Συντακτικός

SONDERDRUCK/OFFPRINT

Studien
zur historisch-vergleichenden Sprachwissenschaft

Herausgegeben von
Harald Bichlmeier

Band 20

Συντακτικός

Studien zur historischen Syntax, Pragmatik
und Etymologie der indogermanischen Sprachen

Gedenkschrift für Heinrich Hettrich

herausgegeben von
Kristina Becker, Harald Bichlmeier, Daniel Kölligan,
Tiziana Quadrio und Theresa Roth

baar

Hamburg 2022

Baar-Verlag
Hamburg
URL: http://baar-verlag.com
E-Mail: info@baar-verlag.com

Bibliographische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek
Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliographie; detaillierte bibliographische Daten sind im Internet über http://dnb.d-nb.de abrufbar.

© The authors, the editors and Baar-Verlag 2022

Das Werk einschließlich aller seiner Teile ist urheberrechtlich geschützt. Jede Verwertung außerhalb der engen Grenzen des Urheberrechtsgesetzes ist ohne Zustimmung des Verlages unzulässig und strafbar. Das gilt insbesondere für Vervielfältigungen, Übersetzungen, Mikroverfilmungen und die Einspeicherung und Verarbeitung in elektronischen Systemen.

Druck und Verarbeitung: SOWA, Piaseczno.
Umschlagsgestaltung: Linda Sophie Gableske (5°sued), Dresden.

All rights reserved. This publication may not be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publisher.

Printed and bound in Poland.

ISBN 978-3-935536-40-0
ISSN 2192-0133

Inhalt

Schriftenverzeichnis von Heinrich Hettrich 13

Tabula commemorativa 23

Syntax und Pragmatik 25

Benedetti, Marina
Accusatives as Default Options: Meronymic Unions in Ancient Greek 27

Bichlmeier, Harald / Benvenuto, Maria Carmela
Zum Ausdruck prädikativer Possessivität im Altavestischen 37

Brosch, Cyril Robert
„Aufwärts“ > „auf“: Eine deutsch-hethitische Parallelentwicklung 53

Casaretto, Antje
Adverbien mit lokaler Semantik im Rigveda 65

Conti, Luz
A Pragmatic Analysis of Lykaon’s Supplication (*Il*. 21.74–96) 89

Daues, Alexandra
Zum Prohibitiv im Hethitischen: Präventive und inhibitive Funktion 101

Forssman, Bernhard
Willem Caland zu *Vīdēvdād* 5,2 119

García Ramón, José Luis
The Evidence for Augment in Mycenaean Revisited: Augmented Aorist Indicative and Unaugmented Aorist Injunctives 125

Klein, Jared S.
Two Issues in the Employment of Non-Indicative Modality in Gothic 151

Leszczyński, Maciej
Der Infinitiv in der Bhagavadgītā: Untersuchung seiner Grammatikalisierung 167

Melchert, H. Craig
Hittite *namma* in Determiner Phrases 185

Oberlies, Thomas
Parataxis and Hypotaxis in Pāli 201
Oettinger, Norbert
Zu Rigveda 3.33,10–13 (Viśvāmitra) und dem Genus indogermanischer Flussnamen 229
Ozono, Junichi
Zur Entwicklung des Modus Irrealis im Altindoarischen 239
Wolf, Norbert Richard
Die Indogermanen sind schuld 257

Etymologie 271

Braun, Ludwig
Der Flussname *Viadrus*, oder: Ein Druckfehler macht Karriere 273
Dupraz, Emmanuel
Bennan, **bennarrihi**: Zu einer möglichen Bezeichnung der ‚Frau' im Messapischen 287
Gotō, Toshifumi
Snow Burns 305
Kim, Jeong-Soo
Altindisch *rā́trī-* ‚Nacht' 317
Koch, Christoph
Ein altes Ärgernis: Gotisch *þarf þaúrbum* und Zubehör 325
Kölligan, Daniel
Mimos, the Shapeshifter 341
Pinault, Georges-Jean
Vedic *jénya-* under New Light 361
Stüber, Karin
Homerischer Kampfesmut: μένος und μέμονα 379

Griechische Literatur 391

Baier, Thomas
Die List in der *Odyssee* 393
Erler, Michael
Atalloisa elpis (Pind. Frg. 214 S./M.) – Hoffnung als Amme: Ein Zitat Pindars und seine Funktion in Platons *Politeia* 417
Panagl, Oswald
Spuren von phrygisierendem Griechisch in der hellenischen Literatur 429

Archäologie 443

Haas, Cornelia
Ältere Neuigkeiten zu einer altpersischen Inschrift in Mumbai und zugehörige Geschichte(n) 445

Peter-Röcher, Heidi
Migrationstheorien in der prähistorischen Archäologie 455

Vath, Bernd
How the West Was Won – Anmerkungen zur Indogermanisierung und Keltisierung Westeuropas 469

HITTITE *NAMMA* IN DETERMINER PHRASES

H. Craig Melchert, Carrboro NC

1.1 *namma* as predicatival adverb and clause-linker[1]

Hittite *namma* 'next, then' is a strong marker of temporal posteriority. As a predicatival adverb its discourse-neutral position is before the finite verb (plus preverb) and following the negation if present. However, since its very use underscores posteriority vis-à-vis preceding clauses, it also appears with some frequency topicalized, following clause-linkers like *nu* and *ta*.[2] When the posterior event repeats or parallels that of a preceding clause, the sense is 'again' (when negated, the idiomatic English is often 'no longer'). Rarely, predicatival *namma* may have an additive force 'further, in addition' (*CHD* L–N 386, 3.c), but most such alleged examples must be construed otherwise, as I will argue in detail in what follows. Some will prove to be ambiguous.

One distinct use of *namma* has not been fully recognized. As demonstrated by Cambi (2005), its opposite *karū* has two distinct functions: as an ordinary predicatival adverb it means 'already', and its discourse-neutral position is, as we would expect, in the predicate, following any direct and indirect object.[3] One point that she overlooked is that, like *namma*, it can also be topicalized:

(1) *KUB* 26.1 iv 18 (CTH 2552.A Instructions of Tuthaliya IV for courtiers, NH)[4]

nu=wa	*karū*	*ḫalliya*	*wēḫtat*
CLL=QUOT	previously	days-NOM.PL	turn-PST3SG

"The days have already turned (passed)."

---

[1] I am most grateful to Joseph Eska and Federico Giusfredi for advice and references on the formal analysis of determiner phrases and extraction therefrom and to Guglielmo Cinque and Dominique Sportiche for references for French *encore*. I alone am responsible for my use of them. I also thank Claire Le Feuvre, Norbert Oettinger, and Massimo Poetto for native-speaker judgments.

[2] The two clause-linkers cited are sufficient to mark weak temporal or logical progression. That *namma* when "fronted" is topicalized from the predicate is shown by the many examples where it still stands in the scope of the negation (see the *CHD* L–N 388–390, 6.b.1′ and 6.c).

[3] I prefer the label 'predicatival' to 'verbal' (Cambi 2005: 222), because both adverbs may occur in nominal sentences (see her example 10 for *karū* and *KUB* 26.1+ iii 19 for *namma*).

