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Abstract

Hittite attests a set of complex sentences in which (mostly) relative clauses (other subordinate clauses are also attested) appear in linear syntax to be within another subordinate (usually conditional, rarely temporal) clause or main clause. The relative clause can be preceded by a very limited array of constituents from the matrix clause, e.g., mān ‘if’ or the quotative particle ⸗wa(r). There are also examples which attest the conditional subordinator and the irrealis particle in two positions simultaneously, at the left edge of the whole sentence and in the conditional clause (= main clause for the relative clause). I provide a fine-grained descriptive and structural analysis of the structure and show that the type cannot be explained as bare indefinites, embedded relative clauses or parenthetic clauses. It is shown that, structurally, the sentences containing subordinate (mostly relative) clauses within other clauses are heterogenous and of three types. The difference lies in the elements that precede the relative clause and in the structure of the sentences, whereby a standard Hittite relative clause adjoins at different heights. All three types display the same mismatch between prosodic domains and syntax/semantics—the constituent that is part of the main clause from the semantic and syntactic perspective is prosodically part of the relative clause. Since there is a clause boundary delimiting the end of the subordinate clause within the main clause, it makes sense to treat the surface structure as a distinct taxonomic unit, which is correspondingly labelled a mismatch sentence. The new evidence allows us to obtain a fuller understanding of the Hittite left periphery than was previously possible. It thus offers an important window into hitherto unrecognized aspects of the underlying structure of the complex sentence in Hittite.
Keywords


1 Introduction

This paper, based on the corpus outlined below in section 9, deals with the syntax/prosody interface in Hittite. It does so by exploring a mismatch between prosody, semantics, and syntax in the Hittite left periphery. The other closely related issue, the distribution of clitics, is systematically taken notice of, but will be analyzed in detail in a different paper.

The mismatch is seen in the following example, which served as a starting point for our research:

   1a. [našm]a-šmaš
       or_if-you.PL.DAT
   2. šumeš kui-ēš LÚMEŠ SAG you who-NOM.PL.C men head
   1b. ANA LUGAL-kan [ tér-Š]u?-i šuppai to king-LOC>P body-his-DAT.SG pure.DAT.SG šaliki-ške-tteni approach-IPF-2PL.PRS
   3. nu-šmaš suppešn-i [x x x]-da CONN-you.PL.DAT purity-LOC.SG X 
      tıšant-eš ēš-ten be_mindful².PTCP-NOM.PL.C be-2PL.IMP
   ‘(1) Or if (2) you who are courtiers, (1) you approach the undefiled person of the king, (3) be mindful [...] of (your) purity.’

Here the relative clause (cl. 2) immediately follows the clause-initial conditional subordinator [našm]a ‘or if’ (1a), whereas all the rest of the subordinate conditional clause (without the subordinator, (1b)), follows the relative clause.

Thus the structure consists of a subordinate relative clause within another subordinate (conditional) clause introduced by [našm]a ‘or if’. More explicitly, the relative clause is preceded by part of the conditional clause (the conditional subordinator, marked as (1a) and followed by the rest of the conditional
clause (marked as (1b)). The conditional clause is the main clause to the relative one; nothing resumes the relative clause as its subject is 2pl (and there is no enclitic resumptive available for this person in Hittite). There is no clause boundary marked by the clause connective between the relative and conditional clauses. However, the second part of the conditional clause (1b) has a sentential second-position clitic *kan after its first word, which implies a clause boundary immediately in front of ANA LUGAL ‘to the king’. At the same time, there is no clause boundary between the conditional subordinator [našm]a ‘or if’ in (1a) and the relative clause that follows it (cl. 2); this is shown by the fact that the second-position enclitic pronoun *šmaš ‘you’ (functioning as reflexive in a nominal sentence and thus belonging to the relative clause) follows not the first word of the relative clause (*sumeš ‘you’ in (cl. 2)), but rather the subordinator [našm]a ‘or if’ (in (1a)) which is syntactically part of the conditional clause. We will see later that both of these properties are important and recurrent. Thus the use of enclitics indicates that part of the conditional clause (1a) and the relative clause (2) form one prosodic unit for the placement of clitics, whereas the rest of the conditional clause (1b) is set off from this unit by a clause boundary. Seen from another perspective, the relative clause splits the conditional clause and thus necessitates marking of the part of the conditional clause to the left of the relative clause as (1a) and the part of the conditional clause to the right of the relative clause as (1b). Thus, we witness a mismatch between the prosodic domain relevant for the placement of enclitics and syntactic structures: in syntactic terms, (1a) is the initial part of the syntactic structure (1b)—the conditional clause, as marked by the same shading in (1’), whereas in prosodic terms (1a) is the initial part of (2), as marked by the same shading in (1’):

