A. V. Sidel'tsev

INVERTED WORD ORDER IN MIDDLE HITTITE[1]

PRELIMINARIES

The aim of the paper is to delimit between a) Hittite proper inversions; b) borrowed types; c) indirect influence of the languages Hittite contacted with on the use of inversions.

The following abbreviations are employed: V—predicate[2], S—subject, O—object, Adv—any other kind of either obligatory (e.g., direction with motion verbs) or non-obligatory nominal constituents, Neg—negation of any kind. The notation is purposefully very imprecise. The ⊗ sign marks clause boundaries.

Bold type normally marks the verb to help the reader to identify the inverted clause and does not bear any other significance. Similarly, in the clauses with proleptic pronouns both the pronoun and the co-referent noun are in

[2] V (predicate) is mostly a verb, but it also can be a predicate adjective or an NP, behaving syntactically identically (see, e.g., Garrett // Sprache 36/1 (1994): 34; I owe the reference to the courtecy of Craig Melchert).

bold type for easier identification only. The same holds good for the right-dislocated constitutents in § 1.2.1.2.1.

0.1. The object of this study is represented only by the position of O, S, Adv, Neg in relation to V within a clause which consists of minimum two stressed constituents.

That means that I do not consider the position of all the rest of constituents (O, S, Adv, Neg) in relation to each other. In terms of the constituent that moves this is nominal constituent or negation fronting, i.e. a separate type of inversion. I believe that the analysis of this type may lead to different conclusions than those arrived at in this paper without falsifying the latter as the types are completely independent.

Some constituents are not viewed as their position[3] in the clause is either absolutely fixed (e.g., accented connectives—the words that can occupy only the initial position: *nu*, *ša*, *ta*, or only the initial or first position: *kāša*, *naššu/našma* on the clause level, etc.), or free (not fixed) (e.g., *namma* (see CHD, L—N: 386—390), vocatives). The enclitics are mostly attached to the word occupying the initial position in the clause so they are not noted. Attributes also have the fixed position in reference to the noun (either pre- or post-position) and thus are not taken into consideration (see Luraghi, OH Sentence: 139, note 4, w. lit.). The situation with place-words depends on their semantic functions (see ibid.: 32—33, 120—121, 34—35, w. lit.; cf. ibid.: 46). If according to the semantic function the place-word occupies the last position, it functions as one syntactic whole with the verb (i.e. it moves together with the verb and thus is not specially noted in this paper) when the verb or any other constituent is emphasized. However, place-words are also subject to inversions, but to a very limited degree: they can move only leftwards and occupy the first/initial position in the clause (tmesis). See also Justus, Subject and Topic (1975): 220, 244, 343.

The second restriction means that I do not consider clauses V+clitics/V[4], as they are syntactically identical to the movement of the second (after a stressed sentence connective) stressed (nominal) constituent (+ at least one more stressed constituent) into the initial position, which is not analyzed for the reasons given above. See also McCone // Szemerényi, 1: 469.

0.2. The normal position largely prevailing (in about 97 % of cases according to McCone's counts in FsSzemerényi, 1: 469) in the texts written in MS ductus is that with the final verb, which serves as the marker of the right hand clause boundary and is almost fully grammaticalized (see Weitenberg // Per una grammatica ittita: 329; Luraghi, Word Order: § 0; Luraghi, OH Sentence: 12, 17, 18, 46, 112, 115, esp. 123—124; cf. ibid.: 46, 36, 37, 44—46, 72—73, 84 for other constituents). The following deviations (presumably semantically/pragmatically motivated) are attested (I basically accept Luraghi's conclusions in her "OH Sentence", and other papers):

a. predicate precedes all the other parts of the clause (S, O, Adv, Neg);
b. several (or one) nominal constituents or negation precede V. Several (or one) nominal constituents or negation follow V.

---

[3] For the distinction of the relevant initial, first, last (= preverbal) and final (= post-verbal) positions see Luraghi, Word Order, § 1.1; and esp. idem, OH Sentence: 12—13.

[4] Contra Weitenberg // Per una grammatica ittita: 329 (w. n. 17), 334 following Dressler.

As for the constituent that moves from its unmarked position in the clause, these classes are interpreted as following types:

T h e 1ˢᵗ t y p e: predicate moves into the initial or first position (is fronted).

T h e 2ⁿᵈ t y p e: a nominal constituent (S, O, Adv) or negation moves into the post-final position (is right dislocated).

Besides, a different (marginal) type is attested:

T h e 3ʳᵈ t y p e: a nominal constituent moves into the cleft sentence.

I. Data

§ 1. Non-Relative Clauses (Non-Bilingual Evidence)

T h e F i r s t T y p e

1.1. The first type[5] consists in the movement of the predicate in front of Adv, S, O. This type of inversion is evident when all the rest of constituents are at the end of the clause (and no proleptic pronouns are attested) as the supposition that they are all emphasized seems far-fetched. There are only 11 clear cases of this type:

V-S-O.

(CTH 404.2.A) KBo 39.8 Rs. III 11 **[(kar-ap)-du** (*pít-ti-ya-*)]*al-li-iš*[6] GÌR-*aš i-da-a-lu-un* EME-*an*[7] ⊗ (12) [(*nu-wa-ra-an iš-ki-ša-a*)]z *kar-ap-du* ⊗ ZU₉-*ya-wa-ra-at* (13) [(*kar-ap-du i-da-a-lu*)] KAxU-*it i-da-a-lu* EME-*an* "[(may the swi)]ft foot [(lift up)] the evil tongue…" see § 1.2.1.1.1 for the analysis of the rest (direct speech);

bis (CTH 324.1.A) KUB 17.10 Rs. IV 14 **ha-a-aš-ta** ᴸᵁNI.DUH 7 ᴳᴵˢIG ⊗ *a-ap-pa* **hu-it-ti-ya-at** 7 ᴳᴵˢ*ha-at-ta-lu* "the doorkeeper opened seven doors, he unlocked seven (door)bolts" (direct speech).

It is identical to MS (CTH 325.C) KBo 26.133(+)Rs. IV 5' and NS (CTH 325.A) KUB 33.24+ Rs. IV 5' (both fragmentary). The stability of (at least the first) clause in different versions makes it likely that it goes back to OH.

V-O-S.

(CTH 137) KBo 16.27+ Rs. III 12' **li-in-ga-nu-u[t** *ku-u-uš* ᵐ*A*]*r-ma*-LÚ-*iš* ᴸᵁDUB.SAR-*aš* ᵁᴿᵁ*Ha-at-tu-š*[*i* vacat] "[A]rmazitiš, a scribe in Hattuš[a,] pu[t them] under oath" (description).

---

[5] Routinely described in the papers dealing with IE syntax—e.g. Bader // Papers from the 7ᵗʰ International Conference on Historical Linguistics (1987): 13 ff.; specially for Hittite see Justus, Subject and Topic: 244, note 15; Luraghi, Word Order: 355—386; idem, OH Sentence: passim; Иванов, Общеиндоевропейская: 257—259.

[6] The restoration ideally fits the lacuna. Differently Rost // MIO 1/3 (1953): 359, followed by Watkins // Gs Kerns: 347). The restoration of -*du* is after the parallel contexts contra I.B KUB 15.39+. The traces of the erased sign in Vs. II 25 look like DU (??).

[7] Fragmentary NS I.B KUB 15.39+ Vs. II 25—26 is syntactically identical.

Despite the fragmentary context an inversion seems plausible: the line constitutes a separate paragraph. In the preceding and following paragraphs placing concrete people under the oath is described. This paragraph mentions the person who put them under the oath. Similarly in Rs. IV 32']x *pa-ah-ši* ⊗ *ku-u-uš* URU*Ha-at*[-*tu-ši* …] m*Wa-za-za-aš li-in-ga-nu-ut* "… guard. Wazazaš placed these under the oath in Hattu[ša …]". The restoration ideally fills the lacuna, as all the preserved spacings are rather short.

V-O-Adv.

(CTH 483.A) KUB 15.34 Vs. II 39 *na-aš-ta* [*A-NA* LUGA]L MUNUS.LU⸗GAL *an-⸢da⸣ aš-šu-li na-iš-du-ma-at* ⊗ (40) *nu-uš-ma-aš* [**pí-i**]**š-ki-it-tén** TI-*tar ha-ad-du-la-a-tar* MUHI.A GÍD.DA EG[IR?.UDMI] "turn [to the king] (and) queen in favour, ⊗ [gi]ve them life, health and long years for the fu[ture]" (direct speech). Dupl. MS KBo 8.70 1' is too fragmentary.

(CTH 151) VBoT 1 Vs. 14 *nu-uš-ši* **li-il-hu-wa-i** Ì-*an* SAG.DU-*ši* "he will pour/pour (imp.) oil on her head"[8] (letter);

V-Adv-S.

(CTH 200) ABoT 60 Vs. 7' *ša-li-⸢ka⸣-aš-ma-mu ka-ru-wa-ri-wa-a*[*r*] (8') m*Ni-ri-ik-qa-⸢i-li-iš⸣* LÚ URU*Ta-ap-ha-a*[*l-lu-uš-ša?*] ⊗ (9') *me-mi-an ú-da-aš*… "Nirikkali out of Tapha[luša] woke me in the mornin[g], he brought a message"[9] (letter);

V[…]-Adv.

(CTH 396.1) KBo 15.25 Vs. 18 [*i-*]**it-wa** […] URU-*ri* HUR.SAG*Šu-up-pí-in-na* ÍD*Zi-ip-pí-ra-ya* ⊗ (19) *nu-wa ku-u-u*[*n¹?* NINDA.Ì.E.DÉ.]A *A-NA* DÚ-*i-šu-ri-⸢ya⸣-an-ti pí-e-da* "[G]o to the city […], to the Mount Šuppinna, and to the river Zippira, bring thi[s oily loa]f to Wišuriyant![10]" (direct speech);

V-O(indir)-O(dir) [O(dir), etc.].

(CTH 151) VBoT 1 Vs. 22 *nu-ut-ta* **ú-wa-an-zi**[11] *ú-da-an-zi ku-ša-ta* DUMU..MUNUSTI "they will come and bring bridal gifts for the daughter" (letter);

In this as well as in all the rest of the contexts out of VBoT 1 (except for line 18), Starke sees Egyptian influence. Cf. Rost // MIO IV/3 (1956): 336.

(CTH 483.A) KUB 15.34 Vs. II 17 *nu kat-⸢ta⸣* **tar-na-at-tén** *A-NA* LUGAL MUNUS.LUGAL TI-*tar ha-ad-du-la-a-tar* [M]U[HI.A] GÍD.DA (18) DUMU-*la-tar* DUMU.NITAMEŠ DUMU.MUNUSMEŠ *ha-a-aš-šu-uš ha-an-za-aš-šu-uš* LÚ-*ni* LÚ-*na-tar* (19) *tar-hu-⸢i⸣-la-tar* MUNUS-*ni* MUNUS-*na-a-tar an-ni-tal-wa-a-tar*[12] "release to the king (and) the queen life, health, long [y]e[ars], power of procreation, sons (and) daughters, grandsons (and) great-grandsons, virility (and) bravery to the man, femininity (and) motherhood to the woman" (direct speech);

---

[8] Cf. Rost // MIO 4/3 (1956): 336.

[9] Cf. wrongly Hagenbuchner, THeth. 16: 78.

[10] Following Carruba, StBoT 2: 3, 25.

[11] "Phaseological" *uwa-*.

[12] Syntactically identical to fragmentary NS KUB 60.151 Vs. 9—11.

Following CHD, P: 328. Haas—Wilhelm, Kizz.: 191 translate two last words as "Gebär- und Liebeskraft?". The clause is used in a very long sequence of benedictions with normal word order.

In view of (CTH 483.A) KUB 15.34 Vs. II 17—19 and 40 the following example should probably be also understood as the verb fronting with the omission of the indirect object. This is all the more plausible as the indirect object is used in the NS duplicat KUB 60.151 Vs. 1 immediately after *udatten*:

(CTH 483.A) KUB 15.34 Vs. II 6 *na-aš-ˊtaˋ an-da A-NA* KUR ᵁᴿᵁ*Ha-at-ti ha-an-ta-a-an-*[*ti*] (7) SIG₅-*an-ti mi-iš-ri-wa-an-ti ú-wa-at-tén* ⊗ *nu* **ú-ta-a**[(**t-tén**)] (8) ⟨*A-NA* LUGAL MU≠ NUS.LUGAL⟩ TI-*tar ˊha-ad-du-la-a-tarˋ* MUᴴᴵ·ᴬ GÍD.DA ˊDUMUˋ-*la-tar* DUMU.NITAᴹᴱˢ D[(UMU.MUNUSᴹᴱˢ *ha-aš-šu-uš*)] (9) *ha-an-za-aš-šu-uš* ˊDINGIRᴹᴱˢˋ-*aš a-aš-ši-ya-u-wa-ar* DINGIRᴹᴱˢ-*aš* [*mi-i-(ú-mar*)] (10) *tar-hu-i-la-a-tar nu-ú-un iš-ta-ma-aš-šu-wa-ar* ⊗ *nu A-N*[*A* LUGAL MUNUS.LUGAL] (11) *LI-IM la-ap-li-pu-uš kar-ap-tén* ⊗ *na-aš-ta* LUGAL MU≠ NU[S.(LUGAL)] (12) *an-da aš-šu-li a-uš-tén* "come into the true, good and beautiful (?) land of Hatti. ⊗ Bri[(ng)] life, health, long years, power of procreation, sons (and) d[(aughters, grandchildren)] (and) great-grandchildren, the gods' love, the gods' [kindli(ness)], valour, satisfaction (?) (and) obedience. ⊗ Lift a thousand eye-lashes fo[r the king (and) queen], ⊗ and look at the king (and) que[en] in favour" (direct speech).

NS KUB 60.151 Vs. 1—3 is syntactically identical. The translation follows CHD, L—N: 476 against Haas—Wilhelm, Kizz.: 191 who restore *al-šu-wa-ar* in the lacuna in l. 9.

V-O(indir)₁-O(indir)₂-Adv₁-Adv₂-...-Advₓ.

(CTH 330.5) KUB 33.62 Vs. II 7' [*nu-za-kán?*] *an-da* **wa-ah-nu-ut** ᴰIM ᵁᴿᵁ*Ku-li-ú-iš-na* (8') ˊA-NA ᴸᵁBEˋ-EL Éᵀᴵᴹ ᶠBE-EL-DI Éᵀᴵᴹ DUMU.NITAᴹᴱˢ DUMU.MUNUSᴹᴱˢ-*aš* (9') *aš-šu-li* TI-*an-ni in-na-ra-u-wa-an-ni ha-at-tu-la-an-ni* (10') MUᴴᴵ·ᴬ GÍD.DA EGIR.UDᴹᴵ DINGIRᴹᴱˢ-*aš a-aš-ši-u-ni-it* DINGIRᴹᴱˢ-*na-aš mi-ú-um-ni-it* ⊗ (11') *kar-di-mi-ya-at-ta-an-ma ar-ha tar-na* ⊗ ... "Turn [your-self], O Stormgod of K., toward the lord of the house (and) the lady of the house for (the giving of) sons, daughters, well-being, life, vigor, health, for long years in the future, through the love of the gods (and) the kindness of the gods. Release anger", followed by a series of 'benedictory' clauses (direct speech).

The context is practically identical to Vs. II 17'—20', but there all the ends of the lines are in lacunas, the position of the verb is not clear. The translation follows CHD, L—N: 309 (with argumentation).

The Second Type

1.2. The second type is the movement of a constituent into the post final position (for this type see also Starke // ZA 71/2 (1981): 223; idem // ZA 69/1 (1979): 50 f.).

1.2.1. The most common subtype, that of movement of a nominal con- stituent into the post final position (= right dislocation) has been termed "am- plificatory" by McCone // FsSzemerényi, 1: passim[13]. It is important to stress

---

[13] I owe the reference to the courtecy of Craig Melchert.

that Luraghi's very narrow understanding (Hittite, § 3.3.1; Word Order, § 3; OH Sentence: 21, 22, 85, 106) of this type is wrong — it is falsified primarily by the examples where it is Subject that moves into the post-final position. According to McCone (op. cit.: 470—471, 475, 482) the right dislocation of a nominal constituent has to be copied by a proleptic pronoun.

1.2.1.1.1. If a direct object is dislocated, it is normally copied by a proleptic pronoun:

Neg-V-O.

(CTH 324.1V.A) KUB 17.10 Vs. I 28' …*Ú-UL-wa-ra-**an** ú-e-mi-ya-nu-un* **ᴰ*Te-li-pí-nu-un*** (29') ⌈*na*⌉*-ak-ki-in* **DINGIR**ᴸᴬᴹ … "I have not found him, Telipinu, the noble god" [14] (direct speech).

Syntactically identical to MS (not counted separately) (CTH 325.C) KUB 33.26+ Vs. I 4' …*pár-ga-mu-u*[(*š-kán*)] (5') [(HUR.SAGᴹᴱˢ*-uš ša-an-hu-un*)] ⊗ *ha-a-ri-uš-kán hal-lu-u-wa-mu-uš* [(KI.MIN)] ⊗ (6') [(*hu-wa-hu-eš-šar-kán* k)]*u-*⌈*wa-li*⌉*-ú* KI.MIN ⊗ *na-at-ta-**an** AK-ŠU-U*[(*D*)] (7') [(vacat)] ***ne-pí-ša-aš*** ᴰ**IM-*an*** [(vacat)] "[(I have searched)] hi[(gh mountains)], [(I have searched)] deep valleys, I have searched calm? [(waves)]. I have not foun[(d)] him, the Stormgod of the sky" (direct speech) [15];

V-O.

(CTH 404.2.A) KBo 39.8 Rs. III 17 … [(*p*)]*a-*[(*r*)]*a-a-wa-ra-**an**-kán* (18) [(*al-la*)*-pa-ah-te-e*]*n* ***a-pí-el*** **UD-*aš* *hu-ur-ti-ya-aš*** … "[you have spa]t them! [(o)]ut, (namely) the curses! of this day" (direct speech).

I suppose a mistake — pronoun *-an* is written for *-aš* (acc. pl.). The interpretation of *hurtiyaš* as acc. pl. follows HED, H: 436 (the context was unclear for Rost // MIO IV/3 (1956): 374). All other cases of the form of gen. for acc. in HED come from the ritual of Maštiqqa too. However, they are more unclear than it may seem from Puhvel's presentation. The only certain fact is that [*hu*]*rtiyašš=a* in NS I.A KBo 2.3+ Vs. I 50 (according to CHD, L—N: 22 it functions as a regular gen.) c o r r e s p o n d s to *hūrtaušš=a* in MS II.A KBo 39.8 Vs. II 37. See also §4.3 and §1.2.1.1.3.

MS II.E KBo 38.167 5'—6', NS I.B IBoT 2.110+ Vs. II 33—34, I.A KBo 2.3+ Vs. II 26' are syntactically identical, but fragmentary: the case ending of the noun is seen only in I.B; the traces in II.E look more like K[ÁN (?)]. NS II.B KBo 8.75(+) Vs. II 32—33 surely contains an inversion, but is rather different: no pronoun, EME-*an* at the end of the clause.

O₁-V-Adv-O₂.

(CTH 404.2.A) KBo 39.8 Rs. III 11 [(*kar-ap*)*-du* (*pít-ti-ya-*)]*al-li-iš* **GÌR-*aš* *i-da-a-lu-un*** EME-*an* ⊗ (12) [(*nu-wa-ra-an iš-ki-ša-a*)]*z kar-ap-du* ⊗ **ZU₉-*ya-wa-ra-at*** (13) [(*kar-ap-du* ***i-da-a-lu***)] **KAxU-*it* *i-da-a-lu*** EME-*an* "[(may the swi)]ft foot [(lift up)] the evil tongue, may it (*i.e.* the swift foot) lift it (*i.e.* the evil tongue) with (its) [(back)] (*i.e. carry it on its back*), and may it also [(lift)] them (*i.e. the tooth*

---

[14] NS II.A IBoT 3.141+ Vs. 16' (= fragmentary MS II.B KUB 33.5 3') … *Ú-UL-wa-ra-an ú-e-mi-ya-nu*[*-un*] ⊗ .

[15] NS Ex. A KUB 33.24+ Vs. I 29' is identical syntactically.

and the tongue), (namely) the evil tooth with its mouth (and) the evil tongue" (direct speech) [16].

The translation (with the exception of "them") follows Craig Melchert's analysis (e-mail of 01.06.2002). He also notes that the noun "tooth" has then been fronted again because of *-ya*, leaving its adjective behind. See also § 4.3.

NS I.B KUB 15.39+IBoT 2.109+ Vs. II 25 *kar-ap* (erasure) *pít-ti-ya-li-iš* GÌR-*aš i-d*[(*a-a-lu-un*)] (26) EME-*an* ⊗ *nu-wa-ra-an iš-ki-ša-az kar-ap-du* ⊗ (27) [*IŠ-T*]*U* EME^HI.A-*ŠU-ya-wa-ra-an kar-ap-du* (28) [(*i-da-a-l*)]*u* KAxU-*iš* *i-da-a-lu-un* EME-*an* "O fleet-foot! Lift off the evil tongue! Let him lift it from the back; let him lift it [f]rom their¹ tongues (namely) the [evi]l mouth (and) evil tongue!" CHD, L—N: 24—25 (fragmentary NS II.B KBo 9.106(+)KBo 8.75 Vs. II 26—27 is similar). Cf. Watkins // GsKerns: 348—9. It is interesting to note that the NS text is more regular than the MS one.

V(part)-V(copula)-O.

(CTH 443.1) KBo 15.10+ Vs. II 26 ⌜D⌝UTU-*uš* **D**UTU-*wa-aš* DINGIR.LÚ^MEŠ ⌜D⌜IM⌝ ⌜D⌜IM-*na-aš* DINGIR.LÚ^MEŠ *ku-u-uš túh-šu-me-en* ⊗ (27) [*n*]*a*-**at** *ar-ha túh-ša-an e-eš-tu ŠA* ^f*Zi i-da-a-lu* **ut-tar al-wa-an-za-tar** ⊗ (28) [*n*]*a-at* EGIR-*pa A-NA* ^f*Zi-pát w*[*a-*]*ha-a-an e-eš-tu...* "Sundeity (and) Sundeity's male gods, Stormgod (and) Stormgod's male gods, we have cut these. Let them, (namely) Zi's evil word (and) sorcery, be separated (likewise). Let them be turned back to Zi" (direct speech).

This interpretation (with proleptic pronoun) is to be preferred to that of Kassian, Zi: 41.

The usage analysed in this section comes rather close to the clauses where a number of direct objects were moved into the post-final position. The most important difference of this type is in the fact that it duplicates the objects not by enclitic pronouns, but by either pronouns (e.g., *ki* "this", *kuit kuit* "whatever" in KUB 23.72+ Rs. 13—14, *kuitki* "something" in KBo 15.33 Rs. III 16—17) or generic nouns (e.g., in KUB 17.21+ Rs. IV 7—10, KUB 14.1+ Rs. 29f). E.g.: MS (CTH 396.1) KBo 15.25 Vs. I 3 *nu ki-i da-ah-hi* 3 NINDA *a-a-⌜an⌝ ŠA ½ ŠA-A-TI* [...] (4) 1 DUG KAŠ 1 DUG *KU-KU-UB* GEŠTIN* 1 DUG ⌜KU⌝-KU-UB KAŠ 1 ^GIŠBANŠUR AD.KI[D...] "I take this: three warm loaves of ½ *šutu* [...], 1 vessel of beer, 1 vessel of wine, 1 vessel of beer, 1 reed table [...]".

1.2.1.1.2. No proleptic pronoun is used in the following contexts as the element moved is in the locative/ablative (there is no corresponding pronoun) or as the reflexive pronoun is used:

V(adj+copula)-Adv.

(CTH 404.2.A) KBo 39.8 Vs. II 24 **pár-ku-wa-e-eš**-*wa-aš-ma-aš* [(*na*)]*m*-[(*m*)]*a* **e-eš-te-en** (erasure) KAxU-*it* EME-*it* "may you be pure [(ag)]a[(i)]n with mouth and tongue" (direct speech);

NS I.A KBo 2.3+ Vs. I 36—37 is syntactically identical.

O₁-O₂-...-Oₓ-V-Adv₁-Adv₂-...-Advₓ.