[4] I use the standard sigla for date of composition of a Hittite text and date of the manuscript: OH = Old Hittite, MH = Middle Hittite, NH = New Hittite, while OS = Old Script, MS = Middle Script,

However, as Cambi correctly emphasizes, in its sense 'previously', marking anteriority of the content of a clause versus that of a preceding one, *karū* occurs in absolute clause-initial position, in *complementary distribution* with clause-linkers like *nu* or *ta*.[5] One must recognize an entirely parallel use of *namma* as a clause-linker, marking either posteriority or addition: 'then, subsequently' or 'further-(more)'. Against the *CHD* L–N 378–380 *et passim*, one must not confuse this use with topicalized predicatival *namma*. Evidence for the distinct clause-linking *namma* is twofold. First, in several hundred examples in historical narratives, rituals, and instructions it is never marked by *=a*/*ma* or *=a*/*ya* as standing in contrastive or additive focus.[6] Second, clause-linking *namma* plays no role in the syntax of "indeterminate" and "determinate" (*recte* indefinite and definite) preposed relative clauses:

(2) *KBo* 3.1+ ii 46 (CTH 19 Edict of Telipinu, OH/NS)

namma	*kuiš=a*	LUGAL-*uš*	*kišari*
further	who-NOM.SG.=PTCL	king-NOM.SG.	become-PRS3SG

"Further(more), whoever becomes king..."

(3) *KUB* 21.1 iii 73–74 (CTH 76 Treaty with Alaksandu of Wilusa, NH)

namma	*kī*	*kuit*	*ṬUPPU*	*tuk*	^{m}*Ala*[*kšandu* ...]	°-*un*
further	this-N.-A.SG.	which-N.-A.SG.	tablet-N.-A.SG.	you-DAT.SG.	PN-DAT.SG.	x-PST1SG

"Further(more), this tablet that I __ed for you, Alaksandu..."

As established by Huggard (2011: 97f.), building on Goedegebuure (2009: 953–956) and refining the analysis of Held (1957), in a preposed RC with an indefinite referent the relative pronoun is in "information-identifying focus" and must stand first in its clause, but *namma* in (2) does not affect the indefinite reading of *kuiš=a*. Further, as shown in Melchert (2015), non-focused relative pronouns are prosodically weak and *must* be preceded by at least one fully accented constituent, just like indefinites, for which see Huggard (2015: 66–82), confirming earlier suggestions of Hahn and Watkins. The position of *kuit* after *kī* by so-called "prosodic flip" in (3) confirms that clause-linking *namma* cannot serve as the required "host" for non-focused *kui-*. These features demarcating clause-linking *namma* will be important in what follows.

NS = New Script. In glosses CLL = clause linker, DN = divine name, GN = geographic name, PN = personal name, PROH = prohibitive, PTCL = particle. The = sign marks clitic boundaries.

[5] For this reason I prefer to assign absolute initial *karū* and *namma* to the connective function of adverbs instead of that of sentence modifiers (cf. Cambi 2005: 222). I leave open whether as a clause-linker they are interclausal, in a position such as ForceP, or some other position.

[6] There are inevitably some examples so marked in incomplete contexts whose discourse status is indeterminate, but I am not aware of any counterexamples in complete contexts that we control.

1.2 Non-conforming *namma*

Multiple editors of Hittite texts and those of the *CHD* L–N lemma have correctly identified instances of *namma* that cannot be interpreted as a clause-linker or predicatival adverb—but inconsistently. The *CHD* L–N 387f. (5.f) also acknowledges instances where *namma* stands within a noun phrase (NP):

(4) *KUB* 14.1 Vo 29 (CTH 147 Indictment of Madduwatta, MH/MS)

E[GIR$^{?}$]-*az*	*ŠA* ^{d}UTU=*ŠI*	*namma*	*aš*[*ā*]*nta*	KUR.KUR-*TIM*	*dāš*
af[ter-war]ds	His Majesty-GEN.SG.	further	occupied-N.-A.PL.	land-N.-A.PL.	take-PST3SG

"Af[terwa]rds$^{?}$ he took further occupied/settled lands of *His Majesty*:" (extraposed list follows)

However, it implies that *namma* is still the predicatival adverb and incorrectly compares its appearance in the NP to that between a preverb and finite verb. There is no syntactic structural position in an NP (or more properly determiner phrase, DP), where a predicatival adverb may plausibly stand. Manifestly false is my own idea (Melchert 2015): that *namma* as a predicatival adverb may be prosodically weak, like indefinites or non-focused relative pronouns, and thus require an immediately preceding accented word as "host" (at the cost of creating discontinuous syntactic constituents). It occurs with some frequency marked by the particle *=pat*, and as indicated above (references in footnote 2), it frequently appears topicalized. A clause-initial focused case appears in (21) and one in preverbal focus in (12). Most crucially, it has been overlooked that there is a direct correlation between the position of *namma* in a DP/NP and its sense. As I will now show, in such cases it is not a predicatival adverb, but a constituent of the DP with an additive sense comparable to French *encore* and Italian *ancora* plus numeral or other quantifier, for which German uses *noch* and English '*n* more, still more, (still) further, (still) (an)other'.[7]

1.3 Additive *namma* in Determiner Phrases (DPs)

There are several instances of additive *namma* that stand unambiguously within the DP. Some occur with a numerical quantifier:

(5) *KBo* 24.1+*KUB* 32.113+*KBo* 8.76 i 6–12 (CTH 404.3 Ritual of Mastigga, MH/MS)

"(Next the ritual client spits into the pot, and she breaks it on the ground.)

§ *nu=za*	^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI	*namma*	*dān*	^{DUG}ÚTUL	*dāi*
CLL=REF	old woman-NOM.SG.	further	second	pot-ACC.SG.	take-PRS3SG

The practitioner takes a further second pot, (holds it over the head of the ritual client and speaks as follows: 'It is the ritual substitute of your head', and she whirls it over and away from him and breaks also that one.)"

[7] English notoriously uses '(an)other' in the senses 'additional' and 'different'. Like the other languages cited, Hittite distinguishes the two.

(6) *KBo* 22.2 Ro 6 (CTH 3.1 Tale of Zalpa, OH/OS)

nu M[UNUS.LUGA]L *nam*[*m*]*a* 30 MUNUS.DUMU *ḫāšta*
CLL queen-NOM.SG. further 30 daughter-ACC.SG. give birth-PST3SG
"The queen gave birth to an additional/a further thirty daughters."

Miller (2004: 127) correctly renders the first as "yet another pot." As per the *CHD* L–N 383b, the order of this DP example excludes a predicatival adverb, where the Hittite order is invariably *dān namma*. It also explicitly states that the order *namma dān* occurs only when "the latter relates to the following noun" and references example (6), but then wrongly renders it as "again." The thirty daughters are an addition to the thirty sons given birth to previously.

