sa mi-ti-i* | (DEUS)TONITRUS-hu-za-sa | *za-zi* | *wa/i-ra/i-ya-zi* | CUM-*ni-*' | *â-tâ*' 'I presented him (i.e. Tarhunzas of the vineyard) here in turn with a f-bird,

and the reason was that Sarwaiwaras, deputy of Wasusarmas, Tarhunzas granted these aids....' This is the classic very unabashed *quid pro quo* mentality of the Hittites and Luvians. Goedegebuure is correct in saying that in the immediately preceding context the setting up of the statue of Tarhunzas resulted in wealth for the country, but she reverses the sense of what follows. In gratitude for the blessings bestowed, Sarwaiwaras 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 Sultanhân.

As noted above, REL-*i* also has a temporal meaning 'when, as'. If we add contrastive *-pa*, we would expect the combination to mean 'while (on the other hand)'. This fits several examples of REL-*i-pa* perfectly, as already seen by Meriggi (1967). These are cases notably not discussed in detail by Goedegebuure. The clearest of these is KARATEPE XXX-XXXI, Hu (Meriggi, 1967:79, has correctly 'menire invece'): INFRA-*ta-ha-wa/i-ta* | (SOLIUM)*i-sâ-ni-hâ* (DEUS)ORIENS-*mi* VERSUS-*na* | *â-mi-ya-za-ta (FINES)*i-ra/i-hâ-za* REL-*pa-wa/i* | A-tana-wa/i-ni-zi(URBS) | zi-tâ | â-pa-ti* | INFRA-*ta* | (SOLIUM)*i-sâ-ni-wa/i-ha* 'I also settled them (deported residents of the places attacked) to the east in my boundary territories, while/as on the other hand I settled the Adanians from here (to) there.' Note that an emphasizing sense for REL-*i-pa* makes no sense here. The second sentence does not reinforce the first; it complements it. Azaiwadadas is practicing the well-known resettlement 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-*i-pa* clause contrasts with the other, it unsurprisingly follows.⁵

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 army upon army, I added shield upon shield, all through Tarhunzas and the gods.') REL-*pa-wa/i* | (*255)*ma,+ra/i-ya-ni-zi* | ARHA | *ma-ki-sa-hâ* 'While on the other hand I un-...ed the *marjanini*, (and removed all the evil that was in the land.) There is interestingly nothing corresponding to REL-*i-pa* in the Phoenician that would suggest focus or emphasis (see Goedegebuure, 1998:242, note 28). Since the two final actions are in fact simply additions to the first three, simple connective *w-* was felt to be sufficient.

⁵ Since there is a contrast between the other peoples and the Adanians, the fronting of *ddnym* in the Phoenician noted by Goedegebuure is also not unexpected.

The clearest evidence for REL-*i-pa* as REL-*i* plus *-pa* comes from a case where it is overtly contrasted with simple REL-*i*.⁶ In TOPADA 8 we find: *wa/i-sa REL-i REX-ti-sa ... REL-i-pa-wa/i[sa] POST+RA/i-sa CAPUT-ti[sa] ...* 'In case he is a king (let the gods punish him thus). But/while in the case he is a lesser person (let them punish him thus).' Note that simple REL-*i* has undergone *wh*-movement and occurs in initial position save for the opening quotative particle and enclitic pronoun, but has not been fronted to absolute initial position, since it is not the focus of the clause. In the second sentence, however, which is a new possibility overtly contrasted with the first, REL-*i* has been fronted and marked with the focus particle *-pa*. There can be no doubt in this instance that the REL-*i* of REL-*i-pa* is the same as the preceding simple REL-*i*.⁷

