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1. INTRODUCTION. BASIC HITTITE CLAUSE ARCHITECTURE: STATUS QUAESTIONIS

Although Garrett (1990); Luraghi (1990); Hoffner, Melchert (2008), building upon earlier research, established basic Hittite syntactic features, there still remains a lot to be done, both purely descriptively and in the context of advances in typological understanding of how syntax works. This paper focuses on the seemingly well-studied area of the structure of the Hittite clause. As described in (Hoffner, Melchert 2008), Hittite attests a very rigid SOV word order:

(1) OH/OS (CTH 547.II) KUB 37.223 c. 5

kūru-ś uru-an lušši-zi š

enemy-NOM.SG.C city-ACC.SG.C strike-3SG.PRS

“The enemy strikes the city.”

Some non-canonical word orders, especially involving a constituent in the derived position in the left periphery (clause leftmost position) are described as being conditioned by the information structure, but the details remain unclear. Some classes of pronouns (e.g., indefinite and negative pronouns) are described as having aberrant syntactic behavior, different from nouns, namely they are positioned closer to the verb. Subordinators and relative pronouns are positioned clause initially, some of them turn up later in the clause. Negations are normally immediately in front of the verb (Hoffner, Melchert 2008; Luraghi 1990).

In the meantime there has been a lot of cross-linguistic work done on clause architecture, mostly on focus, wh-words, relative pronouns and subordinator positions in a clause. Considering the research is revealing for a better understanding of the structure of Hittite clause. The first steps in this direction have been done for Hittite by (Goedegebuure 2009; 2014; Huggard 2011; 2013; 2014; Sideltsev 2014b; 2014c). Goedegebuure (2009; 2014) established the preverbal position of replacing/counterexpectant focus and wh-words. The same was done for relative pronouns and the conjunction kuit “because” in (Huggard 2011; 2013). Goedegebuure (2014) provides, among many other things, a reliable framework for the analysis of Hittite information structure, which I follow in the present paper. Sideltsev (2014b) attempted to keep apart (mostly on information structure grounds) two non-canonical verb positions in the clause and to define the preverbal position. Huggard (2014) and Sideltsev (2014c) assessed the position of wh-words, relative and indefinite pronouns in the Hittite clause.

1. Previous versions of the paper were delivered as lectures at a meeting of Sodalizio Glottologico Milanese in Milano on 9 December 2013, and at a meeting of Celtic-Anatolian Seminar at the Department of Anatolian and Celtic Studies, Institute of Linguistics on 24 April 2014. I am grateful to the audience, and particularly to A. Rizza, Ya. Testelets and M. Vai for the feedback. Drafts of the paper were read by O. Belyaev, D. Erschler and E. Ljutikova who provided invaluable criticism. Naturally, all errors are mine.


3. = ex situ.

The present paper aims to consolidate previous research and provide a unified account of Hittite clause architecture, in the way that I term “cross-linguistically informed”, but without going into technical details of any formalism.

2. PREVERBAL POSITION IN THE HITTITE CLAUSE: FOCUS

I will start by exploring the preverbal position in a clause. As recent research of P. Goedegebuure (2003; 2009; 2014) showed, despite the claim for rigid SOV word order above, the relative placement of S and O to each other is frequently determined not by their grammatical function, but by their information structure: e.g., the canonical SO word order is determined by the dominant topical status of subject and focal status of object. If subject is contrastive focus and object is topic, the order is reversed –it becomes OS, as in:

(2) MH/MS (CTH 186) HKM 13 rev. 13-14

(This capitulation (to the enemy) by Marruwa, the ruler of Ḥimmuwa, about which you wrote me, (adding):

“I have dispatched him (to you).” On a tablet you wrote to me about him: “I have dispatched him (to you),”

but as of now he has not come. Now put him in the charge of an officer, and have him conduct him quickly before My Majesty. Otherwise.)

nu=za apēl wāstul zīk dā-ṭi #
CONN=REFL his sin.ACC.SG.N you.NOM.SG.C take-2SG.PRS
“you take upon yourself his ‘sin’.”5

Following (Goedegebuure 2014: 401), in this example the actual offender is replaced with another person, who might take his sin upon himself. Thus zīk “you” which is preverbal in the non-canonical OSV word order is contrastive focus.6

2.1. Preverbal position in the Hittite clause: other constituents

As illustrated above, contrastive focus is preverbal. However, the linearly preverbal position is targeted by many other constituents.7 The following constituents can be preverbal:

SOME SUBORDINATORS:8

(3) eNH/NS (CTH 49.II) KBo 10.12+ obv. i 5-6

nu=za tūl [-Za=KA SAG.DU=KA DAM₃=KA DUM₂=KA Š=KA * * [ ] U]
CONN=you your soul=your person=your wives=your sons=your KUR.URU=KA GIM-[n nakki-ēš] #
land=your as dear-NOM.PL.C
“As your [soul, your person, your wives], your [sons], and your land are dear to you…”9

5. Following (Hoffner 2009: 118).

6. Replacing focus in P. Goedegebuure’s terminology (Goedegebuure 2014). Alongside preverbal position, P. Goedegebuure posits another, clause-initial, position of narrow informational foci, such as additive focus, etc (Goedegebuure 2014).

7. In traditional Hittite grammars (Hoffner, Melchert 2008) the preverbal position of many of the constituents was not well understood. See (Goedegebuure 2014; Luraghi forthcoming; Huggard 2011, 2013, 2014; Sideltsev 2014b) for independently formulating the rules for the preverbal position.

8. Commonly kuit “as” (Huggard 2013), kuwapi “when” (Hoffner, Melchert 2008: 417) and occasionally mehran “when, as” (ibid: 417).

RELATIVE PRONOUNS OR RELATIVE PHRASES:10

(4) NH/INS (CTH 106.A.1) Bo 86/299 obv. ii 22-24
(They shall not take those revenues and supplies for ceremonies for the gods of Tarhuntassa)

1. ANA =LAMMA=-ma LUGAL KUR URU ³U-tašša ABU=YA kui-t pe-liša #
to Kurunta=kur king land Tarhuntassa father=my which ACC.SG.N give-3SG.PST

2. ḌUTI=ny=slī kui-t pi-līša #
Majesty=My=him which ACC.SG.N give-1SG.PST
“(1) from that which my father gave to Kurunta, king of the land of Tarhuntassa,
(2) and that which I, My Majesty, have given him”.11

WH-PHRASES:12

(5) NH/NS (CTH 89.A) KUB 21.29(+) rev. iv 13-14
(But if you men of the city tolerate/condone (?) someone/something,)
šummeš=kan kui-t ney-ari #
you.DAT.PL=LOC what nom.SG.N happen-3SG.PRS.MED
“what will happen to you?”.

NEGATION MARKERS AND NEGATIVE PRONOUNS14

(6) NH/NS (CTH 204) Msk. 73.1097 17-19
kimnu=šš=kan apet ḌUtula=GEŠTIN=nya ar[ba] lē kuiški ta-[šš] #
now=him=LOC that house vineyard=and away PROHIB something take-2SG.PRS
“Now, that house(hold) and vineyard you should in no way take from him!”.

INDEFINITE PRONOUNS:16

(7) NH/NS (CTH 85.2) KUB 21.37 obv. 48’
[mi≠ ANA ḌUTUL=Š] HUL-lu kuiški pediš #
CONN=QUOT=me if evil ACC.SG.N somebody NOM.SG.C bring-3SG.PRS
“[If] somebody brings evil to My Majesty…”.

PREVERBS:18

(8) NH/INS (CTH 106.A.1) Bo 86/299 rev. iii 3-5
zilati =wa=kan LUGAL-UTTA ŠA KUR ḌU-tašša ANA NUMUN
in.the.future=QUOT=LOC kingship of land Tarhuntassa to progeny
nNIR.GAL lē kuiški arba dāš #
Muwattalli PROHIB anybody NOM.SG.C away take-3SG.PRS
“For all time no one shall take the kingship of the land of Tarhuntassa away from the progeny of Muwattalli”.

10. A relative phrase is relative pronoun + NP. Cf. (Huggard 2011). Both relative pronouns in determinate and indeterminate relative clauses can be preverbal. Relative pronouns functioning as indefinite in conditional clauses behave in the same way:

(a) MH/MS (CTH 147) KUB 14.1+ rev. 45
nu=wa=mu mūn idālu-n # memia-n kuiš #
CONN=QUOT=me if evil ACC.SG.C word ACC.SG some NOM.SG.C tell-3SG.PRS
“If anybody tells me a bad word” following (Beckman 1996: 150).


14. Following (Hoffner, Melchert 2008).


16. See (Sideltsev 2014b; Huggard 2014; Goedegebuure 2014; Luraghi forthcoming).


18. See (Tjerkstra 1999: 173; Luraghi 1990: 32, 35; Francisco 2002a; Salisbury 2005: 216). Preverbs are separable from the verb, they do not form one morphosyntactic or phonological complex with the verb.

LOW MANNER ADVERBS AND ADVERBIALS\textsuperscript{20} like SÍG₃-in “well”, kiššan “this way”, apeniššan “that way”, namma “then, again”, mekki “much”:\textsuperscript{21}

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(9)] MH/MS (CTH 138.1) KUB 13.27+ obv'. 22'-23' 
\begin{tabular}{ll}
[n]aš\textsuperscript{wa} & $\text{ḥall[i]}$ \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\textsc{UL} SÍG₃-in $u\text{-ška-zi}$ \\
\textsc{or=QUOT} watch.ACC.SG.N \textsc{NEG} properly $\text{see-IMPF-3PL.PRS}$ \\
\begin{tabular}{l}
“We they do not keep watch properly”. \\
\end{tabular}
\end{enumerate}

Some of these constituents, primarily negation markers, preverbs and low adverbs, are preverbal in the canonical word order, but they can move to the clause initial position for information structure and discourse reasons.\textsuperscript{22} Negation can also move into any position if its scope is immediately over the constituent it moves in front of. The preverbal position of the constituents in the section is statistically different –for some it clearly dominates (negation markers, negative pronouns, low adverbs), for some it is one of the two options (indefinite, relative and interrogative pronouns, subordinator kuit).\textsuperscript{23} For some it is a statistically minor position (subordinator mahjan).

\subsection*{2.2.1. The inner structure of the preverbal position}
If several of these constituents are preverbal simultaneously, they are linearly ordered as follows, from left to right:\textsuperscript{24} (a) focus, \textit{wh}-phrases; (b) subordinators, relative pronouns, and indefinite pronouns; (c) preverbs,\textsuperscript{25} (d) negation markers, negative pronouns;\textsuperscript{26} (e) low manner adverbs and adverbials.\textsuperscript{27}

\textbf{Evidence for the ordering:}

\textsc{Wh-Word} – \textsc{Negation}:

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(10)] NH/NS (CTH 177.3) KUB 23.101 obv. ii 5 
\begin{tabular}{llllllll}
\multicolumn{1}{l}{\textsc{nu} tu-\textit{el} } & \hline
\textsc{UL} \textsc{kwat} & \textsc{UL} & punuš-sa # \\
\textsc{CONN} you-GEN.SG & \textsc{why} & \textsc{NEG} ask-3SG.PST \\
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{l}
“Why did you not ask your messenger”.\textsuperscript{28} \\
\end{tabular}
\end{enumerate}

\textsc{Wh-Word} – \textsc{Manner Adverb}:

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(11)] NH/NS (CTH 171) KUB 23.102 obv. 5'-6' 
\begin{tabular}{lllllllllllll}
\multicolumn{1}{l}{\textsc{šēš} $\text{̄\text{ṭfr}}$ša-ma } & \hline
\textsc{U} ŠÅ $\text{ba\textquestionmark\text{š}š}$ & $\text{Ammana}$ & $\text{uwa\textquestionmark\text{š}š}$ & kuit & namma & meme-ške-šš # \\
\textsc{brotherhood=but and of Mt. Ammana coming} & \textsc{why then} & \textsc{speak-IMPF-2SG.PRS} \\
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{l}
“But why do you continue to speak about “brotherhood” and about coming to Mt. Ammana?”.\textsuperscript{29} \\
\end{tabular}
\end{enumerate}

20. See (Tjerkstra 1999; Sideltsev 2014b; Goedegebuure 2014). Namma is in fact floating with predominantly clause-initial position –out of 57 entries in M. Molina’s MH/MS letter corpus only 14 are not clause-initial. What matters, however, is that one of the positions namma can occupy in the clause is preverbal.