Additive DP *namma* also occurs with *damāi-*, which identifies something as an indefinite 'other' in the sense 'different', also with a numeral:

(7) *KUB* 1.1 i 33–34 (CTH 81 Autobiography of Hattusili III, NH)

[(*nu*=*m*)]*u* $^{m.d}$*SÎN*.^{d}U-*aš* DUMU ^{m}*Zidā* *namma*=*ya*
CLL=me-DAT.SG. PN-NOM.SG. son-NOM.SG. PN-GEN.SG. further=and
damāuš UN[(.MEŠ-*uš* *uw*)]*āitiškeuwan* [(*ti*)]*yēr*
other-NOM.PL. people-NOM.PL. do woe-SUPINE begin-PST3PL
"And Armadatta, son of Zida, and still other people began to do me woe."

(8) *KUB* 32.123+*KBo* 29.206 i 18–22 (CTH 772.3.A Istanuvian festival, ?/NS)

("Because there are four tents for the ritual equipment, on the first day they enter two tents to perform rites,)

[*I*]*ukkatta*=*ma* *INA* UD.2.KAM [*na*]*mma damēd*[*aš* *A*]*NA* 2 *TAPAL*
at dawn=FOCUS 2nd day-DAT.-LOC.SG. further other-DAT.-LOC.PL. two-DAT.-LOC.PL.
^{GIŠ}ZA.LAM.GAR.ḪI.A *andan* [*p*]*ānzi*
tents- DAT.-LOC.PL. into go-PRS3PL
but at dawn on the second day they enter still another two tents."

In (7) the coordination of the two DPs assures that *namma* is in the second DP, precluding a predicatival adverb. The *CHD* L–N 387b correctly translates (8), but misrepresents the syntax: *namma* is not "after the ordinal," with which it is unconnected, but clearly stands in the DP with *damāi-* and the numeral, following a contrastively focused constituent and a topicalized temporal expression.[8]

There are also multiple examples of additive *namma* with relative pronouns where both word order and sense assure that it stands in a DP:

[8] Further examples where additive *namma* plus *damāi-* is assuredly in the DP are *KUB* 9.31 iii 58 and *KUB* 31.71 iii 22–24. The preceding context makes clear that in the first *n*=*aš* LÌL-*ri namma tamēdani AŠRI pennia*[*nzi*] means "and they drive them into the open country to yet another (different) place." That is, after they had already been driven once "into the open country to a different place." Cf. correctly A. Chrzanowska (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 394 (TX 13.07.2016, TRde 23.03.2016): "an einen weiteren anderen Ort." The position after another dat.-loc. precludes that *namma* by itself has been moved to a topic phrase (TopP) in the left periphery. The *CHD* L–N 387b correctly interprets *namma damēdaš kuedašqa* ^{É}*ḫalenduwaš* in the second as "still other palaces of some sort" (likewise Werner 1973: 329), against van den Hout (1994:13): "dann danach."

(9) *KUB* 31.100 iv? 11–13 (CTH 257.4 Instructions of Arnuwanda I for the Mayor, MH/MS)

namma	*kuiēš kuiēš*	*kuel(u)wanes*		*šer*	É.x [ ]
further	whatever-NOM.-PL.	drainage basins?-NOM.-PL.		up	house[]
kuiēš	*namma*	*kuiēš*	*kuwapi*	*n=uš*	*ḫūmandu*[*š*]
whatever-NOM.-PL.	further	whatever-NOM.-PL.	anywhere	CLL=them-ACC.PL.	all-ACC.PL.
wanalliškandu	*ištalkiškand*[*u*]				
scrape?-IMV3PL	smoothe-IMV3PL				

"Furthermore, whatever drainage basins (are) up [next to the x]-building, whatever further ones are anywhere, let them scrape and smooth them all."

Against Miller (2013: 193), the second *namma* cannot be clause-linking 'further(more)' introducing an additional new topic like the first, either contextually or by word order. The reference is to further, additional *k.*'s besides the ones mentioned in the preceding clause. The *CHD* L–N 388a correctly renders the DP as "whatever other *k.*'s are (any)where." For the position of *namma* in this indefinite preposed RC see Huggard (2011: 97f.).

(10) *KBo* 5.8 ii 15–17 (CTH 61.II.1 Comprehensive Annals of Mursili 20th year, NH)

nu	^{URU}*Tūmmannan*	URU-*an*	*namma=ya*	*kuiēš*	URU.DIDLI.HI.A BÀD
CLL	GN-ACC.SG.	city-ACC.SG.	further=and	which-NOM.PL.	fortified cities-NOM.PL.
wedanteš	*ešer*	*n=aš*	LÚ.KÚR	^{URU}*Gašgaš*	*ḫarnikta*
built-NOM.PL.	be-PST3PL	CLL=them-ACC.PL.	enemy-NOM.SG.	GN-GEN.SG.	destroy-PST3SG

"And the city of Tummanna and what other/further fortified cities were built (up), the Kaskaean enemy destroyed them."

See Götze (1933: 152f.), but Tummanna is one of the fortified cities, and the coordination of the RC as a DP with the preceding DP in a "hanging topic" precludes a predicatival adverb. Note that in this definite RC *namma* serves as "host" for the non-focused relative pronoun: see Melchert (2015) and the remarks above on example (3).[9]

We have already seen in (4) an instance of additive *namma* within a DP with a genitive modifier. I will treat the issue of its word order in the following sections, but the examples (4)–(10) are sufficient to establish that Hittite has an additive *namma* in DPs functionally distinct from the clause-linker and predicatival adverb.

[9] Against the restorations by Götze (1933: 92f.), we surely have the same hanging topic structure with an RC as the last of two coordinated DPs in *KUB* 19.30 i 13–15 (CTH 61.II.1). For further examples of additive *namma* in a definite RC coordinated as a DP see *KUB* 23.1+ ii 11–14 (CTH 105 Treaty of Tuthaliya IV with Šaušgamuwa, NH) and *KUB* 5.6 iv 3–5 (CTH 570 Oracular Inquiry, NH). A preposed definite RC where topicalization of a dative DP from the predicate assures that *namma* is in the subject DP is *KBo* 15.33 ii 27–28 (CTH 330 Ritual for the Storm-god of Kuliwisna, OH/MS). See Glocker (1997: 66f.), but with false understanding of *namma*.

2.1 Word order in Hittite Determiner Phrases

The diction of Hittite texts predictably precludes our finding a single DP illustrating the order of all possible constituents, but we have enough evidence to draw firm conclusions for most of them: *apāt karuwili* ^{GIŠ}*tallayaš* Ì.DÙG.GA "that old fine oil of the *t*.-vessel" (*KUB* 29.4 iv 25) shows Demonstrative+Attributive Adjective+Adnominal Genitive+Head Noun, and further examples confirm the order of the last three. That of *apēdani ŠA* ^{f}*Danuḫepa* DUMU=*ŠU ḫarganaš memini* "in that matter of the ruination of Tanuhepa's son" (*KBo* 52.17+*KUB* 21.19 ii 4–5) shows that the position of the adnominal genitive applies to both a possessive and an objective genitive. As expected, demonstratives precede numbers (*kāš* 6 ME ÉRIN.MEŠ "these six hundred troops" in *KUB* 14.16+ iv 20), and numbers precede attributive adjectives (2 GAL *laleš* "two large tongues" in *KBo* 17.2 i 4). By the "transitive property" we may reasonably infer the order Demonstrative+Number+Attributive Adjective+Adnominal Genitive+Head Noun. We have seen that *damāi-* also precedes a number and is itself preceded by additive *namma*: recall [*na*]*mma damēd*[*aš A*]*NA* 2 *TAPAL* ^{GIŠ}ZA.LAM.GAR.ḪI.A "into still another two tents" in example (8) above. Since *damāi-* refers to indefinite referents, while the demonstratives *kā-* 'this' and *apā-* 'that' typically point to definite referents, we may provisionally conclude that they occupy the same structural position, and that additive *namma* precedes the demonstrative and consequently all other constituents: *namma*+Demonstrative+Number+Attributive Adjective+Adnominal Genitive+Head Noun. For pragmatic reasons, additive *namma* in DPs is rare with definite referents, and it is surely due to accident that (thus far) our only examples of *namma* plus *kā-* 'this' and *apā-* 'that' involve the latter in focus (see next section). I thus tentatively conclude that additive *namma* stands in a structural position within DP ahead of all other constituents.