Predictably, there are several occurrences where the REL-*i-pa* clause may be read either as reinforcing a preceding clause (REL-*i-pa*) or as complementing/contrasting with it (REL-*i-pa*); e.g. SULTANHAN SS46-47 "LUNA⁸ *-ma-sá-pa-wa/i-na | ha+ra/i-na-wa/i-ni-sá | á-pa-sá ("CORNU") kipu-tá- | à-ta | tu-wa/i-ti-i | REL-tá-wa/i-na | ka+ra/i-<ka>-mi-si-za-sa | (DEUS)ku-AVIS-pa-pa-sa á-pa-na | mu-wa/i-i* 'The Harranean Moon-god shall place his *k*. (on) him; while/indeed Kubaba of Carchernish shall unman him.' I tend to find it more likely that the second punishment is complementary to the first, but I would not wish to exclude that it is meant rather to reinforce it (by being even more severe). I do not believe, however, that our inability to assign some cases with certainty to the one construction or the other in any way obscures the genuine differences between the two.⁸ I thus contend that in addition to the real examples of unitary REL-*i-pa* explained by Goedegebuure there are also some instances of the synchronic combination of subordinating REL-*i* 'when; because' plus contrastive focus particle *-pa*.

3. The function of unitary REL-*i-pa* - /kwipa/

Goedegebuure (1998:224) assigns REL-*i-pa* to the class of "focus particles". As she ably 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 to focus on some particular element in the discourse. So for example when KARATEPE XXVIII Hu begins *amu-pa-wa/i-ra/i*

⁶ This crucial example was overlooked both by Goedegebuure and by me in my oral presentation of this paper.

⁷ Cf. the more usual contrasting series of clauses with /man/ and /man-pa/, as in CARCHEMISH A2, 5-6: *wa/i-sa' | ma-na | REX-ti-sa ma-pa-wa/i REGIO.DOMINUS-sa | ma-pa-sa 355-It-sa* 'If he is a king, or if he is a local lord, or if he is a...'

⁸ Further indeterminate examples are found in PALANGA 2 and SULTANHAN 7.

LITUUS-á-za-ti-wa/i-ra/i-sá... I(0), Azaiwadas,...', the emphatic personal pronoun *amu*, its fronted position, and the use of *-pa* all place the focus on T' (Azaiwadas, and no one else). Goedegebuure compares REL-*i-pa* as a focus particle with Hitite *-pat* and *-ma ~ -a*, and with Luvian *-pa*, as well as with Hitite *imma*. That the first three are true focus particles is beyond doubt.⁹

The status of *imma* is another matter. I showed in Melchert (1985) that Hitite and Luvian *imma* is an asseverative adverb that insists on the truth of the clause that contains it. It is true that I also argued that the focus of the asseveration is on the element immediately preceding *imma*, 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 1985:188f. & 194ff.). Most egregiously, I had to deny the existence of the example in *KBo* 4.14 iii 24, where *imma* appears in sentence-initial position: *imma-man-wa-šši tepu-ya kuiti haiknešzi* 'Would that indeed even a little something become tight/constraining for him!'. A closer examination shows that *imma*, as an asseverative adverb with scope over the whole clause, stands normally immediately in front of the verb (or predicate nominative). Like the negative, it can also occur before the preverb-verb combination. Its occurrence after the negative in this position is merely a function of the fact that *matza* and *imma* share the same basic distribution. Like any other sentence constituent, *imma* may also undergo focus or emphasis and appear in one of the three usual positions for this function: topicalized or fronted or more rarely extraposed to the right of the verb. When it is fronted, another element may be topicalized to its left and further marked with the focus particle *-ma ~ -a* (cf. note 4), giving the superficial appearance that *imma* is emphasizing that element, but that function is filled by the real focus particle and by the topicalization itself. Likewise in the case of *imma* with the relative pronoun I had to try to explain away examples where the *imma* preceded the relative (1985:198f.). These fall out naturally from the true distribution just stated. In sum, *imma* is an asseverative adverb, not a focus particle.

As Goedegebuure concedes (1998:242⁹), she cannot demonstrate that REL-*i-pa* highlights any particular element either. It is, of course, conceivable that it might mark focus on the entire clause, but it is very suspicious that it would happen to do so in every instance. She herself terms REL-*i-pa* "emphasizing" or "reinforcing" (1998:234). I believe that this characterization is the correct one. A sense 'indeed, certainly, yea (verily)' fits all occurrences of unitary REL-*i-pa* (Goedegebuure herself uses 'yea' for some passages, 1998:243).