(CTH 324.1V.A) KUB 17.10 Vs. I 10' ^D*Te-li-pí-nu-ša ar-ha i-ya-an-ni-iš* ⊗ *hal-ki-in* ^D*Im-mar-ni-in* (11') *ša-al-hi-an-ti-en ma-an-ni-it-ti-en iš-pí-ya-tar-ra* **pí-e-da-aš** *gi-im-ri* (12') ⌜ú⌝-*e-el-lu-i mar-mar-aš an-da-an* ⊗ ^D*Te-li-pí-nu-ša pa-it...* (narration).

---

[16] The function of instr. is here comitative ("together with"), that is, it is functionally very close to the succession of two coordinated O's. Cf. § 1.2.1.2.1.

Usually inversion is assumed: CHD, L—N: 192 (cf. CHD, L—N: 174): "He carried off grain… and abundance of food into the steppe, the meadow (and) the m[armarr(a)]'s (a kind of terrain)…", similarly Goetze, ANET²; Alp, Tempel: 33. Differently Hoffner, Myths²: 15: "Telipinu too went away and removed grain, animal fecundity, luxuriance, growth, and abundance to the steppe, to the meadow. Telipinu too went into the moor…"

According to CHD, L—N: 192 the analysis is based on MS (CTH 324.Fr.4) KBo 26.127 Rs?. 9' [ᴰTe-li-pí-nu-ša-]az ša-a-it ⊗ na-aš-ši-kán [hu-u-ma-an **pí-e-da-aš** gi-im-ri] (10') [ú-el-lu-i mar-m]ar-ra-aš ⊗ na-aš-ša-an ⌜ú⌝[-el-lu-i mar-mar-ri an-da-an u-li-iš-ta] (narration, not counted separately). Cf. also very fragmentary NS (CTH 325.A) KUB 33.24+ Vs. I 8' [ne-pí-ša-aš ᴰIM-aš ar-ha i-ya-an-ni-iš ⊗ gi-im-ri ú-e-]el-lu-i (9') [mar-mar-aš an-da-an ma-an-ni-it-ti-i(n šal-hi-it-t)]i-in (10') [iš-pí-ya-tar-ra (pí-e-d)**a-aš** ⊗ pa-it-aš ᴰIM-a]š… The suggested segmentation into clauses is contra Hoffner's translation (Hoffner, Myths²: 21): "[The Storm-god of the Sky set out towards the steppe], the meadow, [and the moor (?). He carried off plenty, prosperity, and abundance. The Storm God departed]…".

In view of the parallels, I analyse gi-im-ri ú-e-el-lu-i mar-mar-aš an-da-an in KUB 17.10 Vs. I 10'—12' as belonging to b o t h clauses, i.e. the context arose due to the omission (in an unjustified attempt to get rid of a kind of dittography) of gi-im-ri ú-e-el-lu-i mar-mar-aš which were used with anda and belonged to the second clause. In any case, whether my 'diachronic' (i.e. dealing with the text history) explanation is accepted or not, the context is corrupt and unparallelled, as place words never follow the verb [17]! See also § 4.3.

S-V-Adv-Adv.

(CTH 443.1) KBo 15.10+ Vs. I 33 nu ki-e i-da-a-la-u-e-eš al-wa-an-zi-in-ni-eš EME[ᴴᴵ·ᴬ **wa-h**]**a-an-du** BE-L[Í] (34) QA-DU DAM-ŠU DUMUᴹᴱˢ-ŠU É-ZU ⊗ nu ᶠZi QA-D[U DUMUᴹᴱˢ-ŠU har-kán-]⌜du⌝ … "and let these evil sorcerous tongue[s tu]rn away from the lord together with his wife, his sons, his house. ⊗ Let them (the tongues) [hol]d Zi together wit[h her sons]" (direct speech) [18].

1.2.1.1.3. Normally no proleptic pronoun is attested when Subject is moved into the post-final position (cf. McCone // FsSzemerényi, 1: 470). There is only one case when it is accompanied by a proleptic pronoun:

V-S.

(CTH 404.2.A) KBo 39.8 Rs. IV 15 …tu-wa-ar-na-at-ta-ru-wa-ra-**at** (16) **hu-u-ma-an-da ud**[**-d**]**a-a-ar hu-ur-ta-a-uš-ša** "May they, (namely) all the w[or]ds and curses be broken" [19] (direct speech). See also § 4.3.

All the rest do not contain proleptic pronouns:

V(part+copula)-S.

(CTH 404.2.A) KBo 39.8 Vs. I 46 …KAxU-it EME-it (47) [(ku-it)] me-mi-iš-ki-it-⌜tén⌝ ⊗ ki-nu-na-wa ka-a-ša ti-iš-ša-at-wa ⊗ (48) [(nu-uš-m)]a-aš-kán **túh-uh-ša-⌜an⌝**

---

[17] Even if they (at least partly) function as postpositions.

[18] The function of instr. is here comitative ("together with"), that is, it is functionally very close to the succession of two coordinated Adv's. Cf. § 1.2.1.2.1.

[19] Very fragmentary NS II.C KUB 58.98 Rs. III 1'—2' is probably syntactically identical.

e-eš-tu *tu-ig-ga-aš a-pí-da-aš* (49) [(UD^(KAM)-*aš* EM)]E^(HI.A)… "[(that which)] you spoke with mouth and tongue ⊗—here are *tiššatwa*—⊗ let the [(tong)]ues [(of those days)], (those) of the body, be detached from [(y)]ou!"[20] (direct speech);

(CTH 404.2.A) KBo 39.8 Rs. IV 19 …*kat+ta-wa-ra-aš-ma-aš-kán* (erased) ***wa-ar-ša-an*** (20) ***e-eš-tu*** ⌈*i*⌉-*da-a-lu ud-*⌈*da*⌉-*a-ar* KAxU-*aš* EME-*aš* "let the evil words of the mouth (and) tongue be wiped off you" (direct speech).

After CHD, L—N: 22 ("them"). NS I.A KBo 2.3+ Rs. III 42—44 and fragmentary NS II.B KBo 9.106(+) Rs. III 33'—34' are identical; MS III. KUB 34.82+ KBo 24.1+ Vs. I 18' [*ka*]*t-ta-wa-ra-ták-kán* ***wa-ar-ša-an e-eš-tu*** ⊗ *ki-e-da-ni* UD-*ti ku-e* (19') [*u*]*d-da-a-ar a-ni-ya-u-en* ⊗ *nu-wa-ták-kán i-da-a-lu ud-da-a-ar kat-ta* (20') [*na*]*m-ma wa-ar-ša-an e-eš-tu* "may the words that we made on that day be wiped down from you (sg.), may the evil words be wiped down from you (sg.) again". The relative clause probably belongs to the first main clause—the structure is agrammatical;

Adv-V(noun+zero copula)-S.

(CTH 404.2.A) KBo 39.8 Vs. II 36 …SAG^(HI.A)-*aš-ma-aš tu-ig-ga-aš hu-u-ma-an-da-a-aš* (37) ***tar-pa-al-li-iš*** UDU GE₆ ⊗ KAxU-*i* EME-*an hu-u-ur-ta-uš-ša* EGIR-*an*[21] ⊗ (§, 38) *na-an-ša⟨⟨-an⟩⟩-ma-aš-k*[*á*]*n še-ir ar-ha wa-ah-nu-zi* ⊗ *nu-uš-ši-kán* (39) 2 *BE-EL* SÍSKUR *i*[*š*]-*ši-i an-da al-la-pa-ah-ha-an-zi*… "this black sheep (is) a substitute for your heads and all the parts of (your) bodies, ⊗ then tongue and curses (are in its) mouth[22]. ⊗ She waves it over them. ⊗ The two sacrificers spit into its m[o]uth" (direct speech). See also § 1.5 sub V-Adv.

In favour of this analysis one can cite a similar syntactic structure occurring in KBo 39.8 Vs. II 28—29 in the imperative: …*ka-a-ša-wa-aš-ma-aš* (28) *tar-pa-al-li-iš* ⊗ *nu-wa-aš-*⌈*ma*⌉-*aš tu-ig-ga-aš* ***tar-pa-al-li-iš*** (29) ***e-eš-tu*** ⊗ KAxU-*i* EME-*i hu-u-ur-ta-a-uš*[23] ⊗ *nu-uš-ši-kán iš-ši-*⌈*i*⌉ (30) *an-da al-la-pa-*[(*a*)]*h-ha-an-zi* ⊗ *nu ki-is-sa-an me-ma-i* ⊗ (§, 31) *i-da-a-la-u-e-eš-wa-k*[*á*]*n hu-u-ur-ta-a-uš pa-ra-a al-la-pa-ah-te-en* "Look, here is a substitute for you, may (it) be the substitute for you, (your) persons. (May) the tongue and curses (be in its, sheep's) mouth[24]. They spit into its mouth. She speaks as follows: 'spit out the evil curses!'" Mixing acc. and nom. pl. is parallelled, dat. for "tongue" was used due to the attraction to the previous word. Thus we get two regular clauses instead of one inverted, the second one being elliptic.

In all the rest the subject is a pronoun:
(CTH 374.1) KUB 31.130 (+) Vs. 2' … *na-aš-ta* KUR-⌈*ya*⌉ *iš-tar-na* (3') [… ***aš***(-*ša*ʔ)-***nu***]-***wa-an-za*** ᴰUTU-***uš*** DINGIR-***uš*** *zi-ik* "Throughout the country you, oh Sungod, are a widely worshipped god" (direct speech).

---

[20] After CHD, L—N: 24. NS I.B KUB 12.34+ Vs. I 9—10 is syntactically identical.

[21] NS I.A KBo 2.3+ Vs. I 49—50 …EME-*i* [*h*]*ur-ti-ya-aš-ša* EME-*an*… cf. HED, H: 436 "for the tongue, curses too (and) tongue" with the analysis as acc. pl.

[22] Rost's analysis is impossible semantically: there can be no substitutes for curses! HED, H: 436 "for the mouth, tongue and curses thereafter"; Goetze, ANET²: "In (its) mouth (and its) tongue is the tongue of curses".

[23] NS I.A KBo 2.3+ Vs. I 39—40 is syntactically identical.

[24] Following Goetze (ANET², 350) against Rost // MIO 1/3 (1953): 373.

Regular word order in NS (CTH 372.A) KUB 31.127+36.79+ Vs. I 17 …ᴰUTU-*i* (18) *šar-*ku** LUGAL-*u-e* DINGIRᴹᴱˢ-*na-aš-kán iš⟨-tar⟩-na zi-ik-pát* (19) **aš-nu*-an-za…*

(CTH 374.1) KUB 31.130 (+) Vs. 4' … **ha-an-da-an-za** ⊗ (5') [*da-an-ku-wa-ya-aš* KUR]⌈*-e*⌉*-aš hu-u-ma-an-da-aš* **at-ta-aš an-na-aš** *zi-ik* "(you are) (the) established (lord), you are father and mother to all the [dark count]ries" (direct speech).

Cf. with the same word order NS (CTH 372.A) KUB 31.127+36.79+ Vs. I 20 *ha-an-da-a-an-za ma-ni-ya*[*-ah*]*-ha-ya-aš iš-ha-a-aš zi-*⌈*ik*⌉ ⊗ (21) *da-an-ku-wa-ya-aš* KUR-*e*[*-aš*] *at-ta-aš an-na-aš zi-*⌈*ik*⌉;

(CTH 374.2.A) KUB 36.75 + Bo 4696 **[25]**+ Vs. I 13' ᴰUTU-*uš ku-ri-i*[(*m-ma-aš w*)]*a-an-nu-mi-aš-ša* **at-ta-aš** (14') **an-na-aš** [vacat] *zi-ik* "Oh Sungod, you are father and mother to the (oppressed), lon[(ely)] and [(b)]ereaved" (direct speech).

Syntactically identical (?) to fragmentary MS (CTH 374.1) KUB 31.135 + KBo 34.22+ Vs. 5" and (CTH 374.2.C) KUB 31.134(+?) Vs. 9'—10', analogous to NS (CTH 372.A) KUB 31.127 + ABoT 44 + KUB 36.79+ Vs. I 35—36.

See also very similar contexts from the same group of texts sub **V-S** in §1.5.2;

(CTH 147) KUB 14.1+ Rs. 44 …*ka-a*]*-ša-wa-az ki-e-da-aš* A-NA KUR.KURᵀᴵᴹ [ᴸᵁ**a-ú-ri-ya-la-aš**] (45) [**uš-**]**ki-iš-**[**g**]**a-tal-la-aš-ša** *ú-uk*… "look, I am [a warder] and guard for these countries…" **[26]** (direct speech).

The following example is too fragmentary and unclear:

(CTH 820.4) KBo 21.22 Rs. 36' ⌈ᴰUTU⌉*-wa-aš wa-at-ta-ru ú-it* ⊗ *na-at ma-a-ah-h*[*a-an i-ya-an*] (37') *kat-t*[*a*]*-ša-ra-at-kán* NA₄-*ta ú-e-da-an* ⊗ **iš-ki-y**[**a-an** …] *lu-li-*⌈*it*⌉⌈?⌉ "The Sundeity's spring/fountain came. ⊗ And ho[w is it made]? ⊗ It is built with stones from base to the top, ⊗ it is cove[red …] with *l*." (words/spells of different magical substances = direct speech). It can be analysed both as V-[…]-Adv or as V[-Adv ⊗ V-]Adv.

1.2.1.1.4. The use of proleptic pronouns with the right dislocation is very common in the bilinguals (see the Bilingual section (§ 2) where these passages are treated in more detail and in different order):

Adv-V-S.
bis (CTH 788.1.A) KBo 19.145 Rs. III 30' [(*k*)]*u-e-e*[(*z-za-***at***-ká*)]*n* ⌈*ú*⌉⌈?⌉[(*-e-er*)] **a-a-an-te-e**[**š** **NA₄**ᴴᴵ·ᴬ] ⊗ (31') [(*k*)]*u-*⌈*e*⌉[(*-ez-za-a*)]*t-*[(*kán* HUR.SAG)*-az* …] *kat-ta ma-*⌈*uš-še-ir*⌉ (32') [(**a-a-an-te-eš** **NA₄**ᴴᴵ·ᴬ **[27]** ⊗ *a*)*-a-a*]*n-te-eš-*⌈*kán*⌉ NA₄⌉[ᴴᴵ·]ᴬ (33') [(ᵁᴿᵁ*Ni-i-nu-wa-az* HUR.SAG) … *š*]*a*⌉?*-zi-ya-*[… *-a*]*z*⌉?*-x* (34') [(*pa-ra-a ú-e-er* x) …]x-*ša-aš-ká*[*n* …]*-ta*-x (35') [(*i-wa-ar*) …] A-NA [(ᴰIŠTAR) *me-n*]*a-ah-ha-an-da ú-e-er* "[(From w)]hat ⟨place⟩ did [(they,)] (namely) the ho[(t stones,)] c[(ome)]? [From (w)]hat [(mountain did the)y,] (namely) [(the hot stones)] fall down?"

[25] Transliterated in Otten—Rüster // ZA 62 (1972): 232 f.

[26] Noted by Sommer—Falkenstein, HAB: 31, 154 with more NS examples of putting (mostly) pronouns into the post-final position for emphasis.

[27] The NS duplicate KUB 34.101 3'—5' is identical. Practically no Hurrian text is preserved.

"[The (h)o]t stone[s (came forth from Nineve, from the mountain) …] x x x [… (like) …]. They came to [(Šawuška.)]" (direct speech);

(CTH 789) KBo 32.14 Vs. II 55 …*wa-al-ah-du-ya-an* (56) ᴰIM-*aš* **te-eš-šum-mi-in**… "may the Stormgod strike it, (namely) the goblet". In Hurr. text: V(with the transitivity suffix)-O-S. Neu (StBoT 32: 157) supposes that the Hitt. enclitic pronoun conveys the transitivity suffix;

(CTH 789) KBo 32.14 Rs. III 46 …*wa-al-ah-du-ya-***an** ᴰIM-*aš* **AN.ZA.GÀR**… "May the Stormgod strike it, (namely) the tower". In Hurr. text: V(with the transitivity suffix)-O-S;

(CTH 789) KBo 32.15 Vs. II 18' *na-***an**-*kán hu-⌈iš⌉-nu-mi-ni* **ᴰIM-an**… "we want to save him, the Storm-god…".

I follow Neu's interpretation (StBoT 32: 323—324): Hitt. initial complex of enclitics corresponds to Hurr. enclitic pronoun. For more details see below, §2.1.1.3.

(CTH 789) KBo 32.15 Rs. III 15 *ú-ga-***an** *pí-⌈e⌉[-hu-t]e-mi* **pa-ri-iš-ša-a-an** "I will g[iv]e it, namely *a group of captives*";

There is no Hurr. correspondence for *parišš an*. Neu (StBoT 32: 362) supposes that *parišš an* may have been used by the Hitt. translator to ensure the referential unequivocality for the pronoun. The reading and translation follow Neu.

(CTH 789) KBo 32.19 Vs. II 2 *ar-ha-ma-***an** *tar-n*[*a* **Pur-ra-an-pá**]*t*? **EGIR-*pa* pí-ya-⌈an⌉**[(-*t*)*a-an*…**]** "releas[e] him, (namely) capt[(i)ve Purra]". Hurr. enclitic pronoun is missing. Similarly ibid 27'—28';

tris (CTH 725.J) KUB 48.2 5' [(*ma-a-na-*)]***at** *ta-pa-ri*[(-*ya-u-e-ni-ma*)] (6') [(*la-ba-*)]*ar-na-aš* LU[(GAL-*wa-aš* **É-ir**)] ⊗ (7') [(*i-ya-u-e-n*)]*i-ma-***aš** HU[(**R.SAG**ᴹᴱˢ ⊗ *na-***aš**-*ši*)] (8') [(*pí-ú-e-ni* SIG₅-*an-d*)]*u-u*[(*š* **NA₄**ᴴᴵ·ᴬ)] "[(when)] they! dete[(rmin-ed!)] it (namely,) [(the house of Lab)]arna, the ki[(ng, (they spoke thus:) "we will mak)]e them, (namely) moun[(tains, we will give them, (namely) favour)]a[(ble stones to him")]"[28];

I do not include the following example: (CTH 789) KBo 32.15 Vs. II 19' …*Ú-UL-ma-an* (20') *i-ya-u-e-ni pa-ra-a* ⌈*tar*⌉-*nu-mar*… "we will not release him". Hurr. word-order is identical (including the enclitic pronoun *-na*). I follow Neu's understanding (StBoT 32: 324—326) because of the general context. For the translation "we do not do it, (namely) liberation" assuming a mistake of -*an* for -*at* see Neu // Orientalia 59/2 (1990): 227; StBoT 32: 290—291; Wilhelm // AoF 24/2 (1997): 277; de Martino // Hethitica 14 (1999): 16—17 with further lit.

It makes sense to inspect the correspondence between the translation and the original. Among Hurrian translations, KBo 32.15 Vs. II 18' is not relevant for Hittite syntax as it translates the Hurrian original word by word. KBo 32.15 Rs. III 15 seems irrelevant either as it is a transformation during the translation to clarify the Hurrian version. However, the position of the object is meaningful as it follows the H i t t i t e model of the use of proleptic pronouns. Only in KBo 32.14 Vs. II 55—56 and KBo 32.14 Rs. III 46 the word order

---

[28] Following Schuster, HHB: 67, 85 (on Hattiac influence in the use of proleptic pronouns).

and the enclitic pronoun correspond directly to the Hurr. transitivity marker. KBo 32.19 Vs. II 2 does not correspond exactly.

In KBo 32.15 Vs. II 18' and KBo 32.15 Vs. II 19'—20' the proleptic pronoun translates the Hurr. pronoun. KBo 32.14 Vs. II 55—56 and KBo 32.14 Rs. III 46 provide so complete parallels for the Hurr. original that it would make sense to suppose that the enclitic pronouns really translate the Hurrian transitivity marker, but it is odd that all of these cases follow the H i t t i t e model of the use of enclitic pronouns.

The following example is particularly interesting as the NS Ex. A contains a proleptic pronoun in KUB 2.2+ Rs. III 21 *da-a-aš-˹ma˺-aš-za*. The MS text is considered not to have had the pronoun, see Schuster, HHB: 113, 116: MS (CTH 725.C) KUB 48.3 2' [(*d*)]*a-a-aš-ma*ˁ-*za* TÚ[(Gᴴᴵᴬ ᴷᵁˢNÍG.BARᴴᴵᴬ ᴷᵁˢE .SIRᴴᴵᴬ-*ya*)] "he (the god Zilipuri) took (off) clo[(thes, skins and shoes)]…". All the rest of proleptic pronouns from (CTH 725.J) KUB 48.2 are supposed to display Hattic influence.

The following is quite likely to be just another example of Alp's error in transliteration. Unfortunately, I cannot prove it as HKM is not available: (CTH 199) HBM No 18 l. Rd. 2 **ha-al-ki-iš**-*ma*-**aš** *a-pí-ya a-ni-ya-an-za* (3) *ku-it* ⊗ *nu* EGIR-*an ti-ya-at-tin* "As it (-*aš*), (namely) the grain is sown there, take care (of it)!".

1.2.1.2.1. Five following cases are also amplificatory inversions. They are treated apart as two constituents at the same time are moved into the post-final position [29]:

S-V-O-Adv.

(CTH 591.I.a.A) KBo 17.88 + Rs. III 24' …*a-aš-šu-ša-***aš** *ha-lu-ga-aš* (25') *ú-e-mi-iš-ki-id-du ma-ya-an-ta-an* ᴰUTU-*šum-mi-in* (26') ᶠ***ta-wa-na-an-na-an*** AN.BAR-*aš* ᴳᴵˢDAG-*ti*… "may the good news find them (-*aš*), (namely) our vigorous 'Sungod' (i.e. the king) and *tawananna* on the dais of iron" (direct speech) = KBo 20.67+ IV 24—25, 10—11 and 16—17 (both broken), probably also KBo 17.88+24.116+ Rs. III 10'—12' (the enclitic pronoun is in the lacuna).

The translation is after Klinger, StBoT 37, 321, 330—331, 346; Garrett // JCS 42/2 (1990): 239, contra CHD, L—N: 117.

Identical word-order in NS I.a.B KBo 22.201 Vs. III 11'—12'- Rs. IV 1—3 (fragmentary); Rs. IV 13—14 (fragmentary); I.a.C KBo 11.13 Rs.ˈ 2'—4' (fragmentary); I.a.D KBo 10.39 12'—14' (fragmentary); I.b.A VAT 7481 Rs. IV 13—17; I.b.C KBo 34.147 Rs. (III) 4'—5' (fragmentary); I.b.G IBoT 4.51+ Vs. II 1—2 (fragmentary); I.a.E KUB 57.27 2'—5' (without the pronoun).

O(indir)-O-V-Adv-O?.

(CTH 591.I.a.A) KBo 17.88+ Rs. III 8' …[(*m*)]*a-˹ya˺-an-ti-ma* ᴰUTU-*š[um-mi* ᶠ*ta-wa-na-an(-na-i)*] (9') [(*ša-ku-aš* M)]Uᴴᴵᴬ-*uš* **up-p**[**i-i**]**š-k**[**án-d**]**u** (§ [30], 10') [9-*an*] *LI-IM* 9-*an d*[*a-a*]*n* 9-*an* GAŠANᵀᴵ MUᴴᴵᴬ-*uš*… "let them bri[n]g [(y)]ears to o[ur

---

[29] O$_1$-V-Adv-O$_2$ (CTH 404.2.A) KBo 39.8 Rs. III 12—13 and S-V-Adv-Adv (CTH 443.1) KBo 15.10+ Vs. I 33—34 do not refer here for the reasons indicated in fn. 16 and 18.

[30] For the wrong placement of the Paragraphenstrich see § 4.3.

(v)]igorous Sungod [(and) Tawanan(na for the eyes?) 9 times] 1000, t[wic]e 9 times, 9 times …? years"[31] (direct speech).

Syntactically identical to NS I.a.D KBo 10.39 8'—12', NS I.b.A VAT 7481 Rs. IV 9—12 is analogous.

