З Б О Р Н И К

МАТИЦЕ СРПСКЕ
ЗА ФИЛОЛОГИЈУ И ЛИНГВИСТИКУ

LIV/1

ПОСВЕЋЕНО СЕЋАЊУ НА АКАДЕМИКА
МИЛКУ ИВИЋ

НОВИ САД
2011

Andrej V. Sidelcev

HITTITE PARALLELS
FOR BALKAN SPRACHBUND CLITIC DOUBLING[*]

This paper deals with Hittite parallels to Balkan clitic doubling. The structure and functions of Hittite clitic doubling are briefly described, then they are compared with the Balkan one. The small number of occurrences as well as the exclusively pragmatic conditioning of Hittite clitic doubling (not any kind of topic, but rather shift topic) testify that clitic doubling was just emerging in Hittite. The comparison with the pragmatically conditioned Balkan Sprachbund clitic doubling demonstrates that these very first steps of clitic doubling evolution in Hittite attest a very different scenario from the one in the Balkans, namely that clitic doubling need not always develop along the same cline dependent on the topical hierarchy. This Hittite – Balkan comparison contributes to the little described diachronic typology of clitic doubling.

Keywords: clitic doubling, Hittite, Balkan Sprachbund, topic, topical hierarchy, diachronic typology.

0. Introduction. The research of clitic doubling in the languages of the Balkan Sprachbund has recently been activated by an important collection of papers (Kalluli – Tasmowski 2008). Outside the Balkans, clitic doubling has also been described in Romance, Celtic and Slavic languages, as well as in more "exotic" ones (see Arkadiev 2009; 2010b).

This paper aims to bring Hittite data into the diachronic typology of clitic doubling. The Hittite data are interesting for non-specialists in Hittite in two ways: Hittite contributes to the universal diachronic typology of clitic doubling (for which, see Arkadiev 2009; 2010b)[1] and, as a consequence, it is also of interest to specialists in the languages of the Balkan Sprachbund. Of particular importance is the contribution of Hittite to the functional aspect of universal clitic doubling typology. Since clitic doubling is functionally described in the most detailed way in the Balkan Sprachbund languages, this aspect is also of interest to scholars of those languages. Like the languages of the Balkan Sprachbund,

[1] I will also try to draw parallels from clitic doubling of 'exotic' languages (Arkadiev 2010b), Celtic (Parina 2006), Slovenian dialects (Marušič – Žaucer in print) and Romance languages (Narumov – Suchačev 2001; Narumov 2001; Čelyševa 2001; Vanelli 1998).

Hittite demonstrates pragmatic conditioning of clitic doubling by topicality. At the same time it attests an interesting variation of the type of topicality involved: it is shift topic that triggers clitic doubling in Hittite.

For Hittitologists, the typological background may speak in favour of clitic doubling as a special pragmatic category, up to now virtually ignored in Hittite linguistics. Clitic doubling was discovered already in Garrett 1990, but has been completely ignored ever since. Even for A. Garrett the function and typology of Hittite clitic doubling were a complete mystery.

0.1. Hittite clitics. Traditionally Hittite clitics are divided into three classes: enclitic personal pronouns: subject, direct object and indirect object (Hoffner – Melchert 2008: 135–137, 279–282). Particles included the direct speech particle -*wa*(*r*), the reflexive particle -*z*(*a*), local particles, the emphatic particle -*pat* (Hoffner – Melchert 2008: 354–388), and the enclitic conjunctions -*a*/*ma* 'but', -*a*/*ya* 'and' (Hoffner – Melchert 2008: 395–400). This distinction is based mostly on semantics although there are syntactic differences as well, mostly as far as clitic position is concerned. The majority of the clitics are sentential clitics[2] and are always placed in accordance with Wackernagel's law, after the first accented word (Hoffner – Melchert 2008: 410).

1. Hittite clitic doubling. Clitic doubling involves enclitic personal pronouns in their standard Wackernagel position in one clause with the full coreferential NP in the same syntactic function. The position of the NP within the clause is not marked, i.e. it is base-generated:

> NS (CTH 461.D) KUB 44.63+ Vs. II 8ʾ (Garrett 1990: 264)
> *mahhan=ma=**at**   =šši   =kan   išhar*
> when=but=**it**-CL.PRON.3SG.ACC.N.=him-CL.PRON.3SG.DAT.=LOC.PART. blood-ACC.SG.N.
> *arha tarnai* #
> off   lets-3 SG.PRES.
> 'But when (s)he lets **it**, the blood, off from him, …'

Clitic doubling is rare. However, it is attested 14 times at all periods of Hittite language history: once in an Old Hittite text written in Old Script; twice in Old Hittite texts preserved in New Script copies; seven times in texts written in Middle Script; four times in texts written in New Script. The number of clitic doubling occurrences is comparable to that of left dislocations in Hittite (15 cases). These seemingly irrelevant statistics are significant because left dislocations are unanimously acknowledged in studies of Hittite syntax, whereas clitic doubling is ignored.

1.1. Hittite clitic doubling as different from appositive dislocation. Taxonomically it is necessary to distinguish clitic doubling from appositive dislocation where the clitic doubled NP has to be marked off with comma intonation. As opposed to appositive dislocation, clitic doubling should demonstrate no pauses between the enclitic pronoun and the coreferent NP. Naturally, this assessment

---

[2] With the exception of the emphatic particle -*pat*, partially local particles and enclitic conjunctions.

remains unverifiable for Hittite since there is no way to establish any intonation or intraclausal pauses.

However, it seems that there are still criteria that distinguish clitic doubling from appositive dislocations even when no prosodic data are present:

First, 1st and 2nd person pronoun clitic doubling (both enclitic pronoun and accented pronoun are 1st or 2nd person) is cross-linguistically attested only as clitic doubling, but not as appositive dislocation. So the only Hittite example of this type has to be clitic doubling.

MH/MS (CTH 188) HKM 48 Vs. 4–6
ᴰUTU*ŠI*   =**[m]u**³   *kuit*   *BELI*=[Y]A
Your Majesty=**me**-CL.PRON.1SG.ACC. concerning the fact that lord=my
ammu[*k*]   ᵐ*Hapirin*   *kiššan*   *wātarnahta* #
me-STRESSED PRON.1SG.ACC. Hapiri-ACC.SG. as follows commanded-3SG.PRET.
'Concerning the fact that you, Your Majesty, my lord, commanded **me**, Hapiri, as follows'.

The second difference between clitic doubling and appositive dislocation is the fact that appositive dislocation is used with both stressed and enclitic pronouns whereas clitic doubling is only employed with enclitic pronouns. An example of appositive dislocation with a stressed pronoun is

MS (CTH 186) HKM 17 Vs. 9–11
1. [*n*]=*ašta*   **t[u]k**   ᵐ*Hullan*   *kuwapi gimmanti*
s.c.part.=loc.part. **you-**STRESSED PRON.2SG.ACC. Hulla-ACC.SG.C. when in winter-LOC.SG.
parā nehhun #
out sent-1SG.PRET.
2. *nu*   =*tta*   *apiya* UL   *ištamaššer* #
S.C.PART.=you-CL.PRON.2ACC.SG. then   not   heard-3PL.PRET.
'(1) When I sent you, Hulla, out in winter, (2) they did not hear about you then'.

In the example already cited, appositive dislocation occurs in the same context with clitic doubling:

MH/MS (CTH 188) HKM 48 Vs. 4–6
ᴰUTU*ŠI*   =**[m]u**⁴   *kuit*   *BELI*=[Y]A
Your Majesty=**me**-CL.PRON.1SG.ACC. concerning the fact that lord=my
ammu[*k*]   ᵐ*Hapirin*   *kiššan*   *wātarnahta* #
me-STRESSED PRON.1SG.ACC. Hapiri-ACC.SG. as follows commanded-3SG.PRET.
'Concerning the fact that you, Your Majesty, my lord, commanded **me**, Hapiri, as follows'.