22. E.g., apeniššan is overwhelmingly preverbal –in the MH/MS letter corpus of M. Molina out of 17 entries apeniššan is 15 times preverbal (once it is postverbal out of 15). In two cases it is not preverbal because it is topicalized. So we might want to change the taxonomy –low adverbs are preverbal when they are focus and not preverbal when they are topical, but see below (section 2.2.3) for the reasons to keep them apart from the rest of foci.

23. See below for the other option.

24. See (Sideltsev 2014b; Goedegebuure 2014).

25. Preverb position is more complex and will be dealt with in a separate paper.

26. I.e. negation marker + indefinite pronouns.

27. I know of only one case where the linear sequence is reversed, it quite expectably involves adverbs:

\textbf{Low Adverb – Subordinator:}

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(b)] MH/MS (CTH 186) HKM 17 rev. 28-29 
\begin{tabular}{lllllllllllll}
\multicolumn{1}{l}{\textsc{kapapalšuwa-š} } & \hline
\textsc{mekki} & kuit & $\text{páḫḫišNu\textquestionmark\text{š}š}$ # \\
\textsc{Kapapalšuwa-NOM.SG.C} & much & since & protect-PRTC.NOM.SG.C \\
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{l}
“Since Kapapalšuwa is well protected” following (Hoffner 2009: 124). \\
\end{tabular}
\end{enumerate}

In a number of cases where the subordinator is between the negation marker and the verb, it may just be in the second position.

FOCUS – SUBORDINATOR:

(12) NH/NS (CTH 81.A) KUB 1.1+ rev. 4 7-8

ammak=ma LUGAL-UTTA 1 ISTAR GAŠAN=YA annišan=pat kuit memi-like-t #
me.DAT.SG=but kingship Istar lady=my previously=EMPF because say-IMPR-3SG.PST
“Because to me my lady Istar had previously promised the kingship, (at that time my lady Istar appeared
to my wife)”.30

FOCUS – PREVERB – MANNER ADVERB:

(13) NH/NS (CTH 407) KBo 15.1 obv. i 12-14

1. nu=kan ANA LÚ LUGAL-uiš andu kišan memai #…
   CONN=LOC to man king-NOM.SG.C into in.this.way speak.3SG.PRS

2. [nu=kan AN]A LÚ apašš andu kišan [memai] #
   CONN=LOC to man he.NOM.SG.C into in.this.way speak.3SG.PRS

“(1) And it is the king who speaks to the man in this way. (But if it does [not] please the king (to do so),
3 he will send someone else, 4 and that one will assist at the ritual instead (of the king).) (2’) He will
[speak] to the man in this way instead”.31

RELATIVE PRONOUN32 – LOW ADVERB:

(14) NH/NS (CTH 106.A.1) Bo 86/299 rev. iii 2-3

našma ANA AWAT KUR 1 U-tašša kuiš kišan
or to matter land Tarhuntassa which-NOM.SG.N as.follows
EGIR-an iya-n #
then do-PRTC.NOM.SG.N

“Or concerning the problem of the land of Tarhuntassa something is stipulated subsequently
(to my father’s treaty tablet) as follows”.33

FOCUS – INDEFINITE PRONOUN:

(15) NH/NS (CTH 106) Bo 86/299 rev. iii 3-8

(But in the future let no one take away the kingship of Tarhuntassa from the offspring of Muwatalli).

nu apāšš kuški iya-ci #
CONN that.ACC.SG.N someone.NOM.SG.C do-3SG.PRS

“(If) someone does the following instead, (that is, he gives it to another descendant of Muwatalli while
taking it away from the offspring of Kuruntiya, anyone who performs that action instead, may
the Stormgod of Hatti and the Sungoddess of Arinna destroy him)”.34

2.2.2. The position of indefinite pronouns

It was observed in passing above that indefinite pronouns are in the preverbal position as different from all
other verbal arguments:

(16) NH/NS (CTH 42.A) KBo 5.3+ obv. ii 27

našma kātur KIBAL kuški
or hostile.ACC.SG.N revolt someone.NOM.SG.C take-3SG.PRS

“Or (if) anybody starts a hostile revolt”.35

If a clause simultaneously attests verbal arguments which are instantiated by noun phrases and by
indefinite pronouns, including noun phrases modified by indefinite pronouns, all the rest of verbal arguments,

29. Following (Hoffner 2009: 323).
31. Following (Goedegebuure 2014: 395). The example is from ritual description. The nearest diplomatic parallels
are P. Goedegebuure’s exx. 7.13 (apiya kuški anda), 7.40 (apiya anda).
32. Functioning as indefinite in the conditional clause.
of Tarhuntassa, because it is hereby stipulated subsequently (to my father’s treaty tablet) as follows”.
34. Following (Otten 1988: 20f; Goedegebuure 2014: 393 = ex. 7.31).
both definite/specific and indefinite/non-specific, both topics and foci, are always in front (to the left) of indefinite pronouns, irrespective of their syntactic function. E.g., in (16) the direct object karur K1.BAL “hostile revolt” is in front of the subject instantiated by the indefinite pronoun, which brings about the non-canonical OSV word order.

This behavior of indefinite pronouns is not available in well-studied SOV languages where indefinite pronouns behave like other verbal arguments. This is true even for Hungarian which otherwise attests a dedicated quantifier position (Kiss 2004; Hungarian existential quantifiers like valaki “somebody” are either in the topic position or postverbal (Kiss 2004: 106-7).

2.2.3. How many preverbal positions are there?

Thus wh-words, relative and indefinite pronouns as well as subordinators are preverbal. Now two questions arise: (a) whether the preverbal position is the same for all these constituents and (b) whether the position is original or derived.28

2.2.3.1. One vs. several preverbal positions

The evidence for one vs. several positions is extremely scanty and unclear.

It looks like there are data that indefinite pronouns and wh-words occupy different preverbal positions. Wh-words are likely to occupy the same position as preverbal focus:

(a) both preverbal contrastive focus (17) and wh-words (18) are in front of preverbs:29

(17) NH/NS (CTH 407) KBo 15.1 obv. i 12-13
nu=kan ANA LÜ LUGAL-naš andu kiššan memai #
CONN=LOC to man king-NOM.SG.C into in.this.way speak.3SG.PRS

“...And it is the king who speaks to the man in this way.”30

(18) MH/MS (CTH 186) HKM 43 obv. 1-5-
n=atura "Tarul[j]1[y][a]š tazz-n Zilapiyaššu=
CONN=LOC Taruliya,GEN.SG army-ACC.SG.C Zilapiya,GEN.SG=and
ĒRIN,MES mahšun sarš ovat-er #
troops new how up bring-3PL.PST

“How could they have brought up the army of Taruliya and the new troops of Zilapiya?”.

(b) Both focus and wh-words stay higher than the non-canonical clause-internal position of the verb (19):32

(19) NH/NS (CTH 63.A) KUB 19.31+ rev. iii 27’-31’
nu kiššan memiya-n kovat lya-tten QATAMMA #
CONN this.ACC.SG.C matter-ACC.SG.C why do-2PL.PST in.this.way

“So, why have you handled this matter in this way? (you keep taking those civilian captives away from Tuppi-Teššah)?”.

Naturally, as QATAMMA in (19) stands for kiššan, not apeniššan, it is not replacing focus.

36. Cf. wrongly (Huggard 2014).

37. Cross-linguistically, this is highly unusual. Indefinite/non-specific arguments often occupy a different structural position than definite/specific ones (see, among others, (Gračanin-Yüksek, Işever 2011; Kiss 2004; Kahнемуипюр, Megerdoomian 2008; appendix A; Kahnemuiyipour, Megerdoomian 2011 with ref.; Travis 2005: 209; Vikner 1995), or to raise to a lower position, so indefinite/non-specific arguments are one of the few constituents which can intervene between focus and verb in SOV languages (Kim 1988). However, I know of no language where only indefinite/non-specific arguments which are indefinite pronouns behave in a different way from all noun phrases, both definite/specific and indefinite/non-specific. Thus the different syntactic behavior of indefinite pronouns cannot be attributed to their nonspecificity/indefiniteness contra (Huggard 2014).

38. In the paradigms which operate with movement the original position is the position where a constituent is base-generated (in situ) whereas the derived position is the position where the constituent moves (ex situ).

39. See (Goedegebuure 2014).

40. Following (Goedegebuure 2014: 395).

41. Following (Hoffner 2009: 169).

42. See below in more detail.

(e) Finally, the information structure of both focus and wh-words is similar.\textsuperscript{44} Actually, there are no cases in my corpus where both indefinite pronouns and wh-words are attested in the same clause.\textsuperscript{45} But if wh-words and focus are in the same position, there are ample data that both indefinite pronouns and focus are attested in the same clause, as in (20) where focused apiya "then" precedes indefinite pronoun kuišši "someone":

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{NH/NS (CTH 379) KUB 31.121 obv. ii 11'-13'}
\begin{enumerate}
\item karri kuišši LUGAL,\textsuperscript{46} eš-ir #
before who-NOM.PL.C kings be-3PL.PST
\item nu=kan mā[n] apiya kuišši andu da[t]-\textsuperscript{4} #
CONN=LOC whether then any-NOM.SG.C into put-3SG.PST
\end{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}

"(I do not know) (1) whether any (2) of the kings that ruled (lit. were) in the past (1) added (any word) then".\textsuperscript{46}

So, albeit admittedly indirectly, it can be assumed that indefinite pronouns and wh-words occupy two distinct preverbal positions.

Several different positions are not so clear in case of indefinite pronouns, relative pronouns and subordinators. At first sight it looks like they all occupy the same position. All of them are different from wh-words in that they are not attested to the clause-internal verb as in (19), they rather stay lower (21-23).\textsuperscript{47}

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{NH/NS (CTH 383) KUB 21.19+ obv. ii 9}
apiya-ma HUL–lu uttar iya-\textsuperscript{4} kuišši #
that ACC.SG.N=but evil ACC.SG.N thing ACC.SG.N do-3SG.PST WHO-NOM.SG.C
"The one who did that evil thing...".\textsuperscript{48}
\item \textit{NH/NS (CTH 61.II.7.A) KBo 2.5+ rev. iii 34-35}
u nu Aparru-\textsuperscript{49} LÚ kiiššima kūrūriš-ta kuišši #
CONN Aparru-NOM.SG.C man Kalasma get.hostile-3SG.PST as
"As Aparru, the man of Kalasma, started hostilities, (he mobilized 3000 troops)".\textsuperscript{49}
\item \textit{OHOS (CTH 291.Lb.A) KBo 22.61+ obv. i 4 (§3)}
[kukk LŪ-ašt našma MUNUS-un ELLAM walaḫ-zi kuišši # if man ACC.SG. or woman ACC.SG.C free strike-3SG.PRS somebody NOM.SG.C
"[If] anyone strikes a free [man] or woman...".\textsuperscript{51}
\end{enumerate}

Besides, they all attest wide-going similarities in the clause distribution –they can all be preverbal, second position and clause initial/first.\textsuperscript{52} The parallelism is at first sight contradicted by the fact that subordinators and indefinite/relative pronouns are simultaneously attested preverbally\textsuperscript{53} in the same clause (24):

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{MHMS (CTH 190) HKM 84 obv. 12'-14'}
nu=tta n[am]ma kuišši [kuišši iya-\textsuperscript{4} #
CONN=you then who-NOM.SG.C anything ACC.SG.N make-3SG.PRS
"(But if there is no grain,) then who ever again will make anything for you?" following (Hoffner 2009: 247).
\end{enumerate}

44. There is enormous literature on the topic. Cf. (Goedegebuure 2009) who I believe overinterpreted the difference between information structure of preverbal and clause-initial/first wh-words.
45. The only example I am aware of is restored in the relevant point and thus cannot serve as independent evidence:

c) \textit{MH/MS (CTH 190) HKM 84 obv. 12'-14'}
nu=tta n[am]ma kuišši [kuišši iya-\textsuperscript{4} #
CONN=you then who-NOM.SG.C anything ACC.SG.N make-3SG.PRS
"(But if there is no grain,) then who ever again will make anything for you?" following (Hoffner 2009: 247).
46. Following (Goedegebuure 2014: 385).
47. The verbs are either topics, as in (19, 21-22) or part of broad informational focus, as in (23). Cf. wrongly (Siddeu 2014c).
49. Following (Goetze 1967: 188-189).
50. Restored from OH/NS copy KBo 6.3+ obv. i 6.
51. Following (Hoffner 1997: 18).
52. Admittedly, with considerable statistical differences between the frequency of each position.
53. Naturally, subordinators and indefinite/relative pronouns are attested many times in the same clause if the subordinator is clause-first/initial and the relative/indefinite pronoun/subordinator functioning as indefinite pronoun is preverbal.
(24) NH/NS (CTH 255.2.A) KUB 26.1+ rev. iii 50-51
[ci]m'mazš=ma kuit GIM-an [i]damaš-ten #
you=but which-ACC.SG.N when hear-2PL.PST
“But when you have heard something...”\(^{54}\)

