

Syntax of Hittite *imma*

ANDREI SIDELTSEV
RUSSIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

Building upon Melchert 1985, I assess the syntax of Hittite *imma* with special attention to its second-position requirement.

1. INTRODUCTION

It was suggested by Melchert 1985 that *imma* shows second-position constraint. The position was taken as granted by Sideltsev 2017. However, not all the aspects of the second position of *imma* were dealt with by Melchert. Besides, it is necessary to place *imma* in the context of numerous other second-position constituents in Hittite. This is what I propose to do in the present paper.

The data in the paper come from a corpus that comprises ca. 17,000 clauses and includes Middle and New Hittite texts. Old Hittite texts were not included, since Melchert showed that no *kui- imma* (*kui-*) pronouns were attested in the Old Hittite period. The corpus is balanced, including texts of different genres. It comprises prayers (as at www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_gebet/textindex.php?g=gebet&x=x), treaties (as in Otten 1988; Miller 2007; Friedrich 1926; Friedrich 1930 with subsequent additions; editions at www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_svh/textindex.php?g=svh&x=x), tablet catalogues (as in Dardano 2006), annals (as in Goetze 1933 with subsequent additions; Del Monte 2008), letters (as in Alp 1991; Hoffner 2009; Giorgieri and Mora 2004; Hagenbuchner 1989), instructions (as in Miller 2013), court proceedings (as in Werner 1967), the Apology of Hattusili III (as in Otten 1981), the Indictment of Madduwatta (as in Otten 1969), oracles (as in Ünal 1978), dreams and vows (as in Mouton 2007; de Roos 2007).

1.1. *How Many immas Are There in Hittite?*

Imma is attested in Hittite texts as an adverb, a focus particle, and a part of free choice pronouns *kui- imma* (*kui-*) “whatever.”

Whereas it is obvious that *imma* as part of *kui- imma* (*kui-*) should not be directly equated with the focus particle or adverb *imma*, it is also obvious that in its origin it is clearly the same as focusing *imma*—see now in detail Sideltsev 2018b. As for the synchronic semantic identity of *imma* as part of free choice pronouns and the focus particle, naturally this cannot be clearly demonstrated for Hittite, but it should be seen in the cross-linguistic context where additive focus particles frequently and synchronically productively combine with interrogative pronouns to form indefinite pronouns of various types (König 1991: 2; Haspelmath 1997: 158), including free choice pronouns.

In this context I feel justified in examining here both *imma* in free choice pronouns and *imma* as a particle/adverb, keeping them distinct but systematically confronting their syntax.

Author's note: Supported by grant RSF 18-18-00503.

1.2. Semantics of *imma*

As for the functions, as was already seen by Melchert (1985: 187–91), the contexts in which *imma* is attested are compatible with contrastive (“rather”), intensifying (“even”), or additive (“also”) meanings for *imma*. Melchert was keen on adducing one common function for *imma* covering *all* the contexts. However, I consider this attempt not justified—multiple functions are well attested for modal particles, see König 1991. Very often, focus particles are also synchronically attested as adversative conjunctions, e.g., English *but* (König 1991: 3) or Hittite *-(m)a* (Sideltsev and Molina 2015). Another systematic polysemy is between focus particles and coordination in many languages (König 1991: 2); see Sideltsev and Molina 2015 for Hittite *-(y)a*. Thus I am quite content to operate with all three functions. In such contexts *imma* functions as a focus particle (additive “also,” scalar additive “even,” restrictive “only,” and some other meanings) or as an adversative particle marking contrast between clauses with the meaning “rather.”

Some contexts favor the translation of *imma* as an adverb “really, indeed, actually,” which Melchert (1985: 192) termed an asseverative function. He observed (1985: 192) that there is an “element of surprise in such sentences, which leads to the use of *imma* to assert the reality of what is stated: ‘If you actually do so-and-so (much to the surprise of any reasonable person) ...’.” This understanding makes it likely that the so-called asseverative function is simply a contextual extension of the focusing function. Yet further extension is seen in negative contexts (Melchert 1985: 187).

Although Melchert (2002: 229; idem 2016: 300) explicitly withdrew his 1985 analysis of *imma* as a focus particle and suggested only the asseverative “indeed” as its sole function, he did not produce any *semantic* arguments against the focusing function. Nor is his analysis easily applicable to examples like (1):

- (1) KUB 13.4 iii 50, CTH 264.A (NH/NS), cf. Miller 2013: 258–59

(He who douses it (the fire), and for whom a disaster occurs in his temple)

<i>nu</i>	<u>É.DINGIR-LÌ=ŠU?</u>	<i>imma</i>	1- <i>an</i>	<i>ḫarak-zi</i>
CONN	temple=his?	ever	1-NOM.SG.N	perish-3SG.PRS

“and **only** his temple is destroyed (while the goods of the king of Hattusa are not destroyed, whoever caused the disaster will be completely destroyed along with his descendants)”

Even though I follow the reading and understanding of the context suggested by Miller, I still believe that the information structure was correctly understood by Melchert already in 1985. Translating his argument into modern terms, the noun phrase is focused. Focus is marked by *imma* (Melchert 1985: 193). It would follow from the translation that the entire phrase É.DINGIR-LÌ=ŠU? 1-*an* “his one temple” is focused. However, the numeral is here positioned after the noun phrase, not in its standard position in front of the noun it modifies (Hoffner and Melchert 2008: 165); thus the numeral cannot be part of the quantifier phrase É.DINGIR-LÌ=ŠU? 1-*an* “his one temple.” Hoffner and Melchert (2008: 165) present evidence that postposition of the numeral “one” is quite well attested in Hittite and assess it as appositional: “his temple, 1 (temple), is destroyed” or, in more standard English, “his temple alone is destroyed.”

Whatever the exact analysis, it does appear that “his temple” and “alone” do not form a phrase here. So one has to think that “his temple” is contrasted with ^{URU}*Ḫattušaš* LUGAL-*aš āššu* “the goods of the king of Hattusa” in the next clause. Consequently, the scope of focus-

ing *imma* is over the phrase É.DINGIR-*LÌ*=*ŠU*? “his one temple” which it follows. The context also favors the restricting meaning of *imma*, in the translation “only.” Clausal scope of *imma*, its assessment as adverb and the meaning “indeed” as suggested, e.g., in *HED* E-I 359¹ are much less convincing, since they imply a fairly different and less plausible understanding of the whole context. Besides, asseveration hardly fits the modal, prescriptive context of the instruction.

Thus I still believe that *imma* has several functions, one of them focusing. That asseverative function coexists with that of focusing synchronically follows from, e.g., English *very* marking focus < French *vrai* “true” (see König 1991: 130–32).

2. *IMMA* WITHIN A PHRASE

After this very brief summary of the functions of *imma*, I will pass on to the topic of the paper, the syntax of *imma*. I will start the discussion from cases where *imma* is a focus particle modifying a phrase. I will use more linguistically oriented terms and speak about such cases as *imma* having scope over a phrase.

The basic and most common rule is that *imma* follows the word over which it has scope; see already Melchert 1985.

This is obvious in a case where *imma* follows a negation and has scope over it (Melchert 1985; *HW*² I: 49–50):

(2) KUB 21.38 obv. 53', CTH 176 (NH/NS), cf. Hoffner 2009: 286

ANA	ŠEŠ=YA	MUNUS-TUM	UL	<i>imma</i>	ēš-ta
to	brother=my	wife	NEG	even	be-3SG.PST

“Didn’t my brother have a wife at all?”

Here *imma* scopes over (modifies) the negation marker (Melchert 1985; *HW*² I: 50).

The same direct correlation between scope and position in the clause is also attested with other types of constituents, e.g., verbs, as in:

(3) HKM 6 obv. 11–1.e. 14, CTH 186 (MH/MS), cf. Hoffner 2009: 105

(“(the enemy) himself passed through, and I don’t know where he went”)

<i>nu</i>	<i>apā-š</i>	LÚKÚR	<i>alwanzahhanza</i>	<i>imma</i>	ēš-ta
CONN	that-NOM.SG.C	enemy	enchant.PRTC.NOM.SG.C	even	be-3SG.PST

“was that enemy enchanted, (that you did not recognize him)?”

