

Syntax of Hittite *mān* “if / when”

Andrey V. Sideltsev – Russian Academy of Sciences,
Dept. of Anatolian and Celtic Languages, Institute of Linguistics, B. Kislovskij per. 1/1, Moscow

[The article explores the syntax of Hittite *mān* “if/when”. It is standardly supposed to be one of the few Hittite subordinators which is clause first/initial. I provide data that it can be clause second, just like virtually any other Hittite subordinator. The issue thereby sheds light on the more general issue of distribution of subordinators in clause initial/first vs clause second positions in Hittite which is argued to be a common ½ position.]

Keywords: Hittite, syntax, subordinators, topic, left dislocation, second position, clause initial/first position.

1. Introduction

It is well known that *mān* “if/when” is normally in the initial or first position in the Hittite clause¹. It hosts Wackernagel clitics, but does not count when the first position for *-ma* or relative/indefinite pronouns or second position subordinators is determined:

(1) MH/MS (CTH 261.II) KUB 26.17 obv. i 4²
mān ^dUTU-*Š=I=ma* *kuwapi* *apāšila* *lahhiyai-zzi*
when majesty=me=but when himself go.on.a.campaign-3SG.PRS
“**When** His Majesty himself, though, **at any time** goes on a campaign, ...”³.

Structurally, in the minimalist program, it can only be accounted for by assuming highly articulated left periphery with projections above ForceP in the specifier of one of which *mān* “if/when” sits.

However, quite surprisingly, *mān* “if/when” is occasionally in what at face value is a clause internal position, either second or preverbal or unambiguously second. In such cases *-ma* does not cliticize to *mān* “if/when”, but it cliticizes to the word to the left of it and “skips” *mān* “if/when”:

(2) OH/OS (CTH 1.A) KBo 3.22 obv. 3
n=ašta ^DIM-*unn-i=ma* *mān* *āššu-š* *ēš-ta*
CONN=LOC Stormgod-DAT.SG=but when dear-NOM.SG.C be-3SG.PST
“But when he was dear to the Stormgod”⁴.

1. CHD L-N, sub *mān*, Hoffner, Melchert 2008: 421.
2. Here and elsewhere only the clauses which are discussed are glossed.
3. Following Miller 2013: 130-1.

OH-MH/MS (CTH 262) IBoT 1.36 rev. iii 55
*nu LUGAL-*u*-š **mān** ^{GIS}GIGIR **wek-zi***
CONN king-NOM.SG.C when chariot request-3SG.PRS
“When the king requests the chariot”⁵.

MH/MS (CTH 41.II.2) KUB 36.127 obv. 9'
*ANA ^mŠunaššura=ma **mān** āššu*
to Sunassura=but if good.NOM.SG.N
“But if it suits Sunassura”⁶.

NH/NS (CTH 69.A) KBo 19.70+ obv. i 52-53
*kīdaš **mān** kui-š Š[A MĀMĪT]I*
this.DAT.PL if which-NOM.SG.C of oath
“If there is someone of oath among these (men), ...”⁷.

2. Left Dislocation Analysis?

Neither CHD L-N sub *mān* nor Hoffner, Melchert 2008 account for such cases⁸. The most obvious way to reconcile examples (2) with (1) is to suppose that the constituents in front of *mān* “if/when” are left dislocated. I.e. they display the same structure as

(3) OH/NS (CTH 19.II.A) KBo 3.1+ obv. ii 13
5 *ŠEŠ^{MEŠ}=ŠU* # *nu=šmaš* ^{É^{MEŠ}} *taggašta*
five brothers=his CONN=them houses allot.3SG.PST
“(As for) his five brothers, he allotted **them** houses”⁹.

MH/MS (CTH 244⁷) HKM 113 Rs. 14–15
^m*Huidudduwalli-š* # *n=an* ^{URU}*Šallašna* *ašaš-er*
H.-NOM.SG.C CONN=they S. settle-3PL.PST
“(As for) Huidudduwalli, they settled **him** in Sallasna”¹⁰.

In such cases an NP is to the left of the sentence connective *nu*, but it is semantically connected with the following clause where it is clitic doubled by anaphoric enclitic pronoun.

If (2) and (3) attest the same structure, the clauses in (2) above should all be analyzed as:

4. Following Neu 1974: 10-11, Hoffner 2003: 182, CHD L-N: 148.

5. Following Miller 2013: 116-7.

6. Following F. Fuscagni (ed.), *hethiter.net*/: CTH 41.II.2 (INTR 2011-08-24), Beckman 1996: 22.

7. Following G. Wilhelm-F. Fuscagni (ed.), *hethiter.net*/: CTH 69 (TX 17.02.2014, TRde 17.02.2014), Beckman 1996: 80.

8. Nor do they explicitly recognize their existence. It is only acknowledged in van den Hout 2003: 186.

9. Following Hofmann 1984: 28-9, Luraghi 1990: 92 ex. 1009a, Hoffner, Melchert 2008: 408.

10. Noted in Hoffner, Melchert 2008: 408.

(4) OH/OS (CTH 1.A) KBo 3.22 obv. 3

n=ašta ^DIM-*unn-i=ma* # *mān* *āššu-š* *ēš-ta*
 CONN=LOC Stormgod-DAT.SG=but when dear-NOM.SG.C be-3SG.PST
 “But when he was dear to the Stormgod”.