The MS example is interesting by the fact that the direct object "years" seems to be repeated twice—once in its proper place and then in the post-final position[32]; this is not retained (deleted as tautological by the scribe?) in a similar context in Rs. IV 22 KUR-*an-ta-aš* DINGIR^{MEŠ}-*aš* ^{D}UTU[-*šum-mi* ⌜*ta-w*]*a-na-an-n*[(*a-i š*)]*a-*⌜*ku*⌝-*aš* MU$^{HI.A}$-*uš* (23) ***up-pí-iš-kán-du*** 9-*a*[*n LI-IM*] 9[-*a*]*n da-an* ⌜9⌝[-*an*] GAŠAN^{TI};

According to A. Kassian, pers. comm., (CTH 591.I.a.A) KBo 17.88+ Rs. III 8'—10' is to be interpreted as two clauses, the second one (in l. 10') being elliptic. However, I do not know any MS benedictory contexts which use two clauses with the same Object and Verb, the second one introducing a new Adv.

V-S-Adv.

(CTH 404.2.A) KBo 39.8 Rs. III 34 … ***tu-wa-ar-na-at-ta-ru-w****a-ra-at* (35) ^{DUG}*hu-pu-wa-ya* KAxU-*it* EME-*it*… "let it, (namely) *hupuwa*-vessel, be broken with mouth and tongue" (direct speech), see also § 4.3;

NS II.B KBo 9.106(+) Vs. II 49—50 and I.A KBo 2.3+ Vs. II 42'—43' are syntactically identical.

O-V-Adv$_1$-Adv$_2$.

(CTH 151) VBoT 1 Vs. 28 *nu-ut-ta ka-a-aš-ma pí-ip-pí-eš-šar* ***up-pa-hu-un*** ⌜*aš*⌝-*šu-l*[*i*] (29) *ki-iš-ša-ri-iš-ši* ^{m}*Ir-ša-ap-pa* ^{LÚ}*ha-lu-g*[*a-tal-la-aš-ma-aš*][33] "Look, I have sent you in the hand of my me[ssenger] Iršappa a shipment in good wil[l]: …"[34] (followed by a list of gifts in 30—38) (letter), see also § 4.3.

Contra Luraghi, OH Sentence: 29 (but cf. ibid.: 96), I do not refer to this section all movement of non-amplificatory (in her understanding) nominal constituents into the post-final position.

All the texts have one common feature: they contain numerous deviations from the standard MH language which may be interpreted as another language influence. This is particularly true for KBo 39.8 and VBoT 1 (for details see § 4.3). KBo 17.88 + (at least the direct speech) is a translation from Hattic (see Klinger, StBoT 37, 253—4.).

The only text not demonstrating o b v i o u s other-language influence is:

V-O-S.

(CTH 820.4) KBo 21.22 Rs. 36' ⌜^{D}UTU⌝-*wa-aš wa-at-ta-ru ú-it* ⊗ *na-at ma-a-ah-h*[*a-an i-ya-an*] (37') *kat-t*[*a*]-*ša-ra-at-kán* NA$_4$-*ta ú-e-da-an* ⊗ *iš-ki-y*[*a-an* …] *lu-li-*⌜*it*⌝ ⊗ (38') *na-at pár-ša-ni-eš pa-a-ah-ša-an-ta* ⊗ *wa-a-tar-še-da-kan* x[…] (39') [*l*]*u-*

---

[31] Following Klinger, StBoT 37, 319, 344—6.

[32] The only parallel is (CTH 789) KBo 32.15 Rs. III 19—20 (see § 2.1.1.2).

[33] This is the only example which does not show the expected proleptic pronoun.

[34] After CHD, P, 271—272. Cf. Rost // MIO 4/3 (1956): 336. Starke's analysis (ZA 71/2 (1981)) differs markedly.

ú-li-az ar-aš-zi ⊗ *na-**an** pa-ah-ha-aš-nu-an-du* **la-b**[**a-ar-n**]**a-an** (40') [**LU**]**GAL-un** *pa-aš-ši-li-eš* ⊗ *na-aš* ᴰUTU-*wa⟨-aš⟩* AN.BAR *ki-ša-r*[*u*ˀ] "The Sundeity's spring/ fountain came. ⊗ And ho[w is it made]? ⊗ It is built with stones from base to the top, ⊗ it is covered […] with *l.,* ⊗ and leopards are guarding it; ⊗ its water flows out of a [b]asin of […]. ⊗ May the pebbles protect him, the Lab[arn]a, [the ki]ng. ⊗ May he becom[e] iron ⟨of⟩ the Sundeity" (words/spells of different magical substances = direct speech[35]).

1.2.1.2.2. Moreover, the right dislocation of two constituents is parallelled by the bilingual data (for details see § 2.1.2.1 and § 2.2.2):

(CTH 789) KBo 32.14 Vs. II 13 …*pí-eš-ši-an-*ˈ*du*ˈ*-ya-**an** (14) **a-li-ya-na-an** ᴸᵁ·ᴹᴱˢ*ŠA-A-I-DU-TIM*… "May the hunters fell it, (namely) the deer".

(CTH 789) KBo 32.13 Vs. II 13 *nu ša-ni-iz-zi-in* EZEN₄-*an i-e-et* (14) **ták-na-a-aš ha-at-tal-wa-aš ták-na-a-aš** ᴰ**UTU-uš** "the Sungoddess of the Earth celebrated a pleasant festival on the bolts of the earth".

(CTH 789) KBo 32.216+ Rs. III 9' [⁽ᵐ⁾*Me-*]ˈ*e*ˈ *ⁱ̈ˈ-ya-wa-ra-**at** [vacat] (10') [ᵁᴿᵁ]ˈ*E*ˈ*-eb*[*-l*]*a* ᴳᴵˢŠÚ.A-*aš* URU-*r*[*i*] (11') [(**pa-r**)]**a-a tar-nu-mar** … "[Me]kki, make it, (namely) [l]iberation in Eb[l]a, the cit[y] of throne";

(CTH 789) KBo 32.19 Vs. II 20 *ma-a-an Ú-UL-m*[*a i-ya-*]ˈ*at*ˈ*-t*[*e-ni*] (21) **pa-ra-a tar-nu-mar** ᵁᴿ[ᵁ*E-eb-*]ˈ*la*ˈ*-i* ᴳᴵˢŠÚ.A-*aš* URU-*ri* "if you do not [m]ak[e] liberation in [Eb]la, the city of throne".

(CTH 725.J) KUB 48.2 2' [(*da-a-ir-m*)]*a-**at** ᵁᴿᵁ*Ha-a*[(*t-tu-ši*)] (3') [(*šal-li* ᴳ)]ᴵˢŠÚ. .A ⊗ *da-a-ir-m*[(*a-at*)] "[(b)]ut in Ha[(ttuša)] they (the gods) [(placed)] it, (namely) [(the great)] throne. They placed [(it…)]".

1.2.1.2.3. I consider the movement of two constituents into the post final position to be a direct borrowing of a syntactic type from Hurrian and Hattic as (1) in the overwhelming number of MS inversions only one constituent is normally moved; (2) the MS Hittite texts that have two constituent movement show another language influence[36] (see § 4.3) with the probable exception of (CTH 820.4) KBo 21.22 Rs. 39'—40'; (CTH 820.4) KBo 21.22 Rs. 39'—40' presumably demonstrates a very sporadic extention of the type onto regular contexts; (3) the movement of two constituents is attested in the texts which are translations (moreover, bilinguals) from Hattic and Hurrian.

1.2.1.3. As far as proleptic pronouns are concerned[37], I think (following Melchert's argumentation in his e-mail of 01.06.2002) that proleptic pronouns were part of the Hittite amplificatory construction[38]. Hurrian and Hattic influ-

---

[35] See Klinger, StBoT 37: 735 w. Anm. 34 on the special character of the text.

[36] The only McCone's example of both subject and object postposition also comes from the Song of Ullikummi!

[37] The explanation as well as the analysis of some concrete examples is to be preferred to that of Kassian et al., Hittite Funerary Ritual (2002): 620—621.

[38] Contra Neu who (StBoT 32: 157, 398) thinks that "proleptic" pronouns translate the Hurr. transitivity suffix. But his hypothesis cannot be proved, as in the majority of

ence s t i m u l a t e d the use of this right dislocation (native Hittite) construction[39] and thus also i n d i r e c t l y the use of proleptic pronouns.

1.2.2. Negation inversions are a subclass of the second type. I want to stress that, as different from the common indefinite pronoun type (see below, §1.3), there are no s y n t a c t i c restrictions on the position of negation (see CHD, L—N, s. v. *lē* and *natta*):

S-V-Neg.
(CTH 404.2.A) KBo 39.8 Rs. III 2 …*ka-a-aš-wa* [(IM-*aš*)] (3) ⟨⟨*ma-a-ah-ha-an*⟩⟩ *ma-a-ah-ha-an wa-ap-pu-*[(*i*)] EGIR-*pa Ú-UL* [(*pa-iz-zi*)] ⊗ (4) *kap-pa-ni-ya-wa* **har-ki-i-e-eš-zi** *Ú-UL* [40] ⊗ *nu-wa-ra-at-z*[(*a*)] (5) *da-ma-i* NUMUN-*an* ⌜*Ú*⌝-*UL ki-ša-ri* ⊗ *iš-na-aš-ma-wa-kán* (6) *ka-a-aš* DINGIR^MEŠ-*aš* ^NINDA⌜*har*⌝-*ši Ú-UL pa-iz-zi*… "Just as this clay does not return to the bank, and the (black) cumin does not become white and cannot be used for seed a second time; (as) this dough does not get into a sacrificial loaf for the gods…" (direct speech);

bis (CTH 448.1.4T.A) KBo 21.6 Vs. 10 *ki-e da-šu-wa-an-te-eš* ⊗ *ki-e-ma du-ud-du-m*[*i-ya-an-te-eš* ⊗ *ki-e-ma* **ú-wa-an-zi**] (11) *Ú-UL* ⊗ *ki-e-ma* **iš-ta-ma-aš-ša-an-zi** *Ú-U*[*L*… "these are blind, these are de[af, these] shall/do not [see], these shall/do no[t] hear" (direct speech?; the context is fragmentary, it follows definite direct speech and precedes indirect one; a similar context is KUB 12.62+[41] Rs. 7—9 in the imperative with the identical type of inversion (thus Hutter, Bexehung); on these grounds I tend to consider this context to be direct speech too);

O-V-Neg.
(CTH 147) KUB 14.1+ Rs. 22 …[KUR] ^URU*Ha-pa-a-al-la-wa-kán na-aš-*⌜*šu*⌝ *ku-e-mi na-aš-ma-wa-ra-at QA-DU* NAM.RA^HI.A GU₄^HI.A UDU^HI.A *ar-nu-mi* [*na-at A-NA*] ^D⌜UTU⌝^ŠI (23) *pa-ra-a pí-ih-hi* ⊗ *nam-ma-ma-kán* KUR ^URU*Ha-pa-a-al-la* **ku-**⌜**en**⌝**-ta-ya** *Ú-UL* ⊗ **e-ip-ta**-*ya-at Ú-UL* ⊗ *na-at A-NA* ^DUTU^ŠI *pa-ra-a Ú-*[*UL pa-it-ta?*] ⊗ (24) *na-at-za* ^I*Ma-ad-du-wa-at-ta-aš da-a-aš* "'I will either smite the country Hapalla or I will remove it together with deportees, cattle (and) sheep, and will give [it to] My Majesty'. But furthermore you/he neither smote the country Hapalla, nor[42] seized it and you/he d[id not give] it to My Majesty. Madduwattas took it for himself" (address in the narration?)[43]; semantically

cases the Hurrian transitivity marker is not reflected in the Hittite translation at all. Another Neu's idea (ibid.: 157), according to which the "proleptic" pronoun was used in the cases when the object was "far", is also refuted by the greater material—see the examples.

[39] For this hypothesis see the Analysis section.

[40] I.B KUB 15.39+12.59+ Vs. II 16 (-*ma*), II.B KBo 9.106(+) Vs. II 16 (frgm), I.A KBo 2.3+ Vs. II 12 (frgm) (all—NS) are syntactically identical; KBo 2.3+ Vs. II 12 employs *Ú-UL-*[*pá*]*t*^?? (not noted in Rost // MIO 1/3 (1953): 358) to reinforce emphasis.

[41] It is interpreted as a categorical negative in CHD, L—N: 57.

[42] Following Melchert, e-mail of 01.06.2002.

[43] Described as an emphatic inversion of negation in HEb.², I: 146.

contrasted to the previous situation; inversion is used to organize coordinate verb-forms.

The verbs c a n be understood as 2 sg. pret. (following Goetze, Madd.: 25, 134). The only reason for this is *zikkes* in line 21, followed by *zikkit* in line 22, if we think that the author of the text wanted to keep the same sequence of persons in the verb—first direct address 2 sg., then narration 3 sg. However, even this sequence is not the rule in the analyzed text. Goetze's categoric acceptance of 2 sg. (Goetze, Madd.: 134) cannot be upheld—see Garrett // JCS 42/2 (1990) specially for the use of enclitic pronouns with verbs.

Adv?-V-Neg.

fragmentary (CTH 765.2) KBo 12.89 [44] Vs. II 2 EGIR?-]*ŠU-ma **i-ya-an-ni-iz-zi** *Ú-UL* [45] "the]n? he/she does not go" (ritual description?).

1.2.2.1. The following cases are considered as the movement of Neg, not of V because of HBM No 68 Vs. 5—6 (see below, § 1.3):

V-Neg.

bis (CTH 147) KUB 14.1+ Vs. 35 […*nu-wa-ra-an*] **ša-an-na-at-ti**-*ya li-⌈e⌉* ⊗ **mu**[*-un-na-*]**a?-ši?**-*y*[*a*]*-wa-ra-an li-e*… "…neither conceal [him] nor [46] h[id]e him" (direct speech); in a very long (ll. 28—41) series of predominantly 2 sg. imperatives (both positive and negative) with direct word order;

The translation follows CHD, L—N: 330. The supposition about the emphatic inversion of the negation goes back to Goetze, Madd.: 114, followed by HEb.², I: 146.

This double example falsifies Hoffner's hypothesis that the inversion of *le* takes place only when the verb opens the clause followed by enclitic -*ma* "but" (Hoffner // JCS 29/3 (1977): 151—152). But cf. MS (CTH 404.2.A) KBo 39.8 Rs. III 4 -*ya* "and" in the inverted clause vs. -*ma* "but" in NS I.B KUB 15.39+12.59+ Vs. II 16.

(CTH 147) KUB 14.1+ Rs. 23 …**e-ip-ta**-*ya-at Ú-UL*… "…nor took it (address? in narration), see above for the full context;

(CTH 270) KBo 16.50 Vs. 12 *nu A-NA* ᴸᵁ*BE-EL ⟨MA-AT⟩-KAL-AT-TI me-mi-ya-an* (13) *hu-u-da-a-ak ú-du-um-me-ni* ⊗ (§, 14) **a-ap-pa-la-a-u-e-ni**-*ma-an Ú-UL* "(if …), we will immediately bring a word to the District Governor. But we will not deceive him" (direct speech);

? (CTH 738) KBo 32.114 15' *iš-ha-mi-iš-kán-zi-m*[*a?*] ⌈*Ú?*⌉[*-UL?* "but they do not sing", too fragmentary;

(CTH 138.1) KUB 13.27 + 23.77 + Vs. 26' … *šu-me-ša-aš a-uš-te-ni* ⊗ (27') *nu-uš-ma-aš* NINDA-*an pí-iš-t*[*e-ni?* ⊗ …]x-*te-ni* ⊗ **za-ah-hi-ya-at-te-ni**-*ma-aš Ú-UL* ⊗ *na-aš-ša-an* KASKAL-*an* (28') *im-ma ti-it-t*[*a-nu-ut-te-ni* ⊗ *nu* …]x *wa-la-ah-te-en*… "(if…), you shall watch them ⊗ you shall gi[ve] bread to them, ⊗ you shall […], ⊗ but you shall not fight with them ⊗ you shall p[ut] them on their way, you shall strike […]" (direct speech);

---

[44] MS dating follows Klinger, StBoT 37: 34 Anm. 11, contra Starke, StBoT 30: 242, 426; StBoT 31: 254.

[45] The lacuna that follows can contain one sign if nothing was written on the Rand.

[46] Following Melchert, e-mail of 01.06.2002.

(CTH 138.1) KUB 23.77+ Rs. 63' [*n*]*a-an-ša-an* ᵁᴿᵁ*Ha-at-tu-ša-aš* KASKAL-*ši ti-it-ta-nu-ut-te-en* ⊗ **e-ip-ši**-*ma-an* [*li-e* **⁴⁷** ⊗ *na-a*]*n*? EGIR-*pa* I-NA KUR ᵁᴿᵁ*Qa-aš-ga* (64') [*na-*]*it-*⌈*ti*⌉ ⊗ *na-aš-ma-an-za* I-NA KUR ᵁᴿᵁ*Ha-at-ti ha-ap-pi-ra-a* [-*ši*] "(if…), set (2 pl.) him on the way to Hattuša, but [do not] seize (2 sg.) him and send (2 sg.) him back to Qašqa or sell him into Hatti" (direct speech);

(CTH 146) KUB 23.72+ Rs. 23 …*ku-i-ta-aš-ma-aš ut-tar ha-*[*at-ra-a-iz-zi* ⊗ *nu a-pa-a-at*] (24) ⌈*ut*⌉-*tar* A-NA ᴰUTUˢᴵ *ta-a-wa-na ha-at-ra-a-an-zi* ⊗ **wa-ah-nu-wa-an-zi**-*ma-at-kán* Ú-UL… "what word/thing [he] wr[ites] to them, they shall report that word/thing truthfully to My Majesty, but they shall not distort it" (direct speech);

(CTH 251.A) KBo 16.24 (+) 25 Vs. I 25' …*ku-i-ša-an mu-un-na-i*[*z-zi* ⊗ **te-ik-ku-ša-**]**nu-uz-zi**-*ma-an* **⁴⁸** Ú-UL ⊗ (26') *nu a-p*[*u-u-un* NI-I]Š DINGIRᴹᴱˢ (27') [*ap-p*]*a*[-*an-d*]*u* ⊗ *na-an* QA-DU DAM-ŠU DUMUᴹᴱˢ-ŠU [*har-ni-in-kán-d*]*u* "let the [oa]th-deities [se]i[z]e (and) [destro]y with his wife (and) his children the person who hid[es] him ⊗ and does not [ex]pose him" (putting under the oath = direct speech);

(CTH 199) HBM No 17 lk.Rd. 2 …] (3) EGIR-*an ti-ya* ⊗ *nu-uš-*[*š*]*i-š*[*a-an* … *pa*?-*r*]*a*?-*a*? U[*L*?] *a*[*p*?-*pí*?-]*i*[*š-ká*]*n-zi* ⊗ (4) *nu-mu ha-at-ra-i* ⊗ **da-at-tén**-*ma-aš-ši-kán li-e* ⊗ *ku-it-ma-an ku-it-k*[*i* ?*ha-at-ra-a-mi*] ⊗ (5) *nu-ut-ta ma-ah-ha-an ha-at-ra-a-mi na-at* QA-TAM-MA (6) *pí-pa-at-ti* "[…] stay/step behind. They will not s[ei]ze […] from him. Write to me. Do not take from him (anything) befo[re I write] somethi[ng.] When I write to you, knock (?) it down (?) likewise" (letter) **⁴⁹**;

(CTH 694) KBo 29.120 Rs. IV 4 … ᴸᵁ·ᴹᴱˢNAR] (5) SÌRᴿᵁ ⊗ **pal-wa-a-an-zi**-*ma* Ú-UL [vacat] "[… singers] sing, but they do not shout?/declaim?" (ritual description);

(CTH 694) KBo 29.113 9' **pa**]**l-wa-a-an-zi**-⌈**ma**⌉ Ú-UL (ritual description).

This and the previous passages are presumably in different contexts and thus are counted independently.

(CTH 268) KUB 23.82+ KUB 21.47(+) Vs!. 23' *ma-a-an-mu i-da-la-u-wa-an-ni-ya ku-iš wa-ag-ga-ri-y*[*a-wa-a*]*n-zi ša-an-ha-zi* ⊗ *šu-ma*!-*a-ša* (24') [*h*]*a-at-ra-a-mi* ⊗ *nu-mu-uš-ša-an ma-a-an wa-ar-ri lam-n*[*i-i* **⁵⁰**] Ú-UL *e-ir-te-ni* ⊗ *na-aš-ma-at šu-me-eš-ma* (25') [*i*]*š-ta-ma-aš-ta-ni* ⊗ *na-at ma-a-an* A-NA ᴰUTUˢᴵ *hu-*[*-da-*]*a-ak* Ú-UL *me-ma-at-te-ni* ⊗ (26') *a-pa-a-**aš-ša-aš-ma-aš* *ma-a-an* Ú-UL ᴸᵁKÚR ⊗ *na-an* **la-ah**[-**hi-y**]**a-at-te-ni** Ú-UL ⊗ (27') [*n*]*u-uš-ma-ša-at* ⌈ŠA-PAL NI-IŠ⌉ DINGIRᴸᴵᴹ *ki-it-t*[*a-ru*… "If someone with evil intent seeks to stir up a rebe[lli]on against me, and I write to you and if you do not instantly come to my aid; or (if) you hear about this, if you do not tell it to My Majesty ri[gh]t away; and if he is not an enemy for you, and you do not make war upon him, that shall be pu[t] under oath" (putting under the oath = direct speech).

---

⁴⁷ The restoration is certain because of the context.

⁴⁸ The restoration follows CHD, L—N: 330.

⁴⁹ Following Alp, HBM: 147.

⁵⁰ Following CHD, L—N: 36.

The inversion of the negation also occurs in fragmentary MS (CTH 692) KBo 41.105+ KBo 29.114+ Rs. III 20' -a]n-zi-ma [51] Ú-UL (repeated in the identical context in 26'). The damaged context, however, does not allow to make any more detailed observations.

1.2.2.2. The following examples seem to contradict the rule according to which only one constituent can move into the emphatic position. But actually the negative particle and the indefinite pronoun constitute one semantic whole—a negative pronoun [52]. That is why from the point of view of inversions they behave as one syntactic unit:

S-V-[Neg-Adv(indef. pronoun)].

(CTH 199) HBM No 3 o.Rd 23 …*na-aš-ta* ŠEŠ.DÙG.GA-*YA* (lk.Rd. 1) **la-ah-la-ah-hi-iš-ki-zi** [*li-e ku-wa-at-qa*] "let my dear brother [not] worry [at all]" (letter).

Following Alp, HBM: 125. 2 sg. pres. (which is also expected in the context in question because of ibid. 3 *ha-at-ra-a-i*) and usual word-order are attested in all the rest of the contexts: No 2 lk. Rd. 3 *na-aš-ta* ŠEŠ.DÙG.GA⟨⟨.HI⟩⟩-*YA* (4) [*l*]*i-e ku-wa-at-qa* (5) *la-ah-la-ah-hi-i*[*š-k*]*i-ši* "do not worry at all, my dear brother!", similarly in No 37 Rs. 6' —7' (without the vocative), (?) No 48 Rs. 31—32 (fragmentary), No 66 Vs. 6—7, lk. Rd. 4—5 (both without the vocative).

V-Neg-[S(indef pronoun)].

fragmentary (CTH 251.A) KBo 16.24(+) 25 Vs. I 18' [*nu*] *hu-u-ma-an-za nu-un-tar-ri-e-i*[*d-du* ⊗ … *n*]*i*?*-ni-ik-du-ma-at* [53] ⊗ (19') **ku-ud-da-ni-e-iz-zi**-*ma li-˹e˺* [*ku-iš-ki* ⊗ *na-an*? *a*]*r-ha li-e ku-iš-ki* (20') *tar-na-i* ⊗ *nu-za ma-aš-ka-an da-a-˹i˺* […] "(when…), let everyone make has[te. ⊗ …] Get moving (pl.)! ⊗ But let no [one] use strongarm tactics, (nor) anyone grant discharge [for him?] (and) accept a bribe" [54] (putting under the oath = direct speech);

(CTH 780.4.I) KBo 23.23+ Vs. 58' [(*na-at-kán dam-p*)]*u-u-pí an-du-uh-ši še-ek-nu-iš-ši i*[(*š-hu-u-wa*)]*-a-i* ⊗ **a-uš-zi**-*ma-at* Ú-[(*UL ku-iš-ki*)] [55] "then she t[(hro)]ws [(it)] (bread) to [(a barba)]ric person into his mantle (i.e. into a barbaric person's mantle) [56], but [(nobody)] shall see it" (description);

O[-…?]-Adv?-V-Neg-S(indef pronoun).