Here *imma* follows the participle *alwanzahhanza* “enchanted” over which it has scope. The participle is the focus of the question, thus “enchanted” is one of the set of alternatives. What is important is that “enchanted” is the least likely of all alternatives that are implied by the question focus—“enchanted” being the least likely of all potential attributes of the enemy. This gives rise to counterexpectancy, scalar focus, which is close to, but not identical to English “even.” It is obvious that no asseverative meaning of the type “indeed” with the scope over all the clause can be at play—the speaker knows well enough that the enemy was not enchanted—and asking for the reassurance of *this* would be totally unwarranted. The speaker instead stresses the fact that “enchanted” is the least likely attribute of the enemy. Consequently, *imma* marks scalar focus of the participle it follows.

1. “The temple alone will indeed perish, but Hattusas, the king’s possession, will not perish.”

This use is also attested with noun phrases, as in:

- (4) KUB 13.4 iv 21, CTH 264.A (NH/NS), cf. Miller 2013: 262–63

(Furthermore: When you plant grain, and the priest does not send a man after you to plant the seed, (and) he distributes it to you to plant, and you plant much, but you tell the priest it was little; or the field of the deity is prosperous, while the field of the ploughman fails, and you designate the field of the deity yours and yours you designate the field of the deity; or you store the grain at some point, and report half of it, but you conceal the (other) half, and thereafter you divide it among yourselves [...])

<i>n=an=kan</i>	<u>UN-š̄i</u>	<i>imma</i>	<i>tāi-tteni</i>
CONN=it=LOC.PART	man-DAT.SG	even	steal-2PL.PRS

“Are you stealing it from a man? (Are you not stealing it from the deity?)”

Miller (2013: 263) translates the clause as “Are you stealing it from just a man?”² His understanding generally conveys the Hittite text accurately, but in my opinion the context does not give any grounds for introducing the restricting operator “just” into the clause. The previous context describes a series of actions that a person may perform to deprive the cult of some of its income. In this context the verb “steal” in the clause under discussion refers back to the misconduct in the previous passage and is consequently discourse-linked (= topical). Thus the fact that stealing occurs is presupposed for the question and is out of its scope. The focus of the question is here solely on the “man,” which is further confirmed by the focus of the following question, the “deity.” The fact that both clauses should be understood as questions follows from the fronted negation marker in the following clause, a frequent marker of rhetorical questions (Hoffner 1986: 88–89; *CHD* L–N: 415–16; Hoffner 1995: 91–92; Sideltsev 2016).

Since *imma* is here a particle and particles are sensitive to the information structure, I assume that *imma* is associated with narrow focus over the noun phrase “man,” the first of the alternatives, while the second alternative, “god,” is introduced in the following clause. Thus, as is typical of focus, it chooses the referent out of a limited set of alternatives, even though it marks the first of the two alternatives. The context does not require any additional semantics from *imma*, either adversative, additive, or restricting, mostly because it scopes over the first of the two explicitly introduced alternatives. There might be a counterexpectant nuance in its function since the previous context already made it clear enough that the misconduct is directed against the cult of a deity; thus a man is the least likely of the alternatives.

Actually, *HED* E–I: 359 again suggests the meaning “indeed” and sentential scope for *imma* in the clause: “you (may) **indeed** steal it from a man, but you cannot steal it from a god.”

I think this understanding is inferior to that of Miller, which I follow here for the following reasons: First, its essential feature is that it introduces the modality, which is not explicit in the Hittite context. The modality “cannot” is most commonly expressed by the prohibitive in Hittite, particularly in instructions. Second, nothing in the previous context implies that it is possible to steal from a man. Indeed, all the misconduct is obviously not directed at a human being. Thus any asseverative nuance is totally at odds with the message of the broader context.

2. Similarly, but without a question is Melchert 1985: 193: “you (may) indeed steal it from a **man**, but you (may) not steal it from a god.”

2.1. *Second-Position Constraint of imma*

Now we will see what happens if *imma* scopes not over a phrase that consists of a single word, but over a branching (= multiword) phrase. The clearest case is represented by free choice pronouns *kui- imma kui-* + (optionally) a noun phrase. In view of cross-linguistic data establishing that focus particles + interrogative pronouns form indefinite pronouns of different kinds (König 1991: 2; Haspelmath 1997: 158), it is quite reasonable to equate *imma* in free choice pronouns with *imma* as a focus particle in Hittite. It is also obvious that *imma* in free choice pronouns scopes over at least both *kui- kui-* pronouns. However, in the absolute majority of cases it is positioned after the first *kui-* pronoun, see, e.g.:

- (5) Bo 86/299 ii 62, CTH 106.A.1 (NH/INS), cf. Beckman 1996: 112; Otten 1988: 18–19

<i>kui-š=kan</i>	<i>imma</i>	<i>kui-š</i>	ŠÀ.BI	KUR	^{1D} <i>Hūlaya</i>
who-NOM.SG.C=LOC.PART	ever	who-NOM.SG.C	inside	land	Hulaya
<i>ēš-zi</i>					
be-3SG.PRS					

“Whoever is in the land of the Hulaya River ...”

Deviations from this rule are sporadic. There are rare cases where *imma* is third or first within its phrase. It is third only in 3³ contexts (5.6%), versus 51 in second place (92.6%), and once⁴ (1.8%) first in a phrase.

Moreover, when word order is reversed, if it is the noun that is first and the *kui-* pronoun follows, *imma* is again used after the first word of the phrase, this time *preceding* the pronoun:

- (6) HHCTO 4 obv. 7–9, CTH 186 (MH/MS), cf. Ünal 1998: 41; differently Hoffner 2009: 255

[<i>nu=war=aš</i>]	<i>IŠTU</i>	<i>DUB.SAR</i>	<i>imma</i> ¹	<i>ku[ēz]</i>	<i>waštanuwanza</i>
CONN=QUOT=he	by	scribe	even	who.ABL	sinned.NOM.SG.C

“by **whichever** scribe a sin has been committed”⁵

In fact, Ünal (1998: 41) emended this to *IŠTU DUB.SAR <kuēz> imma ku[ēz]*, but this is ad hoc, simply in order to get rid of the reverse sequence *imma kuēz* for the expected *kuēz imma*. At face value *IŠTU DUB.SAR imma¹ ku[ēz]* provides a very clear indication that *imma* occupies the second position within the phrase even if the word order in the phrase is different from the common *kui- imma kui- noun*. Here the first element within the free choice phrase is not the *kui-* pronoun, but rather the noun *IŠTU DUB.SAR* “by a scribe.” *IŠTU*, like all Akkadian prepositions, was not pronounced while reading the text and never counted in determining the first position; see now Kudrinsky 2016 (with lit.).

The distribution establishes the fact that the position of *imma* is not dictated by purely scopal considerations. Instead, it implies a second-position constraint for *imma* within the phrase that *imma* is part of and has scope over.

3. KBo 5.3+ ii 52, CTH 42.A (NH/NS); KBo 4.14 ii 58–59, CTH 123 (NH/NS); KUB 13.4 iii 52, CTH 264.A (NH/NS).

4. KUB 15.3 i 15–16, CTH 584 (NH/NS).

5. Hoffner (2009: 255) restored [*taparriyaš*'] and translated “by whichever scribe the instruction? was disregarded.”

Second position within a phrase means that *imma* is placed after the first phonetic word of the phrase. If the phrase is branching (multiword), *imma* is second after the first phonetic word of the phrase and precedes all the rest of the words of the phrase, irrespective of the scope of *imma* and irrespective of what the word is.

The same constraint is seen in other second-position words, most clearly indefinite pronouns when they are part of a phrase, see Huggard 2015; Sideltsev 2015; Sideltsev 2017.