(25) NH/NS (CTH 255.2.A) KBo 26.1+ rev. iii 16
nu=za kii-t GIM-an kii-ari #
CONN=REFL which-ACC.SG.N when hear-2PL.PST
“And should something happen...”\(^{55}\)

(26) NH/NS (CTH 255.2.B) KBo 26.8 obv. ii 5'
[...] x=ma kuit GIM-an *u-šš'ke-teni #
=x=but which-ACC.SG.N when see-IMPF-2PL.PRS
“But when you observe something...”\(^{56}\)

Exx. (24–26) would certainly be a strong argument against subordinators and indefinite/relative pronouns occupying the same position.\(^{57}\) However, it is conspicuous that the three examples are the only ones from my corpus of diplomatic texts, they are extremely late and come from two very closely related texts. Moreover they are lexically very similar. Besides, in one of the three examples, the relative pronoun functioning as an indefinite one is clause-first. In two other examples, the position of the relative pronoun is ambiguous between clause second and preverbal. In view of the scantiness and ambiguity of evidence it is an open question whether subordinators and indefinite/relative pronouns occupy the same position. What is potentially relevant for the discussion is the fact\(^{58}\) that in relation to the verb’s position in the clause, including non-canonical verb’s position, the position of indefinite pronouns, relative pronouns and subordinators is the same. I also expressly reject the claim of Huggard\(^{59}\) (2011) that relative pronouns occupy the same position as \(\text{wh}\)-words and preverbal focus as the information structure status of relative pronouns has nothing to do with contrastive focus or even with the narrow informational focus of \(\text{wh}\)-words.

2.2.3.2. Original vs. derived position?

The next question is whether the preverbal positions of \(\text{wh}\)-words, relative pronouns, indefinite pronouns and subordinators are original or derived. The arguments in favor of the position being the original one are the following: if \(\text{wh}\)-words, relative pronouns, and indefinite pronouns are verbal arguments, only objects are preverbal whereas subjects are not.\(^{59}\) Thus preverbal \(\text{wh}\)-words, relative pronouns, and indefinite pronouns which are objects simply conform to the canonical SOV Hittite word order and are in the original position. As different from this, subjects are not preverbal\(^{60}\) and thus again conform to the canonical SOV word order. However, this is not really so. Both for relative pronouns, \(\text{wh}\)-words and especially indefinite pronouns, there are attestations where subjects instantiated by relative pronouns\(^{61}\), \(\text{wh}\)-words\(^{62}\) and indefinite pronouns\(^{63}\) are preverbal, thus bringing about non-canonical OSV word order:

(27) NH/OS (CTH 292.II.a.B) KBo 6.26 rev. iii 16 (§ 186)
ŠA 2 GU₄ išaššaš UZU=ŠUNU
of 2 cattle yearling,GEN.PL meat=their
[k]uiššaš wait-t #
“Whoever buys the meat of 2 yearling cattle”\(^ {62}\)

54. Following (Miller 2013: 302-303).
55. Following (Miller 2013: 300-301).
56. Following (Miller 2013: 298-289).
57. The position of relative and indefinite pronouns is different vis-à-vis negation markers: whereas the former normally precede it even when they are preverbal, the latter (as part of negative pronouns) follow it when they are in the preverbal position.
58. Which I will demonstrate further.
59. See (Huggard 2011).
60. Thus (Huggard 2011).
61. See (Goedegebuure 2009) for the examples.
This means that the position of relative pronouns, *wh*-words and indefinite pronouns is not original, but rather derived—just like the preverbal position of contrastive focus which brings about the same non-canonical OSV word order is derived. Naturally, however, it might be supposed that all the rest of verbal arguments move in these very particular cases, leaving the constituents which surface preverbally in their original position. This, however, is refuted by the placement of relative pronouns, *wh*-words, subordinators and indefinite pronouns vis-à-vis preverbs.

As is obvious from the corpus of data from diplomatic texts, both the position of relative pronouns, *wh*-words, subordinators and indefinite pronouns in front of the preverb, and their position between the preverb and the verb are attested. See for preverbal indefinite pronouns the following two examples where (29) attests the indefinite pronoun between the preverb and the verb and (30)—the indefinite pronoun in front of the preverb:

(29) OH/NS (CTH 292.II.a.B) KBo 6.26 obv. i 18 (§ 162a)

\[ \text{takku} \quad \text{P} \quad \text{EGIR-} \quad \text{nāa} \quad \text{kuiški} \quad \text{if you,ACC.SG}=\text{but Tuppi-Tessup, with a word...} \]

(30) NH/NS (CTH 62.II.A) KBo 5.9+ obv. ii 25–26

\[ \text{mūn} \quad \text{tak=ma} \quad \text{TUPPI–} \quad \text{uddan-aza} \quad \text{kuiški} \quad \text{if you,ACC.SG=but Tuppi-Tessup,ACC.SG.C word-ABL some.NOM.SG.C into oppress-3SG.PRS} \]

But statistically the two positions are very different represented in the texts. For indefinite pronouns, the counts are as follows: the position between the preverb and the verb is attested 7 times (19%) whereas the position in front of the preverb is attested 30 times (81%). Three of the seven attestations occur in the lexically identical phrase which occurs in three NH/NS treaties. Besides, subject or direct object indefinite pronouns occur only 1 time between the preverb and the verb whereas they occur 19 times in front of the preverb. Thus the statistics is very different if syntactic functions are considered. It is an impressive 5% to 95%! For relative pronouns, only the position in front of the preverb is available in my corpus:
If one follows Huggard (2014) that the position between the preverb and the verb is the original position for all verbal arguments, then the data can only be interpreted in one way: the preverbal position in reality is heterogeneous. All of the preverbal categories are located originally between the preverb and the verb, but they stay there only in very rare cases. In the majority of cases the preverbal position is derived—it is in front of the preverb.

2.2.3. low adverbs and wh-words

It follows from section 2.2.1 that low adverbs follow all other preverbal constituents and immediately precede the verb. However, it happens only when low adverbs are part of the broad VP focus, as in exx. (11, 13, 14). When low adverbs are topicalized or narrowly focussed, they target the same position as other contrastive foci as seen in (34), or other topics, as seen in (33).

(33) MH/MS (CTH 186) HKM 8 obv. 12-14

\[ n=ašta \quad \text{KÚR} \quad \text{QATAMMA} \quad \text{kuit} \quad \text{KUR-e} \quad \text{anda} \quad \text{lammar} \]

\[ \text{CONN=LOC} \quad \text{enemy} \quad \text{thus} \quad \text{because} \quad \text{land-LOC.SG} \quad \text{into} \quad \text{instantly} \]

"Because the enemy thus marches into the land at a moment’s notice."

(34) NH/NS (CTH 40) KBo 5.6 obv. iii 52

\[ \text{kuwat}\text{-wa} \quad \text{apeniššan} \quad \text{TAQBI} \]

\[ \text{why=QUOT} \quad \text{in.that.way} \quad \text{speak} \]

"Why have you spoken in that way?"

In (34) the wh-word is in front of the contrastively focused adverb apeniššan "in that way". Following (Goedegebuure 2014: 251) "... the adverb apeniššan is used to express a type of counter-expectant focus: ‘Why did you write in this way (focus) ’..., (instead of believing me immediately and send a son’)? The fact that we find eniššan in iv 4, referring backward to the same piece of text ‘Do they deceive me?’, shows that apeniššan replaces non-focal kiššan’. In this case it can be supposed that the wh-word is in the clause initial position, see for such position section 2.2.4, whereas the focussed adverb is in the same position as other preverbal foci.

However, the explanation is not applicable to (35) which similarly attests both a contrastive focus and a wh-word in the clause. But, as different from (34), in (35) the position of the wh-word is preverbal:

(35) NH/NS (CTH 127) Bo 2810 obv. 8-9

\[ \text{nu=mu} \quad \text{DUMU=YA} \quad \text{kuwat} \quad \text{iya-t} \quad \text{apeniššan} \quad \text{vo} \]

\[ \text{CONN=me} \quad \text{son=my} \quad \text{why} \quad \text{do-3SG.PST} \quad \text{that.way} \]

"Why has my son acted that way towards me?"

The only way to assess (35) is to modify the explanation for (34), i.e. to suppose that the wh-phrases in (34-35) are topical, and thus are positioned in the topic position, i.e. in front of replacing focus which is regularly preverbal. The preverbal position of wh-word in (35) follows from the non-canonical position of the verb.

An important conclusion is that wh-words are sensitive to the information structure. Other preverbal constituents—indefinite pronouns and subordinators— are not.

70. Following (Goedegebuure 2014: 251).
71. See for the information structure (Goedegebuure 2014: 251).
73. Which will be assessed below.
74. Cf. in the same spirit, but along very different lines (Goedegebuure 2009).
75. See (Huggard 2011, 2014; Becker 2014).
However, the sensitivity very seldom brings about clause positions which are different from preverbal or, as we will shortly see, other positions in the clause.

### 2.2.4. Clause initial vs. preverbal positions in a Hittite clause

I have already mentioned that relative pronouns can be both preverbal and clause initial. The same is true for the majority of the constituents which are preverbal – they can also be at the left edge of the clause, as is the case with the subordinator *mahjan* "as", which was preverbal in (3)\(^76\) and is clause initial in (36):

\[
(36)\quad \text{NH/INS (CTH 106:A.1) Bo 86/299 obv. ii 101-102} \\
\text{nu mahjan ANA LUGAL KUR }^{130} \text{Hatti ZI-anca} \\
\text{CONN as to king land Hatti soul.NOM.SG.C} \\
\text{"(He shall be treated) as the King of Hatti pleases."}^77
\]

As is seen from the example, constituents in the clause initial position can follow sentence connectives like *nu*, especially in Middle and New Hittite texts.\(^78\)

The clause initial/first and preverbal positions in Hittite are identical only to a very limited degree – only subordinators, relative pronouns and *wh*-words can occur in either position.\(^79\) This does not, naturally, mean that I equate the positions themselves. The majority of subordinators are clause initial,\(^80\) only a few are preverbal (most frequently *kuit* "because"\(^81\) and much rarer *mahjan* "as"), and all of the preverbal ones can occur in the first/initial position. Relative pronouns are normally clause second in determinate relative clauses and clause initial in indeterminate relative clauses,\(^82\) they are quite seldom unambiguously preverbal.\(^83\) *Wh*-words occur in either position,\(^84\) although preverbal position clearly dominates: out of 145 questions in (Hoffner 1995), only 12 *wh*-words are unambiguously clause initial and not preverbal.\(^85\) Contrastive foci are only preverbal, contrastive topics are only clause initial\(^86\) whereas non-contrastive topics are not necessarily clause initial. Indefinite pronouns are attested once in the first position in my corpus.

Both initial and preverbal positions can be filled in a clause simultaneously: the clause initial position in such cases normally hosts subordinators, whereas the preverbal position may contain focus, relative pronouns, indefinite pronouns, subordinators functioning as indefinite pronouns.

#### 2.2.4.1. Clause second position

As it was observed in section 2.2.2.5, not all the left edge constituents are clause initial. Some of them occupy the second position. The main second position constituents in Hittite are indefinite pronouns, relative pronouns\(^87\) and second position subordinators\(^88\) like *kuit* "because", *kuvapi* "where", more seldom *mahjan*...