OH-MH/MS (CTH 262) IBoT 1.36 rev. iii 55

nu LUGAL-*u-š* # *mān* ^{GIŠ}GIGIR *wek-zi*
 CONN king-NOM.SG.C when chariot request-3SG.PRS
 “**When** the king requests the chariot”.

MH/MS (CTH 41.II.2) KUB 36.127 obv. 9'

ANA ^mŠunašsura=ma # *mān* *āššu*
 to Sunassura=but if good.NOM.SG.N
 “But if it suits Sunassura”.

NH/NS (CTH 69.A) KBo 19.70+ obv. i 52-53

kīdaš # *mān* *kui-š* ^{Š[A} *MĀMĪT]I*
 this.DAT.PL if which-NOM.SG.C of oath
 “**If** there is someone of oath among these (men), ...”.

Possibly, the following case (5) is even likelier to be a left dislocation in view of lexically identical but syntactically regular (6):

(5) MH/NS (CTH 259.B) KUB 13.20 obv. i 13–14

tuzzi-ya=ma *peran* *mā[n* DUMU LUGAL)] *našma* *BĒL* GAL
 army-LOC.SG=but before if son king or lord great
kuinki *wātarnah-mi*
 some.ACC.SG.C place-1SG.PRS

“But if I place some [(prince)] or great lord in command of the army, (then just like the command of My Majesty [you must] ca[rry out] his (command) likew<(ise)> [and] the whole army must obey [hi]m”¹¹.

(6) MH/NS (CTH 259.B) KUB 13.20 obv. i 26-27

1. *mān=kan* *apāš=ma* DUMU LUGAL *našma* *BELU*
 if=LOC that.NOM.SG.C=but son king or lord
tuzzi-ya *peran* *arha idālu uttar pēhute-[zzi]*

army-LOC.SG before away evil word bring-3SG.PRS

2. *n=ašta* ^DUTU-*ŠI zammurāi-zzi*

3. *šumašš=a=an* *ēp-ten*

4. *n=an* MAHAR ^DUTU-*ŠI uwatetten*

“(1) However, if that prince or great lord in charge of the army speak[s] a malevolent word (2) and he disparages My Majesty (3) then you must seize him (4) and you must bring him before My Majesty”¹².

11. Following Miller 2013: 148-9.

3. Problems of Left Dislocation Analysis

The analysis is, unfortunately, not totally unambiguous. All the examples lack *nu* between the presumed left dislocation and the main clause. Thus it cannot be demonstrated on independent grounds that the constituents to the left of *mān* are actually left dislocated out of the main clause. However, it might be objected that the use of *nu* in this position is frequent, but not obligatory. I.e., it is absent in the following case involving an unambiguous left dislocation:

(7) NS/NH (CTH 81.A) KUB 1.1+ rev. iv 73-5

1. ^{DUG}*haršiyali=ya=kan išhuiškanzi*
 2. ^D*IŠTAR* # DINGIR-LIM=*aš=mu*
 Istar goddess=she=me
 3. *nu=šmaš=šan* ^D*IŠTAR* *šarlaimmin [š]ipanzakanzi*
 “(1) And they fill the *h*-vessel. (2) (As for) *IŠTAR*, **she** is my goddess. (3) They will make libations for themselves to the exalted *ISTAR*”¹³.

However, another mismatch is obvious from the comparison of (2) and (7). The clitics are in the main clause in (7) and on the left dislocated phrase in (2). Thus the left dislocation analysis of (2) implies optional clitic movement out of the main clause. Unambiguous left dislocations actually provide data that such an optional movement is attested:

(8) OH/OS (CTH 752.A) KBo 8.74+ obv. ii 12
hēyaw-eš=a # *n=e* *mān* *šēr* *huy-ant-eš*
 rain-NOM.PL.C=but CONN=they if up run-PRTC-NOM.PL.C
 “Rains, if they run on top”.

(9) OH/OS¹⁴ (CTH 627.A) KBo 20.26+ rev. iii 18'
^{LÚ.MEŠ}*hāpi-eš* # *karū=ma=aš* *tarku-anzi*
 hapi-NOM.PL.C already=but=they dance-3PL.PRS
 “But (as for) hapi people, they are already dancing”.