⁹ As per above, Hitite *-ma ~ -a* and Luvian *-pa* have the further function of introducing a new topic, often contrastive or even adversative. Hitite *-pat* on the other hand adds to the effect of focus the further notion of identity with a preceding referent or action: see Hart (1971) and also the *CHD P* (1994-97) 212ff.

4. The source of asseverative /kwipa/ 'indeed, certainly'

Some readers will have already noticed that HLuvian /kwipa/ thus matches both formally and functionally Latin *quippe* 'for, seeing that; certainly, indeed' < **k^wid-pe*. The question then becomes whether this is merely a typological parallel, resulting from independent creation, or a case of cognates reflecting a common preform. HLuvian /kwipa/ is formally ambiguous. Since inherited /p/ in the particle *-pa* is spelled in CLuvian regularly as *-ppa*, the HLuvian surely has a geminate /pp/ whether it reflects inherited **k^wid-pe* with assimilation or merely synchronic /kwi/ plus the particle. The presence of *-pa* as a synchronically productive particle in Luvian might suggest that /kwipa/ 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 inherited *imma* < **im-ma* (see Eichner, 1981:64; false Melchert, 1985:202ff.), as shown by the fact that *imma* is also found in Luvian, where *-ma* does not exist.

We must decide on other grounds. There is agreement that Latin *quippe* is in origin an interrogative adverb 'why then/so?' (cf. *quippimī* 'why not?': see Meillet-Ernout (1939:843), Walde-Hoffman (1954:408f.), et al.). For the shift in meaning to an asseverative adverb compare English 'why' as in 'why so it is!' (since the 16th century). One can nicely render KARATEPE XXXV (see Goedegebuure, 1998:238) as: 'why in my day(s) even women with spindles (can) walk (the roads)!'.¹

The likelihood that HLuvian /kwipa/ also began as an interrogative adverb helps decide in favor of an inheritance. In Lycian and Milyan we find *tibe-kibe* 'or', which is transparently from interrogative *ti-ki* < **k^wi* plus particle *-be*. As per Morpurgo Davies (1975:164), the development to a disjunctive conjunction from an interrogative is typologically commonplace: cf. Telugu *ēmi* 'either ... or' beside *ēmi* 'what', Acoma *zif* 'what' and 'or' and the other parallels she cites there. We may thus assume a common Lavo-Lycian interrogative adverb *'why/what then?' that developed to an asseverative adverb in Luvian (cf. Latin *quippe*) and to a disjunctive conjunction in Lycian.

It is true that we would expect the regular outcome of a fixed **k^wi*pe to be /kwipa/ in Luvian and **tipe* in Lycian, with "unlenited" *p*. The attested Luvian may be taken as the predicted /kwipa/. In Lycian the particle *-pe* was generalized in its lenited form *-be* (barely attested twice in Lycian, but also present in the reinforced form of 'and' *se-be* (also in Milyan *sebe* and Carian *sb*). For the analogical reshaping of already unitary **tipe* as *tibe* after the particle *-be* compare CLuvian *kuwatti* 'as, how' for expected **kuwatti* < **k^wōti*, presumably after the productive ablative-instrumental ending *-ati*.

HLuvian unitary /kwipa/ - REL-*ipa* may thus be genuinely equated with Latin *quippe* as reflecting an inherited interrogative adverb **k^wid-pe* 'why then?', which in each case underwent the trivial change to an asseverative adverb.

We may add this equation to that of Hittite and Luvian *imma* - Latin *immo*. Whether these two cases of word equations between Anatolian and Latin may be taken as common innovations in the sense of Puhvel (1994) remains an open question, but the double correspondence is certainly(!) striking.