2.2 Syntactic Structure of Determiner Phrases

There is now a widespread (though by no means universal) view that determiner phrases do not consist merely of concatenated constituents under a single head, but are hierarchical structures comparable to complementizer phrases (CPs): see Alexiadou/Haegeman/Stavrou (2007: 53) with references. They further present evidence that the DP structure includes internal focus and topic projections (2007: 80–82). For a more recent overview of the NP/DP debate see Köylü 2021. Giusti/Iovino (2011: 122–126), building on previous work, present arguments that even languages without articles like Latin show features attesting to such DPs with left-peripheral focus and topic projections. For further studies supporting this claim see Erschler 2019 with references.

There is limited but ample evidence for the need to assume a similar DP structure for Hittite. We may begin with example (4) repeated here for convenience:

(11) = (4) *KUB* 14.1 Vo 29 (CTH 147 Indictment of Madduwatta, MH/MS)

E[GIR?]-*az*	*ŠA* ^{d}UTU=*ŠI*	*namma*	*aš*[*ā*]*nta*	KUR.KUR-*TIM*	*dāš*
af[terwar]ds	His Majesty-GEN.SG.	further	occupied-N.-A.PL.	land-N.-A.PL.	take-PST3SG

"Af[terwa]rds? he took further occupied/settled lands of *His Majesty*:" (extraposed list follows)

A predicatival adverb in either the sense "in addition" (Beckman 1996: 149) or "darauf" (Götze 1928: 27) is precluded by the word order. It would need to stand either preverbally or topicalized after *appezziaz*. Compare the normal topicalized position of adverbial *namma* ibid. Vo 30 and 31 ("no longer"). We have seen in the preceding section that in discourse-neutral contexts additive *namma* precedes numerals that in turn precede attributive adjectives and adnominal genitives. The order in this example must reflect a DP-internal topicalization of the adnominal genitive, which is contextually appropriate: "His Majesty" is an anaphoric "resumed mention" topic over ten clauses.[10]

More complicated is a second example of *namma* after an adnominal genitive:

(12) *KBo* 14.12+ iv 25–29 (CTH 40 Deeds of Suppiluliuma, NS)

nu=šmaš	*ABU=YA*	*ANA* DUMU-*RI*	*katta*	*namma*	*IṢBAT*
CLL=them-DAT.PL.	my father-NOM.SG.	son=DAT.-LOC.SG.	under	then	take-PST3SG

nu	*ABU=YA*	*išḫiulaš*	*namma*	*tuppi*	*wēkta*
CLL	my father-NOM.SG.	regulation-GEN.SG.	further	tablet-N.-A.SG.	ask-PST3SG

annaz	*maḫḫan*	LÚ	^{URU}*Kuruštama*	DUMU	^{URU}*Ḫatti*	^{d}U-*aš*
formerly	how	man-ACC.SG.	GN-GEN.SG.	son-ACC.SG.	GN-GEN.SG.	DN-NOM.SG.

dāš	*n=an*	KUR ^{URU}*Mizri*	*pēdaš*
take-PST3SG	CLL=him-ACC.SG.	GN-DAT.-LOC.SG.	carry-off-PST3SG

"So my father *then* occupied himself[11] with a son for them, and my father asked for the other/further *regulation* tablet (about) how formerly the Storm-god took the people of K., sons of Hatti, and carried them off to the land of Egypt."[12]

I follow Güterbock (1956: 98) in taking the *namma* of the first clause as "then," not "again," because the preceding text makes clear that Suppiluliuma brusquely dismissed the widowed Egyptian queen's first request for a son to become her husband (see 1956: 94f., lines iii 16–25). I regard this *namma* as being in the preverbal focus position established by Goedegebuure (2014: Chapter 7), here marking contrast with the Hittite king's lack of engagement with the first re-

[10] That is, "His Majesty," a running theme of the text unmentioned for some time is renewed as a topic, commonplace in Hittite syntax with a TopP in the left periphery, here via a TopP in DP.

[11] The intransitive use of *katta ēpp-* is idiomatic. My rendering following Güterbock (1956: 98) is based on the context.

[12] Hittite here uses collective singular and singular pronominal agreement for "men" and "sons."

quest. For the position between preverb and verb of another focused adverb meaning "then" see her example (2014: 386, footnote 419).

For that same reason, however, one cannot follow Güterbock in taking the *namma* of the second clause as "again," since there is no reason to think that the king had bothered the first time to consult extant tablets relating to previous events. The word order also precludes a predicatival adverb. The key to understanding this passage lies in the following:

(13) *KUB* 14.8 i 9–14 (CTH 378.2.A "2nd Plague Prayer" of Mursili II, NH)

[*nu=za k*]*aruwila* DUB.2.KAM.ḪI.A *peran w*[*emiyanu*]*n* 1 *ṬUPPU Š*[*A* SISKUR *ŠA* $^{\text{ID}}$*Māla karū*$^{?}$]=*ma=wa* SISKUR *ŠA* $^{\text{ID}}$*Māla karuw*[*ili*]*ēš* LUGAL.MEŠ *ḫinka*[*n ḫarker*] *kuitman=ma IŠTU* UD.KAM-*az ABI=YA INA* KUR $^{\text{URU}}$*Ḫatti a*[*kkiškettat*] *ŠA* $^{\text{ID}}$*Māla ŪL kuwapikki iyawē*[*n*]§ [*ŠANU ṬUPP*]*U=ma ŠA* $^{\text{URU}}$*Kuruštamma* LÚ.MEŠ $^{\text{URU}}$*Kuruštamma maḫḫan* [($^{\text{d}}$U $^{\text{URU}}$*Ḫa*)]*tti INA* KUR $^{\text{URU}}$*Mizri pēdaš*…

"I f[oun]d two old tablets before [me]: one tablet of [the ritual of the Mala River. Previously$^{?}$][13] the ancient kings [had] offered the ritual of the Mala River. But while there [had been dying] in the land of Hatti since the days of my father, we never performed the ritual of the Mala River. But [the second] tablet of K. (about) how the Storm-god of Hatti carried off the people of K. into the land of Egypt…"

See for the text Singer (2002: 58) and Daues/Rieken (2018: 378f.). For pragmatic reasons, additive 'further' in DPs usually occurs with indefinite referents, but definite referents are not excluded, as shown by examples (17) and (18) below.[14] Since *išḫiul* 'obligation, regulation' refers equally to rules for a ritual and provisions of a treaty, both tablets would have been *išḫiulaš tuppi*, as opposed to tablets recording other matters.[15] Obviously, for Suppiluliuma the treaty tablet was not "the further" one, but the prayer passage shows that it would have been for the narrator, Mursili or whoever wrote the passage.[16]

---

[13] The restoration of *karū* is far from assured, but the presence of *=ma* suggests a contrastive topic with "since the days of my father" of the next clause. Compare example (4) in Cambi (2005: 225). A similar case with *namma* may be found in *KUB* 14.1 Vo 21–23. For *=a*/*=ma* marking contrastive topics as coordinating structures, *not* contrastive focus, see Goedegebuure 2014: 476–480. Such cases thus do not contradict the claim made in 1.1 above that clause-linking *karū* and *namma* do not occur in contrastive focus.