As was already observed by Rieken 2000, the optional movement occurs in (8) and does not occur in (9). (8) is actually completely parallel to (2) above as it also involves *mān* in the main clause. But the data in (8-9) posit another important problem: it looks like all unambiguous cases of clitic movement out of the main clause to a left dislocated phrase are limited to -(*m*)*a*. (8) shows that all the rest of enclitics stay in the main clause, even if -(*m*)*a* moves. For (2) it is not problematic as the only enclitic in the clause is *-ma*, but my corpus brings more examples involving the movement of both -(*m*)*a* and prototypical Wackernagel enclitics. The first of these examples from the same text attests a clause with canonical word order:

(10) NH/NS (CTH 42.A) KBo 5.3+ rev. iii 16'
nu mān pāi-[tti] apūn memiyan apēdani
 CONN if go-2SG.PRS that.ACC.SG.C word.ACC.SG.C that.DAT.SG.C

12. Following Miller 2013: 150-1.

13. Otten 1981: 29, Garrett 1990: 268, Hoffner, Melchert 2008: 268.

14. Ah.? (S. Košak, hethiter.net/: *hetkonk* (v. 1.75)). Assessed in Garrett 1990: 266-9.

EGIR-*pa* *mema-tti*
 back say-2SG.PRS
 “**If** it so happens that pass that word on to him”¹⁵.

The following example attests the same clause but with an NP in front of *mān* “if/when” hosting -(*m*)*a* all the enclitics:

(11) NH/NS (CTH 42.A) KBo 5.3+ rev. iii 20’

z[ig=]a ***mān*** *apēdani* KUR-*e* *našma* URU-*r-i*
 you=but if that.DAT.SG land.DAT.SG or city-DAT.SG
 EGIR[R-*pa*] *mema-tti*
 back say-2SG.PRS
 “But if you pass (it) on to that country or city”.

The following example attests the same clause but with an NP in front of *mān* “if/when” hosting not only -(*m*)*a*, but also all the enclitics which belong to the main clause:

(12) NH/NS (CTH 42.A) KBo 5.3+ rev. iii 12’-13’

*z[ig=]a[(=šši ***mān*** *pāi-š)]i* *apūn* *memiyan*
 you=but=him if go-2SG.PRS that.ACC.SG.C word.ACC.SG.C
 EGIR-*pa* *mema-tti*
 back say-2SG.PRS
 “But if it so happens that you pass that word on to him”.*

NH/NS (CTH 42.A) KBo 5.3+ rev. iii 23’

z[ig=]a[=šma]š[=a]t ***mān*** *pāi-tti* EGIR[R-*pa*] *mema-tti*
 you=but=them=it if go-2SG.PRS back say-2SG.PRS
 “But if it so happens that you pass it on to them”

The placement of enclitics in (12) directly contradicts the placement of enclitics in prototypical left dislocations (8-9). Purely statistically, however, the data are so limited (2 cases of non-movement vs 3 cases of movement) that optional movement is still an option.

Another worrying fact that none of the presumed left dislocated NPs are ever clitic doubled in what is supposedly main clause, even in cases where it is syntactically possible.

Left dislocations are quite similar in function to NP fronting, and some cases of NP fronting are hardly distinguishable from left dislocations. However, there are others which set them apart¹⁶.

4. NP Fronting Analysis

I will start the analysis of information structure from exx. (2) which I will repeat here with broader context and separately. The first of these involves immediate anaphora after first mention, i.e. the

15. Following G. Wilhelm (ed.), *hethiter.net*/: CTH 42 (INTR 2013-02-24).

16. See generally Rieken 2000, Melchert 2009, Goedegebuure 2003, 2014, Sideltev 2015.

Stormgod is introduced into the text for the first time in the previous line and immediately referred back to by the full NP again:

(13) OH/OS (CTH 1.A) KBo 3.22 obv. 2-3

1. *nepiš=za=ašta* **DIM-UNNI** *āššuš ēšta*
2. *n=ašta* **DIM-UNN-i=ma** *mān āššu-š* *ēš-ta*

CONN=LOC Stormgod-DAT.SG=but when dear-NOM.SG.C be-3SG.PST

“(1) (Pithana) was dear to the **Stormgod of the Sky**. (2) When he was dear to the **Stormgod**, …”.

Immediate anaphora after first mention in Hittite is never to my knowledge marked by left dislocations. The standard syntactic means to mark it is fronting to the first/initial position in the clause of the NP which is anaphoric to the full NP in the previous clause:

(14) NH/NS CTH 380) KBo4.6 obv.15'-17'

1. *nu PANI DINGIR-LIM EN=YA kāš MUNUS-aš wehattaru*
2. *ANA DUMU.MUNUS.GAL=ma=kan anda aššuli namma nešhut*
3. *n=an kēz GIG-za TI-nu-t*

CONN=her this.ABL sickness-ABL save-2SG.IMPER

4. *nu=šši eni GIG awan arha namma tittanu-t*

CONN=her that sickness off completely then lift-2SG.IMPER

‘(1) Let this woman be turned towards the god My Lord instead, (2) but toward the Great Daughter turn again in favor; (3) save her from this sickness, (4) lift **that sickness** completely off from her’¹⁷.