---

76. Spelled with the Sumerogram GIM-an.
78. Thus it would be more accurate to label the position first, and not initial, as is done in (Luraghi 1990).
79. There is just a handful of cases in my corpus where the subordinator is neither clause second, nor preverbal. I leave them out of consideration for the moment for the future research because of their rarity.
80. See for a descriptive overview (Hoffner, Melchert 2008).
81. See (Huggard 2013).
82. Or, following the recent reassessment of relative pronouns’ distribution by (Becker 2014), the information structure is different and more complex.
83. (Huggard 2011) assesses the preverbal position as the original one and treats first and second positions as topicalizations or focusing, but see above.
84. (Hoffner 1995; Goedegebuure 2009).
85. *nu* *wh*-word-V clauses are ambiguous for me.
86. (Goedegebuure 2014) discusses some not completely clear examples which can be *preverbal* contrastive topics.
87. In what was traditionally termed determinate relative clauses (Held 1957, Garrett 1994), but cf. now (Becker 2014).
88. See for subordinators (Hoffner, Melchert 2008), for indefinite pronouns (Huggard 2014, Sideltsev forthcoming).
"as". As different from clitics in the Wackernagel position, which can be second after connectives like *nu*, relative pronouns and subordinators do not count a number of constituents as the first position.\(^{89}\)

(37) NH/NS (CTH 61.II.7.A) KBo 5.8 rev. iii 24-5

nu \(\sim\) uni \(\sim\) kui-n \(\sim\) 9 LM 辖区内

CONN this who-ACC.SG.C 9000 troops \(\sim\) Pitagattalli-NOM.SG.C bring-3SG.PST

"That 9,000-man army which Pitagattalli led (joined battle with me)".\(^{91}\)

(38) OH-MH/MS (CTH 262) IlkoT 1.36 rev. iv 30

LĐ-Mağ \(\sim\) MEŞEDI kuwapi \(\sim\) *du*[makale]ši-t \(\sim\) tišak-anši \#

Bodyguards where inner chamber-LOC.SG step-IMPF-3PL.PRS

"Where the bodyguards stand by the inner chamber…".\(^{92}\)

(39) NH/INS (CTH 106.A.1) Bo 86/299 rev. iv 8-9

našma 4 UTUš\# kuiški našma ANA NUMUN 4 UTUš\#

or to majesty=H my someone or to progeny majesty=H

ANA LUGAL-UTTI ÊA KUR \(\sim\) Hatti ussii pēša-i \#

for kingship of land Hatti difficulty bring-3SG.PRS

"Or (if) someone brings difficulties upon My Majesty or upon the progeny of My Majesty concerning

the kingship of Hatti, […]".\(^{93}\)

2.2.5. Postverbal position in a Hittite clause

After the detailed treatment of the preverbal position I will pass to the main topic of the paper, the postverbal position. The logic behind the structure of the paper is that the constituents which land postverbally are identical to the constituents which are preverbal. I will remind that the preverbal constituents are (a) focus, *wh*-phrases; (b) some subordinators, relative and indefinite pronouns; (c) preverbs; (d) negation markers, negative pronouns; (e) low manner adverbs and adverbials. Now part of these can be postverbal, namely (b) subordinators, relative and indefinite pronouns; (d) negation markers, negative pronouns; (e) low manner adverbs and adverbials. It is curious that focus and *wh*-words are very sporadically postverbal. There is only one example of *wh*-words being postverbal in my corpus, see ex. (41), vs., e.g., 15 indefinite pronouns in the postverbal position, as in (42). It is also curious that contrastive focus is represented only by contrastively/scalarly focused low adverbs, as in (35) above.\(^{94}\)

POSTVERBAL SUBORDINATORS:

(40) NH/NS (CTH 61.II.7.A) KBo 2.5+ KBo 16.17+ rev. iii 34-35

nu \(\sim\) *Aparru-š\# LĐ 83–84 [Kalasma kūruryaš-ta kuiš #

CONN Aparru-NOM.SG.C man Kalasma get.hostile-3SG.PST as

"As Aparru, the man of Kalasma, started hostilities, (he mobilized 3000 troops)".\(^{95}\)

POSTVERBAL *WH*-WORDS:

(41) OH/NS (CTH 19.II.A) KBo 3.1+ obs. i 40

[k]-t=wa iya-nun kuiš #

this-ACC.SG.N=QUOT do-1SG.PST why

"Why did I do this?".\(^{96}\)

89. (Garrett 1996; Hoffner, Melchert 2008; Luraghi forthcoming). It is likely that *nu* is a proclitic.

90. I.e., not after *nu, mán, našma, numma*, etc., see (Sideltsev 2002, 2014b). It implies that there are two clause second positions in Hittite, one for clitics, and one for relative/indefinite pronouns/some subordinators.


92. Following (Miller 2013: 118-119).


94. See in more detail (Sideltsev 2014b). It is significant that the only postverbal *wh*-word is also adverbial. Cf. (Luraghi forthcoming) who misses the real distribution.

95. Following (Goetze 1967: 148-149).

POSTVERBAL INDEFINITE PRONOUNS:

(42) NH/INS (CTH 106 A.1) Bo 86/299 rev. iii 28

måršma ANA NUMUN abTadhišta nakkiesīš-zi kuitki

if=but to progeny Tadhišta weigh-3SG.PRS anything

“If something becomes difficult for a descendant of Tadhišta…” 97

POSTVERBAL RELATIVE PRONOUNS:

(43) NH/INS (CTH 383) KUB 21.19+ obv. ii 9

aqt=ma HUL–št uuttar iyat kuitki š #

that-ACC.SG.N evil-ACC.SG.N thing-ACC.SG.N do-3SG.PST who-NOM.SG.C

“The one who did that evil thing…” 99

2.2.5.1.

The last point—that focus can be postverbal—was discovered by (Bauer 2011). 100 However, she attempted to describe all non-canonical V-X clauses as \( V_{\text{type-}X_{\text{TOPICAL FOCUS}}} \). The point is very important and I will dwell on it in some detail. First of all, it is obvious that some postverbal foci are really contrastive, as (44), (45) or (46):

(44) OH/NS (CTH 8 A) KBo 3.34 obv. ii 8-12

(Askaliya was the lord in Hurma, he too was a man in every respect. They defamed him to my father; so he transferred him, brought him to Ankuwa, and made him an LuAGRI in Ankuwa)

1. šarkuš LÚ-ešš štā #
2. akipš=ma=caš #
3. ṣepšlaumanni #
die-3SG.PST=but=he-NOM.SG.C in.diminished.circumstances-LOC.SG

“(1) He was an eminent/powerful/prominent man, (2) but he died in diminished circumstances”. 102

Here the verb akipš “died” can be understood as topical only if the topic is inferable from the context. 103 There is no obvious mention of “dying” in the previous context. The post-verbal ṣepšlaumanni “in diminished circumstances” is replacing focus: in the spirit of (Goedegebuure 2014) it replaces the šarkuš LÚ-ešš “an eminent/powerful man” in cl. 1. The particle -ma here is contrastive and its scope is over all cl. 2. The following example attests yet another subtype of contrastive focus, scalar focus:

(45) NH/NS (CTH 293) KUB 13.35+ obv. ii 39-45

1. ANŠE #=wa kušši šarkuš #
2. nu=wa=za UL kuitki dabhjum # …
3. dahušun=ma=wa=za UL kuitki #

take-1SG.PST=but=QUOT=REFL NEG something-ACC.SG.N

“(1) Of the asses which I had (charge of) (2) I took for myself nothing. (Five asses died, and I replaced them from (my own) house. Five asses died from abuse. They will drive back here five jackasses (as replacements). Admittedly they haven’t yet driven them here. Mr. AMAR.MUSEN the animal-driver worked them to death, and he hasn’t yet replaced them) (3) But I took nothing for myself”. 104

In (45) cl. 2 and 3’ are identical but for the word order. Both negative pronoun and the verb are informational focus in cl. 2, in cl. 3’ the same proposition is repeated, this time with scalar focus on the negative pronoun (= traditional emphasis) and the verb being topical.

98. The same word order is attested ibid. obv. ii 9, i 31.
100. The first observations to this effect go as far back as (Hoffner 1977), but we owe the systematic research to (Bauer 2011).
101. It is noteworthy that in KBo 3.36+ ex. C the adversative particle is not employed: 18’ akipš=šan.
103. Topical information structure status is not normally acknowledged for verbs, but see for discourse linked verbs, e.g., (Szendrői 2003: 72-73) in Hungarian, and (Yanko 2011) for Russian topical verbs.
104. Presented only in translation.
105. Following (Hoffner 2003: 58; Werner 1967: 8-9).
The following context attests a counterexpectant focus in the postverbal position:

(46) NH/NS (CHD L-N: 422) KUB 21.29+ obv. i 11-19

2. Following (Miller 2013: 261; Taggar-Cohen 2006: 81); (CHD L-N: 422; Š: 331): “his wife”.

The identical verbs in cl. 3 and 4 are inferable topics – resettling logically follows rebuilding in the previous clause. The other constituents (negative adjunct in cl. 3 and adjunct in cl. 4) are informational foci. The question is why non-canonical word order is used in both clauses. Despite presence of -mū106 I do not see any proper lexical contrast in either clause, I rather suppose it is unexpectedness that brought about the non-canonical word order. Unexpectedness is coded by adjuncts, thus they are counterexpectational foci: the way resettling was done is not expected and runs counter to what is considered to be the normal state of affairs by the author of the text. There is no lack of discourse continuity109 that might have conditioned verb fronting – resettling logically follows rebuilding. Thus the fact that postverbal constituents are contrastive or counterexpectational foci appears to be firmly established. However, as P. Goedegebuure (2014) showed, both contrastive and counterexpectational foci are regularly preverbal, see ex. (2) above. Moreover, in other examples the postverbal focus is not contrastive, as in (47):

(47) NH/NS (CHD 264.A) KUB 13.4 rev. iii 77-79

contrastive effect mostly comes from the fact that in (47) the verb is topical, whereas lack of contrast in (48) results from the verbs being informational foci:

(48) MH/MS (CTH 268) KUB 23.82+ obv'. 23'-27'
(Even if someone with evil intent seeks to stir up a rebellion against me, and I write to you, if you do not instantly come to my aid; or (if) you hear about this, if you do not tell it to My Majesty right away –even if he is not an enemy for you)
\[\text{nu an} \text{ lu} \text{hiy-a-reni} \quad \text{UL} #\]
CONN=him make.war-2PL.PRS NEG
“(so that) you do not make war upon him (that shall be put[t] under oath).”

Ex. (48) does not even display contrast on the clausal level, which is demonstrated by absence of -\text{ma}.

The information structure of (48) is identical to that of the preceding clauses, from the same context, reproduced here in translation, some of which are also negative. However, there is no trace of non-canonical word order in any clause in the previous context. Naturally, one can always assume that the negation marker is scalar focus\(^{106}\) (= emphatic in the traditional terms) when it is postverbal, but this assumption remains totally ad hoc and is not supported by the only available analysis –contextual one. So I tend not to interpret the examples involving negation markers as containing postverbal replacing focus. The negation marker in such cases is simply informational focus for me. Still, for (47) the contrastive interpretation of the postverbal negation is not totally excluded: one can still consider the negation as contrastive if it replaces the positive polarity expressed in \text{warptu=pat} in cl. 1.

A further proof that the postverbal focus need not always be contrastive, but can be just informational, comes from:

(49) NH/NS (CTH 61.II.10) KBo 2.5+ rev. iii 39-42
(He defeated Aparru with three thousand troops (and) chariotry of his, and slew them).

1. \(\text{nu} \ \text{epp-i=ra=nu} \text{mekki #}\)
CONN capture-3PL.PST=and much
2. \(\text{kuenn-ir=i} \text{mekki #}\)
kill-3PL.PST=and much
“(1) They captured \text{in large numbers}, (2) and they killed \text{in large numbers}”, (But Aparru escaped).\(^{117}\)

Pace (Luraghi 1990: 101) there is absolutely no verb contrast in the example. The information structure of the example should probably be better interpreted as informational focus on \text{mekki}, which is an adverb (CHD L-N: 247). The verbs of cl. 3 and 4 are inerferable topics –they are inferred from the military context. Still, both verbs host particles -\text{ya}, which, as (Melchert 2009a) showed, commonly trigger fronting of the constituent it criticizes to. Double -\text{ya} means “both… and”, “neither… nor” under negation.