While clitic doubling in this case operates within the 1st person pronoun (clitic -*mu* – stressed form *ammu*[*k*]), the appositive dislocation (*ammu*[*k*] ᵐ*Hapirin* 'me, Hapiri') involves the stressed pronoun (*ammu*[*k*]).

---

³ In the autography (ALP 1991: 51) the sign, although damaged, is unambiguously read MU.
⁴ In the autography (ALP 1991: 51) the sign, although damaged, is unambiguously read MU.

Stressed pronouns never double shift topic NPs, they exclusively co-occur as part of the appositive dislocation. The opposite is not true: both clitic and stressed pronouns occur with appositive dislocation: 1st person pronouns attest both forms (2 times clitic, once stressed in my corpus); 2nd person pronouns attest only stressed forms with it.

Third, clitic doubling and appositive dislocation have different functions. Appositive dislocation involves some kind of qualification/description of the referent of the enclitic (or stressed) pronoun of the 1st and 2nd person, while clitic doubling deals with topicality. Appositive dislocation is never used in the immediate anaphora after first mention (discourse status change function). It only gives additional information about the referent. Conversely, no descriptions whatsoever, not even epithets are possible as the full NP with clitic doubling. By this I mean that normally the clitic doubled full NP is lexically identical to the antecedent full NP.

Unfortunately, this last criterion is not as straightforward as the first three ones sketched above. I cannot exclude the possibility that *some* of the examples which I consider to represent clitic doubling are, in fact, appositive dislocations. The reason for this is the fact that both clear appositive dislocations and presumable clitic doubling employ lexically identical NPs: ᴰUTU*ŠI* 'my majesty'. Names occur quite frequently in appositive dislocations as well as in clitic doubling (ᵐ*Kizzuwan* in clitic doubling; ᵐ*Hapirin* in appositive dislocation MS (CTH 186) HKM 17 Vs. 9–11). So purely lexically, no line can be drawn between clitic doubling and appositive dislocations, especially if presumable clitic doubling examples demonstrate a continued topic function. Only discourse status change keeps them appropriately distinct in some of the clitic doubling uses. Even in this case, appropriate difference from appositive dislocation exists only if immediate anaphora after first mention is involved.

1.2. Hɪᴛᴛɪᴛᴇ ᴄʟɪᴛɪᴄ ᴅᴏᴜʙʟɪɴɢ ᴀs ᴀ ᴅɪsᴄᴏᴜʀsᴇ ᴄᴏɴᴅɪᴛɪᴏɴᴇᴅ ᴘʜᴇɴᴏᴍᴇɴᴏɴ. Hittite clitic doubling is clearly pragmatically conditioned. It attests to three functions.

The first function is shift topic:

MS (CTH 480) KUB 29.7+ KBo 21.41 Rs. 24–30
1. *nu* =*šši*   hašuwā[*i*]ˢᴬᴿ   *pianzi* #
s.ᴄ.ᴘᴀʀᴛ.= her-ᴄʟ.ᴘʀᴏɴ.3sɢ.ᴅᴀᴛ. soapwort-ᴀᴄᴄ.sɢ.ɴ. give-3ᴘʟ.ᴘʀᴇs.
2. *n*   =*at*   *anda puššaizzi* #
s.ᴄ.ᴘᴀʀᴛ.=it-ᴄʟ.ᴘʀᴏɴ.3sɢ.ᴀᴄᴄ.ɴ. in   pounds-3sɢ.ᴘʀᴇs.
3. *anda=ma=kan   kiššan me[mai]* #
then =but =ʟᴏᴄ.ᴘᴀʀᴛ. thus   speaks-3sɢ.ᴘʀᴇs.
4. *mān=wa ANA PA*[*NI*] DINGIRᴸᴵᴹ *kuiški*   EN SÍSKUR   *idālawanni*
if=ᴅɪʀ.sᴘ.ᴘᴀʀᴛ. before   deity   some-ɴᴏᴍ.sɢ.ᴄ. ritual practitioner evil-ʟᴏᴄ.sɢ.ɴ.
memian   harzi #
speak-ᴘᴀʀᴛ.sɢ.ɴᴏᴍ.ɴ. ᴀᴜx.3sɢ.ᴘʀᴇs.ᴘᴇʀꜰ.
5. *paiddu=wa=kan   edani   *DINGIRᴸᴵᴹ-*aš parni*
ᴀᴜx.3sɢ.ɪᴍᴘᴇʀ.=ᴅɪʀ.sᴘ.ᴘᴀʀᴛ.=ʟᴏᴄ.ᴘᴀʀᴛ. that-ʟᴏᴄ.sɢ. god's-ɢᴇɴ.sɢ.   house-ʟᴏᴄ.sɢ.
and[*a*]*n hurtaiš   ling*[*a*]*iš   paprātarr* =*a   hāšuwāyaš*
inside curse-ɴᴏᴍ.sɢ.ᴄ. perjury-ɴᴏᴍ.sɢ.ᴄ. uncleanliness-ɴᴏᴍ.sɢ.ɴ.=and soapwort-ɢᴇɴ.sɢ.
iwar kišaru #
like may become-3sɢ.ɪᴍᴘᴇʀ.ᴍᴇᴅ

6. *nu* =*war* =*at* *hāšu*[*wāy*]*aš*^{SAR} *iwar*
S.C.PART.=DIR.SP.PART.=them-CL.PRON.3PL.NOM.N. soapwort-GEN.SG. like
miyān *ēšdu* #
luxuriant-PART.NOM.SG.N. let be-3SG.IMPER.
7. *nu* =*war* =***at*** =*za* *namma* iyatnuwan
S.C.PART.=DIR.SP.PART.=**it**-CL.PRON.3SG.ACC.N.=REFL. further luxuriant-ACC.SG.N.
hāšuwāi^{SAR} [*puš*]*šuwanzi* [*l*]*ē* *kuiški* *tarahzi* # §
soapwort-ACC.SG.N. to crush/pluck-INF. PROHIB. no one-NOM.C. let be able-3SG.PRES.
'(1) They give her the soapwort (2) she pounds it (3) and then speaks thus: "(4) If
some ritual practitioner has spoken with evil intent befo[re] the deity: (5) "Let
curse, perjury and uncleanliness inside that temple become like soapwort. (6) Let
them be luxuriant like soapwort. (7) Further let no one be able to crush/pluck **it**, the
luxurious soapwort!"§'.

In clause 7 enclitic proun -*at* refers to *hāšuwāi*^{SAR} 'soapwort', a referent dif-
ferent from the referent of the pronoun -*at* in the previous clause 6 (*hurtaiš ling*[*a*]*iš
paprātarr=a* 'curse, perjury and uncleanliness'). Thus there is a topic shift: the
primary topic of clause 7 was the secondary topic of clause 6 whose primary
topic was *hurtaiš ling*[*a*]*iš paprātarr=a* 'curse, perjury and uncleanliness'.

It follows from the term that shift topic always involves a change of topic in
the clause with clitic doubling. The "new" topic is normally present in the previous
discourse – either in the immediately preceding context, or earlier. In the latter
case the topic has been deactivated and the clitic doubling construction serves to
re-activate it. In the former case the topic was a secondary topic. Quite rarely
clitic doubling is used to select one from several equally active referents. Even in
this case there is to some degree topic shift as a less active referent is chosen.

