

Luwian ‘Indeterminate’ Relative Clauses and their Prehistory

Anthony D. Yates
University of California–Los Angeles
adyates@ucla.edu

It has been the *communis opinio* since the pioneering work of Held (1957) that Hittite has two distinct types of preposed relative clauses (RCs) which stand in complementary distribution, viz. ‘indeterminate’ RCs, where the *wh*-word is clause-initial (ignoring clausal conjunction and attached clitics) and refers to an entity that is indefinite and non-specific, and ‘determinate’ RCs, where the *wh*-word is non-initial, and refers to an entity that is definite and specific (cf. Garrett 1994:44)). This ‘indeterminate’ vs. ‘determinate’ contrast was subsequently established for Lycian by Gusmani (1962, 1975) and, on the basis of agreement between Hittite and Lycian, reconstructed for Proto-Anatolian (PA) by Garrett (1994:49). Unsurprisingly, then, it is generally assumed that the same contrast also obtains in Luwian (cf. Melchert 2003:207).

I present new evidence from Hieroglyphic Luwian that complicates the Anatolian situation. Specifically, a comprehensive survey of Hieroglyphic Luwian ‘indeterminate’ RCs shows the systematic absence of a correlation between initial *wh*-word and ‘indeterminate’ semantics (*pace* Melchert 2003:207); rather, the most frequent surface pattern is exemplified in (1), where a single constituent precedes the relative pronoun:

- (1) *za-ya=pa=wa/i=ta* DOMUS-*na*’ **REL-sa** *a-mi-i* |INFANS-*ni-i*
this-ACC.PL.N.=PTC-TOP=PTC-QUOT=PTC-LOC house-ACC.PL.N. who-NOM.S.C. my-ADJ.DAT.S.C son-DAT.S.C.
INFANS.NEPOS-*si* INFANS.NEPOS.REL-*la* [ARHA] [CAPERE-*i*]a-’ #
grandson-DAT.S.C. great-grandson-DAT.S.C. away-PRVB. take-3S.PRES.ACT.
(*a*)=*wa/i=tu-u* “CAELUM” (DEUS)TONITRUS-*hu-za-sá-’* || (DEUS)*kar-hu-ha-sa*
CONJ=PTC-QUOT=CL-3S.DAT. sky-GEN.S.N. Tarhunt-NOM.S.C. Karhuha-PN-NOM.S.C.
(DEUS)*ku-AVIS-pa-pa-sa=ha* (DEUS)LUNA+*MI-sa-’* (DEUS)SOL-*sa=[ha-’]*
Kubaba-PN-NOM.S.C.=and-CONJ Moon-PN-NOM.S.C. (god) Sun-PN-NOM.S.C.=and-CONJ
(DEUS)*pa+ra/i-[k]+ra/i-sa=ha-’* |LIS-*la/i/u-sa-tu*
Parkara-PN-NOM.S.C.=and-CONJ litigate-3PL.IMPV.ACT.

‘But **whoever** shall take away these houses from my son, grandson, (or) great-grandson, against him may Tarhunt of the Sky, Karhuha, and Kubaba, (as well as) the Moon-god and the Sun-god and Parkara litigate [and may they destroy his head!]

(KARKAMIŠ A4a §12-13; *CHLI*, ed. Hawkins)

Having assessed the Luwian evidence, I evaluate its implications for PA. Rather than positing a diachronic innovation in Luwian, I argue that the syntactic patterns there observed can be reconciled with previously neglected evidence in Hittite and Lycian, allowing for a uniform description of ‘indeterminate’ RCs in PA that diverges from Garrett’s (1994) reconstruction. Building on the earlier proposals of Garrett (1994), Samuels (2005), and Huggard (2011), a new analysis of ‘indeterminate’ RCs in Luwian and PA is developed.

References

- Garrett, Andrew. 1994. Relative clause syntax in Lycian and Hittite. *Die Sprache* 36.26–69.
- Gusmani, Roberto. 1962. Zur Frage des lykischen Relativpronomens. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 67.159–176.
- . 1975. In margine alla trilingue licio-greco-aramaica di Xanthos. *Incontri linguistici* 2.61–75.
- Hawkins, J. David. 2000. *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions*. vol. I. Berlin / New York: de Gruyter.
- Held, Warren H. 1957. The Hittite Relative Sentence. *Language* 33(4).3, 7–52.
- Huggard, Mattyas. 2011. On *Wh*-(Non)-Movement and Internal Structures of the Hittite Preposed Relative Clause. In Stephanie W. Jamison, H. Craig Melchert and Brent Vine (eds.), *Proceedings of the 22nd Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference, Los Angeles, CA, 5-6 November 2010*, 83–104. Bremen: Hempen.
- Melchert, H. Craig. 2003. Language. In H. Craig Melchert (ed.), *The Luwians*, 170–210. Leiden / Boston: Brill.
- Samuels, Bridget. 2005. On the Left Periphery in Anatolian. *Linguistic Analysis* 35(1).275–297.