2.2. Position of the Phrase Containing *imma* within the Clause

So far I have been assessing the position of *imma* within a phrase it scopes over, irrespective of the position of the phrase in the clause. Now I will turn to the phrase position. The phrase containing *imma* can occur both at the left periphery of a clause, and in the immediately preverbal position.

The most common phrase containing *imma* is the free choice pronoun *kui- imma kui-* “whichever” + optionally an NP. The phrase occurs either in the first/initial position in the clause or in the immediately preverbal position. The first position of *kui- imma kui-* “whichever” is attested in (7) whereas the immediately preverbal one appears in (8).

- (7) KUB 13.4 iii 4-5, CTH 264.A (NH/NS), cf. Miller 2013: 256–67

<u>kui-š=pat=kan</u>	<u>imma</u>	<u>kui-š</u>	DINGIR ^{MEŠ} -aš
who-NOM.SG.C=EMPH=LOC.PART	ever	who-NOM.SG.C	gods-GEN.PL

GIŠ_{kattaluzzi} šarre-ške-zzi
threshold.ACC.SG.N cross-IMPF-3SG.PRS

“**whoever** normally crosses the threshold of the deities, (neither the one nor the other shall neglect to sleep up in the temple)”

- (8) KBo 31.8 + iv 27–29, CTH 276.1.A (NH/NS), cf. Dardano 2006: 28–29; differently CHD L–N: 199

<u>man=kan</u>	<u>INA</u>	<u>É.DINGIR–LÌ</u>	<u>šupp-ai</u>	<u>ped-i</u>	<u>kui-n</u>
if=LOC.PART	in	temple	pure.LOC.SG	place-LOC.SG	which-ACC.SG.C
<u>imma</u>	<u>kui-n</u>	<u>maršaštarri-n</u>	<u>w<e>miyanzi</u>		
ever	which-ACC.SG.C	desecration-ACC.SG.C	find.3PL.PRS		

“If they find some desecration in the temple, in a consecrated place ...”

Out of all attestations of *imma*, only twenty-two are relevant in this respect. Out of these, in twenty (91%) the first position or the immediately preverbal position is occupied by the free choice pronoun with the syntactic function which elsewhere corresponds to the first or immediately preverbal position in an SOV language; subjects are first/initial, as in (7), whereas direct objects are immediately preverbal, as in (8).

In either case *imma* is second within the noun phrase (free choice pronoun *kui- kui-* + optionally a noun phrase) irrespective of whether it is second or not within the clause. When the phrase is at the beginning of a clause, *imma* is simultaneously phrase and clause second. When the noun phrase is immediately preverbal, *imma* is not clause second.

When *imma* scopes over the negation marker, as in (2) above, it is in the immediately preverbal position. This is determined by the fact that the negation marker that precedes it is normally in the immediately preverbal position.

The twofold distribution of phrases containing *imma* in two positions in the clause—at the left edge of the clause and immediately preverbally—is typical of many words that otherwise attest a second-position constraint, like indefinite or relative pronouns (see Sideltsev and Molina 2015; Huggard 2015). The words that show a second-position constraint at the left edge of the clause—apart from Wackernagel enclitics—also systematically occur in the immediately preverbal position.

It is important to note that by itself the twofold distribution says nothing about whether a word like *imma* occurring within the phrase has a second-position constraint outside of the phrase.

3. *IMMA* WITH SENTENTIAL SCOPE

However, *imma* does not always have scope over a phrase within a clause. In a number of cases it can be shown to have scope over the entire clause, as in:

- (9) KBo 5.9(+) iii 20, CTH 62.II.A (NH/NS), cf. del Monte 1986: 170–71; Beckman 1996: 58, cf. (21) below

(If you do not set them on their way and do not show them the road to Hatti,)

<i>n=aš=kan</i>	IGI ^{Hl.A} – <i>wa</i>	<i>imma</i>	ḪUR.SAG- <i>i</i>	<i>nai-tti</i>
CONN=them=LOC.PART	eyes-ACC.PL.N	even	mountain-LOC.SG	turn-2SG.PRS

“**but rather** direct them to the mountains”

Here the first noun phrase IGI^{Hl.A}–*wa* “eyes” does not have any reference of its own, but rather forms a phraseological unit with the other noun phrase and the verb “turn (someone’s) eyes toward the mountain,” which was a set phrase for encouraging a fugitive to flee (*CHD* L–N: 355). Thus the scope of *imma* in (9) can only be over the entire phraseological phrase, which is equivalent to its sentential scope, and not over the noun phrase IGI^{Hl.A}–*wa* “eyes” that it follows. The previous context favors the adversative meaning of the particle *imma*. However, as observed already by Melchert (1985: 189), *imma* in such contexts can also be translated by “even,” “also, in addition.” Whatever the exact semantic interpretation, which is of no direct interest for this paper, it is obvious that the scope of *imma* is over the entire clause.

3.1. *Second-Position imma at the Left Edge of the Clause*

In this case the placement of *imma* can also be explained by the second-position constraint, but the constraint operates not within the phrase, but rather within the clause.

In such cases *imma* occurs at the left edge of the clause after the first stressed word⁶ of the clause, even when it does not have scope over the word it immediately follows. This is obvious in (9) above, where *imma* follows just the noun phrase IGI^{Hl.A}–*wa* “eyes,” although it scopes over the whole clause, and not only over this phrase.

The second important property of the second-position constraint in the Hittite clause is that if there is a branching constituent at the left edge of the clause, the second-position word pushes it to second after the first word of the clause and phrase (Sideltsev 2017). Thus a second-position constituent in Hittite consistently breaks up syntactic units, i.e., phrases.⁷

6. *nu* (+ enclitics) do not count as the first position, see Sideltsev 2017; and below.

7. The absolute majority of exceptions involve heterographically written phrases, which, if they do not contain overt markers of morphosyntactic analyzability (Akkadian genitive preposition, Hittite case endings) are not

Just as with other second-position constituents, *imma* breaks up phrases it is not part of to be clause second. This is obvious in examples like the following, where *imma* is at the left edge of the clause:

(10) HKM 47 obv. 15–16, CTH 581 (MH/MS), cf. Hoffner 2009: 180

[nu]= <i>nnaš</i>	<u>ŠA</u>	<u>URU</u> <i>Taggašta</i>	<i>imma</i>	<u>uttar</u>	<i>awan katta</i>	[a]u-men ¹
CONN=us	of	Taggasta	even	word	away down	see-1PL.PST

“We **thoroughly** investigated by augury the matter of the town Takkasta”

Here *imma* breaks up the phrase *ŠA^{URU}Taggašta uttar* “the matter of the town Takkasta,” i.e., it stands in the position after its first phonological word, to be clause second, even though it is not part of the phrase. The understanding of the clause I provide as the translation is accepted by virtually all the scholars who have studied the text.⁸ Besides Hoffner (2009: 180), see Marizza (2009: 109): “noi abbiamo indagato **a fondo** la questione della città di Taggasta” with specific reference to van den Hout (2001: 430 n. 36), who translated it as “wir haben die Angelegenheit von Taggasta **tiefgehend** untersucht.”⁹ Might it be suggested that the context should be assessed differently—as “and we continued to investigate by augury the matter of the town *Takkasta*” with the scope of *imma* on only the city in question (the insistence being motivated by the fact that the augury was done from another location, Tapikka)?

This understanding implies contrast between Takkasta and Tapikka—*Takkasta* and not Tappikka. However, it does not fit the broader context. There is no contrast between the locations—it is said that the augury was successfully carried out in Tapikka, but it concerned the plans of the Hittite king about Takkasta, which was the only purpose of the augury (Sakuma 2009: 444). The difference between the location of the augury and the matter the augury concerned is trivial and does not give rise to a contrastive interpretation of any of the place names. Thus, for me, the understanding with *imma* scoping only over Taggasta does not naturally follow from the broader context. Consequently, I suppose that the most natural semantic analysis of *imma* is “thoroughly.” Thus *imma* is an adverb here, scoping over the entire situation.