The second function is discourse status change:

OH/NS (CTH 9.6) KBo 3.28 Vs. II 17–19` (GARRETT 1990: 264)
1. *attaš* =*maš* *haršanī* ^DÍD-*ya* *mekkeš*
of father-GEN.SG.=my-GEN.SG. in the person-DAT.SG. in the river-LOC.SG. many-NOM.PL.C.
paprešker #
were proven guilty-3PL.PRET.ITER.
2. *š* =*uš* *ABI* LUGAL *natta huišnuškēt* #
S.C.PART.=them-CL.PRON.3PL.ACC.C. father of the king not let live-3SG.PRET.CAUS.ITER.
3. ^m*Kizzuwaš=pat* *ANA* SAG<.DU> *ABI=YA* ^DÍD-*ya*
Kizzuwa-NOM.SG.C.=EMPH.PART. in the person of father=my in the river-LOC.SG.
papritta #
was proven guilty-3SG.PRET.MED.
4. *š* =***an*** *attaš=miš* ^m*Kizzuwan*
S.C.PART.=**him**-CL.PRON.3SG.ACC.C. father-NOM.SG.C.=my-NOM.SG.C. Kizzuwa-ACC.SG.C.
nat<ta> hue<š>nūt #
not let live-3SG.PRET.CAUS.
'(1) Many were proven guilty in the river ordeal in (the matter of offending) the person
of my father. (2) The king's father did not let them live. (3) Kizzuwa in particular
was proven guilty by the river ordeal in (the matter of offending) the person of my
father. (4) My father did not let **him**, Kizzuwa, live'.

In this example clitic doubling codes the change of NP discourse status from non-topical to topical: NP *Kizzuwa-* was focus in the previous clause 3. In clause 4 clitic doubling marks the change of *Kizzuwa-* discourse status to the topical.

Discourse status change is actually shift topic. Still it is different enough from other shift topics to be described separately. Discourse status change does not involve referential ambiguity. There is indeed topic shift involved with discourse status change, but the referent which is the topic of the clause with clitic doubling is present in the previous clause, although in that clause it is focus or comment.[5] Moreover, the main topic of the context is normally maintained and coded by an enclitic or zero pronoun. Full scale topic shift (the main topic of the preceding clause is not the main topic of the clause in question; the secondary topic of the preceding context is the main topic of the clause in question) never occurs with the discourse status change function.

It is important to notice that nearly all cases of discourse status change are immediate anaphora after the first mention.

The third function is continued topic:

MS (CTH 443) KBo 15.10+ Vs. II 33–35
1. *nu*   i[*d*]*ā*[*l*]*u*   *harnikten* #
S.C.PART. evil-ACC.SG.N. destroy-2PL.IMPER.
2. *nu*   *ANA BELI ANA* DAM=*ŠU*   DUMU^MEŠ=*ŠU* *āššu*
S.C.PART. for lord   for wife=his   children=his   good-ACC.SG.N.
namma ēšt[*u*] #
then.   may be-3SG.IMPER.
3. [*nu=*]*šši*   ^DUTU-*uš*   ^DIM-*ašš*=*a*   *ANA BEL*[*I*] *ANA*
S.C.PART.=**him**-CL.PRON.3SG.DAT. Sungod-VOC.SG. Stormgod-VOC.SG.=and to lord to
DAM DUMU^MEŠ=*ŠU* *āššu*   TI-*tar*   *mayandatar*
wife children=his   well-being-ACC.SG.N. life-ACC.SG.N. youthful vigour-ACC.SG.N.
^GIŠTUKUL *parā nēantan*   [*na*]*m*[*m*]*a piškatten* #
weapon   ahead pointed-ACC.SG.N. then   keep giving-2PL.IMPER.ITER.
'(1) Destroy evil. (2) May it then be good for the lord, (his) wife (and) his children. (3) But let you, Sungod and Stormgod, then keep giving **to him**, the lord, (his) wife (and) his children well-being, life, youthful vigour (and) weapon pointed ahead'.

ANA BELI 'to the lord' was re-activated in clause 2 and is the established topic of the context. No discourse status change is involved. The use is identical to the enclitic anaphoric pronoun with unmarked word order. Such a use is actually attested to in the lexically identical context of the same text:

(CTH 443) KBo 15.10+ Vs. I 35–36 (= Rs. III 35'–37')
1. ***ANA BELI***=*ma* DAM=*ŠU*   DUMU^MEŠ=*ŠU* TI-*tar*   *hašt*[*iliyatar*]
for lord=but   wife=his   children=his   life-ACC.SG.N. bravery-ACC.SG.N.
mayandatar   *piškandu* #
youthful vigour-ACC.SG.N. let keep giving-3PL.IMPER.ITER.

---

[5] This lack of referential ambiguity is probably the reason why, cross-linguistically and normally in Hittite, discourse status change is coded by an anaphoric clitic pronoun.

2. *nu=šši*   DINGIR^{MEŠ.HI.A} ^{GIŠ}[TUK]UL *parā* *neantan*
S.C.P.=**him**-CL.PRON.3SG.DAT. gods   weapon ahead pointed-ACC.SG.N.
piandu #
let give-3PL.IMPER.
'(1) But let them keep giving to the lord, his wife (and) his children life, bravery (and) youthful vigour. (2) Let the gods give him a weapon pointed ahead'.

Thus, clitic doubling is really redundant here, being identical to the anaphoric enclitic pronoun use with unmarked word order. This function is the rarest, being attested only twice.

All these examples demonstrate that clitic doubling in Hittite is pragmatically conditioned. It is the topical status of the NP that brings about clitic doubling. Normally, clitic doubling is conditioned by some finer-grained topicality, and only in two cases of continued topic function is it pure topicality without finer meanings.

The question arises here – possibly in view of the two examples that code unmarked topicality – of whether we should really consider Hittite clitic doubling to code generic topicality: in some cases accompanied by finer-grained meanings, but not in other cases. However, I am reluctant to resort to this description as in this case clitic doubling would not be employed in the absolute majority of contexts where the conditions for its use are met, as most of the topics are not coded by clitic doubling. So I prefer to assess shift topic, including discourse status change, as the main conditioning of clitic doubling, narrowing the potential contexts for clitic doubling considerably. The continued topic function is for me a rare extension of this function implying the very start of clitic doubling, spread to less specific and more general topicality.

Summing up the section on Hittite clitic doubling, it is necessary to say that the small number of occurrences as well as the exclusively pragmatic conditioning of Hittite clitic doubling testify to the very first steps of the evolution of this syntactic phenomenon in Hittite.

2. HITTITE AND BALKAN PRAGMATICALLY CONDITIONED CLITIC DOUBLING: TOPICALITY. It is unanimously believed that, in the languages of the Balkan Sprachbund, clitic doubling is triggered by topicality. It is sometimes specified that only one kind of topic – the already established topic – triggers clitic doubling (KALLULI – TASMOWSKI 2008: 13–14, 16).[6]

Functional descriptions of concrete languages deviate from this general picture, revealing more complex details. The most interesting case is provided by Bulgarian. Functionally, clitic doubling is described as coding a contrastive topic (FRIEDMAN 2008: 45 with ref. to Leafgren; DIMITROVA-VULCHANOVA – VULCHANOV 2008: 105, 121). The contrastive topic is, however, understood in very different ways.

According to Leafgren, clitic doubling in Bulgarian is almost always used as an overt marker of topicality when this topicality is unexpected owing to its not being an (established) topic of the preceding context (FRIEDMAN 2008: 45 with ref. to Leafgren). It must be noted that this understanding is closer to new topic.

---

[6] The authors term it intended topic.

Thus, for example, in the next example the discourse theme, i.e., the topic of the context, is a philanderer, but in the clause with reduplication, the topic is adolescent greed:

> *No izvednăž zad   gărb-a   mu   ostana   ljubopitstvo-to kăm*
> but suddenly behind back-DEF him.DAT remained curiosity-DEF   to
> *žensko-to   tjalo, njamaše ja poveče junočeska-ta   lakomija da natrupva*
> female-DEF body not.have it more   adolescent-DEF greed   SP accumulate
> *opit   i   toj se čuvaše da kazva na prijateli-te si   …*
> experience and he it heard SP says   to friends-DEF self.DAT
> 'But all of a sudden he lost his curiosity about the female body, the adolescent voracity for accumulating experience was now gone, and he was heard to say to his friends …'
> (FRIEDMAN 2008: 45 with ref. to Leafgren).