(CTH 412) KBo 41.110 + Vs. II 2 *na-at-ši* Ú-UL *ku-it-ki pí-ih-hi* ⊗ *ta-pa am-mu-uk-k*[*a₄* (3) *ku-it-ki* **ka-ra-a-pí** (§ [57], 4) Ú-UL *ku-iš-ki* … "I do not give it to him anyhow, nobody anyhow devours m[e…]" (direct speech?);

---

[51] The autographies are not entirely clear at this point. A collation is necessary.

[52] Thus already HEb.[2], I: 146: "⟨…⟩ können einzelne betonte Wörter die Negation an sich ziehen".

[53] Following CHD, L—N: 440; cf. Rizzi Mellini // FsMeriggi[2].

[54] The translation follows HED, K, 314.

[55] Identical to NS text 3 KBo 12.85+ Vs. I 36' (ed.: Haas—Thiel, Allait.).

[56] The translation follows Rieken, StBoT 44: 199—200. Cf. Haas—Thiel, Allait.: 210.

[57] Paragraphenstrich is in the wrong place (it should have been placed after Ú-UL *ku-iš-ki*) according to Groddek // AoF 28/1 (2001): Anm. 12 (Nr. 102). See also § 4.3.

V-Neg-O(indef pronoun).

fragmentary (CTH 780.4.I) KBo 23.23+ Vs. 63' *…nu* É-*ir* É.ŠÀ^HI.A É*hi-la-an hu-ma-an šu-up-pí-ah-hi* ⊗ **me-ma-**[(*i-ma Ú-UL ku-it-ki*)][58] "she cleanses the house, the inner chambers, the yard, everything, [(but)] she [(does not)] sa[(y anything)]" (description);

bis (CTH 489.A) KBo 17.65+ Vs. 40 [… *ku-it*?-(*ma-an-n*)]*a-kán kar-ap-ta-ri* ⊗ *na-aš-ta* **ha-at-ta-an-zi za-ah-ha-an-zi**-*ya* (41) [(*Ú-UL ku-in-k*)*i* ⊗ *n*]*u* **wa-aš-du-la-an-zi**-*ya Ú-UL ku-in-ki* ⊗ *ma-an-kán k*[(*ar-*)]*tim-mi-ya-ah-hi* (42) [*ku-in-ki*?[59] …] EGIR-*pa* ⟨*pa-iz-zi*⟩[60]… "[W(hil)]e? … is being brought to an end, then they [(do not)] strike or battle [(anyon)e], [n]or do they sin against anyone. Were someone to a[(n)]ger [someone?…] ⟨he would go?⟩ back…" (ritual description). Fragmentary NS KUB 44.59 (489.B) Rs. 12—13 is syntactically identical;

1.2.2.3. Thus I regard the negation inversion as a sub-type of movement of a non-predicative constituent into the post-final position, semantically/pragmatically motivated[61]. The motivation can easily be proved by e.g., (CTH 780.4.I) KBo 23.23+ Vs. 63' or (CTH 251.A) KBo 16.24 (+) 25 Vs. I 25', where it is the negation that is contrasted. Cf. a very different approach (which is falsified by the examples cited in § 1.2.2—1.2.2.2 above) in Luraghi, OH Sentence: 105: "⟨…⟩ in the case of verb-conjunction inversion, as well as for verb-negation, the constituents involved are essential verbal modifiers, whose omission would not result in an ungrammatical or incomprehensible sentence, but simply in another sentence type ⟨…⟩ The inversion, then, has the effect of delaying the determiner of the sentence type until final position", see also ibid.: 20, 22 (specially for MH and NH texts), 46, 74, 140 (note 5), 98, 103; idem, Hittite: § 3.3.1.

A Case Apart.
Indefinite Pronouns: Syntactic Constraint

1.3. Usually the following clauses are analysed differently from the immediately preceding (second) type (see Luraghi and Boley below in the same section): they are brought about by the s y n t a c t i c constraint on the position of indefinite pronouns in the clause (thus they have nothing to do with inversions proper and are not counted in the statistics section):

Con-V-S(*ku*-word).

(CTH 138.1) KUB 23.77+ Rs. 57 […]x[…]x *šu-me-en-za-an* DUMU^MEŠ-*ŠU* […]x […] x x ⊗ *ma-a-an* **hu-wa-a-i** *ku-iš-ki* ⊗ (58) [*na-aš*] EGIR-*pa a-píd-da ú-iz-zi* ⊗ *na-an li*[-*e m*]*u-un-na-at-te-ni* ⊗ ⌈EGIR⌉-*an pí-iš-te-en* "if anyone [from the

---

[58] Identical to NS text 3 KBo 12.85+ Vs. I 45' (ed.: Haas—Thiel, Allait.).

[59] The restoration is a guess, so this case is not taken into consideration.

[60] See Beckman, StBoT 29: 165.

[61] The same semantic/pragmatic effect can be achieved by the movement of the same types of constituents into the first/initial position.

hostages who are in] your […] flies and goes back there, do no[t h]ide him, give (him) back!" (direct speech);

(CTH 489.A) KBo 17.65+ Vs. 14 …*ma-a-na-an-za* **hal-za-a-i**-*ya*[62] *ku-iš-ki* [(vacat)] ⊗ (15) *na-aš* ᴱ*kal-li-i*[*š-tar-wa-ni*? *an-da pa-i*]*z-zi*… "…If someone summons her, then she goes into the *kalli*[*štarwana-*]house" (description);

tris (CTH 446.A) KUB 7.41 Vs. I 12 *na-aš-šu* DUMU.LÚ.U₁₉.LU *li-in-kát-ta na-aš-ma e-eš-har i*[-*ya-at*] ⊗ (13) *nu-uš-ša-an* ᵀᵁᴳ*še-ek-nu-uš-ša-an ki-e-da-aš pár-na-aš* [*ša-ra-a p*(*í-ip-pa-a-aš*)] ⊗ (14) *na-aš-ma-kán an-da* **kur-ku-ri-ya-at** *ku-iš-ki* ⊗ *na-aš-ma* [(**hur-za-aš-ta**)] (15) *ku-iš-ki*[63] ⊗ *na-aš-ma-kán e-eš-ha-aš-kán-za li-in-kán-za an*[-*da ú-it*)] ⊗ (§, 16) [(*n*)]*a-aš-ma-za* **a-ni-i-e-et** *ku-iš-ki*[64] ⊗ *na*⟨-*aš*⟩-*ša-an an-da* [*pa-it*?] ⊗ (17) [(*n*)]*a-aš-ma-kán* É-*ri-pát an-da e-eš-har i-ya-an*… "A man c[ommitted] either perjury or murder/bloody deed and [t(urned) up] his *šeknu*-garment over these houses. Or within someone has spooked or someone [(has cursed)], or a murderer or perjurer en[(tered)] (the house), [(o)]r somebody has practised (sorcery), and [went] inside, [(o)]r a murder/bloody deed was committed in the house itself" (direct speech);

The following clauses with compound predicates are considered to be particularly probative. Thus Luraghi, OH Sentence: 10, 17, 18, 24: the compound predicates (periphrastic forms of the verb) cannot be fronted (i.e. appear in ⊗ V (S) O ⊗). The only exception is when Subject or Object are indefinite pronouns and there are no other nominal constituents (ibid.: 10, 25, 30, 37). This claim is supported by the assumption that indefinite pronouns are necessarily preverbal (ibid.: 37). Note that the following case falsifies this particular claim: (CTH 199) ABoT 65 Rs. 5 *ma-am-ma-an-za-kán ku-iš-ki* É-*ir ta-ma-iš* ⌈*ar*⌉-*nu-ut* ⊗ (6) *ma-an zi-ik* Ú-UL *ar-ša-ni-e-še* "if anybody else had taken (your) house, would you not be angry?".

Also Boley // Per una grammatica ittita: 38: "We only find the two components of the *hark*-construction separated because of the indefinite pronouns and *kuit*. These are constrained to place themselves behind a fully independent form (i.e., not just the sentence connective), and they are therefore found between the participle and *hark*- only when the former is the free-standing form in the sentence they can follow. They shift outside the *hark*-form whenever any other independent form is present ⟨…⟩" with the analysis of the NS dublicat to MS (CTH 261.3) KUB 13.1(+) Rs. IV 5'—6' cited above. But cf. her commentary on NS (CTH 422.A) KUB 4.1 Vs. II 7—10.

I only have to add that *mān* and *našma/naššu* are not fully independent forms. It is proved by the syntactic behaviour of -*ma* — see CHD, L—N: 97—98.

V(part)-S-O-V(*hark-*).

tris (CTH 261.3) KUB 13.1(+) Rs. IV 5' *na-aš-šu* **dam-mi-iš-ha-a-an** *ku-iš-ki ku-it-ki* [(**har-zi** ⊗ *na-aš-ma-za* **da-a-an** *ku-iš-ki*)] (6') *ku-it-ki* **har-zi** ⊗ *na-aš-ma-za*

---

[62] According to CHD, L—N: 155 *mān* with delayed -(*y*)*a* 'even if, even though' is attested with preterite or in nominal sentences.

[63] NS KBo 10.45 (B) Vs. I 3'—4' is syntactically identical. The translation is after HED, 1: 67.

[64] NS KBo 10.45 (B) Vs. I 6' is syntactically identical. The translation is after HED, 4, 268.

ha-ap-pí-ra[(***-an*** *ku-iš-ki ku-it-ki* ***har-zi*** [65] ⊗ *na-aš-ma*)] (7') ÉSAG *ku-iš-ki* ZI-*it ki-i-nu-an har-z*[(*i* ⊗ *na-aš-ma-za-kán* GU₄ LUGAL *ku-iš-ki*)] (8') *ku-na-an har-zi* ⊗ *na-aš-ma* ŠEᴴᴵ·ᴬ-*in ku-i*[(*š-ki ša-ra-a a-da-a-an har-zi…*)] "if either somebody [(has)] damaged something, [(or taken)] something [(for himself)] or [(somebody has)] so[(ld something, or)] ha[s] broken open a granary by his own will, [(or some-body)] has killed [(an ox of the king)] or someb[(ody has eaten up)] the grain[…]" (description);

V(part)-S-V(copula).

(CTH 433.3) KBo 17.105+ Vs. II 34' *…ma-a-an* ᴸᵁMUŠEN.DÙ (35') *ku-iš-ki* PA-NI DINGIRᴸᴵᴹ *i-da-a-lu ut-tar me-mi-an har-zi* ⊗ *na-aš-ma-du-kán* (36') ***kar-di-ma-nu-wa-an*** *ku-iš-ki* ***har-zi*** "If some fowler has said a bad word in front of a god, or someone has angered you" (direct speech);

Neg-V(part)-O(indir)-O(dir)-V(copula).

(CTH 199) HBM No 68 Vs. 4 *am-mu-uk* Ú-UL *ku-it-ki ku-it* (5) *dam-mi-iš-ha-a-an har-mi* ⊗ Ú-UL-*ma-kán* (6) ***da-a-an*** *ku-e-da-ni-ki ku-it-ki* ***har-mi*** "As I have in no way oppressed (anybody), I have taken nothing from anybody…" (a letter) [66].

To explain the position of Neg in front of the nominal part of the predicate one has to suppose that the negative was not "a truly independent form" and moved together with the verb just as place-words did if the verb was emphasized. But it is well known that, as different from place-words, the negation could move into the position after the verb for emphatic reasons itself (see Luraghi, OH Sentence: 46). Both place words and negations could also be fronted independently of the verb. In HEb.², I: 145—146 the inversion of negation is limited to short sentences.

1.3.1. The single following example can be referred to the same class (de-scribed in § 1.3) only if we follow Luraghi's reasoning.

Luraghi, OH Sentence: 104 notes three OH examples of OVS or SVO order with in-definite pronouns. She remarks (ibid.: 104—105) that these sentences as well as those with "the verb ⟨…⟩ in first position preceded by a connective with clitics, also represent variants of the inversion between a finite verb and a *ku*-word. Different types of *ku*-words found in final position are the following: a) relative pronouns functioning as Subject [67] ⟨…⟩; b) indefinite pronouns functioning as Subject or as Direct Object ⟨…⟩; c) conjunctions [68] ⟨…⟩ In the case of relative and indefinite pronouns, inversion has to do with definiteness. Indefinite pronouns stand in last position in the dominant order, as a grammaticalized consequence of the tendency for indefinite noun phrases to occur late in the sentence ⟨…⟩ Possible placement in final position is an extreme consequence of the same tendency ⟨…⟩".

According to Melchert, e-mail of 01.06.2002, lack of proleptic pronouns shows that the cases of *kuiški/kuitki* are not right dislocation. First of all this point has to be modified by leaving out *kuiški* as the right dislocation of the subject rather rarely brings about the use

---

[65] NS I.A KUB 13.2+ Rs. IV 14'—16' and fragmentary NS KUB 13.24 Rs. IV 7'—8' are syntactically identical.

[66] Following Alp, HBM: 251.

[67] The observation is not correct—see below, § 3.1—3.

[68] This claim is falsified by *kuwabi*—see below, § 1.5 (V-Con s. v. *kuwabi*).

of a proleptic pronoun in MS texts. Second, if we believe that the clauses with compound predicates do not show inversion but demonstrate a syntactic constraint on the position of the indefinite pronoun in the sentence, it would leave us with virtually no examples to uphold Melchert's point of view.

O-V-S(*ku*-word).

(CTH 199) ABoT 65 Vs. 8 ᵐ ᴳᴵˢGIDRU-DINGIR*ᴸᴵᴹ-in* **ta-pa-aš-ši-i-e-it** ⌈*ku*⌉-*it-ki* ⊗ (9) *nu* ᵁᴿᵁ*Ha-at-tu-ši pí-en-ni-iš…* "Something has worried/excited? Hattušili. ⊗ He drove to Hattusa" [69] (letter).

The most striking difference of this example from the class of § 1.3 is in the fact that the *ku*-word in the post final position does not result from the same s y n t a c t i c constraint. So, purely formally it can be described as belonging to Type Two.

The Third Type

1.4. Contrary to Starke's claim (see § 1.2), the emphatic movement of non-predicative parts of the sentence takes place not only into the post final position. There are at least two cases of the "counter" positioning [70] of O, S into the cleft sentence preceding the main clause (English *it is the deer that grases…*) for topicalization [71]:

bis (CTH 324.1V.A) KUB 17.10 Vs. II 36' …*na-an a-r*[*a-a-it*] ⊗ (Rs. III 1) **kar-pí-iš** *na-***an** *a-ra-a-it* ⊗ **kar-di-mi-y**[**a-az** *na-***an**] (2) *a-ra-a-it* ⊗ *ša-a-u-ar a-ra-a-it* "she (i.e. Kamrušepa) he[ld him (*i.e.* Telipinu) in check]. The anger, she stopped/lifted it. The wra[th], she stopped/lifted [it]. She stopped/lifted the sullenness" (narration). For the previous context see § 1.5 sub V-S.

The analysis is closest to HW², 247: "Sie brachte sich einen Adlerflügel (mit). Dann hi[elt] sie ihn an (Telipinu). Der Groll—sie hielt ihn an. Der Zor[n—sie hielt ihn an (*oder*: den Zorn hielt sie an). Die Sünde] hielt sie an. Die Wut hielt sie an". Cf. translit. by Laroche, Myth.: 34; transl. by Hoffner, Myths²: 17 ("Kamrusepa saw him and moved (for) herself [with (?)] the eagle's wing. She stopped it, namely, anger. She stopped it, the wrath. She stopped [sin]. She stopped sullenness.") and Archi // Orientalia 62/4 (1993), w. lit. Also Haas—Wilhelm, Kizz.: 23 ("Kamrušepa erblickte ihn und nahm sich eine Adlerfeder. Und ihn erhob Zorn, und ihn erhob Groll, und ihn erhob Sünde (und ihn) erhob Wut"). For the arguments in favour of this restoration see Kassian et al., Hittite Funerary Ritual: 530 fn. 25. Because of the general context Luraghi's interpretation (OH Sentence: 101) is definitely wrong.

KBo 32.14 Vs. II 26 *a-li-ya-na-aš na-aš-ta* ÍD-*an ta-pu-ša ku-i-e-eš* (27) *ú-e-še-eš nu a-pu-u-uš ú-e-ši-ya-at-ta-ri* "The deer pastures (on) the meadows, that (are) on

---

[69] Following Rost // MIO 4/3 (1956): 346; Kronasser, EHS: 499; HEG, T: 123.

[70] Defined by Garrett // Sprache 36/1 (1994): 36 as left dislocation.

[71] Cf. Garrett (ibid.: 38—39): "In this construction an NP is positioned to the left of the sentence proper, within which some element refers to it anaphorically. Any S-adverbs follow the NPs in question, and enclitics follow the first element in the sentence proper". See also Rieken // 125 Jahre Indogermanistik in Graz (2000): 411—419.

(this) bank of the river" (parable). The new parable starts here and *alijanaš* ˹the deer˺ functions not only as the subject of the sentence but also as the "head-line" of the tale.

Hurrian is entirely different. Neu thinks that the scribe started one sentence, but then changed his mind and finished another sentence (StBoT 32, 128). The explanation is in my opinion *ad hoc*.

The Hittite sentence clearly demonstrates that the use of the pronouns anaphorically referring to the topicalized noun follows those for proleptic pronouns (cf. Garrett // Spra-che 36/1 (1994): 38—39).

There are clear (though not exact) parallels for such usage (admittedly in NS texts), that function as "headlines"[72], formally being elliptic[73]. The closest MS parallel is different in the fact that the noun phrase is not separated from the rest of the sentence by any of sentence connectives: MS (CTH 395.3) KBo 20.34 Vs. 6 [… -]*ša-an kat-ta h*[*ar-n*]*a-an-zi* **3 NINDA.GUR₄.RA** (7) [*iš-tar-na*] 1-*EN ki-iz* 1-*EN* [*k*]*i-iz-zi-ya* 1-*EN pár-ši-a*[*n?-zi* … "[…] they s[prin]kle down. ⟨They take⟩ 3 thick loaves. They bre[ak] one ⟨loaf⟩ [in the middle], one ⟨loaf⟩ on the one side and one ⟨loaf⟩ [on the o]ther side.

ibid. Vs. 11 *nu* **1 DUG KAŠ *hu-up*⟨*-pa*⟩*-ra-an*** *ha-aš-ša-an a-ra-ah-za-an-da* (12) *ši-i-e-eš-ša-ni-it gul-aš-zi* ˹DUG˺HAB.HAB *ar-ha tu-ar-ni-ya-an-zi* "⟨She takes⟩ one pan with beer. Around the hearth she pours (lit. marks) with beer. They break the pan".

ibid. (not the beginning of a paragraph!) 10' ˹GIŠ˺*zu-pa-ri* **2-ŠU 9-an** *ki-iz*ⁱ 9-*an lu-uk-kán-zi* (11') [*k*]*i-*˹*iz*˺*-zi-ya* ˹*9-an*˺ *lu-*[*u*]*k-kán-zi* "⟨They take⟩ twice 9 torches. They set fire to 9 ⟨torches⟩ on one side and set fire to 9 ⟨torches⟩ on the other side".

Ambiguous Cases
(First or Second Type)

1.5.   In the following cases it is impossible to structurally define the direction of the movement as there are only two relevant contituents. Each of them could have moved into the emphatic position:

V-O.

(CTH 404.2.A) KBo 39.8 Vs. I 23 …ᴰUTU-*i iš-ha-a-mi ka-a-*˹*ša*˺*-wa-at-ta* (24) *pa-*˹*ra*˺*-*[*a*] ***ti-it-*˹*ta*˺*-nu-nu-un*** *ma-an-*˹*ta*˺*-al-li-i-e-*˹*eš*˺ (25) ˹EMEᴴᴵ·ᴬ-*eš*˺ ⊗ *nu-*˹*wa*˺*-aš-ma-aš ka-a*[*-š*]*a ki-e-da-ni* UD-*ti* ᴰUTU-*i* (26) x[…]˹EME?˺ᴴᴵ·ᴬ x[-x]-[*y*]*a-an-zi* "O Sungod, my lord, look, I have put u[p] for you *mantalli* tongues. Look, Sungod, they will […] tongues for them on this day" (direct speech);

After CHD, P: 121 (a context with the direct word-order from Version 2 [without any other specifications] is cited with reference to Rost // MIO I/3 (1953): 348f! Cf. CHD, L—N: 176 [with the correct quotation]). Fragmentary MS III (KUB 32.113+ Vs. II 9'—10') is syntactically analogous (with the different position of the vocative).

(CTH 404.2.A) KBo 39.8 Vs. I 40 …*nu-wa-kán ka-a-aš* KU₆ (41) [*m*]*a-a-ah-ha-an a-ru-na-*[*a*]*z túh-hu-uš-ta-at* ⊗ *ki-*[*n*]*u-na* ***túh-uh-ša-an-du*** (42) [*a-p*]*í-da-aš* UD-

---

[72] See e.g. Kassian et al., Hittite Funerary Ritual: 529—530.

[73] The most significant semantic difference is in the fact that the "headlines" are not so closely connected with the following sentence.

aš EM[E^HI.^]^A *hu-u-ur-ta-a-uš*... "[a]s this fish is separated from the se[a], ⊗ likewise n[o]w let them separate the ⟨evil⟩ tong[ues] (and) curses of [th]is day" (direct speech);

(CTH 324.1V.A) KUB 17.10 Rs. III 6 … **da-a-ah-hu-un**-*za pát-tar* 1 *LI-IM* IGI^HI.A^-*wa* **[74]** ⊗ *nu-uš-ša-[an] kar-aš-šu-uš* (7) *ŠA* ^D^*Kam-ru-še-pa* UDU.NÍTA^HI.A^-*ŠU iš-hu-u-uh-hu-un* "I took a basket (*i.e.* a sieve) (with) a thousand 'eyes' (*i.e.* small holes). And upon it I have poured *karas*-grains, the 'rams of Kamrusepa'" (direct speech);

Following CHD, P: 242 and Hoffner, Myths^2^: 16. Noted by Luraghi, OH Sentence: 95 with a different translation. Cf. also Goetze, ANET^2^: "I have strewn about the selected sheep of Kamrusepas"; Archi // Orientalia 62/4 (1993): "and I have poured *karaš*-grains upon the rams of Kamrušepa".

(CTH 324.1V.A) KUB 17.10 Vs. I 30' … **i-ya** *ku-it-ki* (31') ^rD^IM^r^-*aš* ⊗ *nu i-it* ^D^*Te-li-pí-nu-un zi-ki-la ša-an-ha* "Do something, Stormgod. Go search for Telipinus yourself" **[75]** (direct speech);

bis (CTH 151) VBoT 1 Vs. 11 *ka-a-aš-ma-at-ta* **u-i-e-nu-un** ^m^*Ir-ša-ap-pa* (12) ^LÚ^*ha-lu-ga-tal-la-an-mi-in* ⊗ **a-ú-ma-ni** DUMU.MUNUS-*ti⟨-in⟩* ⊗ (13) ^D^UTU-*mi ku-in* DAM-*an-ni ú-wa-da-an-zi* "Look, I have sent you Iršappa, my messenger **[76]** (so that) we (can) see your daughter, who they will bring as a wife (for marriage) to My Majesty" (letter);

(CTH 151) VBoT 1 Vs. 15 *ka-a-aš-ma-ta* **up-pa-ah-hu-un** 1^?^ *zu-ha-la-li-ya* GUŠKIN-*aš* (16) SIG₅-*an-ta* "Look, I have sent you 1 gold *zuhaliya* good^?^ **[77]**" (letter);

bis? (CTH 738.2.C) KBo 21.90 Rs. 51' *nu-wa-aš-ša-an ma-a-an* (52') *pa-a-i-mi* ⊗ **na-^r^a^r^[(-hi-i-mu)]** *pár-aš-ni* UR.BAR.RA-*ni* ⊗ **la-ri-ya**-*wa wa-a-tar*… "when I go there, ⊗ I am afraid of the panther, of the wolf, ⊗ and the water is *l.*-ed (lost?)" = Rs. 54' (direct speech).