[14] One may compare English "The two further/more tarts I ate after dinner gave me indigestion" or "Will these two further (new) provisions in the contract satisfy you?"– native speakers with whom I consulted have verified my intuition that neither French, German, nor Italian can express the equivalents with the additive adverb preceding the number and must resort to a suitable adjective.

[15] For the former see the Aphasia of Mursili, *KBo* 4.2 iv 42–44: *nu ŠA* GU$_4$ *pūḫugari* GIM-*an* SISKUR *annalaz IŠTU* $^{\text{GIŠ}}$*LĒ'U gulaššan išḫiūl=šši* GIM-*an iyan* "And as the ritual of the substitute ox is inscribed on an old tablet, as the regulation for it is made…" and *KUB* 5.6 i 20–24.

[16] A third example showing additive *namma* between a topicalized adnominal genitive and its head noun is *KUB* 22.70 Ro 41 *kī kuit ŠA* DINGIR-*LIM* $^{\text{URU}}$*Arušna namma zilaš* DÙ-*at* "As to this (fact) that a further/another sign *of the deity of Arusna* occurred…" Preceding context shows that this is another "resumed mention" topic.

The next example illustrates a clearly topicalized attributive adjective:

(14) *KUB* 17.18 ii 14–18 (CTH 448.2.1.1 Ritual for the Sun-goddess of Earth, pre-NH/NS)

"(They insert the words of the tablets of the substitute figurines, and when they have finished inserting the words of the tablets,)

§	*nu*	*ḫūišwanduš*	*namma*	*tarpalliuš*	LÚ	MUNUS=*ya*
	CLL	living-ACC.PL.	further	substitutes-ACC.PL.	man-ACC.SG.	woman-ACC.SG.=and

a[*nda*] *uwadanzi*
in bring-PRS3PL

they bring i[n] further *living* substitutes, male and female."

The fronting of *ḫūišwanduš* 'living' in this case definitely marks it as a new topic versus the inanimate figurine substitutes. As per Goedegebuure (2014: 502), marking of a topic shift with *=a*/*ma* is a choice made by the speaker. That is, a topic shift may, but need not be, viewed as contrastive. What is crucial about this example is the word order. If this were an instance of the quite frequent use of topicalization of an entire DP in TopP in the left periphery, the order could only be *nu namma ḫūišwanduš tarpalliuš* (the appositional "male (and) female" could have been left behind). The only way to account for the order *ḫūišwanduš namma tarpalliuš* is to assume that just the attributive adjective has been fronted to a TopP *within* the DP.

The same applies to instances of focusing of DP constituents that do not involve additive *namma*:

(15) *KUB* 12.34+15.34 ii 15–18 (CTH 404.II Ritual of Mastigga, MH/NS)

kāš=wa	IM-*aš*	*maḫḫan*	*wappui*	EGIR-*pa*	*UL*	*paizzi*
this-NOM.SG.=QUOT	clay-NOM.SG.	as	riverbank-DAT.-LOC.SG.	back	not	go-PRES3SG

kappani=ma=wa	*ḫarkēšzi*	*UL*	*nu=war=at=za*	*damai*
cumin-N.-A.SG.=FOCUS=QUOT	whiten-PRS3SG	not	CLL=QUOT=it=REFL	other-N.-A.SG.

NUMUN-*an*	*UL*	*kišari*	*iššanaš=ma=wa=kann*	*kāš*
seed-N.-A.SG.	not	become-PRS3SG	dough-NOM.SG.=FOCUS=QUOT=PTCL	this-NOM.SG.

DINGIR.MEŠ-*aš*	NINDA*ḫarši*	*UL*	*paizzi*
god-GEN.PL.	leavened bread-DAT.-LOC.SG.	not	go-PRS3SG

"As this clay does not return to the riverbank, and cumin does not whiten and become another seed, while this *dough* does not go into the leavened bread of the gods…"

Here the contrastive focus is on the head noun, highlighting the difference in material, rather than the more common mere underscoring of the change of topic, which would have resulted in contrastive focus of the entire DP in FocP in the left periphery: *kāš=ma=wa=kan iššanaš* "while this dough." The order *iššanaš=ma=wa=kan kāš* again argues that only the adnominal genitive has been contrastively focused in a FocP in its DP.[17]

We see the same difference when various constituents of the DP have been focused to the left of *namma*. I cite first one with an adnominal genitive:

(16) *KUB* 31.86+40.78+Bo 5391 ii 42–44 (CTH 261.I Instructions for Border Commanders, MH/NS)

ANA UR[U-*LI*]*M=kan*	*šer*	GIŠ-*ŠU*	*ŠA* LUGAL	[*ḫ*]*andān*	*ēš*[*du*]
city-DAT.-LOC.SG.=PTCL	up	wood-N.-A.SG.	king-GEN.SG.	arranged-N.-A.SG.	be-IMV3SG

GIŠ-*ŠU*=[*y*]*a=kan*	*namma*	*arḫayan*	*ANA* URU-*LIM*	*š*[*er*]
wood-N.-A.SG.=FOCUS=PTCL	further	apart	city-DAT.-LOC.SG.=PTCL	up

mekk[*i=pat*	*ḫ*]*andan*	*ēšdu*
much- N.-A.SG.=PTCL	arranged-N.-A.SG.	be-IMV3SG

"Let the king's wood be arranged up in the city, and let also further *wood* be separately arranged up in the city, lots of it!"

The text and restorations follow Miller (2013: 224f.), but the additive focus constituent cannot precede clause-initial *namma* 'further(more)'. Thus *namma* GIŠ-*ŠU* is "further/additional" wood, with additive focus on "wood", producing the word order. Once again, additive focus on the entire DP would have resulted in *namma=ya=kan* GIŠ-*ŠU arḫayan* etc.