In DIMITROVA-VULCHANOVA – VULCHANOV 2008 (105, 121) contrastive topic is understood in a more standard way:

> "[Clitic] doubling is predicted to occur when reference is made to a referent already present in the discourse […] and when this referent is selected out of a larger set. The necessary condition then is that the larger set is introduced previously, thus making the concrete referent available for selection later on through the clitic doubling mechanism."

Whatever the exact nature of the contrastive topic in Bulgarian, Hittite provides an interesting parallel. In Hittite it is not just topicality, but rather topic shift (including change of the discourse status from non-topical to topical) that is marked by clitic doubling. When the NP is already an established topic and there is no topic shift, it is not marked by clitic doubling.[7] This situation is very close to Bulgarian in *Leafgren*'s rendering.

An illustration of widely divergent finer-grained types of topicality triggering clitic doubling in the languages of the Balkan Sprachbund is provided by Romanian where clitic doubling entails some sort of familiarity with the topic, i.e. having a referent in mind beforehand (FRIEDMAN 2008: 54 with ref. to L. Tasmowski).

2.1. INHERENT/CONTEXTUAL HIGHER VS. LOWER TOPICALITY. For the languages of the Balkan Sprachbund a number of asymmetries of clitic doubling are observed: human, definite/specific, quantified by 'all', indirect object, 1st and 2nd person pronoun NPs (**a**) more often and more regularly trigger clitic doubling or (**b**) display less pragmatic constraints on it (thus being more grammaticalized) synchronically, (**c**) are the first to get clitic doubled diachronically than non-human, indefinite, not quantified by 'all', direct object, 3rd person and full lexical NPs. This asymmetry is motivated by higher vs. lower topicality (FRIEDMAN 2008: 59; ARKADIEV 2009: 12 with ref. to Haspelmath; 2010b). Left members of these pairs (human, definite/specific, quantified by 'all', indirect objects/recipients, 1st and 2nd person pronouns) are more topical that right ones (non-human, indefinite, not quantified by 'all', direct

---

[7] With the exception of two examples which are in any case practically indistinguishable from appositive dislocation.

objects/themes, 3rd person pronouns and full NPs). The Balkan Sprachbund clitic doubling is thus sensitive to the degree of topicality. Outside the Balkans the same hierarchy is also operative.

All these parameters are part of the universal hierarchy of topicality:[8]
a. human > non-human; b. definite > indefinite; c. more involved participant > less involved participant (agent > dative > accusative); d. 1st person > 2nd person > 3rd person (GIVÓN 1976: 152). The parameters may be linearly ordered as subject > definite object > human object > indefinite object (GIVÓN 1976: 152). The topicality hierarchy of M. Haspelmath is virtually identical: recipient vs. theme; 1st/2nd person vs. 3rd person; pronoun vs. full NP; proper name vs. common name; animate vs. inanimate; definite vs. indefinite (ARKADIEV 2009: 12). The hierarchy correlates with the likelihood of verb agreement (GIVÓN 1976: 152), thus predicting earlier development of clitic doubling into an agreement marker for indirect objects and 1st and 2nd person pronouns in the languages of the Balkan Sprachbund.

On the contrary, Hittite clitic doubling seems to be independent of the hierarchy. This is not unique. There are other data that contradict this correlation of the topicality hierarchy with the likelihood of agreement marking. For example, Bakker and Siewierska highlighted the fact that agreement as head-marking is more likely for the patient of transitive verbs (direct object) than for the recipient (indirect object). The latter is likelier to be dependent-marked (by case) (see ARKADIEV 2009: 1, 9 with lit.; ARKADIEV 2010a: 2).

2.1.1. HUMAN VS. NON-HUMAN. It is repeatedly noted that, in Romanian, animacy triggers clitic doubling (CORNILESCU – DOBROVIE-SORIN 2008: 304–5):

a. *L-am*   *văzut*   *pe*   *profesor-ul*   *tău.*
3SG.ACC-AUX.1SG.SBJ seen   OBJ   professor-DEF   your
'I saw your professor.'
b. (**L-)am*   *văzut* (*pe) *autobuzu-ul*   *tău.*
3SG.ACC-AUX.1SG.SBJ   seen OBJ   bus-DEF   your
'I saw your bus.' (ARKADIEV 2010b: 7).

As animacy obviously is more inherently topical than inanimacy, it is quite often deduced from this that animacy/humanness should be an obligatory stage in the grammaticalization process (Givón) and that a universal correlation exists between animacy/humanness and a higher degree of topicality, including such a connection in clitic doubling (FRIEDMAN 2008: 59; ARKADIEV 2009: 12 with ref. to Haspelmath; 2010b).

In Hittite animacy/humanness is irrelevant for clitic doubling: any kind of NP can trigger clitic doubling: both animate, human, common gender NPs (LUGAL MUNUS.LUGAL-*ann=a* 'the queen and the king', ᵐ*Kizzuwan* proper name, ᴰUTUˢᴵ 'My Majesty' as the title of the Hittite great king, *BEL*[*I*] 'lord'), animate, non-human, common gender NPs (ᴹᵁˢ*illuyanka*[*n*] 'the serpent'), and inanimate, non-human NPs of both neuter gender (*hāšuwāi*ˢᴬᴿ 'soapwort', *tarhuilatar* 'valour', *išhar* 'blood', *ŠA*ᴴᵁᴿ·ˢᴬᴳ*Ammana uwawar* 'coming to Mt. Ammana', ŠEŠᵁᵀᵀᴬ 'brotherhood') and common gender (MUᴴᴵ·ᴬ-*uš* 'years', *galulupēš* 'fingers').

---

[8] See also KALLULI – TASMOWSKI 2008: 19, 26; HILL – TASMOWSKI 2008.

More importantly, within the languages of the Balkan Sprachbund itself only Romanian attests animacy as conditioning clitic doubling.[9] This certainly means that animacy/humanness implies greater topicality indeed,[10] but it also means that animacy/humanness as a topicality related phenomenon does not automatically trigger clitic doubling and, indeed, triggers it very seldom *by itself*.[11] So animacy/humanness as an obligatory stage on the universal topicality scale is open to question.

2.1.2. DEFINITE/SPECIFIC VS. INDEFINITE. Another important pragmatic trigger of clitic doubling related to higher topicality degree is definiteness and specificity (KALLULI – TASMOWSKI 2008: 10–11; FRIEDMAN 2008: 43; MIŠESKA TOMIĆ 2008: 70).[12] Mostly definiteness and specificity co-occur with topicality,[13] more rarely they conflict, and in this case there are two scenarios: 1. Topicality has priority: in Albanian and Modern Greek clitic doubling is triggered by non-pronominal direct object DPs if they are topical/given/anti-focal irrespective of their definite status (KALLULI – TASMOWSKI 2008: 16, 18; FRIEDMAN 2008: 43). 2. Definiteness has priority over topicality: in Macedonian bare indefinite direct objects are not clitic doubled even when topicalized (MIŠESKA TOMIĆ 2008: 73–74).

Hittite follows the first scenario since shift topic triggers clitic doubling. While I have no examples of shift topic indefinite NPs being clitic doubled,[14] no definite focal NPs are ever clitic doubled.