The example is analyzed as follows:

Immediate anaphora after first mention [...] occurs when the referent of the demonstrative noun phrase is not expected to function as a discourse and/or sentence topic. Perhaps this explains *eni* GIG ‘that sickness’ in the following example. The repetition of GIG cannot be explained as setting up a new discourse node, because the sentence in which it occurs is closely connected with the preceding sentence. Another option is to take *kēz* GIG-za ‘from this sickness’ as nonsalient given its peripheral grammatical case. In that case the noun phrase might have been necessary to increase the level of saliency and bring the sickness in the focus of attention, besides the Great Daughter. Either way, the distal demonstrative clearly indicates dissociation.¹⁸

Another example of immediate anaphora after first mention is:

(15) NH/NS (CTH 81.A) KUB 1.1+ rev. iv 41–43

1. *nu=za DUMU.LUGAL ešun*
2. *nu=za G[(AL)] MEŠEDI kiš-hahat []*

CONN=REFL chief bodyguard become-1SG.PRS.MED

17. Following Singer 2002: 72; Goedegebuure 2014: 208, ex. 3.122.

18. Goedegebuure 2014: 207-8.

3. **GAL MEŠEDI=ma=za** LUGAL KUR *Hakp*[(išš)]*a* *kiš-hahat*
 chief bodyguard=but=REFL king land Hakpissa become-1SG.PRS.MED

4. LUGAL KUR [*Hak*(piš=ma=za)] LUGAL GAL *namma* *kišhah*[(a)]*t*
 “(1) I was a prince, (2) and I became **chief of the bodyguard**. (3) As **chief of the bodyguard**, I became King of the Land of Hakpissa. (4) As King of the land of Hakpissa, I became in turn Great King”¹⁹.

Melchert provides the following analysis for the example:

As is typical for this usage, the king’s status as chief of the bodyguard is introduced as new information in the second clause, in an unmarked clausal position. The third clause is then linked to the preceding by fronting the constituent containing established information and marking it with *-ma*, and Hattusili’s promotion to being King of Hakpissa is introduced as new information. In the last clause the procedure is repeated, with the kingship of Hakpissa as the linking element fronted and marked with *-ma*, and the final promotion to the position of Great King introduced as new information.²⁰

As *unambiguous* left dislocations never mark immediate anaphora after first mention, it is likelier that (13) involves NP fronting.

Other examples involving NPs in front of *mān* are similarly different from prototypical left dislocations from the information structure point of view. In (16) LUGAL-*uš* “king” is last mentioned at the end of the previous paragraph, but it was not the primary topic. It becomes the primary topic only in the clause where it precedes *mān*:

(16) OH-MH/MS (CTH 262) IBoT 1.36 rev. iii 54-55

1. **GAL MEŠEDI=ma našma** UGULA 10 **MEŠEDI našma** NIMGIR.ÉRIN^{MEŠ} LUGAL-*i tezzi*

2. *taruptat=wa*

3. *nu* LUGAL-*uš* ***mān*** ^{GIŠ}GIGIR *wek-zí*
 CONN king-NOM.SG.C when chariot request-3SG.PRS

“(1) The chief of the bodyguard, or the commander of 10 bodyguards or the military herald says to the king, (2) “It’s finished.” (3) **When** the king requests the chariot”.

The usage is thus similar to NP fronting and only remotely analogous to left dislocations proper which normally imply considerably lesser accessibility of the referent of the left dislocated NP. The closest parallel from left dislocations comes from (17) where ^D*IŠTAR* is similarly the established topic of the whole text.

(17) NS/NH (CTH 81.A) KUB 1.1+ rev. iv 73-5

1. ^{DUG}*haršiyali=ya=kan išhuiškanzi*

2. ^D*IŠTAR* DINGIR-LIM=*aš=mu*
 Istar goddess=she=me

19. Following Otten 1981: 26-7; Melchert 2009: 190.

20. Melchert 2009: 190.

3. *nu=šmaš=šan* ^D*IŠTAR šarlaimmin [š]ipanzakanzi*
 “(1) And they fill the *h*-vessel. (2) (As for) *IŠTAR*, **she** is my goddess. (3) They will make libations for themselves to the exalted *ISTAR*”²¹.

However, ^D*IŠTAR* was not mentioned in the immediately preceding context, it was mentioned in the text before, much further away than the previous mention of the king in (16).

Information structure similarly sets the following example apart from left dislocations. In (18) Sunassura is the established topic of the context which did not get in any way deactivated:

(18) MH/MS (CTH 41.II.2) KUB 36.127 obv. 9'
 ([If the King of the land] of Mitanni begins war against the King of Hatti, Sunassura must not give [...] to him. He must not allow him to pass through his land, but must defend his land. He must not come [in a hostile manner(?) (against Hatti) together with] infantry and chariots.)
ANA ^m*Šunaššura=ma mān āššu*
 to Sunassura=but if good.NOM.SG.N
 “But if it suits Sunassura, (he will [come to the aid] of His Majesty. But if it does not suit him, he will not come)”.