Demonstratives may be focused within their DP:

(17) *HKM* 36: 29–36 (CTH 186 Letter of the King; MH/MS)

"The matter of the troops of Ishupitta that you wrote me about (saying): 'I took three hundred troops and released them up to Kasipura,"

kūn=ma=wa	*namma*	ÉRIN.MEŠ	*šaramnit*	*daḫḫun*
this-ACC.SG.=FOCUS=QUOT	further	troops-ACC.SG.	bread ration[?]-INST.	take-PST1sg

"but *these* further troops I took up with (their) bread ration[?], (and I sent them to Isas'. I have heard it, and it is fine.)"[18]

The contrastive focus here is solely on the demonstrative. If the contrastive focus were on the entire second DP, we would find *namma=ma=wa kūn* ÉRIN.MEŠ. A further more elaborate example shows two instances of focused *apā-*, the first with additive focus and the second with contrastive focus:

(18) *KUB* 19.18 i 6–12 (CTH 40 DŠ 15–17, NH; restorations after *KBo* 14.3+ iv 11–17)

parā=ma	*namma*	6 ŠU-*TI*	*INA* [RU]*Ḫūwana*-x-[x]	*IKŠUD*
farther=FOCUS	further	6 detachment-ACC.SG.	in GN-DAT.-LOC.SG.	meet-PRET3SG

"Farther on, he met six further detachments[19] in H." (and my father slew them too, so that the enemy troops died e[n masse].)"

---

[17] That the sentential particles *=wa* and *=kan* follow *iššanaš=ma* is irrelevant. As clitics, their final surface positioning is phonologically conditioned. They precede in the syntax.

[18] Against Hoffner (2009: 150), there is no basis for restoring anything after *kūn=ma=wa* in line 33 (see the autograph by Alp 1991: 40). One could alternatively take *šaramnit* as a hypercorrect instrumental for an ablative "from the citadel."

[19] For ŠU-*TI* as 'detachment', not 'tribe' see Melchert (forthcoming), but this does not affect the interpretation of *namma* and *apā-* in the passage.

apūnn=a *namma* 7 ŠU-*TI* *INA* ^{URU}*Ni*-°[… *Ù*]
that-ACC.SG.=FOCUS further 7 detachment-ACC.SG. in GN-DAT.-LOC.SG [and]
INA ^{URU}*Šapparanda* *IKŠUD*
in GN-DAT.-LOC.SG meet-PST3SG

"he also met seven further detachments (of) that (enemy), in N. [and] S. (and my father slew them, so that the enemy troops died en masse.)"

apāš$^{!}$*=ma* *namma* LÚ.KÚR [(^{URU}*Arza*)]*uwa* *INA* KUR ^{URU}*Tupaziya*
that-NOM.SG.=FOCUS further enemy-NOM.SG. GN-GEN.SG. in GN-DAT.-LOC.SG
Ù *INA* $^{ḪUR.SAG}$*Ammuna* *parā* [(*wa*)*lḫ*]*ūwanzi* *ēšta*
and in GN-DAT.-LOC.SG forward attack-INFINITIVE be-PRET3SG

"Still more (of) *that* enemy of Arzawa was advanced in the land of Tupaziya and on Mount Ammuna to attack."[20]

For the text see Güterbock (1956: 75f.). However, two aspects of his interpretation cannot be upheld. First, the *namma* of *namma* 6 ŠU-*TI* cannot be the predicatival adverb "again," because the immediately preceding context says that "he slew the entire aforementioned detachment." This precludes that he had previously met six detachments. Güterbock does correctly understand that *namma* 7 ŠU-*TI* refers to "still another seven" and *namma* LÚ.KÚR ^{URU}*Arzauwa* to a further instance of an Arzawaean enemy—i. e., that they are additive *namma* in a DP. But he suppresses entirely both instances of *apā-* 'that', which clearly has an anaphoric function that must not be ignored, even if it is hard to render the Hittite syntax in idiomatic English.[21] The seven additional detachments and the advanced outposts of the Arzawaean enemy are further manifestations of that same enemy force that is the topic of the entire episode—not an influx of new previously unmentioned Arzawaeans. The "tracking" use of stressed *āpā-* for 'the aforementioned' underscores this.

Attentive readers will have noticed that in the hypothetical cases of focused subject DPs cited the "fronting" to the left periphery is invisible. The same applies to focused or topicalized object DPs if there is no full DP subject to make "fronting" to the left periphery unambiguous. Since additive *namma* occurs leftmost in its DP in discourse-neutral contexts (see section 2.1), the result is that in sentences like the following it is impossible to determine whether *namma* is in FocP or TopP in its DP or the entire DP is focused/topicalized in the left periphery:[22]

(19) *KUB* 22.70 Ro 33 (CTH 566 Oracular Inquiry about Intrigues in Royal Court, NH)[23]
mān *kī=pat* *namma=ma* *damāi* NU.GÁL *kuitki*
if this-N.-A.SG.=PTCL further=FOCUS other not-is anything
"If it (is) only this, but there is nothing else further/*further*."

[20] Emended reading *apāš* after duplicate for erroneous *apūn* with Güterbock.

[21] The Hittite syntax of the first seems to be that of a partitive apposition. Cp. *uni* LÚ.KÚR ^{URU}*Gašgan* ÉRIN.MEŠ ŠU-*TI* "that troop detachment (of) the Kaskaean enemy" (*KBo* 14.3 iii 17–18).

[22] Since locatival DPs usually follow direct objects, it *is* likely that the entire dative-locative DP in (20) has been topicalized. Whether *namma* is topicalized within its DP is indeterminate.

(20) *KUB* 9.25+27.67+ iii 48 (CTH 391 Ritual of Ambazzi, pre-NH/NS)

nu	*namma*	*damēdani*	*pedi*	$^{GIŠ!}$*laḫur*[*nuzzi*	*d*]*āi*
CLL	further	other-DAT.-LOC.SG.	place-DAT.-LOC.SG.	foliage-N.-A.SG.	place-PRS3SG

"And in yet/*yet* another place one puts foliage."

Pragmatically, the difference in sense is minimal. Whether Hittite speakers could or did disambiguate the two possibilities prosodically we cannot determine. Rare examples like the following do seem to pose a potentially serious problem:

(21) *KBo* 2.6 iii 7–9 (CTH 569.2 Oracular inquiries about enemies of Hattusili III, NH)

nu=za	*mān*	GIDIM	*kēdaš=pat*	*waškuwaš*	*šer*
CLL=REFL	if	deceased-NOM.SG.	this-DAT.-LOC.PL.=PTCL	offense-DAT.-LOC.PL.	due to

TUKU.TUKU-*uanza*	*namma=ma=za*	GIDIM	*tamēdani*
angry-NOM.SG.	further=FOCUS=REFL	deceased-NOM.SG.	another-DAT.-LOC.SG.

memini	*šer*	*ŪL*	*kuitki*	TUKU.TUKU-*uanza*
matter- DAT.-LOC.SG.	due to	not	at all	angry-NOM.SG.

"If you, the deceased, are angry due to only these offenses, but you, the deceased, are not *in addition* at all angry due to some other (= different) matter…"

(22) *KUB* 14.1 Vo 19 (CTH 142 Indictment of Madduwatta, MH/MS)

[*nam*]*ma=ma=wa=z*	*IŠTU* K[UR ^{ID}*Šiyanta*	*pa*]*rā*	*tamāi*	KUR-*e*
further=FOCUS=QUOT=REFL	GN-ABL.	further	another-N.-A.SG.	land-N.-A.SG.

tamāinn=a	*ḫapātin*	ZI-*it*	*lē*	*ē*[*štari*]
another-ACC.SG.=and	river valley-ACC.SG.	will-INST.	PROH	occupy-PRS2SG

"Do not from the S.-river land willfully occupy *in addition* still (*parā*) another (different) land and another (different) river valley!"