MS 2.B KBo 21.103+25.155+ Rs. 28'—31' is syntactically identical. For the analysis see Watkins // FsKnobloch: 496 fn. 2. Cf. CHD, L—N: 46, 340, followed by Pecchioli-Daddi // Hethitica 8 (1987): 367; HEG, L—M: 44; HED, L: 64 ("be afr[(ai)d (for me)] of the panther and the wolf, *lariya* the water"); Hoffner // FsOtten^2^: 150 fn. 55 ("Be afraid for me of the panther and the wolf, (but) defy (?) the water!").

(CTH 820.3) KUB 43.23 Vs. 1 [^D^I]M-*na-aš* DINGIR.LÚ^MEŠ^ **ú-wa-te-et-te-en** ^D^IM-*an* (2) [*hu-e*]*l-pí-na-aš* ^GIŠ^KIRI₆-*aš* GEŠTIN ⊗ LUGAL-*uš ku-in da-^r^liš^?^-x^r^[(-)…]* **[78]** ⊗ (3) [*nu*] ^r^e^r^-*ez-du e-ku-ud-du*… "the male gods of the Stormgod,

---

[74] Fragmentary NS KUB 43.34 Rs^?^ 8' and (CTH 325.A) KUB 33.28(+) Rs. III 1' are probably similar.

[75] Missing in other versions.

[76] Following Rost // MIO 4/3 (1956): 335; HED, 3: 46.

[77] The syntactic function of SIG₅-*an-ta* is not clear. See Rost // MIO 4/3 (1956): 34; Otten, StBoT 15: 1. See § 4.3.

[78] The third sign is unlikely to be KI. So the reading *da-liš-ki-(iz-)zi* "he invokes" is impossible. In any case this reading would create a lot of difficulties, as the verb "anrufen,

bring the Stormgod of the green/fresh? vineyard who the king *d*. Let him eat (and) drink" (direct speech);

(CTH 402.I) KBo 21.8 Rs. III 14' …*kat-ta-wa-kán* **ki-i-ša-a-id-du** (15') [*tar⟨-aš⟩-na-aš ta-aš-ku-*]*pí-ma-an* [79] *al-wa-an-za-tar hu-ul-la-a-tar* (16') [vacat] *i-da-a-lu-un* EME-*an* "may she comb down [wheez]ing [of the throat?], sorcery, defilement, harmfull speech" (direct speech).

The context is fragmentary, but the nonstandard word-order is likely in comparison with NS Ex. B (with direct word-order) KUB 24.10 Rs. III 25' …*ka-a-ša-aš-ši-kán* HUL-*un* EM[E-*an*] (26') [HU]L *hu-u-ul-la-an-za-tar* HUL UH₇-*tar* [vacat] (27') [*nu-u*]*š*? *kar-ta-a-nu-un*… "look, (here are) evil tongue, evil defilement, evil sorcery from him. I have cut [the]m";

(CTH 443.A) KBo 15.10+ Vs. II 43 [*iš-ha-na-aš* ᴰUTU-]*uš* ᴰIM-*aš qa-a-ša-aš-ma-aš-ta* B[E]-L[U] QA-DU DAM-[Š]U DUMUᴹᴱ�Š-ŠU ⊗ (44) [*iš-ha-na-aš* ᴰUT]U-*uš* ᴰIM-*aš ga-la-an-kán-te-eš* [*e-eš-t*]*e-en* ⊗ *nu* **pa-ah-ši** (45) […*-u*]*š* ⊗? **an-da li-e ku-it-ki an-⌈da⌉**… "[Sundeit]y [of blood] (and) Stormgod, look, the lord with his wife (and) his children (are before) you. ⊗ [Sundeit]y [of blood] (and) Storm-god, [b]e propitious! ⊗ Guard (sg.!) [acc.p]l.c. ⊗? …" (direct speech).

Kassian, Zi: 47 translates what follows as "⟨and do not guard⟩ anything ⟨besides that⟩!", i.e. his analysis is: ⊗ *nu pahši* […*-u*]*š anda* ⊗ *lē kuitki anda* ⊗. In view of CHD and HW² collections this analysis is groundless: *pahš-* is not used with *anda*. However, I cannot suggest anything better; see also § 4.3.

? (CTH 443.A) KBo 15.10+ Rs. III 33' …*nu* **tar-na-an-du** ᵐ*Du-u*[*t-h*]*a-⌈li⌉-ya-an* "let them release Tu[th]aliya" (direct speech). Not clear as it is followed by a lacuna in the next line.

V-Con.

(CTH 199) HBM No 71 Vs. 16 *nu-mu-uš-ša-an ma-a-an* ÉRINᴹᴱ�Š ᵁᴿᵁ*G*[*a-r*]*a-⌈a⌉-ah-na* (u.Rd. 17) ÉRINᴹᴱᎠ ᵁᴿ[ᵁ]*Iš-hu-pí-it-ta* (18) ÉRINᴹᴱᎠ ᴴᵁᴿ·ˢᴬᴳ*Ša-ak-du-nu-w*[*a*] (19) I-NA ᵁᴿᵁ*Ni-ni-*[*š*]*a-an-k*[*u-wa*] (Rs. 20) Ú-UL *ar-n*[*u-ši*] ⊗ (21) *nu-ut-ta* **ú-w**[**a-mi**] (22) *ma-ah-ha-an* ⊗ *nu-u*[*t-t*]*a* […] (23) LÚᴹᴱᎠ ᵁᴿᵁ*Ha-at-ti ú-wa-an-zi* "If you do not br[ing] to me in Nini[š]ank[uwa] the troops of G[ar]ahna, Išhu-pitta, (and) the troops of Mount Šakdunuw[a], ⊗ then, when I co[me] to [y]ou, ⊗ the Hittites will see your […]." (letter).

The translation of two last clauses follows Starke // Zeitschrift für Altorientalische und Biblische Rechtsgeschichte, 2 (1996): 152—153. Cf. a very different translation and re-storation [*pu-nu-uš-šu-wa-an-zi*] apud Alp, HBM: 255—257. Beal, THeth 20 (1992): 197 f. with the partial translation is not accessible to me.

For *mahhan* "when" with two NS "inverted" examples see CHD L—N: 107—111, esp. 110—111: "in mng. 5 (temporal usage) *m*[*ahhan*] is usually (80—90%) clause initial. It can be preceded by *nu* and its enclitics, *kāša* "lo!", temporal expressions such as *karu*, *kinun*,

auflehen" is not normally written with DA and without geminate LL. But semantically it is the only word in *ta-* that suits the context.

[79] The restoration fits the space in the lacuna, the omission of AŠ in this word is parallelled — see HEG, T: 228. But "wheezing of the throat" is a poor match for sorcery, defilement, harmfull speech. Thus the restoration is highly doubtful.

lukkatta, *INA* UD.x.KAM, *nekuz mehur*, *hudak*, by the optative-potential particle *ma-an*, or by words transported to the head of the clause to call attention to them, often because they are emphatic, have an anaphoric function, or introduce a new subject".

Cf. Luraghi, OS Sentence: 17, 22 specially for MH and NH texts, 105: "Final conjunctions in the above examples are in direct questions; the inversion pattern with conjunctions must have become popular in elaborated style in Late Hittite ⟨…⟩ It is perhaps interesting to remark that in the case of verb-conjunction inversion, as well as for verb-negation, the constituents involved are essential verbal modifiers, whose omission would not result in an ungrammatical or incomprehensible sentence, but simply in another sentence type ⟨…⟩ The inversion, then, has the effect of delaying the determiner of the sentence type until final position".

(CTH 489.A) KBo 17.65+ Vs. 37 [*ha-aš-š(a-an-na-aš-ma ma-)]ah-ha-an* EZEN₄ ⊗ *ha-aš-ši-za ku-wa-pí* ⊗ *nu* EZEN₄ *ma-ah-ha-an i-en-zi* ⊗ (38) [(*n)a-aš* ᴳᴵˢ*kur-ta-aš i-y]a-an-za…* "[(But wh)]en (it is time for) the Festival [of the Wo(mb)]—(that is,)—at the time when she gives birth—how they perform the festival—[it is writ]ten up [as a *kurta*-tablet]" (description).

An identical sentence—with the only deviation in the correct verb form (*ha-a-ši* for *ha-aš-ši* in Vs. 37)—is ibid. Rs. 45 *ha-aš-ša-an-na-aš-ma ma-ah-ha-a[n* EZEN₄ ⊗ *ha-]⸢a⸣-ši-za ku-wa-pí* ⊗ *nu-aš* EZEN₄ *ma-ah-ha-a[n i-en-]zi* ⊗ *na-aš* ᴳᴵˢ*kur-ta-aš i-an-za*. Word order in fragmentary NS Ex. B KUB 44.59 Rs. 7—8 is identical.

kuwabi "when, where" is normally in front of the verb, not after it, thus falsifying the claim of Luraghi, OH Sentence: 104—105 (cited above, §1.3.1)—see the data in HED, K: 229—230. A very small number of inversions in the subordinate clauses (except relative ones) is probably significant—see also below, §3.

V-S.

bis (CTH 404.2.A) KBo 39.8 Vs. II 13 [*túh-u(h-š)]a-ru a-pí-el* UD-*aš* EMEᴴᴵ·⸢ᴬ⸣ [80] ⊗ *túh-uh-ša-ru-wa* [[*a-pí-el* UD-*aš*)] (14) *u[(d-)]d[(a-ar) h]u-u-ur-ta-a-uš* [81]… "May the tongue[s] of this day [be separ(a)]ted, may the [(w)]or[(ds)] (and) c]urses [(of this day)] be separated" (direct speech).

(CTH 324.1V.A) KUB 17.10 Vs. II 35' *a-uš-ta-⟨⟨ta-⟩⟩an* ᴰ*Kam-ma-ru-še-pa-aš* ⊗ *nu-za ha-ra-na-aš*ᵛᴹᵁˢᴱᴺ *pár-ta-u-w[a-ar]* (36') *a[nⁱ-daⁱ-a]nⁱ ar-nu-ut…* "Kammarušepa saw him, she moved an eagle's wi[ng] for herself" [82] (narration); further context is cited separately in §1.4;

(CTH 324.1V.A) KUB 17.10 Rs. IV 8 *pa-id-du* ᴰ*Te-li-pí-nu-wa-aš kar-pí-iš kar-di-mi-ya-az wa-aš-du-ul* (9) *ša-a-u-ar* [83] ⊗ *pár-na-an-za-at tar-na-ú* ⊗ *iš-tar-ni-ya-ša-at an-na-aš-na-an-za* (10) *tar-na-ú* ⊗ ᴳᴵˢ*lu-ut-ta-an-za-at tar-na-ú* ⊗ *wa-wa-ar-ki-ma* ⊗ *iš-tar-ni-ya-ša-at* (11) *hi-la-aš tar-na-ú* ⊗ KÁ.GAL-*at tar-na-ú* ⊗ *hi-lam-na-an-za-at tar-na-ú…* "May Telipinu's anger, wrath, sin, (and) sullenness depart. May

---

[80] Fragmentary NS I.B KUB 15.39+ Vs. I 26 is similar; I.A KBo 2.3+ Vs. I 27 is syntactically identical.

[81] I.B KUB 15.39+ Vs. I 26—27 is syntactically analogous (with the ellipsis of imp. copula?); I.A KBo 2.3+ Vs. I 27 is similar.

[82] The clause is missing in other versions.

[83] NS II.D KUB 33.8 Rs. III 3'—4' is syntactically similar.

the house release it. May the middle *a.* release it. May the window release it. May the hinge ⟨release it.⟩ May the middle courtyard release it. May the city gate release it. May the gate complex release it…"[84] (direct speech);

? (CTH 763) KBo 7.66 Vs. II? 10' *t]úh-hu-us-ta* UD.1^KAM [… "the first day is [f]inished" (ritual description), too fragmentary;

(CTH 443.A) KBo 15.10+ Vs. I 13 …*ki-e-wa i-da-a-la-u-e-eš* (14) [x-]⸢*e*?⸣-*ši-ya-an-te-eš* EME^HI.A ⊗ ***iš-ši-iš-ta****-ma-aš*[85] ^f*Zi-ip-la-an-ta-wi₅-[ya-aš]* ⊗ (15) [*k*]*i-nu-na i-da-a-la-u-e-eš* EME^HI.A ⊗ *nu-wa-ra-at-kán iš-ša-az ku-e-da-ni* [x-]x-x-x ^f*Zi* … "These are evil, [*a*]*dj. nom. pl.* tongues. Ziplantawi[ya] has made them. Now (they are) evil tongues. And from the mouth in which ⟨*kurtali*-container?⟩ Zi has placed them" (direct speech); followed by the description of the evil tongues (= evil speech of Ziplantawiya). See also §3.1 and §4.1.

(CTH 832) KBo 9.114 8']x-*ši* ***a-ú-ri-ya-la-aš*** *ú-uk* ⊗ *iš-pa-an-ti-ma-aš-ši* (9') [… GÌR^MEŠ-*aš* (…) *zi-k*]*i-mi* ⊗ *ha-li-e-eš-ki-mi* "] I (am) his warder, and at night I place […] to him to the feet (and) I kneel (beside him)".

The restoration and translation follow HW², H: 38 contra HED, 3: 38. It is not clear if there was anything more than the complex of enclitics in the lacuna.

V-Adv.

(CTH 199) HBM No 17 Vs. 21 *nu **i-ya-at-tén*** QA-TAM-MA […[86]] "do like-wise" (letter);

(CTH 440) KBo 9.146 + KUB 35.92+ Vs. 44' [***m****e-mi-iš-ki*⟨⟨-*i*[*š-ki*⟩⟩-*iz-z*]*i*-*ma ki-i*[*š-ša-a*]*n* … "but she speaks as follows …", followed by direct speech (ritual description; the context is fragmentary).

Repeated in MS (CTH 440) KBo 9.146 + KUB 35.92+ Rs. 7' [***me-mi-i****š-ki-iz-zi*-*ma k*[*i-iš-*]*ša-an*…, in a different context.

(CTH 443.A) KBo 15.10+ Vs. II 22 *Ù A-NA* ^DIM *Ù* DINGIR.LÚ^MEŠ 3 NINDA.GUR₄.RA *tu-u-ru-up-pa-an-na* QA-TAM-MA *ši-pa-an-ti* ⊗ (23) ***me-ma-i*** QA-TAM-MA… "she sacrifices likewise 3 thick loaves and a *turuppa*-loaf to the Stormgod and (his) male gods, ⊗ she speaks likewise…", a succession of various other actions follows (description).

Kassian, Zi: 104 thinks that the phrase is not an inversion, but "a special syntactical use of QA-TAM-MA";

(CTH 647.6) KUB 25.36 Rs. V 23 … *ta **ma-al-ti*** (24) *ha-at-ti-i-li*… "and makes a recitation in Hattic"[87], in a series of different actions, not followed by direct speech (ritual description).

The same phrase is repeated with the identical spelling 3× more (Vs. I 17', Rs. V 10—11, 29) + 2× fragmentary (Vs. I 30', 11') in the same text. Regular word order ibid.

---

[84] Following Hoffner, Myths²: 17.

[85] The use of *-aš* "them" instead of *-uš* is unparalleled in this text (Kassian, Zi: 80), but it does occur in MH/MS texts. See, e.g. Klinger, StBoT 37, 330—331.

[86] The lack of restoration follows Alp, HBM: 145.

[87] Following CHD, L—N: 133. See ibid. for similar inversions in NS.

Rs. V 17 *ta ha-at-ti-i-li ma-al-ti*. The inverted word order is also attested in similar NS (CTH 647.13.A) KBo 11.45 Vs. III. 9'—10', 15', 18'—19';

(CTH 151) VBoT 1 Vs. 18 *up-pí-wa-ra-at-mu* ⊗ *ne-it-ta* **up-pa-ah-hi** EGIR-*an-da* [88] "send it to me, I will send it to you later" (letter).

Following Rost // MIO 4/3 (1956): 336, 338 for word order. For the absence of Egyptian influence (contra Rost) see Starke // ZA 71/2 (1981).

(CTH 140.2.A) KUB 26.20 + KBo 22.132 10' [*…li-in-ki-ya*] *kat-ta-an QA-TAM-MA-pát da-a-i-i*[(*r*) ⊗ *l*]*i*[?!] [89]**-in-ki-ra** *QA-TAM-MA* "they put [it?/them?] under [the oath] likewise, but they [t]ook the oath likewise", followed by the list of people who took the oath (description);

(CTH 329.1[re]t.1.A) KBo 15.32+ Rs. IV 1' [(DIM URUK)]*u-li-ú-i*[(*š-na* **i-ya-an-ni-ya**)] (2') [(TÚG*ku-ri-eš-*)]*na-aš* KASKAL-*ši* [90] ⊗ *nu-ut-ta* ⌜*nam*⌝-*m*[(*a* GÌRMEŠ-*KA ha-ah-ha-la*)-*an-te-eš*?](3') [(N)]A4*pa-aš-ši-li-iš-ša li-e da-me-eš-ká*[(*n-zi* ⊗ GÌRMEŠ-*aš-ta-aš*)] (4') [(*kat-t*)]*a-an mi-i-ú e-eš-tu* "[(O Stormgod of K)]uliwi[(sna, walk)] on the path (consisting) of [(the *kureššar*-clo)]th! Let [(thor)ns (?)] and pebbles no longer hur[(t)] your feet! Let it (*kureššar*) be smooth [(bene)]ath [(your feet)]!" [91] (direct speech);

(CTH 820.3) KUB 43.23 Rs. 13' *šu-uh-mi-li-iš da-an-ku-iš da-ga-an-zi-p*[*a-aš ták-na-a-aš-ša* DUTU-*uš*] (14') **ú-wa-at-te-en** DIM-*na-aš* EZEN₄-*ni* ⊗ *nu-za e-ez-*[*te-en*] (15') *e-ku-ut-te-en…* "firm, dark ear[th and the Sungoddess of the Earth,] come to the festival of the Stormgod, ea[t] (and) drink…", followed by a benediction (direct speech);

(CTH 591.I.a.A) KBo 17.88+ Rs. III 6' [*kar-ap-pí-*]*ya* [*zi-ga* (TI₈MUŠEN-*aš*)] ⌜*ta*⌝-*p*[(*a-ša-a*)]*n* ⊗ EGIR-*pa* **píd-d**[(*a-a-i*)] (7') [*Ha-at-tu-š*]*a ši*[-*ú-n*]*a-a*[*n* UR]U-[*ri-y*(*a*)… "[rise, you, (Eagle of)] Hea[(ve)]n?. Run back to [Hattuš]a, [the ci]ty of go[d]s…" (direct speech);

Following Klinger, StBoT 37: 319. Syntactically identical to NS I.a.D KBo 10.39 8'—9'; I.b.A VAT 7481 Rs. IV 2—4.

(CTH 447.B) KBo 34.170+ Rs. IV 21 … **hal-zi-an-zi**-*ma-at* 9-*an* "they call them nine times" (description);

(CTH 404.2.A) KBo 39.8 Rs. III 15 …**tar-pa-al-li-iš**-*wa* (16) [*t*(*u-ig-ga-aš hu*)-*u-ma-a*]*n-da-a-aš…* "it is a substitute for all the parts of your bodies" (direct speech);

Fragmentary MS II.E KBo 38.167 3' and NS I.B IBoT 2.110+109+ Vs. II 31, II.B KBo 8.75(+) Vs. II 30 are syntactically identical.

---

[88] There is no rigid borderline between place-words and adverbs. However, normally they can be clearly distinguished, as place-words express directional meanings. In this case we clearly deal with an adverb EGIR-*anda* (*appanda*) which has a temporal meaning.

[89] The traces behind *daer* in fragmentary NS KUB 40.14 (II.B) 8' also look more like Q[A- than L[I.

[90] NS KBo 14.86+ Vs. I 3—4 is syntactically identical. Fragmentary NS KUB 60.115 4'—5' is similar.

[91] After CHD, L—N: 308.

(CTH 404.2.A) KBo 39.8 Rs. III 41 ᴰUTU-*i ka-a-ša-wa-a*[(*š-*)]*ma-aš* **na-ak-ku-uš-ši-iš** [(KAxU-*it* KAxU-*it-ta*)][92] "O Sungod, look, it is a scapegoat for them [(with (its) mouth and tongue¡)]" (direct speech);

I analyse *tarpalliš* and *nakkuššiš* in the two last examples as predicative because of (CTH 404.2.A) KBo 39.8 Vs. II 36—37 (see above, § 1.2.1.1.3).

(CTH 396.1) KBo 15.25 Vs. 34 *ka-a-ša-wa* A-NA ᴰÚ-*i*-[*š*]*u-ri-ya-an-ti hu-wa-ap-pí* MUNUS-*ni* (35) SÍSKUR *pí-eš-ki-mi* ⊗ *nu-za z*[*i-i*]*k* ᴰUTU-*uš ku-ut-ru-wa-aš e-eš* ⊗ (36) **ú-iz-zi**-*at*[93] *ša-a*[*n-na-i ku*]-*wa-at-qa* ⊗ *na-at EGIR-*an** (37) *zi-ik ne-pí-*[*ša-aš* ᴰUTU-*u*]*š ša-a-ak* "Look, I am performing an invocation ritual for Wi-[š]uriyant, the evil woman. ⊗ Be witness, y[o]u, Sundeity. ⊗ (So that if) (any-body) will [so]mehow hi[de] it[94], ⊗ then know it, you, [Sundeit]y of hea[ven]" (direct speech).

The wording of the inverted clause is strange. I assume an omission of the conjunction *mān*;

(CTH 324.Frgm.3) KUB 33.14 Vs. II 7' *nu-za* **e-it** *ša*[*-ni-iz-zi*[95] ⊗ *nu-za iš-pa-a-i* ⊗ *e-ku-ma ša-ni-iz-zi*] ⊗ (8') *nu-za ni-in-ga*[⊗ (9') EGIR-*pa ha-an-d*[*a-ah-hu-ut* "eat sw[eet and satisfy your hunger. Drink sweet] and satisfy your thirst. Com[pose] yourself again" (direct speech);

1.5.1. However, contrary to Luraghi's claims, the following examples demonstrate the movement of Adv into the post-final position, not of the verb into the initial one[96]! This follows from the semantic analysis for KBo 15.25 Rs. 17 as it is the Adv's ("⟨standing⟩—sitting") that are contrasted[97], for KUB 29.50 Vs. I 24'—the distances:

V-Adv.

(CTH 396.1) KBo 15.25 Rs. 14 …*nu* GAL ⟨DUMU.⟩É.GAL *š*[*i-pa*]-*an-z*[*a-ki-iz-zi*] ⊗ (15) *nu ha-an-te-iz-z*[*i pa*]*l-ši* ᴰUTU ⌈*ŠA*⌉-ME-E *e-ku-z*[*i*] ⊗ (16) EGIR-*ŠU-ma* A-N[*A* ᴰ I]M *e-ku-zi* ⊗ (17) EGIR-*ŠU-ma* ⌈*A-N*⌉[*A* ᴰLAMM]A *e-ku-zi* ⊗ **ak-ku-uš-ki-u-wa-**⌈**ni**⌉**-***ma*⌉ TUŠ-*aš* [vacat] "the chief page is l[ib]ati[ng] ⟨standing⟩: for the firs[t ti]me he drink[s] the Sundeity of heaven, then he drinks the [S]torm-god, then he drinks [the Protective deit]y, but we drink seated" (ritual description);

(CTH 286.6T) KUB 29.50 Vs. I 23' [*nam-m*]*a-aš kat-ta pa*[-*l*]*a-ah-ši-ya-an-zi* ⊗ *na-at* ½ DA[NNA *za-al-la-az*] (24') *ú-wa-an-zi* ⊗ **pár[-ha-a]n-zi-y***a-aš* 4 ME *gi-pí-*

---

[92] NS I.A KBo 2.3+ Vs. II 50'—51' (KAxU-⌈*it*⌉ KAxU-*it*), II.B KBo 8.75(+) Vs. II 56—57 (KAxU-*it* EME-*it* with a different enclitic pronoun) are syntactically identical.

[93] "Phraseological" *uwa-* regularly occupies the initial position and is not taken into consideration.

[94] Cf. Carruba, StBoT 2: 5, 38

[95] Syntactically identical to NS (324.II.D) KUB 33.8 Rs. III 15'; KUB 33.11 Vs. II 11—14 is too fragmentary.