2.1.3. THE QUANTIFIER 'ALL'. Clitic doubling is obligatorily triggered by the quantifier 'all' not only in the languages of the Balkan Sprachbund (Romanian, Modern Greek, Albanian), but also in (River Plate) Spanish (KALLULI – TASMOWSKI 2008: 17). It is especially stressed that in Modern Greek only this quantifier triggers clitic doubling obligatorily (KALLULI – TASMOWSKI 2008: 17; FRIEDMAN 2008: 37, 49). Clitic doubling in this context is observed already in Old Slavonic (DIMITROVA-VULCHANOVA – VULCHANOV 2008: 123–124).

This obligatory triggering is explained by the fact that the restrictor of 'all' is always given (KALLULI – TASMOWSKI 2008: 19) and thus it is again higher topicality that regularly triggers clitic doubling in the Balkans and (River Plate) Spanish.

As for Hittite higher degree of topicality is not relevant, 'all' does not obligatory trigger clitic doubling.

---

[9] The only other evidence comes from a Macedonian dialect spoken in Northern Greece where "clitic-doubling of a noun without an article […] can sometimes occur with indefinite human direct objects, especially if they are masculine" (MIŠESKA TOMIĆ 2008: 73 fn. 9 with ref. to Topolinjska).

[10] Humanness is also present in the indirect object which in the basic function of recipient is normally human (see below 2.1.4.2.) and in 1st and 2nd person pronouns.

[11] I.e., outside such inherently human categories as indirect object and 1st and 2nd person pronouns.

[12] See ibid.: 19; FRIEDMAN 2008: 41–43 on some finer-grained distinctions involving non-novelty, referential stability and potential specifiability.

[13] This connection seems to be universal (KALLULI – TASMOWSKI 2008: 13). See also KALLULI – TASMOWSKI 2008: 19 for analyzing certain indefinite expressions as non-novel leading to the conflation of specificity and topichood/givenness and ARKADIEV 2009: 12 (with ref. to Haspelmath) for the definite NPs being more topical.

[14] Naturally, we should remember that Hittite does not grammaticalize definiteness as it has no articles.

2.1.4. Topical asymmetry

2.1.4.1. 1ˢᵗ and 2ⁿᵈ person pronouns vs. 3ʳᵈ person pronouns vs. full NPs. Direct objects instantiated by 1ˢᵗ and 2ⁿᵈ person pronouns trigger clitic doubling *more* obligatorily or have less pragmatic constraints on it than other types of direct objects in at least some languages of the Balkan Sprachbund (Friedman 2008: 40 generally; Kalluli – Tasmowski 2008: 17 and Kalluli 2008: 228, 248 for Albanian; Mišeska Tomić 2008: 70 and Koneski 1981: 334 for Macedonian). There are even Serbo-Croatian dialects where only pronominal direct objects trigger clitic doubling (Friedman 2008: 46–47, 59; Mišeska Tomić 2008: 82; Mønnesland 1977[15]).[16] Diachronically this fact can be unambiguously interpreted as 1ˢᵗ and 2ⁿᵈ person pronouns being the first to trigger clitic doubling. See most explicitly (Krapova – Cinque 2008: 279 fn. 33).

It is noted that, in Albanian, direct objects instantiated by first and second person full pronouns are *always* clitic doubled irrespective of their discourse status (Kalluli – Tasmowski 2008: 9, 17; Kalluli 2008: 228, 248). The situation in Romanian is analogous as clitic doubling there is triggered by all full personal and definite pronouns (Kalluli – Tasmowski 2008: 9–10). Thus, an inherent higher degree of topicality again has priority over contextual topicality that may be completely absent.

Outside the Balkans 1ˢᵗ and 2ⁿᵈ person pronouns are more frequently clitic doubled than 3ʳᵈ person pronouns in Welsh (Parina 2006: 9).

More rarely, the borderline is between pronouns and full NPs: in Slovenian dialects (Gorica) it is pronouns (including 3ʳᵈ person pronouns) that trigger clitic doubling as different from full NPs (Marušič – Žaucer in print: 3; Arkadiev 2010b: 7). Any person, number and case of full personal pronouns (not demonstrative), including reflexive pronouns, triggers clitic doubling. Simultaneous clitic doubling of two pronouns is judged possible, but not recorded in spontaneous speech (Marušič – Žaucer in print: 3–4, 12).

Similarly in North Italian dialects (Turin) object clitic doubling is attested only if the object is instantiated with a pronoun (Čelyševa 2001: 110). In (River Plate) Spanish, the indirect object is obligatorily clitic doubled if it is instantiated by a pronoun and facultative if it is instantiated by a full human NP. It is obligatory if the indirect object is the possessor and when it is a 'quirky' subject (Vanelli 1998: 135–136).

A very interesting distribution occurs in Friulian and in Italian Venetian dialects: subjects are most obligatorily and widely clitic-doubled when instantiated by a 2ⁿᵈ sg. pronoun (Narumov – Suchačev 2001: 378; Čelyševa 2001: 122). The situation in Ladinian is similar, but in some dialects subject clitic doubling is obligatory not only in 2ⁿᵈ sg., but also in 3ʳᵈ person (both sg. and pl.), instantiated by both pronouns and full NPs with some phonological and morphonological conditioning (Narumov 2001: 403, 409). Analogous, but more complex is the situation in North Italian dialects (Čelyševa 2001: 109): in some dialects subject

---

[15] Actually, in Old Serbian there are some examples of clitic doubled full NPs (Mønnesland 1977: 106–107), but they are really sporadic, being attested in three documents under the Albanian influence (ibid.).

[16] Clitic doubling of full pronouns is attested even in the New Štokavian dialect of Serbian which does not attest to Balkan Sprachbund linguistic features (Bošnjaković 2000).

clitic doubling is obligatory in any person, in some – in 2 sg., 3 sg. and 1 pl. In some dialects the subject clitic is facultative. In Genoa subject clitic doubling is obligatory in 2 sg. and 3 sg. In Venetian dialects there are also generalized subject clitics: in Padua *a* is a topicalizor for all persons and numbers (Čelyševa 2001: 122). In Sicily subject clitic doubling is obligatory in 2 sg. and pl. in imperfect, conjunctive and conditional (Čelyševa 2001: 144). For a fuller list of obligatory subject clitic doubling, see Vanelli 1998 (37, 48) where the obligatoriness scale is 2nd sg. < 3rd sg. < 3rd pl. However, it should be mentioned that this difference is actually based on the degree of obligatoriness of subject clitic pronouns *without* clitic doubling (Vanelli 1998: 29–49).

This difference between 1st and 2nd person pronouns vs. 3rd person pronouns vs. full NPs is motivated by the fact that 1st and 2nd person pronouns are more topical than 3rd person pronouns and full NPs (Friedman 2008: 59; Arkadiev 2009: 12 with ref. to Haspelmath).

In Hittite 1st and 2nd person pronouns are not clitic doubled more regularly than full NPs. Actually, there is only one case of 1st person pronouns triggering clitic doubling.

> MH/MS (CTH 188) HKM 48 Vs. 4–6
> ᴰUTU*ŠI*   =[*m*]*u*[17]   *kuit*   *BELI*=[*Y*]*A*
> Your Majesty=**me**-CL.PRON.1SG.ACC. concerning the fact that lord=my
> *ammu*[*k*]   ᵐ*Hapirin*   *kiššan*   *wātarnahta* #
> me-STRESSED PRON.1SG.ACC. Hapiri-ACC.SG. as follows commanded-3SG.PRET.
> 'Concerning the fact that you, Your Majesty, my lord, commanded **me**, Hapiri, as follows'.

As 1st and 2nd person pronouns have higher inherent topicality than 3rd person pronouns and full NPs, the lack of any particular frequency/obligatoriness of them being clitic doubled implies again that Hittite is insensitive to the degree of topicality. However, an important proviso is in place here: it is clitic doubling of the 1st person pronoun in Hittite that differs most clearly from appositive dislocations. Although I believe that the shift topic function of clitic doubled full NPs distinguishes the structures they occur in well enough from the appositive dislocations, I cannot totally exclude the possibility that only clitic doubling of the 1st person pronoun is actually clitic doubling in Hittite. If this is indeed so, the Hittite state of affairs would be similar to that of the Slovenian dialects. In any case, note that clitic doubling of 1st and 2nd person pronouns is an innovation of clitic doubling in comparison with left dislocations out of which clitic doubling most likely developed: personal pronouns are never left-dislocated in Hittite.