The non-contrastiveness of postverbal constituents is even more obvious in case of indefinite and relative pronouns, subordinators and some adverbs: their information structure status is identical in the preverbal and postverbal positions. Generally speaking, in my corpus as well as in P. Goedegebuure’s corpus (Goedegebuure 2014) there are no examples where a constituent is informational focus or topic preverbally and replacing focus postverbally. Rather, contrastive focusing takes place in the preverbal position. Then, as I will argue shortly, the verb sporadically moves to the clause-internal position, past both the constituents which are focused preverbally and the constituents which are in the preverbal position, irrespective of their information structure status.\(^{118}\) This is arguably best seen in the following pair of examples involving preverbal (51) and postverbal (50) \text{wh}-words:

(50) OH/NS (CTH 19.II.A) KBo 3.1+ obv. i 33-35, 39-40

1. \(\text{nu} \text{HUL-la ut[ar i]r=ra #}\)
2. \(\text{nu}=\text{kan} \text{Muršilin kue[nnir]} #\)
3. \(\text{(nu)} \text{eštar i}#\)

115. Following (Goedegebuure 2003: 261), cf. (CHD L-N: 9).
116. Presumably assessed so by (Goedegebuure 2003: 261): “(so) that you do not march against him”.
118. As indefinite and relative pronouns, negation markers and negative pronouns, subordinators.
It is obvious that the postverbal *wh*-word in cl. 7’ of this example is not just informational focus, it also codes surprise/unexpectedness: “*why on earth did I do this?*”. However, as P. Goedegebuure has shown (2009), this discourse function is normally coded by *wh*-words in the *preverbal* position, which is illustrated in (51):

\[(51)\]  
MH/NS (CTH 42.A) KBo 5.3+ rev. iii 56’  
\[\text{zil=wa=kam apa} \quad \text{anda} \quad \text{kawat aui-ta} \# \]  
\[\text{you=QUOT=LOC that.ACC.SG.C into why look-3SG.PST} \]  
“Why did you look at that (woman)?”\(^{120}\)

Thus the postverbal placement of the *wh*-word in (50) is totally identical to the preverbal one in (51) as for the information structure and discourse functions. It is not conditioned by some special information structure status or discourse function of the constituent in question. But it is the verb in (50) which is not identical to the verb in the canonical clause-final position: all the constituents save the *wh*-word in clause 7’ are anaphoric to the previous situation, and thus they are topical.

This pair of examples (50-51) shows beyond all reasonable doubt that the natural temptation to ascribe some emphatic function to all postverbal constituents as different from preverbal ones is not applicable to such cases. In all other (admittedly less clear) cases it is also completely ad hoc and not at all required by the context.

The argument up to this point does not imply that postverbal foci cannot be contrastive foci. It implies that they need not be contrastive foci, prototypical contrastive foci are preverbal – i.e. preverbal and postverbal arguments are identical as for their information structure status.

2.2.5.2. Postverbal position: right dislocation?

It is suggested in (Luraghi forthcoming) that postverbal constituents should rather be described not via verb movement to the left, but via right, postverbal, position of the constituents. In the cross-linguistic perspective it can only be interpreted as right dislocations,\(^{121}\) see, e.g., right dislocated *wh*-words in Japanese:

\[(52)\]  
(one) *wh*-phrase out of multiple *wh*-question:  
\[\text{Dare-ga nomiya-de noN-da no, Nani-o?} \]  
\[\text{wh-NOM bar-LOC drink-TNS Q\text{\textsubscript{sh}} WH-ACC} \]  
\[\text{“Who drank at the bar, what?”} \] (Nakagawa, Asao, Nagaya 2008);\(^{119}\)

\[(53)\]  
reduplicated *wh*-phrase out of *wh*-question:  
\[\text{Mari-ga nani-o nomiya-de noN-da no, Nani-o?} \]  
\[\text{M.-NOM wh-ACC bar-LOC drink-TNS Q\text{\textsubscript{sh}} WH-ACC} \]  
\[\text{“What, did Mari drink at the bar, what?”} \] (Yamashita 2010: 4.2).\(^{121}\)

Right dislocations are constituents outside the matrix clause, so it would be highly surprising that functional constituents whose scope is over the clause should be placed outside the clause. This is not so for Japanese. The Japanese right dislocated *wh*-words are one of two *wh*-words. Hittite examples like this exist, see ex. (50) in (Hoffner 1995: 94), but they are clearly different from postverbal constituents: postverbal *wh*-words in Hittite are not just one of the two *wh*-words, as in Japanese. This is the main argument against assessing postverbal constituents as right dislocated. The same refers to subordinators, negation markers,

\(^{119}\) Following (Hoffmann 1984: 18-21; HED K: 219; CHD L-N: 345).

\(^{120}\) Following (Hoffner, Melchert 2008: 352; hethiter.net/: CTH 42 (TX 17.11.2011, TRde 17.11.2011)). Cf. (Beckman 1996: 22).

\(^{121}\) (Skopeteas, Fanselow 2010; Hyman, Polinsky 2009 with ref.).
negative and relative pronouns: they have to stay in the same clause which they have scope over for the clause to be grammatical. Possibly, indefinite pronouns can in principle be described as right dislocations, but this will destroy the deep parallelism between the classes of constituents I advocated above.

3. VERB POSITIONS

Thus the postverbal position of the constituents in 2.2.5 can only be explained by verb movement. Before I tackle the position of the verb in the examples immediately above, I will outline verb fronting strategies in Hittite.

3.1.

Hittite attests not only verb movement to a clause-internal position, which is necessary to account for exx. from 2.2.5, but also verb movement to the clause initial position, i.e. proper verb fronting.122 see, e.g.,

(54) MHMS (CTH 200) ABot 1.60 obv. 5–8'

(As soon as I dispatched those tablets to Your Majesty, my lord.)

šalik-as=ma=mu karuwariwar "Nirigalliš Tú Tabḫalla(N) #

awake-3SG.PST=but=me following.morning Nerikkaili-NOM.SG.C man Taphallu

"early the following morning Nerikkaili, the man from Taphallu, awoke me (and brought me

the message)".122

This verb fronting is triggered by discourse functions: the verb clause initially is either head-tail linking device or it marks unexpectedness,124 as in (54) above. From the functional point of view it is obvious that there is no contrast in (54) despite the presence of -ma—the clause with the non-canonical word order is just new information, i.e. it is thetic,125 thus the verb codes part of the broad informational focus. However, there is also a discourse function of the verb which conditions its movement to the edge of the clause: (54) comes from a letter where it introduces new information which appeared (immediately?) after the author communicated the previous state of affairs to the addressee. It is very likely that this new information made it necessary to send another letter before there was a reply to the previous one—the state of affairs beyond the customary one. Thus discourse discontinuity is marked.126

Some clause initial verbs are due to second position phenomena.127 In two constituent clauses, i.e. clauses where the only other constituent was the verb, the subordinator/relative/indefinite pronoun which has to be in the second position could only be clause second behind the verb:

(55) NH/NS (CTH 176) KUB 21.38 obv. 40'

(But my brother has not accepted in his own mind my status as a sister and my dignity, saying:

"... and do what should not/cannot be done!... would I not write...")

waḫnu-mi=an=kan kanu #

turn-1SG.PRS=it=LOC when

"when I change it?".128


123. Following (Hoffner 2009: 177).

124. See for detail (Sidletsev 2014b). Cf. (Rizza 2011). In (Sidletsev 2014b) I supposed that contrastive foci are also clause-initial. Now in the light of (Goedegebuure 2014) I prefer to assess the examples like (59), see below, as contrastive focusing in the clause-internal position.

125. Only karuwariwar "early the following morning" can be assessed as a kind of topic-coding setting.

126. This discourse function, often realized as unexpectedness or surprise, is not introduced ad hoc to explain this example. It is assumed to be operative in many cases not involving verb fronting analyzed by (Goedegebuure 2003, 2009, 2014; Meacham 2000: 148-151, 203-204). Some of them are marked by the particle -ma (bid). See along general lines for the function (Hopper 1979; Givón 1983). For an exact cross-linguistic parallel in Biblical Hebrew see (Baayen 1997) where loose clause linkage is textually realized as unexpectedness, surprise, contra-expectation, mostly when it operates on the events in the foreground.

127. See above for a general outline.

So the verb is fronted to the left edge. However, as different from the movement in the examples in 2.2.5, the verb moves solely to provide the first position for the second position constituent.

### 3.2. Clause internal verbs

Now after briefly reviewing verb fronting to the clause initial position, I will go back to verb movement to the clause-internal position in section 2.2.5. Part of the examples are clearly conditioned by the information structure status of the verb which is not identical to that in the canonical clause-final position, part of them are not information structure conditioned and appear to be identical to those in the canonical clause-final position. What is extremely curious, however, is that in both cases the verb moves to the clause-internal position past only the preverbal position, i.e. adverbial wh-phrases, relative, indefinite and negative pronouns, negation markers, low adverbs and adverbials, subordinators. If there is fully stressed subject and/or object in the clause, either topical or focal, it does not raise past them:

(56) NH/INS (CTH 106.A.1) Bo 86/299 obv. ii 87

\[ \text{apin} = \text{mu} = \text{za} \quad \text{MUNUS-an} \quad m^{5}\text{LAMMA-}a^{\text{i}} \quad \text{ANA} \quad \text{PÅNI} \quad \text{ABI=YA} \]

that ACC.SG.C=but=REFL woman Kurunta.NOM.SG.C in to father=my
du-ta=pat nawi #
take-3SG.PST=EMPH not yet

“Kurunta during the reign of my father had not yet even taken that woman”.

(57) NH/NS (CTH 68.F) KUB 19.54 rev. iv

\[ \text{mù} \quad \text{tak=ma}^{2} \quad \text{Kupanta-LAMMA-}a-n \quad \text{waggariya-zi} \quad \text{ku=li#} \]

if you=ACC.SG=but Kupanta-LAMMA-ACC.SG.C revolt-3SG.PRS anyone.NOM.SG.C

“If anyone revolts against you, Kupanta-Kurunta…”

The only subjects or objects the verb moves past are instantiated by indefinite pronouns which are in the preverbal position, see above section 2.2.2. The only foci verbs that move past to the clause-internal position are instantiated by adverbs and adverbials. This would imply two focus positions for Hittite –the high one for subjects and objects and the low one for adverbs and adverbials.

### 3.3. Clause internal verbs: information status different from that in the original clause-final position

In a number of cases the information structure status of the verb clause-internally is different from that clause-finally. In the following context the verb is topical as it refers back to \[ \text{nu=m} \quad \text{u kūrriaḫta} \] “he became hostile to me” in l. 29.

129. As there are at least two distinct positions within the preverbal position (see section 2.2.1), the verb can move past only one of preverbal positions, as in (e) below, or in:

(d) NH/NS (CTH 63.A) KUB 19.31+ rev. iii 27”-31”

1. … (tezz)m #
2. … [x=mu=kan arlua daškanc[le]] #
3. [nu=war=a=za IN]A URU=ŠU EGIR-pa alšanaš[ki]nc[le] #
4. nu \[ \text{k[a]} \] nmemiya-n kawat iya-tten QATAMMA #
   \text{CONN this.ACC.SG.C material-ACC.SG.C why do-2PL.PST in this way}
5. nu=la=kan apani NAM.RA \[ \text{AN} \] ”Tuppi=11 arlua daškėṭen#
   ’(1) [But Tuppi-Teššub] says, (2) they are [still] taking [them] away from me, (3) they keep resettling [them] in their city,” (4) So, why have you handled this matter in this way: (5) you keep taking those civilian captives away from Tuppi-Teššub?”’ following (Miller 2007: 126-7, 129-130).


132. See Melchert (2005: 92) for the context.
Actually, corpus studies demonstrate that the canonical clause-final position of topical verbs heavily dominates: M. Molina (pers. comm.) observes that in the corpus of MH/MS letters (1422 clauses) there is not a single example of non-canonical clause-final topical verbs, all the topical verbs are clause-final, both in two and more than two constituent clauses.

Thus verb movement to the clause-internal position, as in (58), is optional, i.e. it occurs only in part of the cases where it could have occurred.\textsuperscript{134} The fact that movement driven by information structure is optional, i.e. occurs only in some cases, is not surprising. For (Miyagawa 2006) “altering the focus potential of a sentence” is one of the few triggers for optional movement. Optional movement is commonly observed in the information structure sphere. Focusing can be done in situ, i.e. in the original position: narrowly focused subject and object are normally postverbal in Ossetic, whereas contrastive subject and object are preverbal (Lyutikova, Taterosov 2009). In Georgian contrastive foci can be both preverbal (ex situ) and postverbal (in situ) (Skopeteas, Fanselow 2010). In Hungarian out of several foci only the first one is preverbal, the rest are postverbal, i.e. in situ (Szendrői 2003: 49-52; Kiss 2004: 91).\textsuperscript{135} Hungarian verb is focused in situ whereas noun phrases are focused ex situ (Szendrői 2003: 52-3). Hungarian topics can be both in situ (postverbally) and ex situ, preverbally (Szendrői 2003). See also (Melchert 2009a) for optional coding of information structure and discourse functions in Hittite by word order change.