[96] Only the most obvious cases are treated here

[97] See Carruba, StBoT 2: 41 noting the contrastive use of the inversion.

eš-šar [… "[the]n they c[o]ver? them. ⊗ They [tr]ot half a mi[le] ⊗ and gallop 400 ells" [98]; the inverted clause is identical to ibid. Vs. I 9'—10' (fragmentary), Rs. IV 13'—14'; 4T. KUB 29.49 + KUB 29.52+ Vs. I 21'—22'; with different distances: (6 *ME*): 6.T KUB 29.50 Vs. I 11'—12'; 26'—27'; Rs. IV 16'—17'; (2 *ME*): 3T. KUB 29.46+ Vs. I 10'—11'; 1T. KUB 29.45(+) Vs. I 13'; the numeral is in the lacuna: 7T. 165/q(+) [99] Vs. I 42" (description).

Unmarked word order is attested in differing (fragmentary) contexts with *nu+* enclitics: 5T. KUB 29.51 Vs. I 13 [… *nu-uš*] *nam-ma tu-u-ri-ya-an-zi* ⊗ *nu-uš* ½ ⌈DAN⌉[NA] (14) [*pár-ha-an-zi* ⊗ *nu-uš la-a-an-z*]*i* …; 7T. 165/q(+) Vs. I 43" [*nu-uš nam-m*]*a a-ra-a-an-zi nu-uš kat-ta pa-la-ah-ši-y*[*a-an-zi*] (44") [*nu-uš*] ⌈5⌉ *ME gi-pí-eš-šar pár-ha-an-zi nu-uš la-a-an-z*[*i* …; 3T. KUB 29.53+ Vs. I 26' [x x x (x)-*a*]*n-te-eš 3 ME g*[*i-pí-eš-šar pár-ha-an-zi*??.

1.5.2. In the following cases it is the subject *zik* "you" that is emphasized, which is proved by the use of the emphatic particle *-pat*. It is noteworthy that nominal predicates seem to be more liable to 'allow' Subject to be moved into the post-final position as with the verbal predicates in the same contexts subjects are not normally inverted even though they are also marked with *-pat*:

V-S.

(CTH 373.A) KUB 30.10 Vs. 6' …*nu-mu-uš-ša*[*-an* **la-ma-an-mi-it**] (7') **iš-hi-eš-ša-mi-it-ta** *zi-ik-pát*… "Only you (are) [my name] and my relation/connection" (direct speech) in a series of addresses to the god describing him with 2 sg. pret. verbs.

Following Lebrun, Prières: 115. Cf. Güterbock // JAOS 78 (1958); idem // JNES 33 (1974); Goetze, ANET²: 400. NS (CTH 372.A) FHG 1+ Vs. II 17 …*nu-mu-uš-ša-an la-ma-an-mi-it iš-hi-iš-*[*ša-mi-it-ta*] (18) [*a*]*n-tu-u-wa-ah-ha-aš an-da zi-ik-pát* DINGIR-*YA* ⌈*uš-ki*⌉*-it-t*[*a*… "Toi seul, mon dieu, tu m'[a]s observé parmi les hommes quant à mon nom [et mon] lien?" (Lebrun, Prières: 103).

(CTH 373.A) KUB 30.10 Rs. 1 [ᴰUTU-*uš hu-u-ma-an-da-aš* … **ú-e-eš-ta-ra-a**]*š zi-ik* … "You, [Sungod, are the shepher]d [of all]" [100] (direct speech);

(CTH 374.2.A) KUB 36.75+ Rs. III 3' … *zi-ga-*⌈*mu*⌉?*-za* (4') DINGIR-*Y*[*A* **an-na-aš at-ta-a**]*š* **i-wa-ar** *zi-ik* [101] "you, my god, are like father and mother to me" (direct speech). MS (CTH 373.A) KUB 30.10 Rs. 25—26 is too fragmentary.

Cf. Lebrun, Prières: 125. According to A. Kassian (pers. comm.), double *zik* in this phrase can be the result of contamination between a regular clause starting with the pronoun and an inverted one with *zik* at the end.

See also very similar contexts from the same group of texts sub Adv-V-S (in § 1.2.1.1.3).

The only inversion with the verb is:

---

[98] Following CHD, P: 61 w. lit.

[99] Transliterated in Kammenhuber, Hipp. Heth.: 216 f.

[100] Syntactically identical to NS (CTH 372.A) ABoT 44b+44a+KUB 31.131+ Vs. II 61—62.

[101] Repeated with *-pat* ibid. 5'—6'. Frgmentary NS (CTH 372.A) KUB 31.127+ Rs. III 20'—21' is identical (?).

(CTH 374.2.A) KUB 36.75+ Vs. II 15' DINGIR-*YA ša-am-na-a-eš-mu zi-ik* ... "my god, you have given me foundation/ created me".

Identical to MS (CTH 374.1) KUB 30.11+ Rs. 6'—7' according to Lebrun, Prières: 124 (but there seems to be too much space in the lacuna at the beginning of the line); NS (CTH 374.2.B) KBo 22.75+ Vs. II 15'. Direct word order in MS (CTH 373.A) KUB 30.10 Rs. 12.

§ 2. Non-Relative Clauses (Bilingual Evidence)

All Types

2.1. In order to understand whether MS inversions are due to the influence of some other language we have to consider the material of the Hittite translation from Hurrian, namely "Epos der Freilassung" (CTH 789)[102].

Actually all the Bilingual inversions translate Hurrian ones. In some cases it is quite incorrect to speak about Hurrian inversions. This is particularly true for KBo 32.14 Vs. II 29—30; 30; 36—37; 37—38 (see § 2.1.1.2) where in Hittite we deal with negation inversions while in Hurrian verbal forms with suffixal negation are used.

However, the opposite is not true: Hurrian inversions do not automatically bring about Hittite ones[103]. The reason why the translator conveyed some Hurrian inversions by Hittite inversions (or conveyed some morphological constructions by Hittite inversions as in KBo 32.14 Vs. II 29—30; 30; 36—37; 37—38 — see § 2.1.1.2)[104], but translated others by means of direct word order is not analysed in the present paper.

2.1.0. There is only one example when the Hittite inversion does not convey the Hurrian one:

(CTH 789) KBo 32.14 Rs. 44 ... **IŠ-ME** ᴸᵁNAGAR ... "the builder heard (it)" (parable). Hurr. Rs. III 38: S-V (gerundial phrase).

In KBo 32.15 Rs. III 1 (cited in § 3.1) the inversion appeared as the addition of the translation into Hittite.

The Hurrian text is not preserved in KBo 32.216+ Rs. III 9'—11' (see § 2.1.2.1).

In KBo 32.14 Vs. II 55—56 and KBo 32.14 Rs. 46 (see § 2.1.1.2) we deal with a different order of S and O in Hittite compared to Hurrian.

---

[102] For another Hurrian-Hittite bilingual, (CTH 788.1.A) KBo 19.145, see § 1.2.1.1.4.

[103] These facts were not noted in the paper specially dealing with the translation of "Epos der Freilassung" from Hurrian into Hittite — de Martino // Hethitica 14 (1999).

[104] Actually, in this very case there is a possibility that the translator was not actually influenced by the Hurrian grammar, as the suffixal negation is just the norm for Hurrian and was correctly understood as such by the translator, while all the clauses in these two Hittite contexts correspond very finely to the Hittite pattern of the use of negation inversion (see § 1.2.2—1.2.2.2).

2.1.1. The data in the following sections (§ 2.1.1.1—3) will show that the impact of Hurrian upon Hittite was rather selective: the translator was definitely not Hurrian, as he selected predominantly (see § 2.1.2.1) the inversion types that conformed to Hittite syntactic patterns.

2.1.1.1. There are no unambiguous examples of the first type (i.e., verb fronting).

2.1.1.2. The second type (i.e., movement of a constituent into a post final position)[105]:

V-O.

KBo 32.15 Vs. II 18' *na-an-kán* **hu-⌈iš⌉-nu-mi-ni** *DIM-an* … "we want to save him, the Stormgod…" (parable?);

According to Neu (StBoT 32: 323—324) the word-order corresponds to Hurrian including enclitic pronouns. Wilhelm translates differently, including "oppressor" into this sentence (Wilhelm // AoF 24/2 (1997): 280—281). The Hittite word for "oppressor" is used in acc., while abl. would be expected. Because of this irregularity I follow Neu's understanding.

KBo 32.19 Vs. II 2 *ar-ha-ma-an* **tar-n**[*a Pur-ra-an-pá*]*t*? (3) EGIR-*pa pí-ya-*⌈*an*⌉[(-*t*)*a-an* …] "releas[e] him, (namely) capti[(v)e Purra]" (direct speech). Analogous Hurr. word-order. Ibid 27'—28' is analogous.

V-S-O.

KBo 32.14 Vs. II 55 … **wa-al-ah-du**-*ya-an* (56) ᴰIM-*aš te-eš-šum-mi-in* … "may the Stormgod strike it, (namely) the goblet" (direct speech), see § 2.1.0;

KBo 32.14 Rs. 46 … **wa-al-ah-du**-*ya-an* ᴰIM-*aš* AN.ZA.GÀR … "may the Stormgod strike it, (namely) the tower" (direct speech), see § 2.1.0. In both cases Hurr. V-O-S.

Neg-V-O.

… *Ú-UL-ma-an* (20') *i-ya-u-e-ni pa-ra-a* ⌈*tar*⌉-*nu-mar* … "we will not release him" (direct speech?);

Hurr. word-order is identical (including the enclitic pronoun *-na*). In KBo 32.19 Vs. II 11, 13, 38' (fragmentary) Hitt. direct word-order versus Hurr. (Con-)V-O (without the pronoun). The same in Rs. III 36' (no Hurr. context preserved). For the difficult context KBo 32.15 Vs. II 19' I follow Neu's understanding (StBoT 32: 324—326) because of the general context. For the translation "we do not do it, (namely) liberation" assuming a mistake of -*an* for -*at* see Neu // Orientalia 59/2 (1990): 227; StBoT 32: 290—291; Wilhelm // AoF 24/2 (1997): 277; de Martino // Hethitica 14 (1999): 16—17 with further lit.

Adv-V-Neg.

KBo 32.14 Vs. II 29 … *na-aš-ša-an ta-pu-ša-aš ú-e-ši-ya-aš* (30) ⌈*a-ar*⌉-*aš Ú-UL* … "it (the deer) did not reach the meadows on the other side" (parable);

KBo 32.14 Vs. II 36 … *na-aš-kán a-pí-e-da-ni te-li-pu-u-ri-ya* (37) **a-ar-aš** *Ú-*⌈*UL*⌉ … "he did not reach that district…" (parable);

---

[105] For proleptic pronouns see § 1.2.1.1.4.

O-V-Neg.

KBo 32.14 Vs. II 30 … *ki-ma ú-e-mi-it Ú-UL* "…it did not find them" (parable);

KBo 32.14 Vs. II 37 … *ta-a-an-ma te-li-pu-u-ri* (38) *ú-e-mi-it Ú-UL* "…he did not find another district" (parable);

O₁-Adv-V-O(coreferent with O₁).

KBo 32.15 Rs. III 19 *a-pí-el* U[RU^{LAM}-]*ŠU wa-aš-du-la-az* **pár-ku-nu-ut** (20) ^{URU}*E-ip*[-*la-an* UR]U-*an*… "he purified his c[ity], Eb[la], from the sin…"[106] (parable).

The context is rather strange as in Hittite proper all direct objects are expected to move into the position after the verb, there is only one parallel—(CTH 591.I.a.A) KBo 17.88+ Rs. III 8′—10′ (see § 1.2.1.2.1), which is considered to represent a borrowed inversion type;

Conjunction-O-V-Adv.

KBo 32.19 Vs. II 11 *ma-a-an pa-ra-⌜a⌝* [*tar-nu-mar i-ya-at-te-ni*] (12) ^{URU}*E-ip-la-ma* [^{GIŠ}*ŠÚ.A-aš* URU-*ri*] "but if you [make] li[beration] in Ebla, [the city of throne]" (direct speech);

The restorations are after Hurrian and the parallel Hitt. context Rs. III 36′—37′. Hurr. word-order is identical.

In the following case inversion appeared as the translator's attempt to clarify the Hurrian version (i.e., Object was added in the post final position). The position of the Object is meaningful as it is the usual one for the Hittite model of the use of proleptic pronouns:

KBo 32.15 Rs. III 15 *ú-ga-an pí-⌜e⌝*[-*hu-t*]*e-mi pa-ri-iš-ša-a-an* "I will gi[v]e *a group of captives*" (direct speech).

Identical Hurr. word-order, no Hurr. correspondence for *parišsan*. Neu supposes that *parišsan* could have been used by the translator into Hittite to establish referential unequivocality of the pronoun (Neu, StBoT 32: 362). Reading follows Neu contra Wilhelm // AoF 24/2 (1997) and CHD, P: 155.

2.1.1.3. Ambiguous:

V-O.

KBo 32.14 Vs. II 23 *ar-ha* **da-a-li-eš-tén** *a-pa-a-at ut-tar*… "leave that story" = 39, Rs. III 6, 20, 34, 54 (parable). Identical word order in Hurrian;

KBo 32.19 Vs. II 2 *ar-ha-ma-***an tar-n**[**a** *Pur-ra-an-pá*]*t⁷* (3) EGIR-*pa pí-ya-⌜an⌝*[(-*t*)*a-an*…] "releas[e] him, (namely) capti[(v)e Purra]" (direct speech). Analogous Hurr. word-order. Ibid 27′—28′ is analogous.

V-S.

KBo 32.13 Vs. II 11 *nu-za-an an-da* **iš-hu-zi-ya-it** *ták-na-a-aš* ^{D}UTU-*uš* "the Sungoddess of the Earth girded herself" (parable). Analogous Hurr. word-order. The correspondence was noted by Neu, StBoT 32: 248.

---

[106] Hurr. "Ebla, [his city]" is also at the end of the sentence.

KBo 32.14 Vs. II 14 … **_da-a-an-du_**-_ma-an_ (15) LÚ.MEŠMUŠEN.DÙ*TIM*… "may the fowlers catch him" (direct speech). Analogous Hurr. word-order. See also de Martino // SMEA 39/1 (1997): 76 w. fn. 9.

V-Adv.

KBo 32.14 Rs. III 10 _pa-ra-a-an-kán_ **_hu-it-ti-at_** UDUN-_ni-ya-az_… "it (the dog) pulled it out of the oven" (parable).

This Hitt. sentence translates two Hurrian. In the first Hurr. sentence the verb is final, in the second—front. De Martino // Hethitica 14: 12 notes the possibility of Hurrian influence on word-order. Analogous structure (a literary device according to Neu // FsOtten[2]: 246—248) in ll. 11—12, 29 is conveyed by the single Hitt. final verb. Standard word-order: KBo 32.14 Rs. III 28 …_pa-ra-a-an-kán_ UDUN-_ya-az hu-it-ti-at_ while Hurrian has V-Cir without the pronoun.

2.1.2. It is important to stress again that structurally all these cases do not differ from Hittite "proper" inversions. The only significant difference lies in the greater percentage of the second structural type in the bilingual "Epos der Freilassung". All the inversions seem to be functionally motivated within the Hittite text.

Cf. also a very interesting remark of S. de Martino, e-mail of 23.03.2002 concerning the Hurrian-Hittite bilingual "Epos der Freilassung": "… may be one has to consider that in this text the Hittite translation tries to reproduce the poetic style of the Hurrian text, and so it is understandable that also word order can be inverted in the same way it is in Hurrian. In SMEA 31 (1997): 80—82, I had suggested that Hurrian sentences with verb at the beginning might be hypothetical sentences without the hypothetical conjunction (like in German). In these cases Hittite translators seem to have understood the meaning of Hurrian inverted word order translating the sentence into Hittite with a _ma-a-an_ sentence".

2.1.2.1. There are only four cases that do not correspond to Hittite "proper" inversion types, namely they demonstrate right-dislocation (type two) of two constituents at the same time. Still these 4 examples are parallelled among "foreign" type inversions (see §1.2.1.2.1) and by an inversion translating the Hattic original (see §2.2.2). Only the absence of the proleptic pronoun in KBo 32.19 Vs. II 20—21 violates the rules of Hittite grammar (as was show in §1.2.1.1.1, right-dislocation of a Direct Object automatically requires a proleptic pronoun):

V-O-S.

KBo 32.14 Vs. II 13 … **_pí-eš-ši-an-ᵓdu ᵓ-ya-an_** (14) _a-li-ya-na-an_ LÚ.MEŠṢA-A-I-DU-TIM … "may the hunters fell it, (namely) the deer" (direct speech). Hurr. word-order is identical;

V-Adv-O.

(CTH 789) KBo 32.216+ Rs. III 9' [(ᵐ)_Me-_]ᵓ_e_ᵓ-_ki_ ᵓ_i_ᵓ-**_ya_**-_wa-ra-at_ [vacat] (10') [URU]ᵓ_E_ᵓ-_eb_[-_l_]_a_ GIŠŠÚ.A-_aš_ URU-_r_[_i_] (11') [(_pa-r_)]_a-a tar-nu-mar_ … "[Me]kki, make it, (namely) [l]iberation in Eb[l]a, the cit[y] of throne" (direct speech), see §2.1.0;

O-V-Adv-S.

KBo 32.13 Vs. II 13 _nu ša-ni-iz-zi-in_ EZEN₄-_an_ **_i-e-et_** (14) _ták-na-a-aš ha-at-tal-wa-aš ták-na-a-aš_ ᴰUTU-_uš_ "the Sungoddess of the Earth celebrated a pleasant

festival on the bolts of the earth" (parable). Identical word-order in Hurrian, the correspondence was noted by Neu, StBoT 32: 252.

Con-Neg-V-O-Adv.

KBo 32.19 Vs. II 20 *ma-a-an Ú-UL-m*[*a **i-ya-**]⌈*at*⌉*-t*[**e-ni**] (21) *pa-ra-a tar-nu-mar* ᵁᴿ[ᵁ*E-eb-*]⌈*la*⌉*-i* ᴳᴵˢŠÚ.A-*aš* URU-*ri* "if you do not [m]ak[e] liberation in [Eb]la, the city of throne" (parable).

Hurr. word-order is identical. Hitt. Rs. III 45'—46' is analogous. See also de Martino // SMEA 39/1 (1997): 81 for the anomalous word order in Hurrian!

Together these 4 inversions constitute 12 % of all 32 inversions in CTH 789 (the count includes inversions in relative sentences [see § 3.1] as well as the left-dislocation inversion [see § 1.4]).

2.2.   Another bilingual is a translation from Hattic.

2.2.1.   The first type: a rather controversial case:

V-O(dir)-?O(indir).

(CTH 725.C) KUB 48.3 6' *na-aš-ta an-da ú-u*[(*š-ki*)*-e-ir-pát*⁇ [107] ⊗ (*nu **pí-i-e-ir** i-ya-ta*)] (7') *ta-me-e-ta la-ba-a*[*r-na*] (8') LUGAL[(*-i* …)] [108] ⊗ (§, 9') [*na*(*mma*)] ⌈*A*⌉*-NA* [M(UNUS.LU)GAL… [109] "They (i.e. the gods) lo[(ok)ed] in ⟨favourably [110]⟩ (and) "[(sent plenty)] (and) abundance to laba[rna], the king. [Th(en)] may they (the gods) give [111] to [the q(ue)en] sons, grandsons and great-grandsons" (narration).

The last Hittite sentence is the Hittite translator's addition/transformation of the Hattic original where all the nouns after *tamēta* were indirect objets to the Hatt. verb *a-aš-ši-ya* / Hitt. *piyer*. See Schuster, HHB: 118—120.

Actually, for Hittite it is not easy to decide what clause *labarnai* LUGAL-*i* belongs to. Naturally, it is semantically required in the following clause, but its attribution to the preceding clause seems slightly preferable on mostly graphic reasons: (a) there is largish spacing at the end of the line in the MS text; (b) Paragraphenstrich is not normally placed within a clause, though its misplacement is not unique [112]; (c) this use of *namma* (which is not a translation from Hattic—see Schuster, HHB: 124) to connect words within a clause

---

[107] "Erwähnenswert, dass das Subjekt des Satzes im Heth. ⟨…⟩ nicht an der bei einer wortwörtlichen Entsprechung beider Fassungen zu erwartenden Stelle steht, wie es in diesem Text fast ausnahmlos der Fall ist, sondern dass eine normale heth. Satzkonstruktion vorliegt" (Schuster, HHB: 121).

[108] The clause is identical syntactically to NS (CTH 725.A) KUB 2.2+ Rs. III 28—29; NS (CTH 725.D) KUB 48.6 6'—7' is too fragmentary. Word order is identical to the Hattic original—see Schuster, HHB, 121—122.

[109] Further according to NS Ex. A KUB 2.2+ Rs. III 32 …DUMUᴹᴱ]ˢ DUMU.DU[MU]ᴹᴱˢ ⌈*ha*⌉*-aš-šu-uš* (33) [*ha-a*]*n-*⌈*za*⌉[*-aš-š*]*u-u*[*š-ša*ˀ] *pí-an-du*.

[110] According to the Hattic text and similar benedictory contexts. See Schuster, HHB: 72, 121.

[111] Cf. Schuster, HHB: 73, 118—119; CHD, P: 262; HED, 2: 350; HEG, T: 81.

[112] It is attested in inverted clauses in (CTH 412) KBo 41.110+ Vs. II 2—4 (see § 1.2.2.2) and (CTH 591.I.a.A) KBo 17.88+ Rs. III 8'—10' (see § 1.2.1.2.1); see also § 4.3.

is unparalleled according to CHD collections (CHD, L—N, s. v. *namma* 3.a) as it is normally followed by *-ya* "and". I have to admit that practically all the points go back to the Hattic. Probably it is the misplaced Paragraphenstrich that caused the transformation of the Hittite text. Thus, paradoxically, it also influenced the attribution of the words in question to the first clause.

2.2.2. The second type (amplificatory):

Con-V-S.

(CTH 725.J) KUB 48.2 5' [(*ma-a-na-*)]*at **ta-pa-ri**[(*-ya-u-e-ni-ma*)] (6') [(*la-ba*)]-*ar-na-aš* LU[(GAL-*wa-aš* É-*ir*)] "[(when)] they¹ dete[(rmined¹)] it (namely,) [(the house of Lab)]arna, the ki[(ng, (they speak thus)", followed by direct speech quoted in the next example (narration).

The translation follows Schuster, HHB: 67, 91—2; Klinger, StBoT 37: 137 Anm. 40. Cf. HEG, T: 116.

Identical syntactically to NS (CTH 725.A) KUB 2.2 + KUB 48.1 Vs. II 48—49, Ex. B KUB 9.33+ 4'—5' and fragmentary Ex. E KBo 37.8. The word order is identical to the Hattic original.

V-O.

bis (CTH 725.J) KUB 48.2 7' [(***i-ya-u-e-n***)]*i-ma-aš* HU[(R.SAG^MEŠ ⊗ *na-aš-ši*)] (8') [(***pí-ú-e-ni*** SIG₅-*an-d*)]*u-u*[(*š* NA₄^HI.A)] "we will mak)]e them, (namely) moun[(tains, we will give them, (namely) favour)]a[(ble stones to him")] (direct speech). The broader context is cited in the previous example;

The translation follows Schuster, HHB: 67, 85. The word order of the second and third sentences is identical to the Hattic original.

Identical syntactically to NS (CTH 725.A) KUB 2.2 + KUB 48.1 Vs. II 49—50, Ex. B KUB 9.33+ Vs. II 5'—6' and Ex. E KBo 37.8 2'—4'. See Schuster, HHB: 67.

V-Adv-O.

(CTH 725.J) KUB 48.2 1' [(DINGIR^MEŠ KUR)]^⌈MEŠ⌉ *ma-⌈ni⌉-y*[(*a-ah-hi-ir*)] ⊗ (2') **[(*da-a-ir-m*)]*a-at*** ^URU*Ha-a*[(*t-tu-ši*)] (3') [(*šal-li* ^G)]^IŠŠÚ.A ⊗ *da-a-ir-m*[(*a-at*)] ⊗ (4') [(*nu-za l*)]*a-ba-ar-na-aš* LU[(GAL-*uš*) ʾ*an-da-an* ʾ*e-eš-zi*] "[(The gods)] distrib[(uted the land)]s, [(b)]ut in Ha[(ttuša)] they (the gods) [(placed)] it, (namely) [(the great)] throne. They placed [(it, so that l)]abarna, the ki[(ng,)] might sit on it]" (narration).