2.1.4.2. I n d i r e c t   v s.   d i r e c t   o b j e c t. It has been remarked that "[…] the literature on clitic doubling in various languages[18] converges on the view that direct object clitic doubling is much more restricted than indirect object clitic doubling […]" (Kalluli – Tasmowski 2008: 7). See also Friedman 2008: 40. In the western periphery of the South-Eastern Serbian dialects, e.g. in the dialect of

---

[17] In the autography (ALP 1991: 51) the sign, although damaged, is unambiguously read MU.
[18] Actually only Romance languages ((River Plate) Spanish) and the languages of the Balkan Sprachbund are considered – AS.

Prizren, only indirect lexical objects are as a rule clitic doubled (Mišeska Tomić 2008: 82). This fact implies that diachronically indirect objects are the first to be clitic doubled.

It is further specified that "[a]t least in Macedonian and Albanian, clitic doubling of indirect objects can be equated with object agreement" (Kalluli – Tasmowski 2008: 13, 15; Kalluli 2008: 228, 248; Vidoeski 1998–1999: I, 25). In Albanian clitic doubling is pragmatically conditioned when triggered by direct objects. It is triggered only by grammatical factors with indirect objects. So it is a grammaticalized agreement marker for indirect objects and pragmatically conditioned clitic doubling for direct objects (Kalluli – Tasmowski 2008: 13, 15; Kalluli 2008: 228, 248).[19] The only constraint on Macedonian direct objects is definiteness (specificity with partitive indefiniteness) (Mišeska Tomić 2008: 70–73, 79) while the constraint on indirect objects is specificity. However, bare dat[ive] indefinites, which can never be specific, can also be optionally clitic doubled (ibid.: 76). This indicates that "[t]he dat[ive] clitic […] is actually much more close to becoming a mere case marker than the acc[usative] clitic is" (ibid.: 76, 80).[20]

The situation outside the Balkans is similar. In Friulian and in the Venetian dialect of Italian clitic doubling of the indirect object is obligatory with verbs like *dare* 'give', *regalare* 'present', *mandare* 'send', *promettere* 'promise' where the recipient is an obligatory valency of the verb (Vanelli 1998: 134–135). The description seems to imply that clitic doubling of direct objects is not obligatory.

These data mean that there is a distinction between indirect object clitic doubling as an agreement marker[21] (for the definition, see Givón 1976) being grammatically conditioned and direct object clitic doubling as the only clitic doubling proper type being grammatically and pragmatically conditioned (Arkadiev 2009; 2010a; 2010b).[22] The two are diachronically connected as different stages of the grammaticalization of the same cross-referencing relations (Arkadiev 2009; 2010a). Grammaticalization proceeds more quickly with indirect objects because of their inherent higher topicality.[23] This difference between clitic dou-

---

[19] This is not characteristic of all the Balkan Sprachbund: "[…] grammatically constrained clitic doubling on the left handside becom[es] freer and pragmatically significant as one proceeds to the right: Macedonian > Albanian > Romanian > Greek > Bulgarian" (Kalluli – Tasmowski 2008: 9). Clitic doubling of both indirect and direct objects in Greek and colloquial Bulgarian is not only grammatically but also pragmatically conditioned (Kalluli – Tasmowski 2008: 2–3). Notice that, contrary to frequent claims otherwise (Friedman 2008: 50; Kalluli – Tasmowski 2008: 11), both in Modern Greek and Bulgarian clitic doubling is obligatory when properly pragmatically licenced (Dimitrova-Vulchanova – Vulchanov 2008: 121; Janse 2008: 166).

[20] At the same time I fail to understand why the fact that "the clitics can be optionally left out even when the indirect object is obviously specific" (ibid.: 80) should mean that "the Macedonian dat[ive] doubling clitics actually act as case markers" (ibid.: 80). This fact can signify only one thing: Macedonian clitic doubling of indirect object is not yet completely grammaticalized.

[21] See most explicitly: Mišeska Tomić 2008: 69.

[22] Cf. Arkadiev 2010a: 9–10, who assesses both direct and indirect object clitic doubling as being agreement markers. In this case they would just be differently conditioned: both by grammatical relations and by topicality (ibid.: 14). However, even if we consider clitic doubling of all indirect and definite direct objects to be an agreement marker, we have to concede that it is not a canonical one as it corresponds only to the part of criteria for agreement markers in Arkadiev 2010b.

[23] The problem that so much troubled Kalluli and Tasmowski – "if the nature of agreement and topic markers is indeed substantially different […], why are doubling clitics employed as means

bling of indirect and direct objects is explained by the fact that all indirect objects are inherently more topical than direct objects as recipient vs. theme (ARKADIEV 2009: 12 with ref. to Haspelmath).

Again, as with definiteness, inherent topicality can be in conflict with textual topicality. For Macedonian, *all* pragmatic uses (including focal ones) of definite direct objects and all indirect objects trigger clitic doubling; for Albanian, all IOs, DOs instantiated by first and second person pronouns, and all non-focal/non-rhematic DO DPs trigger clitic doubling (KALLULI – TASMOWSKI 2008: 9–10, 25; KALLULI 2008: 228, 248; FRIEDMAN 2008: 48, 54; ARKADIEV 2009: 9 with lit.; MIŠESKA TOMIĆ 2008: 65).[24] This would represent some difficulty for the authors like ARKADIEV 2009 (12) who directly assess obligatory clitic doubling of these categories as topic-related. Alongside the lines of (GIVÓN 1976), I would suggest a somewhat more complex scenario. While *originally* the general greater topicality status of indirect objects and direct objects instantiated by 1st and 2nd person pronouns caused them to trigger clitic doubling more regularly, the situation in Western Macedonian is grammaticalized and synchronically independent of pragmatics: both categories can trigger clitic doubling even when in focus.[25] Another way to explain the situation is to assume the priority of inherent topicality over textual topicality.

Hittite differs markedly from this state of affairs.[26] Indirect objects are not clitic doubled more regularly/obligatorily than direct objects. Clitic doubling of both of them is purely pragmatically conditioned. In this respect Hittite is closer to Greek and colloquial Bulgarian than to Romanian, Albanian, and especially Macedonian (KALLULI – TASMOWSKI 2008: 9). Note that, in contrast to Balkan clitic doubling, in Hittite clitic doubling is never present for both direct and indirect objects simultaneously. Actually in my corpus there is only one clitic doubled indirect object:

MS (CTH 443) KBo 15.10+ Vs. II 33–35
1. *nu   i[d]ā[l]u   harnikten* #
   S.C.PART. evil-ACC.SG.N. destroy-2PL.IMPER.
2. *nu   ANA BELI ANA* DAM=*ŠU* DUMU^MEŠ=*ŠU* *āššu   namma*
   S.C.PART. for lord   for wife=his   children=his   good-ACC.SG.N. then.
ēšt[*u*] #
may be-3SG.IMPER.

---

for fulfilling such different functions?" (KALLULI – TASMOWSKI 2008: 17; KALLULI 2008: 228) – can be answered fairly easily within the functionalist paradigm: they represent different stages of the same cline of grammaticalization dependent on the topicality hierarchy (GIVÓN 1976; FRIEDMAN 2008; ARKADIEV 2009; 2010b). Cf. KALLULI 2008: 249; KRAPOVA – CINQUE 2008: 280.