Here the use of the full NP with the *-ma*, and not the enclitic pronoun, is certainly determined not by any kind of topic shift, but rather by restricting focus on Sunassura: “if it suits *Sunassura* (and not any other person, including My Majesty)”. This is not a function ever marked by left dislocations in my corpus.

The difference from left dislocations is also obvious in case of the following example where the pronoun *kīdaš* which is to the left of *mān* is anaphoric to several relative clauses (reproduced in translation) and is thus highly unlikely to be left dislocated:

(19) NH/NS (CTH 69.A) KBo 19.70+ obv. i 52-53
 (Now seize and hand [over] to me all civilian captives of the land of Arzawa who come over to you – whoever [flees] before me – and whatever civilian captives of the land of Mira [or of] Hatti come [over] to you.)
kīdaš mān kui-š Š[A MĀMĪT]I
 this.DAT.PL if which-NOM.SG.C of oath
 “**If** there is someone of oath among these (men), ...”.

No left dislocation is possible in such a context. The same holds good for the following context too. The broader context is as follows:

(20) MH/NS (CTH 259.B) KUB 13.20 obv. i 10–15
 1. *mahhan=ma* ^{LÚ}*KÚR aki*
 2. *našma=kan* KIN *aššanuddāri*
 3. *nu kuiš* ^{ÉRIN}^{MEŠ} *ašandulaš*
 4. *n=an=kan* ^DUT[(U-ŠI)] *ašanduli anda talahhi*
 5. *kuiš arha tarnummaš=ma* ^{ÉRIN}^{MEŠ} *-az*
 6. *n=an* ^DUTU-ŠI *arha tarn[ahhi]*

21. Otten 1981: 29; Garrett 1990: 268; Hoffner, Melchert 2008: 268.

7. *mān* ^{LÚ}KÚR=***ma*** *kuwatqa zaluganuzi*
 8. *kūrur kuiš* {*KI*} *harzi*
 9. ^DUTU-ŠI=***ma*** EGIR-*pa* ANA DINGIR^{MEŠ}=[YA DÙ-wanzi] *uwami*
 10. *našma kuwapi ANA* ^DUTU-ŠI *āššu*
 11. *nu* ^DUTU-ŠI *apadda paizzi*
 12. *tuzzi-ya=ma* peran *mā**(n* DUMU LUGAL)] *našma* BĒL GAL
 army-LOC.SG=but before if son king or lord great
 kuinki *wātarnaḥ-mi*
 some.ACC.SG.C place-1SG.PRS
 13. *nu mahjan ŠA* ^DUTU-ŠI *išhiūl apell=a* QATAM<(MA)> ē[ššatten]
 14. [n=a]n *tuzziš hūmanza ištamaškeddu*

“(1) **However**, as soon as the enemy has been vanquished (2) or the work has been performed, (3) then the troops that are to remain for the occupation, (4) I, [(My Ma)]jesty, will leave for the occupation, (5) while whatever troops are to be released, (6) I, My Majesty, [will] relea[se]. (7a) **But** when an enemy (8) that retains hostility (7b) somehow persists, (9) **but** I, My Majesty, come back in order [to venerate my] gods, (10) or His Majesty goes (11) wherever his Majesty pleases, (12) **But** if I place some [(prince)] or great lord in command of the army, (13) then just like the command of My Majesty [you must] ca[rry out] his (command) likew<(ise)> (14) [and] the whole army must obey [hi]m”.

It clearly follows from the context that “troops/army” is one of the several established topics of the context. The others are *kūrur* “enemy” and ^DUTU-ŠI “My Majesty”. Switching between the topics is marked by the use of *-ma* as was established by Rieken 2000. There is enough reason for fronting of the NP, but not for left dislocating it.

But it is the following context which clearly testifies against left dislocation analysis:

(21) NH/NS (CTH 42.A) KBo 5.3+ rev. iii 12', 16', 20', 23'
 (Or if I, My Majesty, [impart] to you [my] innermost thoughts and [reveal] my concerns to you – if I have [singled out] some person for favor, saying: “This person behaves well, so I, My Majesty, will treat him well”)

1'. *zig=a[=šši* ***mān*** *pāi-š)j* *apūn* *memiyan*
 you=but=him if go-2SG.PRS that.ACC.SG.C word.ACC.SG.C
 EGIR-*pa* *mema-tti* ...
 back say-2SG.PRS

2'. *nu* ***mān*** *pāi-[tti]* *apūn* *memiyan*
 CONN if go-2SG.PRS that.ACC.SG.C word.ACC.SG.C
apēdani EGIR-*pa* *mema-tti* ...
 that.DAT.SG.C back say-2SG.PRS