The following case also attests the verb in the clause-internal position with the information structure status different from that in the original clause-final position, although in this case the information structure status is different from the previous example:

(59) MH/NS (CTH 261.B) KUB 13.2+ rev. iii 25-28
(25–28)

(1) (He) shall not make winning cases lose.
(2) (He) shall not make losing ones win. (you do what is right).\textsuperscript{137}

In clauses 4 and 5 of this example, all the VPs are contrastive to each other: both direct object DINAM šarazzi and the verb katteraḫḫi in cl. 4 are contrasted with katterra and šaraz<zi>yah-i in cl. 5. The direct objects are contrastive topics: DINAM “case” is established topic for the context, it was coded by the anaphoric pronoun -at “it” in the previous clauses. The verbs are contrastive foci. The negation is very obviously the only constituent which is not contrastive focus in either of these clauses.\textsuperscript{138}

\textsuperscript{133} “As Aparru, the man of Kalsaša, started hostilities, (he mobilized 3000 troops)”.

\textsuperscript{134} Following (Goetze 1967: 188-189).

\textsuperscript{135} See section 2.2.5.1 above for the discussion of the information structure status of postverbal constituents.

\textsuperscript{136} Cf. (Kiss 2004: 89; 2007).

\textsuperscript{137} Cf. (Pecchioli Daddi 2003: 154).

\textsuperscript{138} Following (CHD Š: 250). Cf. (Pecchioli Daddi 2003: 154-155; Hoffner, Melchert 2008: 342; CHD Š: 152). There are two more analogous examples, known at least since (Garrett 1990: 79; CHD P: 226), where the verb is in the clause-internal position and hosts the particle -at which is traditionally assessed as emphatic (CHD P: 224-6):
The following example can in my opinion also be classified as a variety of contrastive focus in the clause-internal position, although it is ambiguous due to the lack of subject or object in front of the verb:

(60) NH/NS (CTH 85.1.A) KBo 6.29+ obv. ii 14-17
(I held up my hand to my lady Istar of Samuha. My lady Istar of Samuha helped me. Upper and lower regions darkened;

1. nu ḫrat-num-ka
   CONN write-1SG.PST which.DAT.PL land-DAT.PL

2. EGIR-ana=wa=nu tiyat-∂ #

3. nu=at=mu EGIR-ana (if) ∂ #

4. ČL=ya kuedaš KUR.KUR-ē-āš ḫrat-num-∂ #
   NEG=and which.DAT.PL land-DAT.PL write-1SG.PST

5. nu ẖānum=pat anmētāṣ tiyat #
   “(1) The lands to which I wrote” (2) “Stand by me”, (3) they stood by me.
   (4) And the lands to which I did not write, (5) all of them stood by me”.

The key to the analysis of this context is the fact that cl. 1 and 4 are correlated: the countries that Hattusili wrote to are confronted with the countries to which he did not write to. There is no full-scale clausal contrast, rather some kind of what is termed in the Russian tradition as 

**“Kurunta during the reign of my father had not yet even taken that woman”**


More specifically, following Hoffner, CHD describes *-pat in such clauses as counterexpectational with the meaning “even, even though” (CHD P: 224-6). Thus the verbs are likely to be counterexpectational foci.

139. Cf. (Sidel'tsev 2014b).

140. Following (HED M: 89). Or “And she m-ec above and below” (CHD L-N: 202; Š: 249).


142. I.e. focus on the truth value of a sentence (Féry 2007; Krifa 2007).

143. (Goedegebuure 2014).
(62) OH/NS (CTH 291.I.a.B) KBo 6.26 obv. 156-59 (§ 187/973)
1. *takku LÚ-iš GU₃-aš katta [waššuši]* #
2. *ḫuršiš* #
3. *aš=as* #
4. LUGAL-an åški unar-[eziy] #
5. *kuen-ezi=ma=an* LUGAL-ur-š #
   kill-3SG.PRS=but=him  
    king-NOM.SG.C
6. *ḫuši₃[u]-ezi=ma=an #
    LUGAL-ur-š #
   let.live-3SG.PRS=and=him  
    king-NOM.SG.C
7. LUGAL-š=ma=as UL tiazišzi #

"(1) If a man sins (sexually) with a cow, (2) it is an unpunished sexual pairing; (3) he will be put to death. (4) They shall conduct him to the king's court (lit. gate). (5) The king orders him killed, (6) or the king spares his life, (7) but he (the man) shall not appear (personally) before the king (lest he defile the royal person)".146

According to S. Luraghi, the particle -ma here codes "unexpected or in some ways exceptional events", the two fronted verbs also bear contrastive focus (Luraghi 1990: 98). I cannot fully accept this position: the fact the offender must die follows from the previous situation. -ma might rather be ascribed here a somewhat prospective function –it refers forward to cl. 7 where the real contrast is expressed. However, cl. 7 is already marked with the particle -ma in the contrastive meaning. The most realistic position in this case is to consider -ma to code discourse discontinuity: cl. 1-4 and 7 are narration, the main line of the story, whereas cl. 5-6 are a clear digression, the general state of affairs, and not part of the narration. The verbs are contrastively focused, but they are not contrastive to the previous situation, they rather form a kind of coordinated structure where all the contrast is between the two verbs. It does not extend outside of the coordinated structure. What I believe triggers the verbs' fronting to the clause initial position in this case is not contrast, it is discourse discontinuity: the narrative line is broken by the two clauses (5 and 6) and then continued by cl. 7 with the canonical word order. Thus (62) is not analogous to verb movement to the clause-internal position in exx. (59-60) above, triggered by contrastive focusing, it is analogous to verb fronting to the clause initial position in ex. (54) above, triggered by discourse functions.

Just as contrastive focusing of noun phrases occurs in the preverbal position whereas additive noun phrase focusing is clause initial (Goedegebuure 2014), contrastive focusing of verbs is clause-initial while additive focusing of verbs is clause initial.146 I listed above exx. (59-60) with contrastive verb focusing clause-externally, now I will illustrate additive focusing of the verb clause initially by the following two examples:

(63) NH/NS (CTH 42.A) KBo 5.3+ obv. i 8-16
1. *nu=za ẓik Š[ḫuqerras]<UTU>šš par ÂSSUM BELUTIM šak #
2. *DUMU=YA=aš kau VIUTUšš semi #
3. *kân=wâ=za šiyanraz šâktu #
4. *n=za kan itšarna tekkwašami #
5. *nu=za ziqqaš Š[ḫuqerras apûn ša[a] # §
7. *n=za=za aššuš ÂSSUM šESš[eš]š TIM Ü ÂSSUM ÂUGU[t] TIM šak #
8. *namma=za za damšin BELAM #
9. *šac # kuiš=za kuiš [UN-ša] #
8a. *ANAššUTUšš EGIR-an arba le kuški šâkti #
10. *šac šac=za=par[ša] šâkt #
11. *puhišš=za=an VIUTUšš[eš]š #
    protect=and=him,  
    Majesty=My

146. This information structure status has to be added to the list of discourse functions clause-initial verbs attest in section 2.3.1.
147. Additional clause inside clause 8–between 8 and 8a, which are actually one clause.
“(1) You, Huqana, recognize only My Majesty as overlord. (5) And recognize my son (2) of whom I, My Majesty, will say: (3) “Everyone shall recognize this one”. (4) and whom I will present among his brothers(?)”.

Furthermore, benevolently recognize (6) those who are my sons—his brothers and [my] brothers in brotherhood and comradeship. (8) But beyond that you shall not recognize behind the back of My Majesty any other nobleman, (9) whoever he might be. (10) Recognize only My Majesty (11) and 

Cl. 11 here displays verb in the clause initial position accompanied by -ya “and”. The work on noun phrases (Melchert 2009a: 194; Goedegebuure 2014) showed that clause initial noun phrase hosting -ya “and” is additive focus. This suits perfectly well the information structure status of the clause initial verb in cl. 11: 

Here too the action of parāḫāḫi “make horses gallop” is seen as additional, whose role runs parallel to [zaclas] inanci “trot”, which is demonstrated by the use of the particle -ya.

It is highly intriguing that the same particle criticizes to the verb in the clause-internal position, when it marks scalar additive focus best translated as “even”:

In the following case the verb is anaphoric to the previous situation, but at the same time it is scalar additive focus which again hosts -ya “even”:


149. Besides linear clause-initial position, this placement follows from the fact that the verb is to the left of direct object. Clause internal verbs can be to the left of only canonically preverbal constituents (wh-phrases, relative pronouns, negative and indefinite pronouns, negation markers, low adverbs), whether their linear position is clause-initial or clause-internal.

150. Following (CHD P: 61) w. lit. the inverted clause is identical to ibid. obv. i 9-10f (fgm.), rev. iv 13'-14'; 4T. KUB 29.49+ obv. i 21'-22'; with different distances: (6 ME); 6.T KUB 29.50 obv. i 11'-12'; 26-27'; rev. iv 16'-17'; (2 ME): 3T. KUB 29.46+ obv. i 10'-11'; 1T. KUB 29.45+ obv. i 13'; the numeral is in the lacuna: 7T. 16/5q (+) 99 obv. i 42'. See (Kammenhuber 1961: 216 f.).

151. Pace (Garrett 1990: 79; Salisbury 2005: 85), katta is not here a preverb, rather an adverb meaning “later”, as follows from its meaning, which is identical to the unambiguous anaburb, see Salisbury (2005: 83-85). It is true that katta is not normally located clause-internally in this meaning, but it is also very obvious that the aberrant syntactic behaviour should tip the balance in favour of katta being an adverb. A parallel for the clause-internal placement of an otherwise clause-initial first-adverb comes from

(g) OH-MHMS (CTH 262) 1BoT 1.36 rev. i 23

min DUMU E.GAL=ma EGIR-anda mel[m]=an udu-i #

if son palace=but afterwards word ACC.SG.C bring-3SG.PRS

“After that, though, if a palace servant brings a message… following (Miller 2013: 114-5).

As it was observed by A. Bauer (Bauer 2011), negation is focus in clause 4, and all the rest of constituents are topical. However, verbs with the identical topical information structure status can also occur in the canonical position, i.e. clause-finally.

Thus, once again, we see different information structure clause-internally and clause initially. It is conspicuous that -ya after "man in the meaning “even” does not show at first sight this distribution with other constituents –it is clause-first in the data collected in (CHD L-N: 155) and (Hoffner, Melchert 2008: 419). However, after a closer examination of data, it is obvious that in all the cases but one collected by CHD and Hoffner-Melchert, the enclitic is either on the only noun phrase in the clause, or on the verb which is the only constituent. In the only case where it is on the nominal part of the predicate and where other noun phrases are attested in the clause, there are no preverbal positions filled in the clause, so it is impossible to say whether the verb is clause-internal or not. Thus the examples like (65-66) are simply the only unambiguous ones and indicate clause-internal contrastive focusing of verbs.

3.4. Clause internal verbs: information status identical to that in the original clause-final position

Finally, I will list the contexts where it is impossible to ascribe to the verb any information structure status different from that in the canonical position, i.e. clause-finally. To make the analysis more convincing I have limited it to the unambiguously clause-internal cases where the verb does not host the enclitics -pat, -ma or -ya and where it unambiguously follows from the context that the verb is part of the broad informational focus.

The cases are quite numerous, especially in case of indefinite pronouns. Out of 15 cases with clause-internal verbs and indefinite pronouns, only two attest verbs accompanied by either focus particles -pat or -ya.