(1’) syntax NH/NS (CTH 255.1.A) KUB 21.42 + rev. iv 33–35:
1a. [našm]a-šmaš
or_if-you.pl.dat
2. šumeš kui-eš LÚMEŠ SAG
you who-nom.plc men head
1b. ANA LUGAL-kan [NÍ.TE-S]U²*-i šuppai
to king-locp body-his-dat.sg pure-dat.sg
šaliki-ške-tteni
approach-IPFV-2PL.PRS
3. nu-šmaš šuppešn-i [x x x]-da
conn-you.pl.dat purity-loc.sg x
tiššant-eš ēš-ten
be_mindful’.PTCP-nom.plc be-2PL.IMP
‘(1) Or if (2) you who are courtiers, (1) you approach the undefiled person of the king, (3) be mindful [...] of (your) purity.’

(1"") prosody NH/NS (CTH 255,1.A) KUB 21,42 + rev. iv 33–35:

ia. \[našm\]a-šmaš  
or_if-you.PL.DAT

2. šumeš kui-eš  
LÚMEŠ SAG
you who-NOM.PL.C men head

ib. ANA LUGAL-kan NÍTE-š[U^2-I] šuppaš  
approach-IPFV-2PL.PRS

to king-LOCP body-his-DAT.SG pure.DAT.SG
šaliki-ške-teni

3. nu-šmaš šuppešn-i [x x x]-da  
CONN-you.PL.DAT purity-LOC.SG x

tišḫant-eš ēš-ten  
be_mindful? PTCP-NOM.PL.C be-2PL.IMP

‘(1) Or if (2) you who are courtiers, (1) you approach the undefiled person of the king, (3) be mindful [...] of (your) purity.’

Such cases will be the topic of this paper. The phenomenon is at first sight marginal and is not acknowledged in Hoffner & Melchert (2008) or in any other research on Hittite syntax that I am aware of (the only exception being Lyutikova & Sideltsev (2021) in Russian, who provide a formal analysis of one of the subtypes of the structure that I am going to discuss), but it recurs in texts of different periods and genres and cannot be written off as a scribal slip.

Subordinate clauses that appear in purely descriptive terms in linear syntax to be within other subordinate clauses are infrequent. I will provide a list of cases that come up in my database.

The paper is arranged as follows. In section 2, I provide a brief overview of the syntax of the Hittite complex sentence as the background to the discussion that will follow. Then, in sections 3 and 4, I will list and taxonomize all “mismatch sentences” that I have come across in my corpus. First, they will be described from a pre-theoretical, inner-Hittite perspective. I will do so by carefully confronting them with structures that appear to be virtually identical, but that will be shown to be different, namely bare indefinites (section 4.1) and embedded relative clauses (section 4.2). Then, in section 5, I will sketch their theory-dependent structural construal and argue that mismatch sentences are very heterogeneous in structural terms. The structural analysis will be done in the Minimalist framework, assuming a split CP hypothesis and supraCP projec-
tions hosting vocatives and clitic-doubled left dislocations. It will be shown that
the only common property of mismatch sentences is that they all attest a mis-
match between the syntactic domain and the prosodic domain. The paper will
then proceed in section 6 to confront mismatch sentences, now firmly estab-
lished both descriptively and structurally, with yet another type of complex
sentence in Hittite—parenthetical clauses. The contribution of this section
is that it will confirm the conclusions of sections 3–5 and crucially highlight
another important property of the mismatch between prosody and syntax, that
the first part of the main clause in mismatch sentences has to be a one-word
constituent. In section 7, I then explore the subtype of mismatch sentences that
involves doubling of the subordinator and show this subtype to stem from one
of the mismatch sentence subtypes previously seen (in section 4.1). Section 8
presents the conclusions, and section 9 describes the corpus of the texts used
for the study.