3'. *z[ig=]a* ***mān*** *apēdani* KUR-*e* *našma* URU-*r-i*
 you=but if that.DAT.SG land-DAT.SG or city-DAT.SG
 EGI[R-*pa*] *mema-tti* ...
 back say-2SG.PRS

4'. *zig-[a=šma]š[=a]t* ***mān*** *pāi-tti* EGI[R-*pa*] *mema-tti* ...
 you=but=them=it if go-2SG.PRS back say-2SG.PRS

“(1) **But** if it so happens that you pass that word on to him. (Or if I have singled out a person for harsh treatment saying: “This person is evil, so I, My Majesty, will treat him harshly”) (2') **if** it

so happens that (you) pass this matter on to him ([or] if I have singled out some land or city for favor, saying: “It behaves well, so I, My Majesty, will treat it well”) (3’) but if you pass (it) on to that country or city (Or if I have singled out that land or city for favor or for harsh treatment,) (4’) But if it so happens that you pass it on to them (it shall be put under oath for you)”.

In the context the fronting of *zig* “you” and the use of *-(m)a* are determined both by contrast between “I, My Majesty” and “you” and by topic shifts among two equally established topics, cf. the analysis in van den Hout 2003: 186. Left dislocations in Hittite never involve personal pronouns.

5. First vs. Second Positions in Hittite

Thus I believe that it is much likelier to assess examples originally cited as (2) not as left dislocations, but as fronting of an NP to the position in front of *mān*. Naturally, this is in direct conflict with exx. like (1) where the NP hosting *-ma* is fronted to the position *following mān*. Purely statistically it is the exx. like (1) which absolutely dominate and which are the only ones described in connection with delaying *-ma*²². Exx. like (2) are extremely rare –in fact I have listed all the contexts²³ from my corpus of diplomatic texts²⁴, but they need an explanation.

I suppose the key to the analysis is the fact that *mān* is the only subordinator which delays *-ma* systematically in OH and MH texts and frequently in NH texts. Other subordinators either host *-ma* and occupy first/initial position, as, e.g., *mahhan* in (25) below or follow *-ma* and occupy the second position, as, e.g., *kuit* «as» or *kuwapi* «when, where».

22. See a summary of proposals in Klockhorst 2014 and criticism of his approach in Molina, Sideltsev forthcoming.

23. There are some restored cases as well:

(i) NS/MH (CTH 268) KUB 21.47+ rev. 2'-3', 7'

1. [šum]aš=ma=aš=kan **mān** kiššuwān~x x[... peran pē]hutē-zzi ...
you=but=he=LOC if such before bring-3SG.PRS
2. [šumeš]=an **mān** hūdāk UL ēp-t[eni ...]
you=him if immediately NEG seize-2PL.PRS

“(1) **If** he [pres]ents to [yo]u this kind of [...], though, [...] (2') (and) **if** y[ou] do not seize him immediately, ...” following Miller 2013: 240.

(ii) NS/MH (CTH 264.C) KUB 13.5 obv. ii 6-7

[NINDA KAŠ GEŠTIN=ya=m]a **mān** apēdani UD-t-i ad-anna akuw-a[(nna) tarah-teni]
bread beer wine=and=but if that.LOC.SG day-LOC.SG eat-INF drink-INF can-2PL.PRS
“**If**, [howe]ver, [you are able (to)] eat and drink [*the bread, the beer and the wine*] on that day, ...” following Miller 2013: 250-1.

24. The only common case is lexicalized adverbial *anda=ma* “moreover”:

(iii) MH/NS (CTH 259.C) KUB 13.21+ obv. i 8'-9'

anda=ma=az LÚ.MEŠ BELU-TI kui-ēš šumeš LÚ.MEŠ BĒL
moreover=but=REFL lords which-NOM.PL.C you-NOM.PL.C lords
MADGALATU ÉRIN MEŠ ANŠE.KUR.RA MEŠ kui-ēš maniyahhiške-tteni
governors.of.posts troops chariots which-NOM.PL.C be.responsible-2PL.PRS
“**Moreover, those** of you lords, **those** of you governors of the posts who are responsible for troops (and) chariots” following Miller 2013: 146-7.

(22) MH/MS (CTH 188) KUB 31.79 obv. 21

namma=ma=mu kuit ammel BELÍ=YA ŠA ^mZid[ašdu hatrāe-š]
 then=but=me because my lord=my of Z. write-2SG.PST
 “Furthermore, **because** my lord has written to me of (the affair of) Zidašdu”²⁵.

MH/MS (CTH 186) HKM 6 obv. 9

namma=ma=wa<r>=aš kuwapi pait
 then=but=QUOT=he where go-3SG.PST
 “But **where** he went (I don’t know)”²⁶.