In breaking up syntactic phrases it is not part of, *imma* behaves like other unambiguous second-position constituents. See Huggard 2015 and in detail Sideltsev 2017. Such cases make it necessary to conclude that *imma* attests a second-position constraint within a clause.

3.2. *imma* in the Immediately Preverbal Position

However, curiously, the same second-position effects as in the left periphery can be seen for *imma* in the immediately preverbal position. In section 2, I described the distribution of phrases in which *imma* appears. They occur in the absolute majority of cases in two positions—at the left edge of the clause or in the immediately preverbal position. The same holds true for *imma* when it has scope over an entire clause and is not part of a phrase. We saw in section 3.1 sub (9) that it occurs at the left edge of the clause in the second position when it has sentential scope.

normally broken up even by Wackernagel enclitics; see Kudrinsky 2016 (and Sideltsev 2020 for an alternative view).

8. It is not quite clear how exactly *imma* was understood by Sakuma (2009: 640), who translates the clause as “Schliesslich sahen wir die erwähnte Angelegenheit von Taggasta durch.”

9. Alp (1991: 204) read the context differently.

Now I will show that *imma* can occur in the immediately preverbal position if it has clausal scope. It is best seen in the following example:

- (11) KUB 14.1+ rev. 88, CTH 147 (MH/MS), cf. Beckman 1996: 151; Beckman et al. 2011: 95

(“His Majesty said as follows [about the land of Alasiya]: “Because [the land] of Alasiya belongs to My Majesty, [and the people of Alasiya] pay [me tribute— why have you continually raided it?” But] Madduwatta said as follows: “[When Attarissiya and] the ruler [of Piggaya] were raiding the land of Alasiya, I often raided it too. But the father of His Majesty [had] never [informed] me, [nor] had His Majesty ever informed [me] to the effect: “The land of Ahhiyawa is mine— recognize it as such.””)

<i>kinuna</i> =wa	<i>mān</i>	ᵀUTU-ŠI	NAM.RA ^{HI.A}	URU ^{Alašiya}	<i>imma</i>
now=QUOT	if	his majesty	captives	Alashiya	even
<i>āppa</i>	<i>wewakk-i</i>				
back	ask-3SG.PRS				

“If His Majesty now **indeed** demands the civilian captives of Alashiya back, (I will give them back to him).”

It might in principle be suggested that *imma* in this example has scope only over the phrase it directly follows, NAM.RA^{HI.A} URU^{Alašiya} “the civilian captives of Alashiya.” In this case the whole clause could be interpreted as “if His Majesty now demands back the civilian captives of *Alashiya*.” This appears to be Melchert’s (1985: 194) understanding of the context: “Madduwatta is claiming that he is willing to give back the deportees precisely of a country, Alashiya, for which there were no previous instructions.” However, I believe that this analysis is less convincing than the understanding of Beckman that I follow in the translation above, which follows for me from the broader context. It does not contain any contrast specifically between Alashiya and any other country. The contrast is rather between two situations—earlier “I raided the land of Alashiya and his Majesty did not mind” and presently “His Majesty now demands the civilian captives of Alashiya back.” In this light I suppose that the scope of *imma* is over the whole situation, and not just over “the civilian captives of Alashiya.” The use of the conditional particularly favors the interpretation of *imma* in the asseverative meaning “indeed.”

The distribution between clause second and immediately preverbal *imma* that is not part of a phrase is fairly straightforward: most *immas* with sentential scope are found at the left edge of the clause, while the sole example in the unambiguously preverbal position is (11). Due to the fact that Hittite clauses tend to be rather short, many cases are ambiguous between second and immediately preverbal position.

3.2.1. Second Preverbally?

What is more, one can also detect properties of *imma*’s distribution in the clause characteristic of its second position at the clause’s left edge in the immediately preverbal position. A very clear indication of *imma* having such a second-position constraint comes from the following context:

- (12) KUB 54.1 + obv. 53, CTH 389.1 (NH/NS), cf. *CHD* Š: 166; differently Archi and Klen-
gel 1985: 59

(As they earlier have taken away my god from me,)

<i>[nu=w]a</i>	<i>ammuk</i>	<i>āššu</i>	<i>imma</i>	<i>kuitki</i>
CONN=QUOT	I.DAT.SG	good.ACC.SG.N	even	something.ACC.SG.N

šanḫ-išk-er
seek-IMPF-3PL.PST

“Were they **really** planning to do something good for me? (Now, do not turn in favor toward these (men), O god, my lord).”

Here the immediately preverbal position is occupied by the noun phrase *āššu kuitki* “something good.” *Imma* is inside the phrase. However, it follows from the broader context that *imma* in this clause is not part of the noun phrase *āššu kuitki* and has the asseverative meaning “really,” modifying the entire clause. In this understanding the contrast in the context is between two propositions—the previous one establishing that bad things have been committed to the person in question—“they earlier have taken away my god from me.” The other situation is positive—“seeking something good for me.” This is likely to be a question, since the inference from the previous situation is that good intentions are highly unlikely. This provides the correlation of the two situations, and the correlation between the previous experience and the situation in question is expressed by the asseverative adverb “really.” Because the *situations* are confronted, it is likely to scope over the whole second clause. We saw above that such *immas* appear in the clause’s second position at the left edge. But in this example *imma* is in the immediately preverbal position. More accurately, it breaks up the noun phrase that is in the immediately preverbal position, i.e., is inside the phrase, following its first word. I interpret this as the first word of the phrase, *āššu*, fulfilling the second-position requirement for *imma*, even though *imma* is not part of the phrase.

This makes it clearer than in other cases that *imma* is not just in the immediately preverbal position, but needs something to lean on even when it is deep inside the clause. It is instructive that this immediately preverbal case is obviously identical to (10) above, where the same happened at the left edge of the clause. For me this is a major argument in favor of complete parallelism between the second position at the left edge of the clause and the second position in the immediately preverbal position, which has already been pointed out for other words in Hittite (see Sideltsev 2017).

The only difference is that at the left edge of the clause we begin counting the positions from the actual edge, whereas in the immediately preverbal position we start counting from the first word of the immediately preverbal position. However, even here the difference is not absolute—at the left edge of the clause we leave out a group of words like *nu* (+ enclitics), *mān* “if,” and some others when we determine the first position (see in detail Sideltsev 2017).

3.2.2. How Can One Identify *imma* in the Preverbal Position as Having a Second-Position Constraint?

Alternatively, for (12) above it might be suggested that *imma* has scope just over *āššu kuitki* “something good,” in contrast to previous evil actions, and thus serves as a focusing particle. In this understanding, the previous evil actions and the present positive ones are not contrasted.

This would entail a very different assessment of the example in its entirety—*āššu imma kuitki* “**even** something good” as a single phrase, with *imma* occurring within the phrase it scopes over.

This understanding at first sight appears to fit the context just as well, as that *imma* in (12) would be identical to other *immas* in the immediately preverbal position. Just as in other preverbal phrases, *imma* would follow the first phonetic word of the phrase *āššu imma kuitki* “something good,” and not the phrase as a whole. Thus, even though the alternative analysis is radically different in all relevant details, it boils down to the same thing as that suggested immediately above. It also implies second position of *imma* in the immediately preverbal position within the clause. The only difference with this option is that the second position is determined simultaneously both within the noun phrase *āššu kuitki* and in the immediately preverbal position.

This brings us back to the fact that the first position for *imma* in the company of other immediately preverbal phrases is also provided by the first phonetic word within the phrase. In *kui- imma kui-* phrases this is fulfilled by the first *kui-* pronoun (see (8) above), outside *kui- imma kui-* phrases by the first word of the phrase (see (11) and (12)), and in cases like (2) by the negation marker.