The word order in all the clauses corresponds to the Hattic original. Cf. Schuster, HHB: 67, 79 f.; CHD, L—N: 164. The word order is identical syntactically to NS (CTH 725.A) KUB 2.2+ Vs. II 43—44. See also §1.2.1.2.2.

2.2.3. It is impossible to define the constituents that moves:

V-O₁(-O₂-O₃).

bis (CTH 725.C) KUB 48.3 2' **[(*d*)]*a-a-aš**-ma¹-*za* TÚ[(G^HI.A ^KUŠNÍG.BAR^HI.A ^KUŠE.SIR^HI.A-*ya*)] ⊗ (3') [*n*]*a-aš-ša-an* d[(*a-a-iš* ^GIŠDAG-*ti*)] ⊗ (4') **[(*d*)]*a-a-iš**-ma-za* GA.K[(IN.AG *EM-ṢU-ya*)] ⊗ (5') *na-at-ša-an* da-⌈*a-iš*⌉ [(^GIŠDAG-*ti*)] "he (the god Zilipuri) took (off) clo[(thes, skins and shoes)] and p[(ut)] them [(on the

throne)]**¹¹³**; he [t]ook¹ che[(ese and sour)] and put it [(on the throne)]" (narration)**¹¹⁴**;

The MS dating of the text follows Klinger, StBoT 37: 74; contra Neu // FsNeumann: 212 (followed by HEG, T: 81).

The word order in all the clauses corresponds exactly to the Hattic original.

The word order in the first two clauses is identical to NS (CTH 725.A) KUB 2.2+ Rs. III 21—22. The second clause is identical to NS Ex. D KUB 48.6 1'—2'. The word order in the last two clauses is identical to NS (CTH 725.A) KUB 2.2+ Rs. III 25 and NS (CTH 725.D) KUB 48.6 2'—4'.

V-Adv.

bis (CTH 725.C) KUB 48.3 2' [(*d*)]*a-a-aš-ma*¹*-za* TÚ[[(G^HI.A KUŠNÍG.BAR^HI.A KUŠE.SIR^HI.A-*ya*)] ⊗ (3') [*n*]*a-aš-ša-an* ***d***[(***a-a-iš*** GIŠDAG-*ti*)] ⊗ (4') [(*d*)]*a-a-iš-ma-za* GA.K[(IN.AG *EM-ṢU-ya*)] ⊗ (5') *na-at-ša-an* ***da-*⸢*a-iš*⸣*** [(GIŠDAG-*ti*)]—see the previous entry.

2.2.4. Thus all the MS examples from (CTH 725) translate the Hattic original very closely. At the same time only (CTH 725.J) KUB 48.2 2'—3' (see § 2.2.2) does not fit into the Hittite proper structural types because two nominal constituents are right-dislocated. See also § 2.1.2.1 and 1.2.1.2.2.

2.3. There is only one context (with predicative fronting) which is a translation from Akkadian**¹¹⁵** presumably (according to Goetze's hypothesis) keeping closely to the syntax of the original and full of mistakes:

V-S-Adv.

(CTH 313) KBo 3.21 Vs. II 6 ***li-iš-ši-ya-la-at-ta***-*ma ne-pí-ša-aš da-ga-an-zi-*⸢*pa-aš-ša*⸣ (7) *ud-da-a-ar kat-ta-an ar-ha pí-e-tum-ma-an-zi* ⊗ (8) ᴰÉ.A-*aš-kán hu-wa-an-hu-iš-ni ku-it ha-at-ri-i-e-eš-ša* (9) *an-da ki-id-da* ⊗ *a-aš-šu* ᵁᶻᵁÌ *hu-wa-ap-pa-an-na* ᵁᶻᵁÌ (10) *ú-wa-an-na*… "the words of heaven and earth are on your mind for bringing (= pondering)—a mission that was established in the depth/watery realm of Ea; the favourable and unfavourable 'flesh' (is on your mind) for beholding" (direct speech).

The translation follows Goetze // JCS 2 (1948): 149—151. Cf. Archi // Orientalia 52/1 (1983): 27 f.; CHD, L—N: 72; HED, 1: 239; HED, 3: 427, 431; HW², A: 624; HEG, L—M: 55.

I interpret the context as two verbal non-finite forms modifying the adj. *liššiyala* which functions as predicative with the inserted relative clause referring to *uddār* (postpositionally!).

Actually the supposition of an inversion holds good only for the confrontation of the Hittite translation with the (!) lost Akkadian original, as for (mistranslated) Hittite alone the syntactically regular analysis of the kind "the ora-

---

¹¹³ Cf. Schuster, HHB: 71, 112.

¹¹⁴ In the statistics section (§ 4.1.1) I consider all these sentences independently.

¹¹⁵ Strictly speaking, not a bilingual.

cular (i.e. pertaining to the liver) words of heaven and earth are for you to take along" is required.

§ 3. Inversion in relative clauses
(Bilingual and Non-Bilingual Evidence)

A l l   T y p e s

3.   Relative clauses with inverted word order occur in my corpus only 18×; 10× of them occur in bilingual "Epos der Freilassung":

3.1.
V-Rel$_O$+O.
(CTH 789) KBo 32.14 Rs. 45 … **ú-e-te-nu-un** *ku-in ku-ut-ta-an* … "the wall which I built" (direct speech). It translates Hurr. participial phrase *pa=ili=y=a=ne=š* … **šuhni=ne=š* "a built wall".

(CTH 789) KBo 32.15 Rs. III 1 **ma-al-ki-an-zi**-*ma ku-it* ᏚᏆᏌᏟ*su-ú-i[l* … "but the threa[d] that they spin" (parable) [116];

? (CTH 448.1.4T.A) KBo 21.6 Vs. 11 … [*nu* **an-ni-iš-ki-iz-zi** *ku-in*] (12) *an-tu-uh-ša-an* ⊗ *na-an-kán* ŠUM-*an te-ez-z[i]* "she says the name of the man [whom she is treating]… " (ritual description), too fragmentary;

V-Rel$_S$+S.
(CTH 683) KUB 53.14+ Vs. II 29 [ᵁ]ᶻᵁ*šu-up-pa*ᴴᴵ·ᴬ *ku-ˈeˈ* ᴺ[ᴬ⁴]*hu-[u-w]a-ši-ya pí-[r]a-an ki-it-ta-at* ⊗ *ne-iz ne-k[u-uz me-hu-ur]* (30) [ᴸᵁ·ᴹᴱ]ˢSANGA ᵁᴿᵁ*Ka-a-aš-ha* [*d]a-an-zi* ⊗ **a-aš-zi**-[*m]a-kán ku-it* UZU.GU4 ᵁᶻᵁZAG.UDU-*pát* ⊗ʔ (31) [… ᴸᵁ·ᴹᴱˢSAN]GA [ᵁᴿᵁ][117]*Ka-a-aš-ha pí-ˈeˈ-[d]a-an[-zi]* "in the even[ing] the priests of Kašha [t]ake for themselves the sacrificial meat (pl.) which was put in f[r]ont of h[uw]aši. [The prie]sts t[a]k[e] to Kašha […] just the ox flesh (and) shoulder which are left".

V-Rel$_{Adv}$+Adv.
(CTH 404.2.A) KBo 39.8 Vs. II 18 … **ha-aš-ši-ˈikˈ-ki-it-te-en** *ku-e-da-ni* [(UD-*ti* [118] ⊗ *nu-wa ka-a-ša*)] (19) *a-pí-el* UD-*aš* EMEᴴᴵ·ᴬ-*eš* … "[(Look)], (these are) the tongues [(of the day)] when you 'got satiated'" (direct speech);

(CTH 789) KBo 32.14 Vs. II 6 **ú-e-ši-ya-ah-ha-ri** *ku-e-da-ni* HUR.SAG-*i* … "the mountain on which I graze" (direct speech). There is no clause with a finite verbal form in Hurrian, but "meadow" precedes "mountain".

(CTH 489.A) KBo 17.65+ Rs. 39 [*…nu ma-a-an* DUMU.NITA *mi-y]a-ti* ⊗ *na-aš* **mi-ya-ti** *ku-e-da-ni* [ITU-]*mi* ⊗ *na-aš-ta* U[D] Iᴷᴬᴹ *na-aš-ma* UD IIᴷᴬᴹ (40)

---

[116] The sentence is missing in Hurrian. The relative pronoun is written above the line.

[117] The reading of the beginning of the line follows the edition (Haas—Rost // AoF 11/1 (1984): 42) contra the hand copy.

[118] NS I.A KBo 2.3+ Vs. I 31—32 is syntactically identical (contra Autographie?).

[*a-aš-ša-*]⌈*an-za*⌉ ⊗ ⌈*na*⌉-*aš-*⌈*ta*⌉ [*a-pí-e-iz* ITU-z]*a ar-ha kap-pu-u-uš-kán-*⌈*zi*⌉ [(…)] "[… And if a male child has been bo]rn, in whichever [mon]th he has been born — whether one day or two days [remai]n — then [from that mon]th they count off." (description);

The syntactically identical clause occurs in ibid. Vs. 28 …*nam-ma* [(*m*)]*a-*⌈*a*⌉-[(*an*)] (29) [DUMU.NITA *mi-i-ya-r*]*i* ⊗ [*na-aš* **mi-i-y**]**a-ri**! [(*ku-*)]*e-da-ni* ITU^KAM **[119]** ⊗ *nu-kán ma-a-a*[*n*] (30) [UD I^KAM *na-aš-ma* UD] III^KAM […] ⌈*a*⌉-*aš-ša-an-za* [(…)] (new paragraph, 31) [*na-aš-ta a-pí-e-*]*iz* ITU[(-*az ar-ha kap-p*)]*u-u-uš-kán-zi*!… However, this cannot be considered to be a totally identical sentence due to the lexical differences, so I consider it to represent a separate case.

(CTH 489.A) KBo 17.65+ Vs. 51 [*ma-a-an-za* MUNUS-*za ha-a-ši*] ⊗ *nu-za* **ha-a-ši** *ku-e-da*!-*ni* UD-*ti* ⊗ *nu A-NA* DINGIR.MAH^HI.A (52) [*tu-e-ig-ga-aš*? ^D*Hé-bat-ya*? … *a-p*]*í-e-da-ni* UD-*ti* EZEN₄ *ha-*⌈*ša-an*⌉-*ta-⟨⟨ra-⟩⟩al-li-ya-aš* (53) [*i-en-zi*…] "[When the woman gives birth,] then on whatever day she gives birth, for the Mother-goddesses [of the body? and for Hebat?… on th]at day the Festival of Birth [they perform…]" (description);

V-Rel_S. **[120]**

(CTH 789) KBo 32.14 Vs. II 45 … **la-a-hu-uš**-*ma-an ku-iš* "who moulded it";

(CTH 789) KBo 32.14 Vs. II 47 …-*mu* **la-a-hu-uš** *ku-iš* … "who moulded me" (the enclitic pronoun was attached to the first word of the main clause);

(CTH 789) KBo 32.14 Rs. 42 … **ú-e-te-it**-*ma-an ku-iš* … "who built it…";

(CTH 789) KBo 32.14 Rs. 43 … **ú-e-te-it**-*wa-mu ku-iš* … "who built me…";

(CTH 789) KBo 32.14 Rs. 70 … **ti-**⌈**it**⌉**-nu-ut**-*mu ku-iš* "who set me";

(CTH 371) KBo 7.28+ Vs. 24' ⌈*du*⌉-*wa-ad-du ták-na-a-aš* ^D UTU-*wa-aš* ARAD^MEŠ-*ŠU* **ša-aš-nu-uš-ga-at-te-ni**-*ya-a*[*n*] (25') [**d**]**a**? **[121]**-**aš-nu-uš-ki-**⌈**it**⌉**-ta-ni**-*ya-an ku-i-e-eš* ⊗ DI-*ma šu-me-en-za-an e-eš*[-*tu*] ⊗ (26') [*nu*?] ⌈*e*⌉-*iz-za-aš-te-*⌈*en*⌉ *e-ku-ut-te-en*… "Mercy! **[122]** you, the servants of the Sungoddess of the earth, who take he[r] to bed and [s]trengthen? her, may the right be yours; eat (and) drink…" (direct speech);

(CTH 789) KBo 32.16 Vs. II 1, 3 … **me-ma-i**š-*ši ku-iš me-na-ah-ha-*⌈*an-da*⌉ "who speaks aganst him" **[123]** (parable);

S-V-Rel_S.

(CTH 789) KBo 32.15 Vs. II 18' ^LÚ*ši-iš-ši-ya-la-an* (erasure) (19') **dam-mi-iš-hi-iš-**⌈**ki**⌉**-iz-zi**-*an ku-iš*… "the oppressor who oppresses him" (parable).

Analogous word-order in Hurrian, except for the non-finite verbal form with the nominalizing suffix (that is translated by *kuiš*) at the end of the word — Neu, StBoT 32: 325—327. Wilhelm translates "who oppresses him in reference with the debt" (AoF 24/2

---

[119] Fragmentary NS Ex. B KUB 44.59 Vs. 14'—15' is syntactically identical.

[120] In next five cases Hurr. active participles without pronouns are attested. Direct speech.

[121] Lebrun, Prières: 84: [*t*]*a-*.

[122] Here *duwaddu* functions as an interjection as it does not agree with ARAD^MEŠ.

[123] The Hurrian text is not preserved in either case.

(1997): 280—281). I keep to Neu's translation as *šiššiyala-* denotes a person. But Neu's understanding assumes unique case marking for *šiššiyala-*. The placement of the enclitic *-an* is also very strange.

Adv-Rel$_{Adv}$-[V$^?$]-S.

? (CTH 443.A) KBo 15.10+ Vs. I 15 … *nu-wa-ra-at-kán iš-ša-az ku-e-da-ni* (16) [**x-**]**x-x-x** ᶠ*Zi*… "⟨in the *kurtali*⟩ in which Zi [has placed?] them from the mouth" (direct speech), completely obscure and ungrammatical; see above, § 1.5 sub V-S, and § 4.3 for the broader context.

3.2. As different from Luraghi (see § 1.3.1) I do not analyse relative pronouns along the lines of indefinite ones as (1) there is no s y n t a c t i c constraint on the position of the relative pronoun; (2) inverted relative clauses are not necessarily indefinite, thus there is no semantic motivation (which seems to be at work for indefinite pronouns in (CTH 199) ABoT 65 Vs. 8—9, § 1.3.1)[124].

3.3. The data show that relative clauses are dramatically different from non-relative clauses (cf. Luraghi, OH Sentence: 128 note 1 for OH; also Justus, Subject and Topic: 244 fn. 15.). Non-relative clauses with inversion in the Hurrian-Hittite bilingual "Epos der Freilassung" constitute 17 % of all the non-relative clauses with inversions in my MS corpus. But this Hurrian-Hittite bilingual contains 55 % of the evidence for the inversion in relative clauses[125]! Much of the remaining material is too fragmentary. Probably this type of the relative clause was considered by the scribe to better translate Hurrian non-finite verbal forms with the nominalising suffix at the end of the word.

Naturally, I do not suppose that inversions in relative clauses are caused by another language influence, even though in my MS corpus only (CTH 448.1. 4T.A) KBo 21.6 Vs. 11—12 and (CTH 371) KBo 7.28+ Vs. 24'—26' come from the texts with low frequency of inversions (group three—see § 4.2—4.2.1). Here, as elsewhere, I suggest that the use of native Hittite inversion patterns was stimulated by another language impact.

3.4. All the rest of subordinate clauses (very rarely inverted) do not seem to differ from non-relative clauses and thus are analysed in the common sections § 1—2.

II. ANALYSIS OF ALL DATA

T h e   T y p e   o f   C o n t e x t

4.1. The first problem is the types of contexts the inverted word order is used. It has often been pointed out that inversions are limited to direct

---

[124] For an up-to-date analysis (w. lit.) of Hittite relative clauses (esp. indefinite ones) see Garrett // Sprache 36/1 (1994): 43—49, 55 for verb-fronting.

[125] This figure is particularly striking if the relative volume of this Bilingual and all of the rest of the MS corpus is taken into consideration.

speech[126]. My data enable me to say that inversions are m o s t l y used in direct speech in the texts for which no foreign-language original is preserved. Inversions in direct speech (including letters) constitute about 80 % of all the cases. However, the situation is different in case of the contexts that have the Hurrian original (18+10 relative bilingual "Epos der Freilassung" contexts): 6+7 relative inversions occur in direct speech while 10+3 relative are in narration. 2 are not clear. In the Hattic-Hittite bilingual out of 9× only 2× are in direct speech. The situation in the bilinguals and the texts for which no foreign-language original is preserved can be reconciled if author's (individual, personal, i.e. emotional) narration is accepted as the common ground for all the types of the texts considered above.

Cf. Luraghi, OH Sentence: 138, note 28: "Less archaic features [frequency of connectives; the use of *mān* in conditional clauses] displayed by the text [of StBoT 8] should rather be taken as reflections of changes that were taking place in the language; they appear to point in the direction of a closer affinity of this text with the spoken language (as also, perhaps, do the comparatively frequent VSO sentences)".

S t a t i s t i c a l   A s s e s s m e n t

4.2. The second problem is highly different amount of inversions in different texts:

In non-relative clauses	In relative clauses	Left dislocation
Hurrian-Hittite bilingual (CTH 789)		
21× [127]	10×	1×
KUB 39.8 (CTH 404.2.A) in 15 contexts		
16×	1×	—
Hattic-Hittite bilingual KUB 48.2, 3 (CTH 725.C, J) [128]		
9×	—	—
KUB 17.10 (CTH 324.I.A) in 8 contexts		
8×	—	2×

---

[126] Иванов, Общеиндоевропейская: 257—258; Luraghi, OH Sentence: 95, 99 (for OH); Kassian, Zi: 104.

[127] One of the sentences is repeated 5×.

[128] Both fragments are considered to represent the usage of the same text as they are not duplicats to each other.

In non-relative clauses	In relative clauses	Left dislocation
VBoT 1 (CTH 151) in 7 contexts [129]		
7×	—	—
KBo 17.65+ (CTH 489.A) in 5 contexts		
3(+1?)×	3× [130]	—
KBo 15.10+ (CTH 443.1) in 4 contexts		
4(+1?)×	1×	—
KBo 21.6 (CTH 448.1.4T.A) in 2 contexts		
2×	1×	—

In the following texts inverting word-order is attested only in non-relative clauses:

5×: KUB 14.1+ (CTH 147) in 3 contexs; CTH 374 in 5 contexts [131];

3×: KBo 15.25 (CTH 396.1), KUB 15.34 (CTH 483.A), KBo 17.88+ (CTH 591.I.a.A) [127] each in 3 different contexts;

2×: KUB 43.23 (CTH 820.3), KBo 23.23+ (CTH 780), KBo 16.24(+)25 (CTH 251.A), HBM No 17 (CTH 199), KBo 21.22 (CTH 820.4), KUB 30.10 (CTH 373.A), KBo 19.145 (CTH 788.1.A), KBo 29.120 and KBo 29.113 (CTH 694), KUB 23.77+ (CTH 138.1);

1(+1?)×: KBo 21.90 (CTH 738.2.C) [132];

1×: KBo 21.8 (CTH 402.I), ABoT 60 (CTH 200), KBo 16.27+ (CTH 137), KUB 26.20+ (CTH 140.2.A), KBo 7.66 (CTH 763), KBo 15.32+ (CTH 329.1t.1.A), KUB 23.72+ (CTH 146), (CTH 286) [133], KUB 25.36 (CTH 647.6) [134], KBo 12.89 (CTH 765.2), HBM No 68 (CTH 199), HBM No 3 (CTH 199), HBM No 71 (CTH 199), KUB 33.14 (CTH 324.Frgm.3), KBo 3.21 (CTH 313), relative KBo 7.28+ (CTH 371), KUB 23.82+ KUB 21.47(+) (CTH 268), KBo 9.114 (CTH 832), KBo 16.50 (CTH 270), KBo 34.170+ (CTH 447.B), KBo 41.105+ (CTH 692) [127], KUB 33.62 (CTH 330.5), KBo 9.146+KUB 35.92+ (CTH 440).

Note that the majority of MS texts do not display any inversions.

---

[129] Although 4× occur in one paragraph, it is impossible to say that they are used in one syntactic context, as there is no syntactic unity, moreover they are all used in different person and number; thus I consider these inversions to occur in 7 different contexts. The relative frequency in the text is extremely high due to its brevity.

[130] All of them are identical syntactically, two are very similar lexically.

[131] One sentence is repeated 2×. The considerable number of examples is weakened by the fact that they are all of the same type with the movement of the pronoun *zik*. Three of them are very similarly even lexically: "you are father and mother to …" (see § 1.2.1.1.3 and § 1.5.2).

[132] Once repeated.

[133] The same clause is repeated 10× with different distances.

[134] The same phrase is used 4× + 2×.

4.2.1. Thus the texts fall into three groups:

1. An average MS text has 1—2 or no inversions.

2. There are texts which show dramatically different statistics ("Epos der Freilassung" [even including the contexts that have no exact Hurrian correspondences], VBoT 1, KBo 39.8, KUB 17.10; KUB 48.2, 3; KBo 17.65+). Together (81×) Together these 6 (!) texts constitute 54% of all the inversions (131× + 18× relative).

3. There are texts that occupy a transitory position between these two extremes (with 3—5 inversions).

4.2.2. The observation that the number of inversions varies from text to text is not by itself new.

See Luraghi, OH Sentence: 22: "A survey of Middle and Late Hittite texts yields rather similar [to OH] results with respect to non-final verbs. First of all, as has been noted with respect to the Old Hittite corpus, the frequency of VSO sentences varies greatly from text to text. Historical texts contain hardly any examples, and indeed there are no examples in Old Hittite narrative (StBoT 17 and StBoT 18). Mythological texts, on the other hand, are more flexible. The Telipinus myth has eight examples, including one in which a verb is fronted together with a preverb ⟨…⟩ From a pragmatic point of view, the VSO sentences in the Telipinus myth resemble those in StBoT 8 ⟨…⟩". The strange distribution of the pattern V-(S-)O is noted ibid., 19: it occurs only in the text edited in StBoT 8, a ritual written in the first person, not typical for rituals; in this text the verb-initial variant is almost as frequent as the OSV variant. 112: "Even such a text as StBoT 8, which displays a wide variety of sentence types than most other texts, has the verb in final position in the vast majority of cases; besides, StBoT 8 is not even typical as a ritual, since in the whole of StBoT 25 one only finds two further instances of non-final verbs".

Cf. also Luraghi's (OH Sentence: 131 note 31) remark: "the Kumarbi-myth ⟨…⟩ is the Hittite translation of a lost Hurrian original. The frequent pattern with co-referential 'proleptic' clitic and post-verbal Subject is in fact a Hurrian construction…"

McCone // FsSzemerényi, 1: 470, notes that in the song of Ullikummi the "amplificatory" constructions occur with considerably more than typical frequency than in all the rest of his corpus.

4.2.3. An explanation of the statistic difference noted in § 4.2.1 is necessary. Thus the most obvious interpretation of the statistic difference is as follows:

1. Inversions by themselves constituted an inherent feature of Hittite syntax. This point follows from the fact that they occur in the historical texts for which no direct another language impact can be assumed. Moreover, the inversions are always functionally motivated.

But inversions were not typical for common scribal usage. This follows from their extreme rarity.

These two points make one seek a special factor conditioning high frequency in the texts of the second group.

2. One factor may be just random preference of a scribe—somehow a particular scribe was inclined to use more inversions than was customary. However, I firmly believe that this "hypothesis" has no explanatory power—it does not explain why the scribe of this particular text chose to do so.

The other factor may be the fact that these texts underwent some kind of influence. I think that two kinds are conceivable. The first is that of colloquial speech which presumably used more of inversions due to its inherently more emphatic character. This hypothesis is based on the fact that inversions predominantly occur in direct speech (see § 4.1). This hypothesis is probably the best grounded, but it fails to explain the bilingual texts in which inversions clearly appeared as translations of Hurrian and Hattic ones.

It is the bilingual texts that suggest another kind of influence, i.e. another language influence. Actually, all the texts of the second group with the greatest number of inversions are somehow connected with non-Hittite traditions[135] – Hurrian[136], Luwian[137], Hattic (see § 5) and presumably Egyptian[138].