[24] See MIŠESKA TOMIĆ 2008: 72–3, 80 for some special cases. This holds good for standard Macedonian and the western dialects (on which it is based). Clitic doubling in the eastern dialects is not so consistent (VIDOESKI 1999: 53).

[25] Although even in Macedonian there is historical evidence from the 18th and 19th centuries for pragmatic factors in clitic doubling (FRIEDMAN 2008: 43, 58): in focal contexts clitic doubling of definite direct objects was blocked.

[26] This concurs with those rare Balkan systems (some Bulgarian dialects) where the frequency of clitic doubling is equal for direct and indirect objects (FRIEDMAN 2008: 40 fn. 11). However, nothing is said about the obligatory/non-obligatory character of both of them in FRIEDMAN 2008 (40 fn. 11). So the real similarity of the Hittite system to the Bulgarian dialectal one remains unclear.

3. [*nu=*]*šši* ᴰUTU-*uš* ᴰIM-*ašš=a* _ANA BEL[I]_
S.C.PART.=**him**-CL.PRON.3SG.DAT. Sungod-VOC.SG. Stormgod-VOC.SG.=and to lord
ANA DAM DUMUᴹᴱˢ=*ŠU āššu* TI-*tar* *mayandatar*
to wife children=his well-being-ACC.SG.N. life-ACC.SG.N. youthful vigour-ACC.SG.N.
ᴳᴵˢTUKUL *parā nēantan* [*na*]*m*[*m*]*a piškatten* #
weapon ahead pointed-ACC.SG.N. then keep giving-2PL.IMPER.ITER.
'(1) Destroy evil. (2) May it then be good for the lord, (his) wife (and) his children.
(3) But let you, Sungod and Stormgod, then keep giving **to him**, the lord, (his) wife
(and) his children well-being, life, youthful vigour (and) weapon pointed ahead'.

What should be especially emphasized here is the fact that this unique case of a clitic doubled indirect object in Hittite has the function of a continued topic, a sporadic secondary development of clitic doubling into the sphere of generic topicality. This has two consequences: 1. The clitic doubling of indirect objects involves a diachronically later function than the clitic doubling of direct objects and subjects. 2. The continued topic function of clitic doubling is indistinguishable from appositive dislocation in Hittite and may actually be an appositive dislocation. At the same time the shift topic function, more distinct from appositive structures, is attested only with direct objects and subjects.

Again, Hittite is not the only exception to the topicality hierarchy. Bakker and Siewierska's head and dependent-marking hierarchy plainly contradicts it (see Arkadiev 2010a: 5): viewed from the perspective of Bakker and Siewierska's hierarchy (for which see Arkadiev 2010a: 5), the topicality hierarchy would produce a typologically unique situation (see Arkadiev 2010a: 5) where indirect objects are both indexed on the verb (head-marked) by an agreement marker and bear case (dependent-marked) while direct objects only bear case (dependent-marked).[27] Head and dependent-marking hierarchy predicts a totally opposite state of affairs. It is also important that systems with indirect object clitic doubling vs. subject and direct object agreement are attested, but not ones with direct object clitic doubling vs. indirect object agreement (Arkadiev 2010b: 4). However, as Arkadiev 2010a showed, there are quite a number of counterexamples to Bakker and Siewierska's hierarchy, e.g. Amharic where in case of ditransitives both Theme and Recipient may be marked accusative, but in this case only the Recipient triggers verb agreement, and this agreement is now obligatory (Arkadiev 2010a: 8). Other counterexamples are Kwomtari and Usan (Arkadiev 2010a: 10–11). Thus, both hierarchies simply do not coincide and neither of them is truly universal.

In any case, it is important to remember that Hittite clitic doubling is not described within Bakker and Siewierska's head and dependent-marking hierarchy either as it has nothing to do with agreement markers being exclusively pragmatically motivated.

2.1.4.3. S u b j e c t v s. o b j e c t c l i t i c d o u b l i n g. According to T. Givón, since agents possess an inherently higher degree of topicality (Givón 1976: 152), they should be more regularly/obligatorily clitic doubled. However, this prediction is not borne out by the clitic doubling data available to me because I know

---

[27] The fact that there are systems with clitic doubling of just indirect objects, beneficiaries and 'raised' possessors (Arkadiev 2010b: 5 Ex. 20) is irrelevant as there is no information whether clitic doubling in Yawuru is clitic doubling proper or agreement.

of no languages where only subject clitic doubling is present. Still, if a language has subject clitics, subject clitic doubling is always present (Hittite; Italian dialects).

Macedonian and Modern Greek lack subject clitics (Miševska Tomić 2008: 66; De Boel 2008: 89). This situation is typologically common: subject agreement vs. object clitic doubling is the most common type of their co-occurrence in a language (Arkadiev 2010b: 4).

In Friulian and in Italian Venetian dialects subject clitic doubling is obligatory and is generally considered to be agreement (Narumov – Suchačev 2001: 378; Čelyševa 2001: 122). In other sources it is observed that in Friulian and in the Venetian dialect of Italian clitic doubling of the indirect object is obligatory with verbs like *dare* 'give', *regalare* 'present', *mandare* 'send', *promettere* 'promise' where the indirect object is an obligatory valency of the verb (Vanelli 1998: 134–5). In the same source nothing is said about subject clitic doubling. (See Narumov – Suchačev 2001: 388; Čelyševa 2001: 110, 122, 144.)

Hittite is similar to Italian dialects since it clitic-doubles subjects in the same way as direct and indirect objects. Thus it is insensitive to the higher degree of topicality again. There are two examples of clitic doubling in my corpus:

NH/NS (CTH 171) KUB 23.102 Vs. I 1'–9'
1. *kuitt=a   =at*   ŠEŠ*UTTA* #
   what=and=**it**-cl.pron.3sg.nom.n. "brotherhood"-nom.sg.n.?
2. *n   =at*   *kuit=ma*   ŠA HUR.SAG*Ammana uwawar* #
s.c.part.=**it**-cl.pron.3sg.nom.n. what=but   of Mt. Ammana coming-nom.sg.n.?
'(1) What is **it**, "brotherhood"? (2) And what is **it**, "coming to Mt. Ammana"?'.
MS (CTH 789) KBo 32.13 Vs. II 30–32
1. *kišraš   =ma =šši*   *galulupēš=šeš*   *talugaē[š]* #
of hand-gen.sg.=but=her-cl.pron.3sg.dat. fingers-nom.pl.c.=her-nom.pl.c. long-nom.pl.c.
2. *n   =at*   *=kan*   *miyaweš   =pat*
s.c.part.=**they**-cl.pron.3pl.nom.c.=loc.part. four-nom.pl.c.=emph.part.
galulupēš   [*ANA B*]*IBRI*   *kattanta*   *kiantari* #
fingers-nom.pl.c. vessel   under   are placed-3pl.pres.med.
'(1) The fingers of her hand (are) long. (2) **They**, (her) four fingers, are placed under the animal-shaped vessel'.

2.2. Higher vs. lower topicality and clitic doubling: summing up. It follows from the material presented above that the languages of the Balkan Sprachbund are sensitive to the degree of topicality while Hittite is not.

The higher degree of topicality of human, specific, quantified by 'all', subject, indirect object, instantiated by 1st and 2nd person pronoun NPs is inherent. In concrete texts most of these NPs can also be focal. This conflict between inherent and contextual topicality in the languages of the Balkan Sprachbund is mostly resolved in favour of inherent topicality. If contextually determined features (definiteness and comment/focus) are in conflict, either property can have priority.

For Hittite generally it is the presence of a particular type of topicality (shift topic including change of discourse status from non-topical to topical) that triggers clitic doubling. Higher vs. lower degree of topicality has no effect whatsoever: Hittite lacks more regular/obligatory clitic doubling of both indirect objects (in comparison with direct objects) and of 1st and 2nd person pronouns (in comparison

with full NPs). In Hittite, a higher level of topicality does not trigger any grammaticalization or more regular use of clitic doubling as it does in the Balkans.