In (21) *namma* stands to the left of the full nominal subject (or more strictly an apposition to the subject "you" marked by use of the reflexive particle in a nominal sentence), indicating that it must stand in FocP in the left periphery. In (22) the ablatival phrase itself has almost certainly been fronted to TopP in the left periphery (ablatives normally follow direct objects), so again the clearly contrastively focused *namma* must likewise stand in FocP in the left periphery. If *namma* here is the additive one with *damāi-* 'another' seen in examples (7) and (8), one would have to assume that it alone has been extracted from its DP. Such movement away from the quantifier over which it has scope seems entirely unmotivated.[24]

[23] The formula of the second clause occurs multiple times in the oracular inquiries; the preceding *mān*-clause varies.

[24] It would also seem to violate the "complex NP constraint" or its modern formulations. Alexiadou/Haegeman/Stavrou (2007: 147f.) and Aravind (2021), both with references, argue that extraction from a DP is possible. However, the examples they cite involve possessives of a very special kind that do not remotely resemble the Hittite data, and they acknowledge the controversial status of such extraction.

Closer observation suggests that assumption of such an unusual and dubious phenomenon is not necessary. As acknowledged in section 1.1., Hittite does employ *namma* as a predicatival adverb in preverbal position in the sense 'in addition', even if examples are few. Nothing thus precludes that it may in that meaning, as with *namma* 'then' and 'again', be topicalized or focused and stand in the left periphery. The difference in sense vs. additive *namma* in the DP is slight, but I have tried to express the difference in the translations.[25]

It does not seem necessary or useful to cite the full text for more of the examples whose surface position is structurally ambiguous—either fronted predicatival adverb 'in addition' or additive *namma* in a DP. For purposes of further research I do include the references to all instances that I have collected thus far (for obvious reasons I omit cases where a predicatival adverb 'again' cannot be excluded, but see note 35):

with bare noun (in TopP in DP or left periphery): *KBo* 5.2 ii 10–14,[26] *KuT* 49:15–17;[27]

with numerical qualifier (in TopP in DP or left periphery): *IBoT* 1.36 ii 56–7,[28] *KBo* 5.2 iv 9–15 and iv 28–29;[29]

with *damāi-* (in TopP in DP or left periphery): *KUB* 9.25+27.67+ iii 48;[30]

with *damāi-* (in FocP in DP or left periphery): *KUB* 14.1 Ro 43–44,[31] *KUB* 5.3+18.52 ii 23–25;[32]

with an adnominal genitive (in FocP in DP or left periphery): *KBo* 4.3 i 27–30.[33]

---

[25] I analyze *parā* in (22) as an incipient use of the predicatival adverb *parā* 'further' as an additive adverb in DPs, following the *CHD* P 122f. (4.d). It is often redundantly reinforced by *namma*, as in the same text, *KUB* 14.1 Ro 20, in the same formula: *namma=ma=wa=[z] parā tamāin ḫapātin tamai* KUR-*e* ZI-[*it*] *lē* [*ēš*]*tari* "Do not occupy willfully a *still* further different river valley, a (further) different land!". This example also shows that the *parā* in (22) is not to be construed with the preceding ablative. The only possible difference is the syntactic status of *namma*. NB that the second example could also be analyzed as "Do not *in addition* willfully occupy a further different…".

[26] Strauß (2006: 237) correctly understands "noch eine Gans."

[27] Against Wilhelm (1998: 179) and Sakuma (2009: 653f.) the reference clearly is to "a further *ḫalliya*-bird" or "in addition…a *ḫalliya*-bird".

[28] Interpreted correctly by Miller (2013: 113) as additive *namma*, based on preceding text ii 51–52.

[29] Since the "further, additional" table is one of only two, Strauß (2006: 243) freely but correctly translates the example in iv 15 as "dem anderen Tisch". I repeat that *damāi-* can refer only to an *indefinite* 'other'. She also correctly interprets iv 28–29 as "zwei weitere".

[30] Against Christiansen (2006: 53) this is not clause-linking "furthermore", but additive *namma*. Likewise for the example in broken context ibid. i 45.

[31] This example is identical to that cited in note 25, except for the order of the direct objects.

[32] This example also includes an indefinite. Beal (2003: 210) correctly translates "not some further deity". A similar example without an indefinite occurs ibid. ii 35–37.

[33] While the position of contrastively focused *namma* is indeterminate, this example does confirm that not every adnominal genitive occurring with *namma* is itself topicalized: *namma=ma=za ŠA* KUR ^{URU}*Ḫatti* ZAG-*an lē kuinki ilaliyaši* "Do not desire for yourself any *further* boundary territory of the Land of Hatti!" Or: "Do not desire for yourself *in addition* any boundary territory…!".

There are also two examples of additive *namma* just with negated indefinites: *Bo* 86/299 ii 80–81 (CTH 106.I.1 Treaty of Tuthaliya IV with Kuruntiya, NH) and *KUB* 22.70 Ro 39 (CTH 566 Oracular Inquiry about Intrigues in Royal Court, NH).[34] Given the complexities of the syntax of indefinites in Hittite (see Huggard 2015: 50–82, but compare Sideltsev 2015), I forgo any formal analysis of these examples.

As observed by Alexiadou/Haegemann/Stavrou (2007: 150), there is massive parameterization as to which constituents of a DP may undergo focus and topicalization in a given language, and where the FocP and TopP stand within the DP vis-à-vis other constituents. Provisionally (cf. ibid. 147–150), Hittite appears to pattern with Bulgarian in that the FocP and TopP of DP dominate all other constituents (in Hittite including also additive *namma*, which dominates all the rest), and there is a similar problem in distinguishing DP-internal cases from some that may be in the left periphery. Unlike Bulgarian there seems to be no restriction in Hittite on which constituents of a DP may be focused or topicalized: we have seen examples for a head noun, adnominal genitive, attributive adjective, demonstrative, and *namma* itself.

3 Conclusion

I hope to have shown beyond doubt that Hittite employs *namma* with an additive function 'further' in determiner phrases, in a use distinct from that as a predicatival adverb and a clause-linker. In discourse-neutral contexts it appears to precede (and thus dominate) all other constituents of the DP.[35] However, there are clear instances of other constituents of the DP, at least attributive adjectives, adnominal genitives, and demonstratives, being focused or topicalized *within* the DP, in which case they precede additive *namma*. These facts argue that Hittite, like Latin, despite having no definite article must be analyzed as having a hierarchical DP projection that includes FocP and TopP positions in its left periphery. In some instances predicatival *namma* 'in addition' is fronted to the left periphery. Unsurprisingly, in view of the heavy use of focusing and topicalization of adverbs in Hittite it is impossible in some cases to determine whether we have ad-

[34] Otten (1988: 19) correctly understands the first example as "kein anderer", but falsely tries to have *namma* also be the clause-linker "weiterhin". Beckman (1996: 113) more accurately translates simply: "no one else shall be greater than he".