This hypothesis can be formulated as follows: inversions which are a proper Hittite feature occur more frequently (than is common) in some texts because these texts are (a) either translations from a language that made a more abundant use of inversions; (b) or the scribes of some of these texts were native speakers of a language which made more abundant use of inversions[139]. The bilinguals clearly belong to the (a)-group; VBoT 1, KBo 39.8, KUB 17.10, KBo 17.65+ may belong to either. As even in the bilinguals the translator normally made use of Hittite proper inversion types, it is impossible to draw any distinction between (a) and (b). I have to stress that another language influence only stimulated what was present in the structure of Hittite language — only 5 clauses from non-bilinguals can be analysed as a directly borrowed type.

The following counterarguments are immediately evident[140]:

—there is no functional difference between the inversions in the texts of group 2 and all the rest of texts;

—another language origin or at least another language influence (revealed lexically, grammatically or extralinguistically) is highly probable for virtually

---

[135] See the same idea already rather differently in Иванов, Общеиндоевропейская: 257—259.

[136] KBo 39.8. Independent evidence of Hurrian influence upon the Ritual of Maštiqqa is the use of *tuegga-* "body" in the meaning "oneself", which is considered to arise due to Hurrian influence — see Neu, StBoT 32: 101, 414. For KBo 17.65+ see Beckman, StBoT 29: 149.

[137] fŠU.GI Maštiqqa (CTH 404) is from Kizzuwatna. For Luwian influence on KUB 17.10 see, e.g. Kellermann // FsGüterbock²: passim; Haas—Wilhelm, Kizz.: 22—33, 47; Starke // BiOr 46, 5/6 (1989): 656, etc. See McCone // FsSzemerényi, 1: 471 for amplified sentences to be a good deal more frequent in Cuneiform Luwian than in Hittite.

[138] VBoT 1, if we keep to Starke's hypothesis. CHD, P, s.v. *pipeššar* treats the Egyptian influence on VBoT I with more reservation. It, however, admits the language of the text is non-standard (due to Luwian influence?).

[139] The influence in this case is more indirect than in (a).

[140] This section reflects stimulating criticism of C. Justus and A. Kassian.

every ritual MS text — the absolute majority of MH compositions are of Hurrian or Luwian origin while OH compositions are Hattic;

— these rituals of clearly Hurrian-Luwian and Hattic background do not display any inversions;

— the texts of the second group do not demonstrate particularly heavy lexical and morphological another language influence.

However, it does make sence to look for some traits of another language influence in the texts of the second group. I suppose that they (i.e. traces of foreign influence) are particularly obvious when we deal with what seems from Hittite point of view a mistake. They are discussed in the next section.

Scribe's Qualification[141]

4.3. The contexts with inverted word order often contain scribal lapses of various kinds[142]. They may be roughly classified into three groups:

1) Trivial mistakes that can be easily found in any Hittite (including MS) text.

a) Omissions: in (CTH 443.1) KBo 15.10 + Vs. II 26—27 (see § 1.2.1.1.1) the scribe has omitted either *māhhan* or *QATAMMA*. In the broader context in (CTH 396.1) KBo 15.25 Rs. 14—17 (see § 1.5) there are two omissions. (CTH 396.1) KBo 15.25 Vs. 36 (see § 1.5 sub V-Adv) with the omission of *mān* "if".

Probably also (CTH 324.1V.A) KUB 17.10 Vs. I 10'—12' according to the "diachronic" explanation (see § 1.2.1.1.2).

In (CTH 404.2.A) KBo 39.8 Rs. III 2—6 in the broader context there is double *mahhan*.

b) Spelling mistakes: in (CTH 489.A) KBo 17.65+ Vs. 37 (see § 1.5) there is a mistake in the inverted verb: *ha-aš-ši* for *ha-a-ši*. In (CTH 489.A) KBo 17.65+ Vs. 28—31 (see § 3.1) there are two spelling mistakes, while ibid. Vs. 51 (see § 3.1) and (CTH 140.2.A) KUB 26.20 + KBo 22.132 10' (see § 1.5) there is one.

(CTH 412) KBo 41.110+ Vs. II 2—4 (see § 1.2.2.2) and (CTH 591.I.a.A) KBo 17.88+ Rs. III 8'—10' (see § 1.2.1.2.1) have the Paragraphenstrich in the wrong place (corrected? in (CTH 591.I.a.A) KBo 17.88+ Rs. IV 22—23).

It is impossible to attribute the mistakes of the first group to another language influence or impact of colloquial speech. Besides, they can be found in very large numbers in the texts not showing any inversions. Thus they do suggest that the scribe was rather careless at writing / copying this particular clause / a number of clauses, but this sloppiness does not demonstrate anything special.

---

[141] In this section I follow some of A. Kassian's suggestions.

[142] The mistakes in the bilinguals are not analysed as the nature of the texts (translations) is clear enough. For all the rest of the texts only the contexts with inversions are considered.

2) Non-trivial mistakes:

The interchange between 2 pl. and 2 sg. forms of the verbs in (CTH 138.1) KUB 23.77+ Rs. 63'—64' (see §1.2.2.1) and (CTH 443.A) KBo 15.10+ Vs. II 43—45 (see §1.5 sub V-O) is rather unusual. Only the interchange of 2 and 3 person is quite well attested for historical texts.

In (CTH 199) HBM No 3 o.Rd. 23 — lk.Rd. 1 (see §1.2.2.2) not only the inversion is attested but also the unparalleled 3 sg. pres. instead of the expected 2 sg. in all the numerous similar clauses from the same corpus of letters with direct word order.

In (CTH 489.A) KBo 17.65+ Vs. 40—41 (see §1.2.2.2) *wašdul-ay-anzi* and *zahh-ay-anzi* are used instead of normal *wašta-anzi* and *zahhiy-anzi* (see Beckman, StBoT 29, 165), the conjunction *mān* is omitted (a trivial mistake of the first group). This is not a proper mistake, but rather a deviation from the standard.

In (CTH 404.2.A) KBo 39.8 Vs. I 23-25 (see §1.5) the form of nom. pl. is used in the acc. pl. function, which is a rare mistake for the MH period.

A reverse mistake (acc. pl. for nom. pl.) is attested in (CTH 404.2.A) KBo 39.8 Rs. IV 15—16 (see §1.2.1.1.3). The same holds good for a clause immediately adjacent (?) to the inverted one in (CTH 404.2.A) KBo 39.8 Vs. II 36—37 (see §1.2.1.1.3). The latter context is, however, not entirely clear.

Although I do not generally consider the use of *-aš* for *-uš* to be a deviation from the norm as it is rather frequent in MS texts, the inverted clause (CTH 443.A) KBo 15.10+ Vs. I 14 (see §1.5) is quite conspicuous as it is the only one in this text that employs *-aš* "them". The broad context (ll. 13—15) is syntactically clumsy and semantically tautological (colloquial speech impact?).

All the mistakes of this group (with the possible exception of (CTH 199) HBM No 3 o.Rd. 23 — lk.Rd. 1) can be characterised as non-standard (i.e., deviating from the common scribal usage). They may be interpreted as demonstrating the impact of colloquial speech.

Specially for VBoT 1 in general see Eichner // Lautgeschichte und Etymologie (1980): 157: "Sein [von VBoT 1] Schreiber zeigt eine fundamentale Abweichung vom Schreibusus in Hattuša, wenn er die offizielle Bezeichnung KUR ^{URU}HA-AT-TI unverschlüsselt als *ha-ad-du-ša-aš-ša* KUR-*e* (Z. 27) wiedergibt ⟨…⟩ Entspechend schreibt er statt *^{LÚ}MEŠ KUR (^{URU})ga-aš-ga* "Leute des Landes der Gasga" einfach phonetisch *an-tu-uh-šu-uš ga-aš-ga-aš* KUR-*ya-aš* (Z. 25); eine derartige Auflösung begegnet in Hattuša nie. Auch in der heth. Syntax zeigt sich der Schreiber mehrmals recht unsicher, aber in den potentiell phonetisch begründeten Dingen stimmt er mit *Hattušumaneš* überein (also bei Pleneschreibungen, Konsonantendoppelung, Tenuis/Media- und *u/ú*-Verwendung) ⟨…⟩ Ein solcher Befund läßt sich durch die Annahme erklären, daß dem Schreiber die Grundlegen für die schriftliche Fixierung der hethitischen Lautung und diese Lautung selbst bekannt sind, während er bei den eigentlichen Orthographika eigene Wege geht".

3) The mistakes that violate the basic rules of grammar of the Hittite language.

The clearest case is (CTH 404.2.A) KBo 39.8 Rs. III 12—13 (see § 1.2.1.1.1) which shows a highly irregular fronting of only the noun, not of the whole subject NP[143].

(CTH 404.2.A) KBo 39.8 Rs. III 17—18 (see § 1.2.1.1.1) demonstrates wrong forms of the noun *hurtai-* (gen. pl. for acc. pl.?) and the proleptic pronoun (sg. c. for pl. c.). While mixing acc. and nom. pl. is comparatively common, all the rest is not.

In (CTH 151) VBoT 1 Vs. 28—38 (see § 1.2.1.2.1) an inverted clause is followed by a list of gifts which refer to the generic noun *pippeššar* "shipment". As is indicated in § 1.2.1.1.1 (end) with reference to KUB 23.72+ Rs. 13—14, etc. this contradicts the normal Hittite construction for such a movement. In (CTH 151) VBoT 1 Vs. 15 (see § 1.5 sub V-O) the syntactic function of SIG$_5$-*anta* is obscure.

The broader context can also be non-standard: (CTH 443.A) KBo 15.10+ Vs. II 44—45 (see § 1.5) is unclear, but the clause(?) which follows the inversion (or is it the same clause?) is clearly ungrammatical with double *anda*. If we follow Kassian's interpretation (i.e. segment as *nu pa-ah-ši* [...*-u*]*š an-da* ⊗ *li-e ku-it-ki an-da*...; see Kassian, Zi: 44—47), the inverted clause will be completely ungrammatical as in this case we will have to suppose verb fronting while the place word remains in its primary position! The rule that preverbs always move together with the verb fronting is absolutely exceptionless in my MS corpus.

The relative clause in (CTH 443.A) KBo 15.10+ Vs. I 13—15 (see § 1.5 and § 3.1) is ungrammatical.

(CTH 404.3V) KUB 34.82+ KBo 24.1+ Vs. I 18'—20' (see § 1.2.1.1.3) is ungrammatical.

It is very interesting to note the occurrence of non-trivial mistakes in the non-bilingual texts showing the greatest number of inversions (CTH 443, 151, especially 404). It is the third group of mistakes that can be used to prove the highly non-standard nature of the contexts. This highly non-standard nature can be interpreted to have appeared due to another language influence rather than the impact of the colloquial speech or scribe's sloppiness.

At the same time it is necessary to stress that even among the texts demonstrating the greatest number of inversions, KUB 17.10 and KBo 17.65+ do not show any mistakes of the third type. Even in CTH 404.2.A KBo 39.8 not all the contexts with inversions are non-standard in some other respect (mind especially (CTH 404.2.A) KBo 39.8 Rs. III 34 (in § 1.2.1.2.1) which is supposed to demonstrate a borrowed syntactic type, but is standard Hittite apart from the inversion. Even if we consider all the mistakes of KBo 17.88+ which is supposed to have two examples of a borrowed syntactic type, they will be of the kind rather difficult to interpret as the third type.

---

[143] The irregularity clearly is an inversion, but of the type not analysed in the paper (see § 0.1). Cf. for a very different situation in Lycian Garrett // Sprache 36/1 (1994): 34.

See Klinger, StBoT 37: 337 Anm. 5, 335 sub II 11 (probably), 338 sub II 34 and II 53, 351 sub III 23'. The following cases are not mistakes in the proper sense of the word and have parallels elsewhere in MS texts. Still they are rare and definitely represent deviations from MH standard: **1)** the use of the form of sg. as the invariable stem-form even in the nom. plural (Rs. III 17'—18', IV 29, 33 … *nu* (^LÚ)*a-ra-aš-te-eš ša-am-ni-(ya-)an-ta-ru*), see loc. cit., 348; **2)** unusual number disagreement of phraseological pai- with the main verb in Rs. III 23'—24' (noted in CHD, P: 10); **3)** Rs. III 22', IV 8 ^MUNUS*ta-wa-na-an-na-i* seems (?) to display Luwian influence. See Starke, StBoT 31: 37 Anm. 43; but cf. Schuster, HHB: 124; Neu // HuI: 188; Klinger, StBoT 37: 350 w. lit.

Synthesis of the Type of Context and Scribe's Qualification

4.4. Now I formulate a kind of preliminary conclusion for the last two sections (§ 4.2.3 and § 4.3).

CTH 404, 443 and 151 demonstrate what I call exceptionally strong deviations from not only scribal usage but also from basic rules of Hittite grammar (mistakes of the third type) that are most plausibly interpreted as another language influence or (alternatively) as inadequate knowledge of the Hittite language[144]. The majority of MS rituals of clearly Hurrian and Luwian origin as well as MS copies of OH texts of Hattic origin contain virtually no mistakes of the third type.

I suppose this may explain why it is just these texts that show another language syntactic influence.

The fact that inversions seem to be functionally motivated in all the texts (including CTH 404, 443, 151) does not disprove another language stimulation of a greater use of inversion. I stand by this point as clear and unambiguous bilinguals (see § 2, esp. § 2.1 and § 2.1.2) show only five clauses of a borrowed (from Hittite point of view) type (see § 2.1.2.1 and § 2.2.4). All the bilingual inversions seem to be functionally motivated if we analyse the Hittite text by itself disregarding the Hattic or Hurrian originals.

In any case, the reason why a certain text displays another language influence only at the lexical level and another both at lexical and grammatical levels is obscure, but existence of different degrees of another language impact upon different speakers is too well known[145]. In § 4.3 I suggested that this reason is a different type of scribe's qualification not only diverging from the scribal usage, but also violating the basic rules of Hittite grammar. By itself this is highly speculative and is intended as a preliminary interpretation of the fact that some texts have more inversions than others. However, I do stand by the

---

[144] Mind that the two phenomena are not identical: the first implies using another language structures in writing Hittite, the second—forming Hittite utterances not necessarily reflecting another language influence, but violating some of Hittite grammar rules.

[145] Especially if they are not native speakers of the language in question.

fact that at least CTH 404, 443 and 151 display another language influence exceding the common one in the syntactic sphere. For KUB 17.10 and KBo 17.65+ the hypothesis about another language influence going as fas as the syntactic structure is ad hoc as it is not supported by any independent evidence.

It is important to bear in mind that even though the previous section treated only mistakes in inverted clauses, there is no statistical correlation between the use of inversions and the number of mistakes in the inverted clause [146]. Only the presence of mistakes of the third type in the text (irrespective of their frequency) is significant. It is significant not by itself but as indicating the fact that the scribe committed errors not easily explainable within Hittite.

§ 5. OH and MH Inversions

5. As there are a number of OH inversions [147], we have to note that the very existence of inversions goes back to OH time when Hurrian-Luwian influence was not so strong [148]. Still the OH period is the time when Hattic influence was at work. Thus, strictly speaking, we cannot a priori exclude other language influence as the source of inversions for any period. But it would be unwise to posit it everywhere (see the Conclusion section).

Quite a few of the examined MS texts are often supposed to go back to the OH originals, even though OS duplicats are not available (I have to note that there is little consensus on some of the linguistic dating presented below). These are (CTH 324.1.A) KUB 17.10 [149], (CTH 325.C) KUB 33.26+ [150], (CTH 371) KBo 7.28+ [151], (CTH 591.I.a.A) KBo 17.88+ [152], (CTH 820.4) KBo 21.22 [153], (CTH 820.3) KUB 43.23 [154], (CTH 738.2.C) KBo 21.90 [155], (CTH 647.6) KUB 25.36 [156],

---

[146] Nor do I mean that inversions are "mistakes" themselves.

[147] See Luraghi, OH Sentence for a systematic description of OS and OH inversions. Cf. Starke // ZA 69/1 (1979), Anm. 8.

[148] The communis opinio seems to be that Luwian loan words started to penetrate into the Hittite language already in OH, but all the rest of influence did not start until the MH time.

[149] For the OH origin see Klinger, StBoT 37: 133 w. Anm. 20, w. lit.; Neu // Hethitica 6 (1985): 148. Also Starke // BiOr 46, 5/6 (1989): 656.

[150] E.g., OH/MS in CHD, P: 264.

[151] Güterbock // Frontiers of human knowledge (1978): 127; CHD, P: 298, etc.

[152] See Klinger, StBoT 37: 253 Anm. 1, 347.

[153] E.g., OH/MS in CHD, L—N: 80; P, 8, 170.

[154] E.g., "mh Abschrift (ah.?)" in Kühne // FsOtten[2]; OS (wrongly) in CHD, P: 317.

[155] E.g., OH/MS in CHD, P: 113; "ah./mh." in Rieken, StBoT 44: 279.

[156] OH?/MS in CHD, L—N: 133.

(CTH 313) KBo 3.21 [157], (CTH 725.C, J) KUB 48.2 [158], 48.3 [159], for the latter, however, see below, in the same section. The situation with KBo 15.25 (CTH 396.1) is rather complicated: on the one hand it shows Hurrian-Luwian features [160] (see Carruba, StBoT 2: passim), on the other — the fragment ABoT 32 (CTH 396.2) contains "'alten' Zeichenformen von AK und E" according to Neu // Hethitica 6 (1985): 152. Both these features can be reconciled as follows: OH ritual was transformed due to Hurrian-Luwian influence. (CTH 412) KBo 41.110+ goes back to OH time as one of the texts of the same group is OS (KBo 17.17 (+) 30.30). On the ritual of the Stormgod of Kuliwisna see Klinger, StBoT 37: 11—12.

Out of them only few texts demonstrate a very significant number of inversions. Among them (CTH 324.1.A) KUB 17.10 (see § 4.2) also shows Luwian influence exceding the one which is common for OH/OS texts (contra Starke // BiOr 46, 5/6 (1989): 656) [161]. Actually, the present paper does not even set an aim to linguistically distinguish between Hurrian, Hattic, Luwian and Egyptian influence. Thus any speculation what language might have stimulated a higher inversion frequency in KUB 17.10 is premature. What I want to prove now is the presence of another language impact. The only text for which Hattic influence is obvious is (CTH 725) because it is a Hattic-Hittite bilingual. (CTH 591.I.a.A) KBo 17.88+ has two clauses of the borrowed type (see § 1.2.1.2.1) and thus is also likely to show another language influence.

Generally, in a field that has not been thoroughly explored so far, one has to take due caution not to base one's primary data on NS copies of MH compositions which may be transformed in the copying or just freely composed from earlier material. I hope that the Mastiqqa data abundantly cited in the paper proves this point beyond any doubt.

The same basically applies to OH/MS texts, which can be very cautiously used for conclusions on both OH and MH language as the texts could have been modified in copying or composed from older material. In any case, the confrontation of MH/MS, OH/MS, and OH/OS texts does not reveal any significant changes between OH and MH apart from one borrowed type. It seems impossible at present to classify any clauses as copyist's transformations that are unparallelled among both MH and OH original compositions.

---

[157] OH?/MS in HEG, T: 144.

[158] Klinger, StBoT 37: 24—28 on NS KUB 2.2: "⟨…⟩ die Überlieferung ins Hethitische erst zu einem späteren Zeitpunkt, d.h. in nachalthethitischer Zeit, hätte angefertigt worden sein können".

[159] E.g., Watkins // HuI: 281 for another exemplar of the same text.

[160] It does not by itself exclude OH dating!

[161] Thus I still entertain the possibility of post OH Luwian-Hurrian influence. Mind that inversions in KUB 17.10 are not very often parallelled by the data from similar texts of the "missing deity" group — an indication of their late introduction while copying the OH text?

III. CONCLUSION

6. As the study was based on MS texts, it is impossible at present to formulate any clear MH conclusions. Rather, the data from KUB 17.10 (but see above, § 5) and the Hattic-Hittite bilingual m a y instead be relevant for OH.

6.1. The following types of inversions were considered in the paper: a) the predicate is fronted; b) amplificatory: one nominal constituent or negation is right-dislocated (not very correctly it can be described as movement[162] into post-final position[163]); c) left-dislocation inversion[164]. In all these cases only one constituent changes its position in the sentence.

6.2. A number (5×) of inversions do not conform to these common types. These are amplificatory constructions with the right dislocation of two elements: S-V-O-Adv (CTH 591.I.a.A) KBo 17.88+ Rs. III 24'—26', O(indir)-O-V-Adv-O$^?$ (CTH 591.I.a.A) KBo 17.88+ Rs. III 8'—10', O-V-Adv$_1$-Adv$_2$ (CTH 151) VBoT 1 Vs. 28—29, V-O-S (CTH 820.4) KBo 21.22 Rs. 39'—40', V-S-Adv (CTH 404.2.A) KBo 39.8 Rs. III 34—35.

Rather, they are parallelled by the inversions that translate Hurrian (3×): O-V-Adv-S KBo 32.13 Vs. II 13—14; Con-Neg-V-O-Adv KBo 32.19 Vs. II 20—21; V-O-S KBo 32.14 Vs. II 13—14; and Hattic clauses (1×): V-Adv-O (CTH 725.J) KUB 48.2 2'. No Hurrian is preserved for V-Adv-O KBo 32.216+ Rs. III 9'—11'.

With the exception of (CTH 591.I.a.A) KBo 17.88+ and (CTH 820.4) KBo 21.22 these inversions occur in the texts with the greatest number of inversions. (CTH 591.I.a.A) KBo 17.88+ is a ritual of the "Hattic cultural layer".

All this allows us to suppose that these inversions are directly influenced by some other language syntax (most likely Hurrian or Hattic).

The fact that this borrowed type is statistically insignificant (5× out of 147×) is relevant in view of §6.4.

6.3. Usually Hittite MS texts have very low ratio of inversions (1—2 most commonly, the standard figure is   !). In view of OH evidence and as there are proper Hittite (i.e. not translational) texts in this group, the very use of inversions has to be considered an inherent feature of Hittite syntax. Despite this fact the scribal practice did not favour their use. There is also clear connection between the use of inversions and direct speech.

6.4. Six MS texts (the Hurrian-Hittite bilingual "Epos der Freilassung"; VBoT 1; KBo 39.8; KUB 17.10; the Hattic-Hittite bilingual KUB 48.2, 3; KBo

---

[162] For the difference between movement and dislocastion see Garrett // Sprache 34/1 (1994): 36 for Lycian.

[163] They can also be fronted with presumably the same semantics, but the type is not analysed here.

[164] For the difference between this type and fronting of nominal constituents see (terminologically differently) Garrett // Sprache 36/1 (1994): 35.

17.65+) show unusually high inversion ratio—together they constitute 55 % of all MS inversions.

It is conceivable that this was stimulated by another language influence[165]. This hypothesis can be strictly proved for the bilinguals as the inversions in these texts are unambiguous translations from Hurrian and Hattic. The hypothesis is plausible for VBoT 1, KBo 39.8, and KBo 15.10+[166], as all of them display errors of the kind that I interpret as another language influence exceding the common one in the syntactic sphere. The hypothesis is ad hoc for KUB 17.10 and KBo 17.65+ as they demonstrate some Luwian and Hurrian features, but there is no independent proof of a particularly strong another language influence.

It should be stressed that even in the clearest case of foreign influence, the bilinguals, another language influence stimulated, not directly caused the use of Hittite inversions. This theory is proved by the fact that, while translating Hurrian and Hattic inversions, the scribes predominantly used Hittite proper inversion types, functionally motivated by the Hittite context. Besides, not all Hurrian inversions automatically brought about the Hittite ones. A similar explanation[167], but in the shape of a hypothesis, is put forward for VBoT 1, KBo 39.8, and KBo 15.10+ and, with less certainty, for KUB 17.10 and KBo 17.65+.

---

[165] Lack of data on Hurrian, Hattic, Luwian and Egyptian syntax is intentional. It has been more important to demonstrate that there are some indications of foreign impact within Hittite texts themselves.

[166] Occupying the transitory position (third group), it has some similarities with KBo 39.8 and other rituals of the Luwian layer. See Szabó, THeth. 1: 104—105; also Haas, GHR: 20.

[167] Translation (?), influence (?) or just inadequate knowledge of Hittite (?).