It might be argued that in (11) *NAM.RA^{HLA} URUAlašiya* “the captives of Alashiya” is a phrase, not a word. However, it is significant that *NAM.RA^{HLA} URUAlašiya* is a combination of a Sumerogram without a phonetic complement and an indeclinable town name. It has long been known that such sequences behave vis-à-vis clitics like true sequences of heterograms in Hittite texts, that is, they function as one phonetic word, and not as a syntactic phrase (see now Kudrinsky 2016).

Getting back to the analysis of (12), the effect that the contrast is narrow over the noun phrase may be simply because the noun phrase is lexically marked as “good,” whereas the previous actions are unambiguously understood as negative. Still, the contrast is in reality much broader and includes all the situations. Thus narrow contrast solely over the noun phrase might well be simply a lexical illusion. Consequently, I prefer the first understanding given as the translation of (12).

3.2.3. A Common Account for Left Edge and Immediately Preverbal Position of *imma*

I have shown that the placement of *imma* at the left edge of the clause and its placement in the immediately preverbal position are parallel. But how can we speak about *imma* being second in the immediately preverbal position when to the observer it is anything but second? Naturally, in the understanding I provided above I simply assumed that the left border of the immediately preverbal position is the kind of border from which the position of *imma* is calculated. So the main question is: What is the reason to believe that the word preceding *imma* in the immediately preverbal position is first in any significant way when it is deep inside the clause, far from the actual left edge? So far the solution appears rather ad hoc.

Cross-linguistically, there has been quite a lot of work to this effect, which falls into two main lines of research—phases and prosodic pauses. The first is theory-specific and limited to the Minimalist Program. It assumes that there are two main building blocks in a clause and suggests that syntactic structure is built up in phases; see first Chomsky 2001. “[T]he computational component of the Language Faculty can only hold limited amounts of syntactic structure in its working memory at any one time, and [...] clause structure is built up in phases” (Radford 2004: 426). “At the end of each phase, part of the syntactic structure already formed undergoes transfer to the phonological and semantic components, with the result that the relevant part of the structure is inaccessible to further syntactic operations

from that point on” (Radford 2004: 381). See in more detail the introductory assessment in Radford 2004: 381–427. Three phases, DP, vP, and CP, are posited for the clause.

In this light the parallelism between the position of Hittite *imma* at the left edge of the clause and in the immediately preverbal position is easily captured by the assumption that in reality we are dealing with phase sensitive placement of *imma*—*imma* is placed at the edge of two phases—CP and vP; see Huggard 2015 and Sideltsev 2018a for a similar suggestion concerning indefinite pronouns. The clause second position at the left edge will result from *imma* being at the edge of the higher phase—CP (Sideltsev 2018a, cf. Huggard 2015), whereas the second position of *imma* in the immediately preverbal position will result from *imma* being at the edge of the lower phase—vP. In this case the position of *imma* will follow from the fact that it has to be second within a phase, both at the left edge of the clause and within vP.

In cases where *imma* has scope over a clause, its first position both in the left periphery and in the immediately preverbal position will be provided by the first word of the nearest constituent.¹⁰ In cases where *imma* has scope over a phrase, its first position simultaneously within the phrase and within the clause is provided by the first phonetic word of the phrase.

The second line of work mostly focuses on prosody. It is a well-known fact that there are pauses not only at clause borders, but also within clauses. Cross-linguistic studies show that focusing is often marked by insertion of a prosodic boundary immediately in front of the focused constituent in SOV languages (Büring 2009). If this is extended to Hittite, which is an SOV language, it can explain the exceptional position of *imma* as well as of other second-position words in Hittite: as shown above, *imma* frequently marks focus. If there was a prosodic boundary in front of the focused constituent, *imma* would be positioned according to the general rules of placement of enclitics: following the first stressed word after a prosodic boundary.

Thus second position in the immediately preverbal position would actually be second position after the pause, i.e., it would be totally parallel to the second position at the left edge of the clause after a clause-initial pause. Cross-linguistically, second-position constituents are often attested in the second position after this focus-induced phrase. Best known are data from the Caucasian languages, genetically unrelated but forming a *Sprachbund*. These attest verbal agreement markers either on the verb or in the position immediately following focus.

Thus in the following two examples from Talyshi, an Iranian language attested in the Caucasus, enclitic verbal agreement marker =š immediately follows the focused constituent, whether it is clause initial (13) or preverbal (14), instead of attaching to the verb (Stilo 2008: 382–83):

- (13) *mæštæ* *kæ=dæ=š* *bæ-b-e*
 tomorrow house-LOC=2S₁ TAM-be-INF

“Will you be home tomorrow?” (or somewhere else?) (Stilo 2008: 383).

- (14) *mæštæ=š* *kæ=dæ* *bæ-b-e*
 tomorrow=2S₁ house-LOC TAM-be-INF

“Will you be home tomorrow?” (instead of *today*?) (Stilo 2008: 383).

In the following case, however, enclitic =*imon* remains on the verb:

10. The details of the analysis are very technical and will be provided elsewhere.

- (15) *dī* *pæs-i* *æmæ* *hæmišæ* *še=dæ=b-imon*
 with sheep-OBL we always went-TAM-AUX.PAS-1P₁

“We were always going with the sheep” (Stilo 2008: 388).

These examples also provide a nice parallel to the Hittite distribution. However, there are several difficulties. First, in the languages for which the system of (13–15) is described, verbal agreement markers are not Wackernagel clitics. They are placed either on the verb or on the focused constituent. This sets the systems quite apart from the Hittite. Secondly, even though one of the functions of *imma* is to mark focus, in my corpus there are no cases when this function of *imma* is attested in the unambiguously immediately preverbal position. But even if this were the case, synchronically in the case of the immediately preverbal free choice pronoun *kui- imma kui-* it is not obvious that the free choice phrase receives the contrastive focus reading, which is the preferred reading of the immediately preverbal position in Hittite (Goedegebuure 2009; Goedegebuure 2014). It is easy to understand why *imma* so consistently follows the negation marker in the immediately preverbal position, because negation is frequently associated with focus, e.g., in Georgian where negation markers are in the same position as focus; see Skopeteas and Fanselow 2010. Therefore, for Hittite I prefer the first explanation, the phrasal one.

It is important that in this section I put forward an explanation for *imma* with sentential scope and with narrow scope only over the phrase. This does not contest the fact that in a number of cases *imma* has scope only over the noun phrase of which it is a part. It simply introduces from theoretical linguistics the means to see that such cases in the immediately preverbal position are built in exactly the same way as those at the left periphery.

More significant from the inner Hittite perspective is that virtually all second-position words, unambiguous enclitics *-(m)a*, *-(y)a*, and what was termed “syntactic enclitics” in Sideltsev 2017—indefinite pronouns, some subordinators, and relative pronouns—appear to behave in the immediately preverbal position in the same way as at the left edge of the clause (see Sideltsev 2015; Sideltsev 2018a). Thus the syntax of not only *imma*, but also of all other second-position words (with the exception of Wackernagel enclitics) is explained very nicely by the cross-linguistic and theoretical data outlined in this section.

It might finally be remarked that the second position was defined in purely linear, even phonetic, terms whereas the phrasal account is couched within a formal and syntactic framework. However, it is not hard to recast the definition of the second position suggested above in formal syntactic terms (see Sideltsev 2018a for an outline of the analysis).

4. POSTVERBAL *IMMA*

I will now tackle several examples where *imma* appears to be postverbal. I will assess the two that occur in the reasonably preserved broader context and allow for study of the semantics and scope of *imma*.¹¹

- (16) KBo 5.6 rev. iii 38, CTH 40.IV.1.A (NH/NS), cf. *HW*² I: 49

((Suppiluliumma) did not intrude into a single one of the temples of the gods (of the conquered city in order to desecrate or damage it))

11. Others occur in fragmentary contexts: KUB 23.77 + rev. 79, CTH 138.1 (MH/MS); KUB 19.29 i 9, CTH 61.II.1 (NH/lateNS).