One of them is (65) above. The other is:

(67) NH/NS (CHT 383) KUB 21.19+ rev. iv 14'15'

\[ x x x x A N A \ D I N G I R ^ { M I S } \ p i r a n \ a p e \ w a l k u r a n - a \]

\[ \text{to gods before that.NOM.PL.N sin.NOM.PL.N} \]

\[ \varepsilon \varepsilon - c i = p a t \ k u i t k i \ n i w a \ # \]

\[ \text{be-3SG.PRS=EMPH some.NOM/ACC.SG.N still} \]

\[ "(And if) those sins somehow still exist before the gods..." 154 \]

In 13 cases, the verb hosts no particles and is part of broad informational focus, thus its information structure status is identical to that clause-finally:

(68) OH/OS (CHT 291.Ib.A) KBo 22.61+ obv. i 4 (§ 3)

\[ t a k k u \ L U - a ( n ) \ n a t i m a \ M U N U S - a n \ E L L A M \]

\[ \text{if man-ACC.SG. or woman-ACC.SG.C free} \]

\[ \text{walat-zi} \ [\text{atikk}' 155 \ #] \]

\[ \text{strike-3SG.PRS somebody.NOM.SG.C} \]

\[ "[If] anyone strikes a free [man] or woman..." 156 \]

(69) MH/MS (CHT 41.II.2) KUB 36.127 rev. 16'-17'

\[ m a n = w a \ k e l \ S A \ \text{ir=YA} \ \varepsilon \varepsilon - c i \ k u i t k i \ # \]

\[ \text{if=QUOT this.GEN.SG of slave=my be-3SG.PRS anything.NOM.SG.N} \]

"If anything belongs to this slave of mine..." 157

(70) MH/MS (CHT 199) AbToT 1.65 obv. 8

\[ m e ^ { 3 5 } \ G I D R U - D I N G I R ^ { 3 5 - i - n } \ t u p a s i l \ p a + \]

\[ \text{Hattušili-ACC.SG.C get.a.fever-3SG.PST} \]

\[ \text{something.ACC.SG.N} \]

"Hattušili contracted a bit of a fever". 158

155. Restored from OH/NS copy KBo 6.3+ obv. i 6.
156. Following (Hoffner 1997: 18).
(71) NH/NS (CTH 176) KUB 21.38 obv. 16'  
Šēš=šE=ma urumē-az u  NGITUKU-ti kuitki #  
brother=my=but I-ABL enrich-2SG.PRS something.ACC.SG.N  
“Yet, my brother, you want to enrich yourself at my expense!” 159

(72) NH/INS (CTH 106.1.A) Bo 86/299 obv. ii 75–76  
mārum ANA NUMUN niššām maššām zu  šE=ma urumē-az u  NGITUKU-ti kuitki #  
if=and upon progeny Kurunta weigh-3SG.PRS anything  
“And if anything weighs upon the progeny of Kurunta…” 160

(73) NH/INS (CTH 106.1.A) Bo 86/299 rev. ii 28  
mārum ANA NUMUN niššām maššām zu  šE=ma urumē-az u  NGITUKU-ti kuitki #  
if=but to progeny Tadhalinya weigh-3SG.PRS anything  
“If something becomes difficult for a descendant of Tadhalinya…” 161

(74) NH/INS (CTH 68.F) KUB 19.54 rev. iv 8'  
[mi] šE=ma  LUGAL šE=ma urumē-az u  NGITUKU-ti kuitki #  
if you.ACC.SG but Kupanta-Kurunta-ACC.SG revolts against [you, Kupanta-Kurunta,...]” 162

(75) NH/INS (CTH 89.A) KUB 21.29(+ rev. iv 13  
mū[š] šE=ma urumē-az u  NGITUKU-ti kuitki #  
if you.ACC.SG but city tolerate-2PL.PRS.MED something  
“But if you men of the city tolerate/condone (?) someone/something, (what will happen to you?)!” 163

(76) NH/NS (CTH 255.1.A) KUB 19.42 + obv. i 33–35'  
[n]aš MANUŠ šE=ma urumē-az u  NGITUKU-ti kuitki #  
anyone.ACC.SG but your.SG.NOM.NOM.SG.C anything.ACC.SG.N  
“Or (if) anyone of you subsequently hears anything...” 164

(77) NH/NS (CTH 293) KUB 13.35+ obv. i 30  
EŠE = ma-du-bi  šE=ma urumē-az u  NGITUKU-ti kuitki #  
later=IRR=QUOTE=REFL take-3SGPRS something.ACC.SG.N  
“Would I afterwards take something for myself?” 165

(78) NH/NS (CTH 70.1.A) KUB 14.4+ rev. iii 21  
DAM=šE=ma urumē-az u  NGITUKU-ti kuitki #  
wife=NOM.SG queen harm-3SG.PST somehow  
“Did my wife harm the queen in some way?” 166

(79) NH/NS (CTH 69.B) KUB 19.50+ rev. iii 12  
ziqē=zaš MANUŠ šE=ma urumē-az u  NGITUKU-ti kuitki #  
you.NOM.SG=and=it Manapa-Tarhunta-NOM.SG.C hear-2SG.PRS somehow  
“And you, Manapa-Tarhunta, somehow hear about him...” 167

(80) NH/INS (CTH 383) KUB 21.19+ obv. ii 10–11  
maššām ŠE=ma urumē-az u  NGITUKU-ti kuitki #  
MANUŠ šE=ma urumē-az u  NGITUKU-ti kuitki #  
Dannehepa became of become.angry-3SG.PST somehow  
“If somehow the Sungoddess of Arinna, my lady, became anger over the matter of Danuhepa...” 168

Similar cases are attested with relative pronouns. The clearest context is attested in several variants in the same group of texts. The first one is:

159. Following (Hoffner 2009: 283).
163. Following (Hoffner 2009: 283).
167. Following (Hoffner 2009: 283).
(81a) OH/OS (CTH 627.3.a) KBo 20.33+ obv. 12

\[\text{KAŠ}_{4.É} \text{tarḫu}-zi \text{kui-š} \]

runner win-3SG.PRS who-NOM.SG.C

1 MA.NA KÙ.BABBAR Ū 2 NINDA wAGADAŠ pianzi #

“They give one mina of silver and two w.-breads to the runner who wins”.170

The second one is virtually identical:

(81b) OH/OS (CTH 627.1.h.A) KBo 25.12+ ii 10–2

\[\text{KAŠ}_{4.É} \text{[tarruḫu}-zi \text{kuiš]} \]

runner win-3SG.PRS who-NOM.SG.C

2 NINDA wagata špianzi #

“They take two w.-breads and one mina of silver from the hand of the king”.171

The most extensive context in the group of texts172 is provided by the late text in which, however, the verb provides the second position for the relative pronoun and thus is by itself of no relevance for the analysis:

(81c) OH/NS (CTH 627.1.j.D) IBoT 1.13+ rev. v 14'-18'

\[\text{EGIR-Š}_{4.É} \text{u} \text{wanzi #} \]

2 nu taraḫu-zi kuiš #

CONN win-3SG.PRS who-NOM.SG.C

3 dān pēdāššu=a kuiš #

4 nu=šma 2 TŪG HI.A ÉRIN ME špianzi #

“(1) Ten runners come next; (2) to the one who wins (3) and to the one who is in the second place (4) they give two ‘tunics’ ”.173

The relative NP in (81a-b) is topical whereas the verb is informational focus. Thus it is identical to the verb clause-finally.

Analogous cases occur when low adverbs are involved:

(82) NH/NS (CTH 40.II.2.E) KUB 19.10+ obv. i 7'

\[\text{[a]numel}=\text{na ABI ABI}=\text{YA trattuiš-tu numma #} \]

my=but grandfather=my recover-3SG.PST again

“But my grandfather once more became well”.174

(83) NH/lNS (CTH 40.II.3.F) KBo 14.3+ rev. iii 22'

\[\text{ABI ABI}=\text{ma trattuiš-tu numma #} \]

grandfather=my=but recover-3SG.PST again

“But my grandfather once more became well”.175

The recovering of “my grandfather” occurs several times in the text,176 but each time it involves a new situation and is not an indication of topical status of the verb.

Finally, clauses with subordinators are also attested:

(84) MH/MS (CTH 186) HKM 7 rev. 23-25

1. tug=a=u Š=I Kaššu=n IDI mahhan #

you.ACC.SG=but=REFL Kaššu-ACC.SG know as

“(1) And since he knows you, Kaššu, (2) write by all means secretly to the Kaššu men”.177

Here the action of knowing is neither anaphoric, additive nor contrastive in the context of the letter, thus it is again identical to that in the canonical clause-final position.

172. See for the discussion of the contexts (Singer 1983: 103-104).
175. Following (Güterbock 1956: 67; del Monte 2008: 18, 28–29).
I believe the examples unambiguously demonstrate that part of clause-internal verbs are not information structure conditioned in their non-canonical position. This, naturally, raises the question why the verb is forced to move to a non-canonical position. An answer was attempted in (Sideltsev 2014b): Cf. (Huggard 2014).

4. CLAUSE STRUCTURE CONTRAINTS ON VERB MOVEMENT

As follows from the previous sections, Hittite verbs are canonically clause-final, but they can be in several non-canonical position. Non-canonical verbs are extremely rare—they are attested once or twice per an average Hittite text, some texts do not attest them at all. Curiously, though, there are two constructions where verb ex situ is much more regular. The first structure is two-constituent clauses, the only other constituent besides the verb is preverbal in the canonical word order. The second structure is verb movement with second position phenomena.

The constraint is not unique to Hittite. Similar clause structure constraints on movement are attested, e.g., according to (Hyman, Polinski 2009), in Aghem (a Western Grassfields Bantu language). It allows verb fronting with transitive verbs only if the object is externalized outside the verb phrase, i.e., right-dislocated (Hyman, Polinski 2009). If the object is not right-dislocated, verb fronting is impossible with two-places predicates. Another dependency of movement on clause architecture is attested in Hungarian where preverb movement out of dependent clause into the main one is acceptable only if the section of the embedded clause crossed by the raised prefix contains nothing but a complementizer —and perhaps a topic (Kiss 2004: 58 fn. 13).

The only possible explanation for the predominance of verb movement in two-constituent clauses is some kind of on-going but not completed grammaticalization: in the majority of cases, just as seen by A. Bauer, the verb raises if the preverbal constituent is contrastive/scalar/countereexpectant focus and the verb is topical. This happens much less frequently in more-than-two-constituent clauses. The fact that the grammaticalization is not yet finished is demonstrated by the data attesting: (a) preverbal contrastive focus in more than two constituent clauses, (b) preverbal contrastive focus in two-constituent clauses, (c) postverbal informational focus constituents, (d) informational focus verbs in the non-canonical position. The fact that grammaticalization is at work is proved by the fact that the previous four types of data are much less frequently attested than VTOP-XCONTRASTIVEFOCUS clauses, although it is curious that a corpus study of MH/MS letters by M. Molina (pers. comm.) did not reveal any statistical correlation between topical verbs and non-canonical word order. The beginning grammaticalization is responsible for the greater frequency of verb movement in two-constituent clauses. The reason for the grammaticalization might have been the realization by some speakers of Hittite that preverbal focus is the most deeply embedded argument or adjunct if there are several arguments/adjuncts. In the wish to recreate the preverbal contrastive focus position as the most deeply embedded in two-constituent clauses, some speakers might have reanalyzed X-XCONTRASTIVEFOCUS V clauses as V-XCONTRASTIVEFOCUS along the lines of clause second constituents which were postverbal only in two-constituent clauses. The linguistic reality might have been the wish to make the contrastive focus the most deeply embedded constituent even if the only other overt constituent in the clause was the verb.

178. See (Luraghi 2012) who evaluates V-initial clauses at ~1% and (in her terminology) postverbal focused negations at < 1%. See now on a limited sample corpus (MH/MS letters) M. Molina (pers. comm.) in the corpus comprising 1422 clauses there are 15 clauses with non-canonical verb positions. Due to the rarity I suppose that no chronologically-based study breaking the data down into OH, MH, NH layers is possible.
179. (Hoffner 1977; Bauer 2011).
180. Although clearly not in all cases contra A. Bauer, see above.
181. See above for the data supporting each claim.
182. That the fact is not limited to Hittite speakers reanalysis is demonstrated by (Hyman, Polinsky 2009), where a description of information structure/syntax is based on embeddedness.
183. Cf. the explanation in (Sideltsev 2014b).
5. HITTITE CLAUSE ARCHITECTURE: A SUMMARY

5.1. Verb position

Hittite verbs are canonically clause-final, but they can be in the non-canonical position. Non-canonical verbs are extremely rare—they are attested once or twice per an average Hittite text, some texts do not attest them at all. If the verb is clause-initial, either verbal arguments (both topics and foci) or constituents which are preverbal in the canonical word order can be postverbal. Preverbal constituents and verbal arguments are not simultaneously postverbal in any clause of my corpus.\(^\text{184}\) If the verb is clause-internal, verbal arguments (subject, object) are to the left of the verb, whereas what was the preverbal constituents in the canonical word order are to the right of the verb. In this case only low focus (adverbal wh-words, low adverbs or nominal part of the predicate) can be postverbal, high focus is always preverbal.