It is important that in exploring every issue I will start from linear facts
described pre-theoretically and only then proceed to theory-dependent struc-
tural analysis. Sections 1–4 and 6–8 are pre-theoretical, whereas section 5 is
couched in the Minimalist paradigm. The heterogeneity is a very conscious
attempt to produce a description of Hittite primary data accessible to special-
ists in Hittite without much theoretical background and at the same time to
argue a cross-linguistically interesting case of prosody/syntax mismatch for
theoretically informed scholars both with and without prior knowledge of Hit-
tite. Thus, rather than being conceptually inconsistent, the paper aims to be
accessible to both potentially interested audiences.

2 Complex sentence syntax: multiple subordinate clauses

First, I will provide a brief sketch of the syntax of Hittite complex sentences
with multiple subordinate clauses, one of which is a conditional clause.

The conditional clause in Hittite always precedes the main clause, as is illus-
trated by

(2) MH/MS (CTH 262) IBoT 1.36 rev. iv 15–16, cf. Miller (2013: 118–119):

1. mān 2 ḫil[ammar]
   if 2 gatehouse
2. n-at-kan    kattera    KÁ.GAL−TÌ šaraš uvanzi
   CONN=they=LOC简直 lower.ACC.PL.N gate up come.3PL.PRS
‘(1) If there are two gatehouses, (2) they come up to the lower gate.’
If the conditional clause is one of several dependent clauses, it may follow other dependent clauses, including relative clauses:

   1. kuitman-kan dUTU-ššI ŠÀ kURNeriqqa
      until-LOC.P sun-my inside Neriqqa
   2. kuitman-aš-kan šarā uš-zzi
      until-he-LOC.P up come-3SG.PRS
   3. mân-ma dUTU-ššI ṭapašša-š anda UL wemîya-z
      if but sun-my fever-NOM.SG.C in NEG find-3SG.PRS
      ‘(1) As long as His Majesty (will be) within the country of Nerik (2) until he comes up (home), (3) if then fever will not befall His Majesty, […].’

      1. *māḫḫan-š-š-kan* LUGAL-šš ḡūluganaz katta
         when-but-LOC.P king-NOM.SG.C carriage.ABL.SG down
         tiyē-zzi step-3SG.PRS
      2. nu mân GAL MEŠEDI ar-ťa
         CONN if big bodyguard stand-3SG.PRS.MED
      3. nu GAL MEŠEDI EGR-ā[r]ta UŠKEN
         CONN big bodyguard back bow
      4. nu *LUGAL-š-š-š* EGR-pa ANA GAL DUMU MEŠ É.GAL
         CONN king-ACC.SG.C back to big sons palace
         ḫik-zi entrust-3SG.PRS
      ‘(1) But as soon as the king steps down from the carriage, (2) and if the chief of the bodyguard is standing (there), (3) then the chief of the bodyguard bows behind (him), (4) and he turns the king over to the chief of the palace servants.’

      1. nu-tta kāša kē ku-e uddār
         CONN-you PRF this.ACC.PL.N which.ACC.PL.N matter.ACC.PL.N
         šAPAL NĪŠ DINGIR-LĪ dai-wen
         under oath god put-1PL.PST

1 Who does not translate the relative clause.
2. *n⸗at mān UL paḥhaš-ti*

   CONN-them if NEG protect-2SG.PRS

3. *našma⸗at-kan šarra-tti*

   or-them-LOCP break-2SG.PRS

4. *nu⸗tta kē Nīš DINGIRMEŠ ḫarnink-andu*

   CONN-you this.NOM.PL.C oath deities destroy-3PL.IMP

‘(2) **If you do not observe** (1) these matters that we have put under oath for you, (3) and violate them, (4) these oath deities will destroy you.’