REFERENCES

- CFHD
1980ff. *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*, ed. Hans G. Güterbock and Harry A. Hoffner. Chicago: The Oriental Institute.
- Eichner, Heiner
1981 Indogermanische Chronik 28a. *Anatolisch. Sprache* 36.29-69.
- Garrett, Andrew
1994 Relative Clause Syntax in Lycian and Hittite. *Sprache* 36.29-69.
- Goedegebuure, Petra
1998 The Hieroglyphic Luvian Particle REL-*ipa*. In: *Acts of the IIIrd International Congress of Hittitology, Çorum, September 16-20, 1996*, ed. A. Süel. Pp. 233-245. Ankara.
- Hale, Mark
1987 Notes on Wackernagel's Law in the Language of the Rigveda. In: *Studies in Memory of Warren Cowgill*, ed. C. Watkins. Pp. 38-50. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Hart, Gillian
1971 The Hittite Particle *-pat*. *TFS* 1971.94-162.
- Hawkins, J. D. and Anna Morpurgo Davies
1978 On the Problems of Karatepe: the Hieroglyphic Text. *AnSt* 28.103-119.
- Held, Warren
1957 *The Hittite relative sentence* (Language Dissertation, 55). Baltimore: LSA.
- Laroche, Emmanuel
1960 *Les hieroglyphes hittites. I*. Paris: CNRS.
- Meillet, Antoine and Alfred Ernout
1939 *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*.² Paris: Klincksieck.
- Melchert, Craig
1985 Hittite *imma* and Latin *immo*. *KZ* 98.184-205.
- 1988 "Thorn" and "Minus" in Hieroglyphic Luvian Orthography. *AnSt* 38.29-42.
- 1994 *Anatolian Historical Phonology*. Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi.
- Merigi, Piero
1966 *Manuale di eteo geroglifico. Parte I. Grammatica*. Rome: Ateneo.
- 1967 *Manuale di eteo geroglifico. Parte II. Testi, I^a Serie*. Rome: Ateneo.

- Morpurgo Davies, Anna
1975 Negation and Disjunction in Anatolia — and Elsewhere. *AnSt* 25.157-168.
- Puhvel, Jaan
1994 West-Indo-European Affinities of Anatolian. In: *Früh-, Mittel-, Spätindogermanisch. Akten der IX. Fachtagung der indogermanischen Gesellschaft*, ed. C. Dunkel et al. Pp. 315-324. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Stärke, Frank
1980 *Untersuchung zur Stammbildung des keilschrift-luwischen Nomens* (StBoT 31). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Walde, Alois and J. B. Hofmann
1954 *Lateinisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*.³ Heidelberg: Winter.

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 (Thieme), or of the occurrence of a definite species of fish such as the salmon (Diebold). But since climatic changes over the millennia deeply affected the arboreal 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.¹ 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*).²

In an effort to link the expansion of the Indo-Europeans with particular archaeological cultures, vast migration theories³ were elaborated to bring the

¹ Thus Giuliano Bonfante, in a contribution to the *Tribute to Cyrus 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 Beekes' view of the IE homeland as situated in southern Russia, objecting to his criticism of the famous 'beech'-argument, discussing the 'salmon'-argument in the light of Tocharian *laks* 'fish' and the horse sacrifice, denying 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 peoples are located; some territories in the continent, for example Bohemia, must be added.

² OInd. *sinha* has definitely nothing to do with Swahili *simba* 'lion' (see my cited paper).
³ In a recent survey of the major views on the *Urrheimat*, four are distinguished: a) the area west and north of the Black Sea between the lower Danube and the Don (= Otto Schrader's North Pontic thesis); b) the Central European plain (Hermann Hirt, Ernst Meyer), modified into the basins of the Weser, Elbe, Oder and Vistula (Paul Thieme); c) the Asiatic steppes (Wilhelm Brandenstein); d) Asia Minor, in the mountainous regions of Upper Mesopotamia (T. Gamkrelidze and V. Ivanov). The earlier emphasis on Corded Ware and its links with the Funnel Beaker culture and the South Russian Ochre Grave