If the verb is to the left of subject and object, its information structure and discourse functions are not identical to those in the original clause-final position: the verb is either in additive focus or it possesses discourse functions, such as unexpectedness or head-tail linking. If the verb is clause-internal (i.e., if subject and object are to the left of the verb, whereas the originally preverbal constituents are to the right of the verb), its information structure is either identical to that in the original clause-final position or different from it. In the latter case the verb is either contrastive focus or topic. Schematically, all available word order options can be represented as follows:

\[(85)\]

**Canonical verb position:**

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{wh/Rel} \quad S-O \quad V \\
&\text{S-O} \quad \text{wh/Rel/Neg} \quad V \\
&\text{O-S} \quad \text{wh/Rel/Neg} \quad V \\
&\text{wh/Rel} \quad S-O \quad \text{Neg} \quad V \\
&\text{wh/Rel/Neg} \quad V \\
\end{align*}
\]

**Non-canonical verb position:**

\[
\begin{align*}
&V \quad S-O \\
&\text{S-O} \quad V \quad \text{wh/Rel/Neg} \\
&\text{V} \quad \text{wh/Rel/Neg} \\
&\text{V} \quad \text{wh/Rel/Neg} \\
&\text{wh/comp} \quad V \quad \text{indef.pron./Neg}^{185} \\
\end{align*}
\]

It is significant that the following word orders are not attested:

\[
\begin{align*}
&*V \quad S-O \quad \text{wh/Rel/Neg} \\
&*V \quad \text{wh/Rel/Neg} \quad S-O \\
&*\text{wh/Rel/Neg} \quad V \quad S-O
\end{align*}
\]

5.2. Preverbal/postverbal position

Hittite attests two focus positions—high (subject and object) and low (adverbs and adverbials, including adverbal wh-words). High focus is always preverbal, low focus can be preverbal or postverbal.

If the verb is clause-internal, there is a very small number of constituents that can be postverbal. They are limited to the constituents which occupy the preverbal position in the canonical word order: adverbal wh-phrases, relative pronouns, some subordinators, indefinite pronouns, negation markers, negative pronouns, low adverbs and adverbials. Only the low focus can be postverbal.

\[184.\] Except clause second constituents.

\[185.\] All the examples above which attest S/O-Comp-V-wh/Rel/Neg involve second position subordinators.

\[186.\] In addition to the clause-initial one, see (Goedegebuure 2014).
APPENDIX

HITTITE DIALECTS?

The above study is based on the corpus of diplomatic texts (treaties, letters, annals), laws and other legal documents, instructions, oracles, dreams, vows and prayers. The corpus of rituals and myths displays divergent clause architecture, with three main points of difference.

It was argued above that in diplomatic texts, clause-internal verbs are to the right of preverbal constituents, but to the left of verbal arguments (subject and object), i.e. S-O-V-wh/rel/indef.pron/neg. However, there is a considerable number of counterexamples in rituals and myths, especially in the direct speech which attest clause-internal verbs to the left of subject and/or object (O-V-S/S-V-O/V-S-O, S-Prv-O-V, Prv-S-V).187

Second, E. Rieken (2011) argued that Hittite proper texts do not attest simultaneous fronting of preverb and verb, but, e.g., in the Mastigga ritual the pattern is very common.

Third, the verb cannot raise past preverb in diplomatic texts. However, myths attest some counterexamples, as in

(86) MH/MS (CTH 789) KBo 32.16 obv. ii 1, 3

merōni=šši kur-t # menaphanda

Who speaks against him...” 188

How does one assess the distribution? There are several options: (a) question the conclusions drawn above on the basis of diplomatic texts only; (b) assess diplomatic and ritual usage as reflecting different dialects of Hittite; with the further option to assess only diplomatic usage to be genuine Hittite usage. Ritual and myth usage will then be construed as either directly borrowed or as reflecting stylistic reanalysis of original calquing from Hattian.189

I suppose the first option is untenable as there is very consistent usage in both diplomatic and ritual texts, different from each other and clearly reflecting some linguistic reality. As for the evaluation of ritual usage as calqued,190 it remains totally a matter of interpretation and is of no direct bearing on the object of the paper. An argument in favor of original calquing and later stylistic reanalysis might be the fact that non-canonical word orders involving verbal arguments heavily dominate in the texts which are either clearly translated from Hattian or Hurrian or which display such aberrant usage as to suggest composition by a non-native speaker of Hittite.191 This is particularly likely in case of verb raising past preverb, unambiguously attested only in translations from Hurrian and in the “Egyptian” letter MH/MS (CTH 151) VBoT 1 obv. 18.192

In any case, the fact that Hittite rituals and myths have experienced extremely strong interference, both culturally and linguistically, is beyond any doubt.193

The distinction between diplomatic and ritual usage is clear-cut and sharp, but it is not absolute. There are sporadic examples in diplomatic texts which clearly attest ‘ritual’ usage. In this section I listed three characteristics which occur in ritual texts, but do not occur in diplomatic ones. Now I will provide sporadic examples from my diplomatic corpus which go with the ritual usage.

188. Following (Neu 1996).
189. (Bauer 2011; Rieken 2011).
190. Or originally calqued and later reassessed as stylistic marker.
192. Which is normally considered to be a translation or to be composed by a non-native speaker of Hittite, see (Sideltsev 2002; 2010; Francia 2002b), cf. (Hoffner 2009: 274 with ref.). See also (Tjerkstra 1999: 172) for an example from a ritual.
193. See the discussion in (Rizza 2007; 2008; 2009; Sideltsev 2002; 2010; 2014a; Rieken 2011).
The position of the verb in the following example can be interpreted only as clause-internal, because the verb is to the right of the preverbal relative pronoun. But the postverbal position is occupied by the subject, a feature typical of ritual texts:

(87) MH/MS (CTH 186) HKM 7 obv. 12-13
\[\text{kašu}=ta \quad \text{kar}=ya \quad \text{kui-t} \quad \text{ḫatra-nun} \quad \text{DU}^{\text{UTU}} \text{š} \quad \text{#}\]
\[\text{hereby} \quad \text{you} \quad \text{previously} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{what} \quad \text{ACC.GN} \quad \text{write} \quad \text{1SG.PST} \quad \text{Majesty} \quad \text{My} \quad \text{have written} \quad \text{you} \quad \text{previously} \ldots^{194}.
\]

The following example is also likely to attest clause-internal verb, due to the fact that the verb does not possess any discourse function, which typically triggers verb movement to the clause-initial position, but the verb is to the left of subject, which is not otherwise attested in diplomatic texts:

(88) NH/NS (CTH 81.A) KUB 1.1+ rev. iv 9-13
\[\text{šallami-nun}=\text{war}=\text{an} \quad \text{kuit} \quad \text{amnuk} \quad \text{#}\]
\[\text{raise} \quad 1SG.PST=\text{QUOT} \quad \text{him} \quad \text{since} \quad \text{NOM.SG} \quad \text{ONES} \quad \text{G}
\]
\[\text{“Since I raised him, (I have never subjected him to an evil doom, to an evil deity).}^{196}
\]

The following example from a prayer attests simultaneous preverb and verb movement, which is frequently attested only in the Mastigga ritual:

(89) NH/NS (CTH 381.A) KUB 6.45+ rev. iii 13
\[\text{š} \quad \text{ar} \quad \text{ā} \quad \text{kan} \quad \text{uw} \quad \text{n}=\text{aš} \quad \text{i} \quad \text{nepi} \quad \text{š} \quad \text{aš} \quad \text{DU}^{\text{UTU}} \quad \text{š} \quad \text{arun-az} \quad \text{#}\]
\[\text{up} \quad \text{LOC} \quad \text{come} \quad \text{2SG.PRS} \quad \text{heaven} \quad \text{GEN.SG} \quad \text{Sungod} \quad \text{NOM.SG.C} \quad \text{sea} \quad \text{ABL} \quad \text{“You, Sungod of Heaven, arise from the sea.”}^{198}
\]

Finally, there is even an example which may attest verb raising past preverb:

(90) MHMS (CTH 190) HKM 71 obv. 4
\[\text{BELU} \quad \text{#} \quad \text{man}=\text{wa} \quad \text{ūnna-tti} \quad \text{kattan} \quad \text{#} \quad \text{lord} \quad \text{OPT} \quad \text{QUOT} \quad \text{drive} \quad \text{2SG.PRS} \quad \text{down} \quad \text{#} \quad \text{“Lord, if only you would drive down here!”}^{200}
\]

Naturally, it is possible to assume that kattan “down” is not a preverb, but rather an adverb. As is well known, preverbs and local adverbs are a class of lexically identical constituents which are extremely difficult to break down into separate taxonomical classes, but the assumption would in this particular case be entirely ad hoc. Besides, locatival adverbs, which kattan definitely is, behave in syntactic terms identically to preverbs.

How do we evaluate such examples? They most likely reflect some marginal but quite expected interference between the two dialects.

\[\ldots^{194.} \quad \text{Following} \quad \text{Hoffner} \quad 2009: \quad 107).\]
\[\ldots^{195.} \quad \text{The subordinator} \quad \text{kuit “since”} \quad \text{is in the second position, see above.}\]
\[\ldots^{196.} \quad \text{Following} \quad \text{Otten} \quad 1981: \quad 24-25; \quad \text{Luraghi} \quad 1990: \quad 99; \quad \text{CHD} \quad 5. \quad 87).\]
\[\ldots^{197.} \quad \text{Following} \quad \text{Salisbury} \quad 2005: \quad 224).\]
\[\ldots^{198.} \quad \text{Following} \quad \text{Singer} \quad 1996: \quad 20, \quad 39; \quad \text{Salisbury} \quad 2005: \quad 224).\]
\[\ldots^{199.} \quad \text{As is supposed by} \quad \text{Tjerkstra} \quad 1999: \quad 172).\]
\[\ldots^{200.} \quad \text{Following} \quad \text{Hoffner} \quad 2009: \quad 227; \quad \text{Klinger} \quad 2001: \quad 68; \quad \text{Alp} \quad 1991: \quad 255; \quad \text{Tjerkstra} \quad 1999: \quad 172).\]
\[\ldots^{201.} \quad \text{Following} \quad \text{Tjerkstra} \quad 1999: \quad 172-173).\]
\[\ldots^{202.} \quad \text{Melchert} \quad 2009b: \quad 613) \quad \text{with ref.,} \quad \text{esp. to} \quad \text{Tjerkstra} \quad 1999: \quad 172-173).\]
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ABSTRACT

The paper aims to provide a comprehensive description of Hittite clause structure. The picture that emerges is quite different from both the view of Hittite clause architecture as codified in (Hoffner, Melchert 2008) and as documented in the parallel line of research (Luraghi 1990; 2012; forthcoming).

The paper focuses on two key features of Hittite clause architecture: (a) preverbal vs. clause initial vs. clause second positions; (b) verb’s positions in the clause, although in-depth study of these aspects involves examination of virtually every significant feature of Hittite syntax.

Preverbal position is constituted by wh-words, subordinators, negation markers, negative, indefinite and relative pronouns as well as some adverbs, only part of these constituents can alternatively be clause initial or second. Contrastive focus is normally preverbal, contrastive topic is clause initial. Two focus positions are distinguished in a Hittite clause—high (subjects and objects) and low (adverbs, adverbials). Wh-words, subordinators and relative/indefinite pronouns can also be optionally postverbal. It is significant that only lower focus can be postverbal, never high focus, even though in the canonical word order both high and low focus is preverbal. No information structure difference is detectible between the preverbal and postverbal positions.

It is shown that non-canonical positions of the verb can be described by two movements to the left from the canonical clause-final position: (a) to the clause-internal position which follows subject and object, both topical and focal, on the one hand, and precedes what is in the canonical word order the preverbal position; on the other, producing V-wh/Neg/Rel, S-O-V-wh/Neg/Rel word orders; (b) to the clause leftmost position, producing V-S-O word order. V-wh/Neg/Rel-V-S-O or *wh/Neg/Rel-V-S-O word orders are not attested in my ‘diplomatic’ corpus.

The last point raises an important question of sociolinguistics of the Hittite language, namely evidence for (idio)lects.
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[204. Negative pronouns are negation marker + indefinite pronoun.]

[205. Apart from clause-initial one, for which see (Goedegebuure 2014).]

[206. Thus the position is actually postverbal.]