In the last example, the relative clause ‘these matters that we have put under oath for you’ is resumed by the anaphoric pronoun in the two conditional clauses (‘at ‘them’ in cls. 2 and 3) which thus are the main clauses to it. Cls. 1–3 thus constitute a typical correlative structure, lit. ‘(1) [these matters that], (2) if you do not observe them, (3) and violate them.’ This example cannot be understood in any other way than the conditional clause functioning as the main clause for the relative clause, because the clause that follows the two conditional clauses (2 and 3)—clause 4, main clause for the conditional clause—does not resume the relative phrase, either explicitly or implicitly.

In other cases other dependent clauses follow the conditional clause:


1. *mān BELU GAL-ма UL kuški ḫa[n]dāi-ttari*

   if lord big-but NEG some.NOM.SG.C arrange-3SG.PRS.MED

2. *nu kui-š 1M̱ MEŠEDIM-a ar-ta*

   CONN who-NOM.SG.C bodyguard-but stand-3SG.PRS.MED

3. *nu apa-š UŠKEN*

   CONN that-NOM.SG.C bow

‘(1) **But if no important lord at all is present,** (2) then whatever bodyguard is standing there (3) bows.’

In (4), the relative clause is independent of the conditional clause; it is resumed by the anaphoric pronoun in the main clause that follows it.

In the following case, the conditional clause is followed by a temporal clause:

(5) **MH/MS** (CTH 262) IBoT 1.36 rev. iv 23–24, cf. Miller (2013: 118–119):

1. *mān-ašta 4G GIGIR-za-ma kuwapi anda pai-zzi*

   if-LOCP carriage-ABL.SG-but where in go-3SG.PRS
Thus, in linear syntax subordinate and main clauses follow each other, with clear demarcation of clause boundaries by clause connectives (most commonly \( nu \)) and enclitics, which are after the first word that follows the clause boundary (clause connectives also count as first words). The use of clause connectives exhibits more variation at the older stages of Hittite and is also governed by a complex set of discourse factors, see (CHD L–N: 446–448; Hoffner 2007: 387–388; Widmer 2009: 332 & 2016: esp. section 6.3), but still, if viewed across a set of examples, it is a reliable indication of clause boundaries. It is significant for the discussion that will follow that commonly a clause connective simultaneously marks both the end of one cause and the beginning of another.

3 Relative and temporal clauses within conditional clauses

However, in yet other cases other subordinate clauses—mostly relative clauses—are in the position that appears in linear syntax within the conditional clause, not preceding or following the conditional clause. In other words, some of the material of another subordinate clause precedes the relative clause and some follows it.

The first example has already been provided in the Introduction. All of its properties hold for all the following examples, which I will term “mismatch sentences” for brevity in the remainder of the paper.


1a. \( kuitman\text{-}wa\text{-}ss\)í

while\text{-}QUOT\text{-}him
Here the structure is literally as follows: ‘(1a) until—(2) the years which are determined for him—(1b) he exhausts them.’ The sentence is a common correlative structure where the relative clause (MU.KAM$^{11A}$ kuiēš daranteš ‘the years which were decreed (for him)’) precedes its main clause and the relative phrase is resumed by the anaphoric pronoun (⸗ aš ‘them’) in its main clause. The relative clause (2) and its main clause (1b) are clearly demarcated by the clause connective nu between cls. (2) and (1b) and by the enclitic chain in clause-second position in its main clause (1b), i.e., ⸗ war⸗aš⸗za. However, the clause which is the main one for the relative clause (1a–b) and resumes with an anaphoric pronoun the relative phrase in the relative clause (2) is simultaneously the temporal subordinate clause to the following main clause (cl. 3). The subordinator from the temporal clause (kuitman in (1a)) precedes the relative clause (2) in the surface syntax. This is unexpected from what we currently know about the Hittite syntax, but I will show that it is quite commonly attested.

However, an important feature of the example is that the subordinator not only precedes the relative pronoun, but is prosodically part of the relative clause, even though in syntactic and semantic terms it belongs not to the relative clause itself, but to the temporal clause which is the main clause for the relative clause. As a prosodic part of the relative clause, it hosts the enclitics of the relative clause, ⸗ šši as well as the direct speech enclitic ⸗ wa, which belongs to the complex sentence.