[35] See Lim 2017: 170–172 and Mosegaard Hansen 2002: 151 for a similar analysis of French *encore* with quantifiers. The latter plausibly suggests that the use in DPs results from a reanalysis of the predicatival use with a direct object DP. Such an account also seems apt for Hittite, given ambiguous examples such as *KUB* 7.1 ii 11–12 (CTH 390 Ritual of Wattiti, pre-NH/NS): *mān* 2=*ŠU* UD.7.KAM *šarā tittanuzzi namm=uš=za=kan likzi nu namma karāduš ŪL azzikkezzi* "When he completes fourteen days (of eating sheep entrails), then he _es them, and he no longer eats entrails/eats no further entrails." See also *KUB* 29.4 i 31–34.

ditive *namma* in its DP or the adverb in FocP/TopP in the left periphery. Further research based on a more complete search of the corpus may allow refinement and revision of the conclusions reached here.

REFERENCES

Alexiadou, Artemis / Haegeman, Liliane / Stavrou, Melita. 2007: *Noun Phrase in the Generative Perspective.* (Studies in Generative Grammar 71) Berlin – New York: de Gruyter.

Alp, Sedat. 1991: *Maşat–Höyük'te Bulunan Çivi Yazılı Hitit Tabletleri: Hethitische Keilschrifttafeln aus Maşat–Höyük*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurukmu Basımevi.

Aravind, Athoulia. 2021. Successive Cyclicity in DPs: Evidence from Mongolian Nominalized Clauses. *Linguistic Inquiry* 52: 377–392.

Beal, Richard. 2003: Assuring the Safety of the King During the Winter. In: Hallo, William W. (ed.): *The Context of Scripture.* Volume 1. *Canonical Compositions from the Biblical World*. Leiden – Boston: Brill, 207–211.

Beckman, Gary. 1996: *Hittite Diplomatic Texts.* (Writings from the Ancient World 7) Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

Cambi, Valentina. 2005: The Hittite adverb *karū*: 'earlier, formerly; already'. In: Jones-Bley, Karlene (ed.): *Proceedings of the 16th Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference. Los Angeles. November 5-6. 2004*. Washington DC: Institute for the Study of Man, 219–234.

CHD = Güterbock, Hans G. / Hoffner, Harry A. (eds.). 1980–1997: *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*. Volumes L–N and P. Chicago: The Oriental Institute.

Christiansen, Birgit. 2004: *Die Ritualtradition der Ambazzi: Eine philologische Bearbeitung und entstehungsgeschichtliche Analyse der Ritualtexte CTH 391, CTH 429 und CTH 463.* (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 48) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Daues, Alexandra / Rieken, Elisabeth. 2018: *Das persönliche Gebet bei den Hethitern: eine textlinguistische Untersuchung.* (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 63) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Erschler, David. 2019: A new argument for existence of the DP in languages without articles. *Journal of Linguistics* 55: 879–887.

Giusti, Giuliana / Iovino, Rossella. 2011: Evidence for a Split DP in Latin. *University of Venice Working Papers* 21: 111–129.

Glocker, Jürgen. 1997: *Das Ritual für den Wettergott von Kuliwišna.* (Eothen 6) Firenze: LoGisma.

Goedegebuure, Petra. 2009: Focus structure and Q-word questions in Hittite. *Linguistics* 47, 945–969.

Goedegebuure, Petra. 2014: *The Hittite Demonstratives: Studies in Deixis, Topics and Focus.* (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 55) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Götze, Albrecht. 1928: *Madduwattaš*. (Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatischen-Aegyptischen Gesellschaft 32) Leipzig: Hinrichs.

Götze, Albrecht. 1933: *Die Annalen des Muršiliš.* (Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatischen-Aegyptischen Gesellschaft 38) Leipzig: Hinrichs.

Güterbock, Hans G. 1956: The Deeds of Suppiluliuma as Told by His Son, Mursili II (Continued). *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 10: 75–98.

Held, Warren. 1957: *The Hittite Relative Sentence.* (Language dissertations 55) Baltimore: Linguistic Society of America.

Hoffner, Harry A. Jr. 2009: *Letters from the Hittite Kingdom.* (Writings from the Ancient World 15) Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

Huggard, Mattyas. 2011: On *Wh*-(Non)-Movement and Internal Structures of the Hittite Preposed Relative Clause. In: Jamison, Stephanie W. / Melchert, H. Craig / Vine, Brent (eds.): *Proceedings of the 22nd Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference*. Bremen: Hempen, 83–104.

Huggard, Mattyas. 2015: *Wh-words in Hittite: A Study in Syntax-Semantics and Syntax-Phonology Interfaces*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.

Köylü, Yılmaz. 2021. An overview of the NP versus DP debate. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 15/3.

Lim, Jung-Hae. 2017: L'adverbe *encore* et ses différentes valeurs. *Korea France Journal* 100: 169–187.

Melchert, H. Craig. 2015: Hittite "Hyperbaton"—The Syntax-Phonology Interface. Lecture, University of Kentucky, Lexington KY, March 25, 2015 (Handout).

Melchert, H. Craig. 2022: The surface position of Hittite subordinating *kuit*. In: Kavitskaya, Darya / Yu, Alan C. L. (eds.): *The Life Cycle of Language: Past, Present, and Future* (Festschrift for Andrew Garrett). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Melchert, H. Craig. forthcoming. Luvo-Hittite *latti-*. To appear in a forthcoming Festschrift.

Miller, Jared. 2004: *Studies in the Origins, Development and Interpretation of the Kizzuwatna Rituals.* (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 46) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Miller, Jared. 2013: *Royal Hittite Instructions and Related Administrative Texts.* (Writings from the Ancient World 31) Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

Mosegaard Hansen, Maj-Britt. 2002: La polysémie de l'adverbe *encore*. *Travaux de Linguistique* 44: 143–166.

Otten, Heinrich. 1988: *Die Bronzetafel aus Boğazköy: Ein Staatsvertrag Tuṯḫilyas IV.* (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten Beiheft 1) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Sakuma, Yasuhiko. 2009: *Hethitische Vogelorakeltexte*. Ph.D. dissertation, Julius-Maximilians-Universität Würzburg.

Sideltsev, Andrej. 2015: The Riddles of Hittite Indefinite Pronouns. *Altorientalische Forschungen* 42: 199–275.

Singer, Itamar. 2002: *Hittite Prayers.* (Writings from the Ancient World 11) Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

Strauß, Rita. 2006: *Reinigungsrituale aus Kizzuwatna: Ein Beitrag zur Erforschung hethitischer Ritualtradition und Kulturgeschichte*. Berlin – New York: de Gruyter.

van den Hout, Theo P. J. 1994: Träume einer hethitischen Königin: KUB 60.97 +? XXXI 71. *Archiv für Orientforschung* 21: 305–327.

Werner, Rudolf. 1973: Ein Traum einer hethitischen Königin. In: Neu, Erich / Rüster, Christel (eds.): *Festschrift Heinrich Otten: 27. Dezember 1973*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 327–330.

Wilhelm, Gernot. 1998: Zwei mittelhethitische Briefe aus dem Gebäude C in Kuşaklı. *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft* 130: 175–187.