Now it is a well known fact that *mān* started to lose its extraordinary syntactic peculiarities in late MH texts and more consistently in NH texts. It started being assimilated to other subordinators in that it started hosting *-ma* via the intermediary double *-ma* stage of *-ma* on the subordinator and the other delayed *-ma* on the following word²⁷:

(23) NH/NS (CTH 105.A) KUB 23.1+ rev. iv 18

mān=ma=aš=ta=kkan ŠA KUR=KA=ma ui-zzi
 if=but=he=you=LOC middle land=your=but come-3SG.PRS
 “**But** if he comes into your land, ...”²⁸.

I suppose that exx. (2) above display the other possible direction of analogy – *mān* started to behave like a second position subordinator. The two most commonly accepted second position subordinators are *kuit*²⁹ and *kuwapi*³⁰, see, e.g.,

(24) OH-MH/MS (CTH 262) IBoT 1.36 obv. i 22–23

nu GAL MEŠEDI kuit ^{GIŠ}GIDRU har-zi
 CONN chief bodyguard since staff hold-3SG.PRS
 “**Since** the chief of the bodyguard holds a staff”.

However, there are other subordinators which can optionally be clause second. One of them is *mahhan*. It is not commonly described as clause second and indeed the dominating position is clause first/initial³¹:

(25) MH/NS (CTH 259.B) KUB 13.20 obv. i 10

mahhan=ma ^{LÚ}KUR ak-i
 when=but enemy die-3SG.PRS
 “However, **as soon as** the enemy has been vanquished, ...”³².

25. Following Hoffner 2009: 83.

26. Following Hoffner 2009: 105.

27. See for the process with a very different interpretation Kloekhorst 2014.

28. Following Beckman 1996: 101, F. Fuscagni (ed.), *hethiter.net/*: CTH 105 (TX 07.05.2013, TRde 07.05.2013).

29. See Hoffner, Melchert 2008: 418; Huggard 2013.

30. Hoffner, Melchert 2008: 417.

31. CHD L-N sub *mahhan* sets the figure at 80-90% of all attestations.

32. Following Miller 2013: 148-9.

OH-MH/MS (CTH 262) IBoT 1.36 obv. ii 29
 nu=šši=kan **māh[ha]n** LÚ.MEŠ MEŠEDI DUMU^{MEŠ} É.GAL=ya *ḥandā-nta*
 CONN=him=LOC when bodyguards servants palace=and be_aligned-3PL.PRS
 “**When** bodyguards are aligned with palace servants, …”.

Still, there are sufficiently numerous examples which guarantee the alternative second position, e.g.³³,

(26) MH/NS (CTH 259.B) KUB 13.20 obv. i 30-31

1. *nu=za šummeš mahhan tuekkašš=a*
 CONN=REFL you.NOM.PL as persons.DAT.PL=and
ANA DAM^{MEŠ}=KUNU DUMU^{MEŠ}=KUNU É^{MEŠ}=KUNU genzu har-teni
 to wives=your sons=your houses=your dear hold-2PL.PRS
2. *LUGAL-uwaš šakli-ya genzu QATAMMA har-ten*
 king.GEN.PL imperative-DAT.SG affection thus have-2PL.IMP
 “(1) And just **as** you hold dear (your own) persons, your wives, your sons (and) your homes, (2) you shall also feel affection for the imperative of the king”³⁴.

OH-MH/MS (CTH 262) IBoT 1.36 obv. iv 8

[*nu*] LÚ^{MEŠ}.ŠUKUR **māhhan** *hilammar arha takšan šarr-i*
 CONN spear-men when gatehouse away middle pass-3SG.PRS
 “[And] **as soon as** the spear-men pass through the middle of the gatehouse, …”³⁵.

MH/MS (CTH 186) HKM 36 obv. 44-46

tuel=ma=an=kan mahhan maniyahant-eš IŠTU ZÍD.D[A] arha daya-er
 your=but=her=LOC how agent-NOM.PL.C with flour away steal-3PL.PST
 “**But how** your agents stole her away together with the flour”³⁶.

It follows from correlation of clause first and clause second uses that *māhhan* is the closest parallel to *mān* as it can be clause first/initial and in this case it can host *-ma*, but it can also *follow* topicalized constituents + *-ma* too.

Thus the distribution of *mān* in the clause simply mirrors that of, e.g., indefinite pronouns which are regularly clause second, but can occasionally be clause first, as in

(27) MH/MS (CTH 199) ABoT 1.65 rev. 5'-7'

mam=man=za=kan kuiški É-er tamai-š arnu-t
 if=IRR=REFL=LOC.PART someone.NOM.SG.C house else-NOM.SG.C relocate-3SG.PST
 “**If someone** else had relocated (your) household/ family, (would you not become upset?)”³⁷.