The alternative scenario could assume that less topical features triggering clitic doubling in Hittite besides more topical ones implies that grammaticalization has gone further than in the Balkans. This would be supported by the facts that (a) not only human but also inanimate NPs, (b) not only indirect, but also direct objects, (c) not only subjects, but also objects; (d) not only 1st and 2nd person pronouns, but also full NPs trigger clitic doubling in Hittite. This certainly means that clitic doubling has spread from the most topical categories to the less topical ones. However, this scenario is not very likely: Hittite does not attest any proper grammaticalization as clitic doubling is triggered by pragmatic factors only. Moreover, it seems that inherent topicality is not relevant for Hittite clitic doubling, only contextually determined topicality is.

3. CONCLUSION. The small number of occurrences as well as the exclusively pragmatic conditioning of Hittite clitic doubling testify that this syntactic structure was only emerging in Hittite. The comparison with the pragmatically conditioned Balkan Sprachbund clitic doubling demonstrates that these very first steps of clitic doubling evolution attest to a scenario different from the Balkan one. It implies that clitic doubling need not always develop along the same cline dependent on the topical hierarchy. Thus, the Hittite – Balkan comparison contributes to the little described diachronic typology of clitic doubling.

REFERENCES

ALP, Sedat. *Hethitische Keilschrifttafeln aus Maşat-Höyük*. Ankara: Türk tarih kurumu basımevi, 1991.

ARKADIEV, P.M. Soglasovanie s imennoj gruppoj v periferijnom padeže: opyt tipologii. *VI konferencija po tipologii i grammatike*. ILI RAN. Sankt-Peterburg 26–28 nojabrja 2009 g., 1–16.

ARKADIEV, Peter. Towards a Typology of Case in Head-Marking Languages. *MPI for Evolutionary Anthropology*. Leipzig, February 4, 2010, 1–20.

ARKADIEV, Peter. Clitic Doubling: Towards a Typology. *Kruglyj stol "Klitiki i sintaksičeskaja tipologija*. RGGU, 7 ijunja 2010 g, 1–10.

BOŠNJAKOVIĆ, Žarko. O ponavljanju rečeničnih konstituenata. *Zbornik Matice srpske za filologiju i lingvistiku* XLIII (2000): 65–72.

CORNILESCU, Alexandra, Carmen DOBROVIE-SORIN. Clitic doubling, complex heads and interarboreal operations. Dalina Kalluli, Liliane Tasmowski (eds.). *Clitic Doubling in the Balkan Languages*. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2008: 289–319.

ČELYŠEVA, I. I. Dialekty Italii. I. I. Čelyševa, B. P. Narumov, O. I. Romanova (red.). *Romanskie jazyki*. Moskva: Academia, 2001, 90–145.

DIMITROVA-VULCHANOVA, Mila, Valentin VULCHANOV. Clitic doubling and Old Bulgarian. Dalina Kalluli, Liliane Tasmowski (eds.). *Clitic Doubling in the Balkan Languages*. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2008: 105–134.

FRIEDMAN, Victor. Balkan object reduplication in areal and dialectological perspective. Dalina Kalluli, Liliane Tasmowski (eds.). *Clitic Doubling in the Balkan Languages*. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2008, 35–64.

GARRETT, Andrew. *The Syntax of Anatolian Pronominal Clitics*. Ph.D. Diss., Harvard University, 1990.

GIVÓN, Talmy. Topic, Pronoun and Grammatical Agreement. Ch. Li (ed.). *Subject and Topic*. New York: Academic Press, 1976: 149–188.

HILL, Virginia, Liliane TASMOWSKI. Romanian Clitic Doubling: A view from pragmatics-semantics and diachrony. Dalina Kalluli, Liliane Tasmowski (eds.). *Clitic Doubling in the Balkan Languages*. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2008, 135–164.

HOFFNER, Harry A. Jr., H. Craig MELCHERT. *A Grammar of the Hittite Language*. Part 1: Reference Grammar. Winona Lake, Indiana, 2008.

JANSE, Mark. Clitic doubling from Ancient to Asia Minor Greek. Dalina Kalluli, Liliane Tasmowski (eds.). *Clitic Doubling in the Balkan Languages*. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2008, 165–202.

KALLULI, Dalina. Clitic doubling, agreement and information structure: The case of Albanian. Dalina Kalluli, Liliane Tasmowski (eds.). *Clitic Doubling in the Balkan Languages*. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2008, 227–256.

KALLULI, Dalina, Liliane, TASMOWSKI. Introduction: Clitic doubling, core syntax and the interfaces. Dalina Kalluli, Liliane Tasmowski (eds.). *Clitic Doubling in the Balkan Languages*. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2008, 1–32.

KONESKI, Blaže. *Gramatika na makedonskiot literaturen jazik*. Del I i II. Skopje: Kultura, 1981.

KRAPOVA, Iliyana, Guglielmo, CINQUE. Clitic reduplication constructions in Bulgarian. Dalina Kalluli, Liliane Tasmowski (eds.). *Clitic Doubling in the Balkan Languages*. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2008, 257–287.

MARUŠIČ, Franc, Rok ŽAUCER. Clitic Doubling in a determinerless language with second position clitics. *Proceedings of FDSL 7.5*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, in print (lingBuzz/000924), 1–14.

MIŠESKA TOMIĆ, Olga. Towards grammaticalization of clitic doubling: Clitic doubling in Macedonian and neighbouring languages. Dalina Kalluli, Liliane Tasmowski (eds.). *Clitic Doubling in the Balkan Languages*. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2008, 65–88.

MØNNESLAND, Svein. Udvajanje ličnih zamenica u srpskohrvatskom jeziku. *Naučni sastanak slavista u Vukove dane* 1 (1977): 101–110.

NARUMOV, B. P. Ladinskij jazyk. I. I. Čelyševa, B. P. Narumov, O. I. Romanova (red.). *Romanskie jazyki*. Moskva: Academia, 2001, 392–410.

NARUMOV, B. P., N. L. SUCHAČEV. Friul'skij jazyk. I. I. Čelyševa, B. P. Narumov, O. I. Romanova (red.). *Romanskie jazyki*. Moskva: Academia, 2001, 365–391.

PARINA, Elena. Direct object double marking in Celtic and South Slavic Languages – Preliminary remarks. S. Mac Mathuna, M. Fomin (eds.). *Parallels between Celtic and Slavic. Studia Celto-Slavica*. Coleraine, 2006, 119–130.

VANELLI, Laura. *I dialetti italiani settentrionali nel panorama romanzo. Studi di sintassi e morfologia*. Biblioteca di cultura 555. Roma: Bulzoni editore, 1998.

VIDOESKI, Božidar. *Dijalektite na makedonskiot jazik*. I–III. Skopje: MANU, 1998–1999.

Андреј В. Сидељцев

ХЕТИТСКЕ ПАРАЛЕЛЕ УДВАЈАЊУ КЛИТИКА У БАЛКАНСКОМ ЈЕЗИЧКОМ САВЕЗУ

Р е з и м е

У раду се разматрају хетитске паралеле удвајању клитика у Балканском језичком савезу. Ретка употреба и искључиво прагматичка функција удвајања клитика у хетитском показују да се ова појава у хетитском тек рађала. Поређење са прагматичком условљеношћу удвајања клитика у језицима Балканског језичког савеза показује да се почетна етапа развоја удвајања клитика у хетитском суштински разликује од сценарија балканског развоја. Основна разлика је у томе што је у хетитском удвајање клитика очигледно независно од хијерархије топикалности, која је битна на Балкану.

Russian Academy of Sciences
Institute of Linguistics
Department of Indo-European Languages
Moscow
cidelcev@rambler.ru