Thus, the relative clauses in exx. (1 & 6) appear in purely linear descriptive terms to split conditional and temporal clauses, i.e., they can be understood as being ‘nested’ within conditional and temporal clauses. I stress that by ‘splitting’, ‘being within’, or ‘being nested’ I have in mind purely linear phenomena in the surface position of the two clauses relative to each other. The relative clauses themselves seen in exx. (1 & 6) are not different by their own properties
in any significant respect from ‘regular’ relative clauses which either precede or follow other subordinate or main clauses. Thus they do not constitute any particular taxonomical class of relative clauses. It is their position within another clause, as well as the overall properties of the resulting complex sentence (mismatch between prosody and syntax) that are special.

4 Analysis of mismatch sentences

In what follows I will tackle several potential problems for the analysis of mismatch sentences and show that they are illusory:

a. Are relative\(^2\) clauses in mismatch sentences bare indefinites (relative pronouns functioning as indefinites in conditional clauses)?

b. Can the relative clauses in mismatch sentences be assessed as embedded relative clauses?

c. Can the relative clauses in mismatch sentences be assessed as parenthetical clauses?

In answering these three questions, I will list and assess other cases of mismatch sentences.

4.1 Relative clauses in mismatch sentences or bare indefinites?

When assessing relative clauses in mismatch sentences, the question that immediately comes to mind is whether we really have a relative clause within a conditional clause and not what is labelled ‘a bare indefinite’.

The relative clauses within conditional clauses are indeed superficially identical to relative pronouns used as bare indefinites, i.e., functioning as indefinite pronouns in conditional clauses. I will illustrate the bare indefinite with the following example:

\[(7)\]


1. \textit{namma mān ħantezzia-š kui-š kui-t tarna-i}  
   then if first-NOM.SG.C which-NOM.SG.C which-ACC.SG.N allow-3SG.PRS

2. \textit{naššu ANŠE.KUR.RA\(^{H1A}\) našma tatrantan GU\(_4\) either horses or rage.PTCP.ACC.SG.C ox}

\(^2\) There are other types of subordinate clauses attested in the structure, namely temporal, manner, and conditional clauses; see below.
3. \textit{n⸗at hantezzi-aš waštul}  
\textit{CONN⸗it first-GEN.SG sin.NOM.SG.N}
4. \textit{mān appezzia-šma kui-š kui-t}  
\textit{if first-NOM.SG.C-but which-NOM.SG.C which-ACC.SG.N}  
\textit{tarna-i allow-3SG.PRS}
5. \textit{n⸗a][t appezzi-aš] waštul}  
\textit{CONN⸗it first-GEN.SG sin.NOM.SG.N}

‘(1) Further, if one of the forward men allows something in (to the procession), (2) either horses or aggressive cattle, (3) then it is the forward man’s fault; (4) if, however, one of the rear men allows something in (to the procession), (5) then it is the rear man’s fault.’

This example attests bare indefinites twice, in clauses (1) and (4). Both times, what are formally relative pronouns (\textit{kuiš} ‘who’ and \textit{kuit} ‘what’) are used as indefinites (in lieu of \textit{kuiški} ‘someone’ and \textit{kuitki} ‘something’, which are also attested in such contexts elsewhere). This happens—in this context and elsewhere—when there is a conditional operator \textit{mān} ‘if’ in the clause. However, examples (1) and (6) from the previous sections are different from bare indefinites.

Ex. (1) definitely belongs to the mismatch sentences: its relative clause cannot be assessed as a bare indefinite in a conditional clause ‘if some courtiers’ because the verb form is 2\textit{PL} (a bare indefinite would require a 3\textit{SG} or 3\textit{PL} verb form). What is more, the use of a 2\textit{ND} pl pronoun (functioning as reflexive) is attested in nominal sentences when the subject is 2\textit{ND} person, not 3\textit{RD} person. It also provides evidence that the relative clause is a separate nominal clause, and not a bare indefinite phrase within the conditional clause.

Ex. (6) also unambiguously contains a relative clause in a mismatch sentence and not a bare indefinite in a conditional clause for two reasons: (a) the relative clause is resumed in the following clause as a regular relative clause; (b) it is within a temporal clause, and not within a conditional clause as is the case with bare indefinites.