The data contribute to the understanding of the fact that in Hittite the distribution of clause first vs clause second constituents is not as straightforward as was supposed before. A very clear case is the

33. See Hoffner, Melchert 2008: 417. There are many more examples in my corpus.

34. Following Miller 2013: 150-1.

35. Following Miller 2013: 118-9.

36. Following Hoffner 2009: 152.

37. Following CHD L-N: 141, Hoffner 2009: 244, Hoffner, Melchert 2008: 422.

reanalysis by Becker 2014 of the distribution of first vs second position relative pronouns. What was traditionally determined as second position constraint is rather $\frac{1}{2}$ position constraint, i.e. any constituent which is clause second can also be first/initial. See, e.g. for *kuit* which was clause second in (24) above and which is clause first in the following context:

(28) MH/NS (CTH 259.B) obv. i 17-18

nu=šši=kan kuit ^DUTU-Š=I ú²[kila tuzzin] kiššar-i te-hhi
 CONN=him=LOC since Majesty=My personally army hand-LOC place-1SG.PRS
 “And since I, My Majesty, *p[ersonally]* place the [army] in his hand, ...”³⁸.

An important fact is that statistically the first and second positions correlate very differently with different constituents.

6. Conclusion.

Hittite *mān* “when/if” can be both clause first and clause second, just like any other constituent for which the common position in the clause is either first or second. The dominating and well-known position of *mān* “when/if” is clause first. Its clause second position was demonstrated in the present paper and is limited to few cases, but it sheds important light on the general correlation between clause first and clause second positions in Hittite, which should rather be described as $\frac{1}{2}$ position.

7. Bibliography

Becker, K., *Zur Semantik der hethitischen Relativsätze*. Studien zur historisch-vergleichenden Sprachwissenschaft 5, Hamburg, 2014.

Beckman, G., *Hittite Diplomatic texts*, SBL Writings from the Ancient World 7, Atlanta, 1996.

CHD – H. Güterbock, H. Hoffner, T. van den Hout (eds.) (1980-): *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*, Chicago, 1980-.

Garrett, A. J., *The Syntax of Anatolian Pronominal Clitics*. Ph.D. Diss., Harvard University, 1990.

Goedegebuure, P., *Reference, Deixis and Focus in Hittite*. PhD Dissertation, University of Amsterdam, 2003.

Goedegebuure, P., *The use of demonstratives in Hittite: deixis, reference and focus*. StBoT 55, Wiesbaden, 2014.

Hofmann, I., *Der Erlass Telipinus*. THeth 11, Heidelberg, 1984.

Hoffner, H. A. Jr., “The case against Ura-Tarhunta and his father Ukkura,” In W. Hallo (ed.): *The Context of Scripture*, vol. 3 Archival Documents from the Biblical World. Leiden-Boston, 2003, pp. 57-60

Hoffner, H.A.Jr., *Letters from the Hittite Kingdom*. SBL Writings from the Ancient World 15, Atlanta, 2009.

Hoffner, H.A.Jr. and H.C. Melchert, *A Grammar of the Hittite Language*, Part 1: Reference Grammar, Winona Lake, Indiana, 2008.

Huggard, M., “More on *kuit*: Causal clauses in Hittite,” ECIEC 32, June 21-24 2013 (handout).

Kloekhorst, A., *Accent in Hittite: A Study in Plene Spelling, Consonant Gradation, Clitics, and Metrics*. StBoT 56, Wiesbaden, 2014.

38. Following Miller 2013: 148-9.

Luraghi, S., *Old Hittite Sentence Structure*, London – New York, 1990.

Melchert, H. Craig, “Discourse Conditioned Use of Hittite -ma,” In E. Rieken, P. Widmer (eds.): *Pragmatische Kategorien. Form, Funktion und Diachronie, Akten der Arbeitsteigung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 24. bis 26. September 2007 in Marburg*, Wiesbaden, pp. 187-195.

Miller, J., *Royal Hittite Instructions*. SBL Writings from the Ancient World 31, Atlanta, 2013.

Molina, M. and A. Sidel'tsev, “Review of Kloekhorst 2014,” *Babel und Bibel*, forthcoming.

Neu, E., *Der Anitta-Text*. StBoT 18, Wiesbaden, 1974.

Otten, H., *Die Apologie Hattusilis III*. StBoT 24, Wiesbaden, 1981.

Rieken, E., “Die Partikeln -a, -ja, -ma im Althehitischen und das Akkadogramm Ù,” In M. Ofitsch and Ch. Zinko (ed.): *125 Jahre Indogermanistik in Graz*. Graz, 2000, pp. 411-419.

Sidel'tsev, A., “Citic Doubling as an Innovative Category,” In A. Archi (ed.): *Tradition and Innovation in the Ancient Near East. Proceedings of 57 RAI*. Winona Lake, 2015, pp. 417-426.

Singer, I., *Hittite Prayers*. SBL Writings from the Ancient World 11, Atlanta, 2002.

van den Hout, Th., “Studies in the Hittite Phraseological Construction I: Its Syntactic and Semantic Properties,” In G. Beckman, R. Beal, and G. McMahon (eds.): *Hittite Studies in Honor of Harry A. Hoffner Jr. on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. Winona Lake, Indiana, 2003, pp. 177-203.