[(<i>n=aš</i>)]	<i>hink-atta</i>	<i>imma</i>
CONN=he	bow-3SG.PST.MED	even

“but **rather** he bowed down (and showed respect)”¹²

It follows from the context that there is either adversativity at the clause level, which is explicitly conveyed in the available translations by “but,” or contrastive focus on the verb. Since *imma* can mark both, it is impossible to understand whether it has clausal scope with the meaning “but, rather” or has scope only over the verb, marking contrastive focus—choosing “intrude (to desecrate or damage)” as against “bow.” In the first understanding, the verb would precede *imma* simply because this would satisfy its second-position constraint. In the second, the verb would precede *imma* because *imma* scopes over it and forms one focus phrase with it. In either understanding we see the effect of the second-position constraint, whether only at clause level or at both clause and phrase level. Examples like (16) are different from examples like the following, where *imma* is postverbal in multiword clauses:

(17) KUB 10.1 i 17–20, CTH 627.1.c.A (OH/NS), cf. *HED* K: 286; *HW*² I: 49

(the priest of Arinna, the priest of Zippalanda, and the foreigners bow before the king)

LÚSANGA	URU	Arinna	LÚSANGA	URU	Zippalanda=ya	<i>kūrudauwanza</i>
priest		Arinna	priest		Zippalanda=and	helmeted.NOM.SG.C
		<i>aranta</i>			<i>imma</i>	
		stand.3PL.PRS.MED			even	

“the priest of Arinna and the priest of Zippalanda, helmeted, stand (but they do not bow)”

Here the position of *imma* cannot be explained as in (16) by the second-position constraint in the left periphery—the verb is not the only other word in the sentence. There is obviously contrast involved here. However, the only *-ma* is used in the following clause “but they do not bow.” In this context it might be supposed that *imma* marks contrastive focus as a choice out of a limited set of alternatives (bow, stand) for the verb. It would be somewhat unnatural to suggest that *imma* marks prototypical adversativity in the context, since the adversativity is marked in the context by *-ma* in the following clause. However, the context contrasts not only the verbs, but also the participants of the actions—different priests are differently dressed and act differently. Thus contrastive focus on the verb is just part of the contrast of two situations. Melchert (1985: 192) thinks that only what he terms emphasizing or asseverative meanings are appropriate for the context in question: “the priest of Arinna and the priest of Zippalanda do indeed stand (but they do not bow).”

Thus only one understanding is available for (17), with *imma* scoping over the verb and marking contrastive focus. The second-position constraint is thereby in this case satisfied for *imma* by the focused phrase to which it belongs and scopes over—the finite verb. Taxonomically, this case is identical to other uses of *imma* within a phrase in the immediately preverbal position. The only difference is that here it is the verb itself that is part of the focus phrase.

12. Cf. *CHD* Š: 102: “but **rather** he **even** bowed down (and showed respect)”; Del Monte 2008: 89, 93, 116: “**ma anzi** si inchinò.

5. FIRST POSITION OF *IMMA*

The next problem is that the distribution of *imma* is in some important aspects different from that of other second-position words like indefinite pronouns. The main difference is that *imma* appears much more frequently in the first position than indefinite pronouns.¹³ This follows from the following examples:

- (18) HKM 10 obv. 7–9, CTH 186 (MH/MS), cf. Hoffner 2009: 113; *HW*² I: 49

(Concerning what you wrote me about how Pihinakki is (re)settling Lisipra: “He has already settled 30 families”—Pihinakki himself said to me:)

<i>nu=war=an=za</i>	<i>imma</i>	3 <i>ME</i>	É- <i>TUM</i>	<i>arnu-m[i]</i>
CONN=QUOT=it=REFL	even	300	house	move-1SG.PRS

“I **indeed** (intend to) relocate three hundred families (to Lisipra which I am resettling)”¹⁴

- (19) HKM 71 obv. 12, CTH 190 (MH/MS), cf. Hoffner 2009: 228; *CHD* P: 157

<i>nu=mu=ššan</i>	<i>imma</i>	<i>kuit</i>	<i>parkiya-ttat</i>
CONN=me=LOC.PART	even	since	rise-2SG.PST.MED

“Since you **actually** rose(?) to me”

Melchert (1985: 196) suggested that in such cases *imma* has scope over the entire clause. Even though he was not yet aware of (18) or (19), I think that his interpretation fits the contexts well and I propose to interpret *imma* here as asseverative “actually, indeed.”

It was actually suggested by Melchert (1985: 196) that in analogous cases we are dealing with the second position of *imma*. In other words, he interpreted the clitic (proclitic + enclitics) chains *nu=war=an=za* in (18) and *nu=mu=ššan* in (19) as providing the first position for *imma* in the second position. However, this analysis is clearly untenable. First, it entails a totally improbable interpretation for the following context:

- (20) KBo 4.14 iii 24–25, CTH 123 (NH/NS), cf. F. Fuscagni, hethiter.net/: CTH 123 (TX 08.05.2012, TRde 12.03.2014); differently Melchert 1985: 195

(Because I have already had these words laid down before you, and indeed you yourself have also kept saying them:)

<i>imma=man=wa=šši</i>	<i>tepu=ya</i>	<i>kuitki</i>	<i>hatkuēš-zi</i>
even=IRR=QUOT=him	small=and	something.NOM.SG.N	become.tight-3SG.PRS

“(it) could (happen that) even something small would **indeed** become difficult for him”

In assessing (20) Melchert (1985: 195) separated *imma* from the enclitic chain written together with *imma* and arbitrarily joined *imma* to the previous clause. There are no parallels for this totally ad hoc analysis that should be abandoned (see already *HW*² I: 49). Basically, two interpretations have been suggested for (20): “something small might **indeed** become

13. It is important to note that the first position here is that of *imma* itself, not of the entire free choice phrase *kui-imma kui-* containing *imma*, for which, see above section 2.2.

14. Cf. Lühr (2001: 340–41): “Lisipra [und keine andere Stadt], welches ich (wieder) besiedel[e.] von dort werde ich **ganz und gar** dreihundert Familien fortführen.”

difficult for him”¹⁵ and “**even** something small might become difficult for him.”¹⁶ Whereas the first fits the suggestion of Melchert that clause-initial *imma* should have scope over all the clause, the second does not. It implies that the scope of *imma* is only over the phrase *tepu kuitki* “something little,” but the two analyses can actually be reconciled. As was shown by Sideltsev and Molina (2015), some of the *-(y)as* in the immediately preverbal position have the meaning “even,” and this might well be the case here. Thus “even,” which appears to be required by the context, is likely to be rendered by *-ya*, which, as the prototypical enclitic, is placed after the first word of the phrase over which it has scope. Because the context does not require “and,” this suggestion is all the more likely. What then does *imma* mean in this context? It might indeed be supposed that it has the meaning “indeed.” This asseverative meaning might be at odds with the hypothetical situation, marked by the irrealis clitic *-man*. However, in this particular case the clash between asseveration and irrealis can be resolved: the point of the context is that a difficult situation might potentially really occur.

Second, more consistently second-position constituents like *-(m)a* and indefinite pronouns show that clitic (proclitic + enclitics) chains and a number of other words were not counted as the first position (see Sideltsev 2017). The same actually holds for *imma*. It is only possible to understand *imma* in the following example as being clause second if *nu* + enclitics are not counted as the first position here:

(21) KBo 5.9(+) iii 20, CTH 62.II.A (NH/NS), cf. del Monte 1986: 170–71; Beckman 1996: 58; cf. (9) above

(If you do not set them on their way and do not show them the road to Hatti,)

n=aš=kan IGI^{HLA}-*w-a* *imma* ḪUR.SAG-*i* *nai-tti*
CONN=them=LOC.PART eyes-ACC.PL.N even mountain-LOC.SG turn-2SG.PRS

“**but** direct them to the mountains”

If one assesses *n=aš=kan* as counting toward the first position for *imma* in (21), one will completely fail to observe any distributional pattern of *imma*, just as with indefinite pronouns. Thus the distributional pattern that some words are not counted as the first position holds for both *imma* and other second-position words like indefinite pronouns. However, they are not treated identically. They differ in how frequently clause-first/initial position of the indefinite pronoun and *imma* is attested. For the first category, this occurs securely only once (see Sideltsev 2015 and 2017 where this is shown to represent a mere 0.2% of 486 attestations of indefinite pronouns). In sharp contrast, *imma* is found eleven times out of 127 attestations in the first/initial position, a minor, but still impossible to ignore, 8.7 percent.

In this the figures for *imma* are closer to those for the subordinator *kuwapi* “when, where,” another basically second-position word, which is also attested in the first position fourteen times (8.5%) out of 164 (see the data and the statistics in Sideltsev 2017). What is particularly striking is the identical frequency of first/initial position for both *kuwapi* and *imma*. It

15. “Ma **davvero** a lui qualche difficoltà, anche piccola, potrebbe sorgere?” (Stefanini 1965: 45); “Könnte **doch** ihm etwas kleines schwierig werden” (Fuscagni, hethiter.net/: CTH 123 [TX 08.05.2012, TRde 12.03.2014]).

16. “**Selbst** das Kleinste könnte ihm irgendwie schwierig werden” (*HW*² H: 514); “Ihm könnte **sogar auch** das Geringste zu schwierig werden” (*HW*² I: 49); “Would that **even** something small became tight for him” (*HED* H: 268).

is also conspicuous that when *imma* is part of the free choice phrase *kui- imma (kui-)*, it is overwhelmingly second, occurring in the first position only once:¹⁷

(22) KUB 15.3 i 15–16, CTH 584 (NH/NS), cf. de Roos 2007: 106

<i>mān</i>	URU	<i>Urikina</i>	<i>mān</i>	<i>imma</i>	<i>kuwapi</i>
if		Urikina	if	ever	where

“(And whatever wish the Moon-god entertains, according to that (wish) will I give the months of silver and gold) either (in) Urikina or anywhere else.”

The phrase *imma kuwapi* in this context is likely to stand for standard *kuwapi imma kuwapi*: The semantics are identical (“whatever”) while the broader context is the same as that for the prototypical free choice pronoun *kuwapi imma kuwapi*. First a concrete location is listed (*mān* URU*Urikina* “either (in) Urikina”), then *imma kuwapi*. Melchert (1985: 199) suggested this should be emended to <*kuwapi*> *imma kuwapi*, but this solution is simply ad hoc and unnecessary in view of other contexts where *imma* is clause first. He suggests that “the speaker is rather insisting that he *will* fulfill the promise: ‘Either in Urukina, or indeed *somewhere*’.” I think this interpretation is a bit far-fetched. “Either ... or ...” contexts are frequent in Hittite and are constructed differently.

What is noteworthy is the imbalance between the position of *imma* within the phrase *kui- imma kui-* and that of *imma* that is not part of the phrase. As we saw above, in the first instance, *imma* is virtually always phrase second (fifty times = 92.6%); only once (1.8%) is it both clause and phrase first, and three times (5.6%) it is third within the phrase. The statistics are totally different when *imma* is not part of the phrase *kui- imma kui-*. Out of a total of fifty-four such occurrences,¹⁸ twelve are preverbal (22.2%), nine are first position (16.6%), six are second position (11.1%), twenty-six are ambiguous between second and immediately preverbal position (48.1%), and one is postverbal (1.8%).

The explanation for the difference might lie in the highly grammaticalized status of the free choice phrase *kui- imma kui-*. As I have already said above, the phrase in the absolute majority of cases functions as the lexicalized free choice pronoun “whoever, etc.” This entails less syntactic freedom for *imma* as part of the free choice pronoun. Outside its use within the free choice pronoun, *imma* is quite frequently in the first position (16.6%), although second position, both at the clause’s left edge and in the immediately preverbal position, clearly dominates (81.5%). This makes *imma* even more common in the first position than *kuwapi*, not to mention indefinite pronouns. However, by itself this is not unexpected. Other words that in some contexts attest second-position constraint, e.g., *mahḫan* “how, when,” are even more frequently used in the first position—*mahḫan* 273 times out of 494 (55.3%) (see the statistics and the discussion in Sideltsev 2017). Thus, a comparison of the statistics for indefinite pronouns, *mahḫan*, *kuwapi*, and *imma* simply shows how diverse and unhomogeneous Hittite second position is in reality.

5.1. *Second vs First Positions of imma*

As was demonstrated above, although the second position, both at the clause’s left edge and in the immediately preverbal position, clearly dominates for *imma* (81.5%), when *imma*

17. Other contexts, e.g., KUB 48.118: 18, (NH/NS) CTH 584.7, are not so clear and can be interpreted in different ways.

18. In several cases the status of *imma* is unclear.

is not part of the free choice phrase *kui- imma kui-*, it is quite frequently in the first position (16.6%).

It follows from examples (9–21) that *imma* is not part of a phrase and has the same wide sentential scope both when it is clause second¹⁹ as when it is clause first or initial. It has unambiguous sentential scope in the immediately preverbal position much less frequently—in my corpus there is only one secure case (11) (and possibly (12)). Thus it appears that *imma* with sentential scope can be placed in any of three positions: most commonly first/initial, second, or very rarely immediately preverbal. As follows from the statistical data above (see in detail Sideltsev 2017), the same variation occurs with relative pronouns as well as with some subordinators. In Sideltsev 2017 this was defined as 1/2 position, first *or* second.

Thus, just as with relative pronouns, but also with subordinators, and again differently than with indefinite pronouns (for which the first position is attested 0.2%), *imma* is 1/2. It was suggested in Sideltsev 2017 that what appears to be a 1/2 position for some subordinators and relative pronouns in reality masks two distinct phenomena: a) syntactic clitics with a consistent second-position constraint, and b) independent forms that have a fixed position in the clause and are first/initial, but second if a constituent with a contrastive topic reading moves in front of them.

One of the tests applied in Sideltsev 2017 to distinguish between these alternatives is to determine the information structure status of the constituent preceding the second-position word. If it is unmarked, the word is likely to attest a prototypical second-position constraint. If it is marked (most commonly, as contrastive topic), the word is probably an independent form that has a fixed position in the clause and is normally first/initial, but appears in the second position if a constituent with contrastive topic reading precedes it. As analysis of the words preceding *imma* in examples (9–21) above and analogous examples shows, their information structure status is unmarked. Therefore this criterion classifies *imma* in the second position as a syntactic clitic with a strict second-position constraint. *Imma* in the first position can only be interpreted as an independent form. The coexistence of homophonous syntactic clitics and independent forms of the same phonetic word is also attested for relative pronouns and some subordinators (see Sideltsev 2017).

6. CONCLUSION

I have explored the evidence concerning the position of *imma* in the clause building upon the observations of Melchert 1985 that *imma* was clause second. It has been shown that *imma* has a second-position constraint both at the left edge of the clause and in the immediately preverbal position. I have teased apart two aspects of its distribution: that it has a second-position requirement and that it occurs in two positions in the clause—at the left edge of the clause immediately before the verb, both as adverb/focusing particle with sentential scope and as part of phrases with its scope over the phrase alone, most commonly free choice *kui- imma kui-*, but also focused noun phrases. In line with the findings in Sideltsev 2017, I attribute *imma* to the class of syntactic clitics. Prosodic information is not available for *imma* (but see for other members of the class Sideltsev 2017).

Just as with some other basically second-position words, *imma* is also alternatively attested in the first/initial position. I have interpreted the first-position forms as independent forms (Sideltsev 2017). The coexistence of homophonous syntactic clitics and independent forms is also attested for relative pronouns and some subordinators (see once more Sideltsev 2017).

19. In some cases *imma* in the second position at the left edge of the clause has scope over the phrase that precedes it.

ABBREVIATIONS

- CHD* *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*. Ed. H. G. Güterbock, H. Hoffner, and Th. van den Hout. Chicago: The Oriental Institute, 1980–.
- HED* *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*. Ed. J. Puhvel. Berlin: Mouton, 1984–.
- HW*² *Hethitisches Wörterbuch*. 2nd ed. Ed. J. Friedrich, A. Kammenhuber, I. Hoffmann et al. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 1975–.

REFERENCES

- Alp, Sedat. 1991. *Hethitische Briefe aus Maşat-Höyük*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Archi, Alfonso, and Horst Klengel. 1985. Die Selbstrechtsfertigung eines hethitischen Beamten. *AoF* 12: 52–64.
- Beckman, Gary. 1996. *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*. Atlanta: SBL Press.
- , Trevor R. Bryce, and Eric H. Cline. 2011. *The Ahhiyawa Texts*. Atlanta: SBL Press.
- Büring, Daniel. 2009. Towards a Typology of Focus Realization. In *Information Structure: Theoretical, Typological, and Experimental Perspectives*, ed. M. Zimmermann and C. Féry. Pp. 177–205. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2001. Derivation by Phase. In *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*, ed. M. Kenstowicz. Pp. 1–52. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Dardano, Paola. 2006. *Die hethitischen Tontafelkataloge aus Hattusa (CTH 276–282)*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Friedrich, J. 1926. *Staatsverträge des Ḫatti-Reiches in hethitischer Sprache*, vol. 1. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung.
- . 1930. *Staatsverträge des Ḫatti-Reiches in hethitischer Sprache*, vol. 2. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung.
- Giorgieri, Mauro, and Cleila Mora. 2004. *Le lettere tra i re ittiti e i re assiri ritrovate a Ḫattuša*. Padua: S.a.r.g.o.n Editrice e Libreria.
- Goedegebuure, Petra. 2009. Focus Structure and Q-words Questions in Hittite. *Linguistics* 47: 945–69.
- . 2014. *The Use of Demonstratives in Hittite: Deixis, Reference and Focus*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Goetze, Albrecht. 1933. *Die Annalen des Mursilis*. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung.
- Hagenbuchner, Albertine. 1989. *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter*, vol. 2: *Die Briefe mit Transkription, Übersetzung und Kommentar*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 1997. *Indefinite Pronouns*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Hoffner, Harry A. Jr. 1986. Studies in Hittite Grammar. In *Kaniššuwār: A Tribute to Hans G. Güterbock on His Seventy-Fifth Birthday, May 27, 1983*, ed. H. A. Hoffner and G. M. Beckman. Pp. 83–94. Chicago: The Oriental Institute.
- . 1995. About Questions. In *Studio Historiae Ardens: Fs. Houwink ten Cate*, ed. Th. van den Hout and J. de Roos. Pp. 87–104. Istanbul: NINO.
- . 2009. *Letters from the Hittite Kingdom*. Atlanta: SBL Press.
- , and H. Craig Melchert. 2008. *A Grammar of the Hittite Language*, part 1: *Reference Grammar*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.
- van den Hout, Theo. 2001. Bemerkungen zu älteren hethitischen Orakeltexten. In *Kulturgeschichten: Orientalische Studien für Volkert Haas zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Th. Richter et al. Pp. 423–40. Saarbrücken: SDV Saarbrücker Druckerei und Verlag.
- Huggard, Mattyas. 2015. *Wh-words in Hittite*. PhD diss., Univ. of California, Los Angeles.
- König, Ekkehard. 1991. *The Meaning of Focus Particles: A Comparative Perspective*. London: Routledge.
- Kudrinsky, Maksim. 2016. Hittite Heterographic Writings and Their Interpretation: The Evidence of Sentential Clitics. *IF* 121: 159–76.

- Lühr, Rosemarie. 2001. Relativsätze im Hethitischen. In *Akten des IV. Internationalen Kongress für Hethitologie, Würzburg, 4.-8. Oktober 1999*, ed. G. Wilhelm. Pp. 333–46. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Marizza, Marco. 2009. *Lettere ittite di re e dignitari*. Brescia: Paideia Editrice.
- Melchert, H. Craig. 1985. Hittite *imma* and Lat. *Immō*. *HS* 98: 184–205.
- . 2002. Hieroglyphic Luvian REL-*ipa* “indeed, certainly.” In *Indo-European Perspectives*, ed. M. Southern. Pp. 223–32. Washington, DC: Institute for the Study of Man.
- . 2016. “Western Affinities” of Anatolian. In *Etymology and the European Lexicon: Proceedings of the 14th Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, 17–22 September 2012, Copenhagen*, ed. B. S. S. Hansen et al. Pp. 297–305. Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag.
- Miller, Jared. 2007. Mursili II’s Dictate to Tuppi-Teššup’s Syrian Antagonists. *KASKAL* 4: 121–52.
- . 2013. *Royal Hittite Instructions*. Atlanta: SBL Press.
- del Monte, Giuseppe F. 1986. *Il trattato fra Muršili II di Ḫattuša e Niqmepa’ di Ugarit*. Rome: Istituto per l’Oriente C. A. Nallino.
- . 2008. *Le gesta di Suppiluliuma: Traslitterazione, traduzione e commento. L’opera storiografica di Mursili II re di Hattusa*, vol. I. Pisa: Edizioni Plus, Pisa Univ. Press.
- Mouton, Alice. 2007. *Rêves hittites*. Leiden: Brill.
- Otten, Heinrich. 1969. *Sprachliche Stellung und Datierung des Madduwatta-Textes*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- . 1981. *Die Apologie Hattusilis III*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- . 1988. *Die Bronzetafel aus Boğazköy*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Radford, Andrew. 2004. *Minimalist Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- de Roos, Johan. 2007. *Hittite Votive Texts*. Leiden: NINO.
- Sakuma, Yasuhiko. 2009. Hethitische Vogelarakeltexpte. PhD diss., Universität Würzburg.
- Sideltsev, Andrei. 2015. The Riddles of Hittite Indefinite Pronouns. *AoF* 42: 199–275.
- . 2016. Negation Markers in Hittite. In *Studies in Honour of Ahmet Ünal*, ed. S. Erkut and O. Sir Gavaz. Pp. 439–54. Istanbul: Arkeoloji ve sanat yayınları.
- . 2017. Accented Clitics in Hittite? *Transactions of the Philological Society* 115: 176–211.
- . 2018a. Hittite Syntax and Modern Linguistic Theory: Two Kinds of NPIs in Hittite. In *100 Jahre Entzifferung des Hethitischen: Morphosyntaktische Kategorien in Sprachgeschichte und Forschung. Proceedings of the Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft 21.–23. September 2015, University of Marburg*, ed. E. Rieken. Pp. 329–54. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- . 2018b. The Evolution of Free Choice Indefinites in Hittite. *JNES* 77: 39–60.
- . 2020. Hittite Syntax 100 Years Later: The Case of Hittite Indefinite Pronouns. In *Proceedings of the Conference Hrozný and Hittite: The First Hundred Years, Prague 11–14, November 2015*, ed. R. I. Kim, J. Mynarova, and P. Pavuk. Pp. 335–53. Leiden: Brill.
- , and Maria Molina. 2015. Enclitic *-(m)a* “but,” Clause Architecture and the Prosody of Focus in Hittite. *IF* 120: 209–54.
- Skopeteas, S., and G. Fanselow. 2010. Focus in Georgian and the Expression of Contrast. *Lingua* 12: 1370–91.
- Stefanini, Ruggiero. 1965. KBo IV 4 = VAT 13049. *Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Rendiconti* 20: 39–79.
- Stilo, D. 2008. Two Sets of Mobile Verbal Person Agreement Markers in the Northern Talyshi Language. In *Aspects of Iranian Linguistics*, ed. S. Karimi, D. Stylo, and V. Samiiian. Pp. 363–90. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Ünal, Ahmet. 1978. *Ein Orakeltext über die Intrigen am hethitischen Hof (KUB XXII 70 = Bo 2011)*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- . 1998. *Hittite and Hurrian Cuneiform Tablets from Ortaköy, Central Turkey*. Istanbul: Simurg.
- Werner, Rudolf. 1967. *Hethitische Gerichtsprotokolle*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.