The following example is also likelier to be understood as a relative clause in a mismatch sentence than as a bare indefinite because if it were a bare indefinite, a singular form of the indefinite pronoun would be expected agreeing with the singular verb of the main clause (\textit{išt[a(маšzi)]} in (1b)), which is not the case. As an anonymous reviewer correctly observes, the verb is restored, but it is restored after duplicates, so we can be sure that it is 3\textit{SG} indeed. What we have is the following structure: ‘(1a) if—(2) which (\textit{PL}) are a brother of the king, a lord, a prince, a courtier, (1b) (if someone) hears of an evil matter regarding the king’:
1a. mānn-ä
if-and

2. šēš LUGAL kui-ēš EN DUMU L[(UGAL LÚ
brother king who-NOM.PL.C lord son king man
SAG) ...] šA LUGAL
head GEN king

1b. ḫuļ–lu utter aśanda išt[a(maš-zi)]
evil.ACC.SG.N matter.ACC.SG.N in hear-3SG.PRS

3. [(apā)-š-ma-at AN]A LUGAL UL mema-i
that-NOM.SG.C-but-it to king NEG say-3SG.PRS

4. nu kī te-[{(zi) [...]
CONN this.ACC.SG.N say-3SG.PRS

5’. GAM–an NIŠ DINGIR–LI [GAR-ru]
down oath god lie-3SG.IMP.MED

'(1a) And if (one of) (2) those who are a brother of the king, a lord, a
prince, a courtier [...], (1b) hears of an evil matter regarding the king, (3)
but he does not report it to the king, (4) and he says this: (quoted direct
speech), (5’) (It) [shall be placed] under oath'.

The relative phrase in cl. (2) is resumed by the stressed pronoun [(apā)š] ‘he’
in cl. (3). Again, in this case there is no clause boundary marked by a clause
connective nu or by sentential clitics between cls. (1–2).

The same is basically applicable to the following case, although there is no
resumption of the relative clause:

(9) NS (CTH 712.A) KUB 27.1 obv. i 20–22, cf. Wegner (1995: 32), CHD (L–N:
4b–5a):

(If the years passed, for the Istar of old they resume the old ritual, but for
Istar the mighty of Mursilis they do not resume the old ritual [...]
The campaigns that the king regularly fought, as many campaigns as he
has fought in the years that went by, while he celebrates the deity, for these
field(campaign)s [...]
To the Lady of the Field, the mighty, of Mursilis, the rite in the matter of
those campaigns is not implemented (the deity) is kindly invited (to the
ritual) for Istar of the field from Samuha)

1a. mān-kan
if-LOC.P

2. MUHš-šma kui-ēš ištarna pant-eš
years·but which-NOM.PL.C inside go.PTCP-NOM.PL.C
1b. *nu* LUGAL–u-š *lahḫi* UL kwapikki
CONN king-NOM.SG.C field.LOC.SG NEG anywhere
*panza* 
go.PTCP.NOM.SG.C

3. *nu* SISKUR UL kuitki ēš-zi
CONN ritual NEG anything be-3SG.PRS

‘(1) But if the king has gone nowhere on a campaign (2) in the years which have gone (by), (3) there is no ritual,’ lit. ‘(1a) if (2) which years have gone (by), (1b) the king does not go to any land (3) there is no ritual.’

Here there is a very explicit clause boundary between the main clause and the subordinate clause: it is marked by the clause connective *nu* before the main part of the conditional clause (1b), which is the main clause for the relative clause (2).

The position of the adversative particle *(m)a* here is noteworthy. It has wide scope over the whole sentence and contrasts the two stretches of discourse: the campaigns that the king has gone on and consequently celebrated with the ritual (the previous context given here in translation), and the campaigns that the king has not gone on and consequently did not celebrate with the ritual (the present context). More concretely, the fact that the king went on a campaign which entails the ritual versus the fact that the king did not go on a campaign which does not entail the ritual are contrasted. Thus, obviously the adversative marker *(m)a* scopes over the main clause (1a–b), yet it is hosted by the first nominal in the subordinate relative clause (cl. 2). This is not at all surprising as this is the common pattern in Hittite, not only for wide scope *(m)a*, for which see Meacham (2000), but also for the quotative particle *(w)a*(r) introducing direct speech; see Sideltsev (2020). This is illustrated by the following two examples for *(m)a*:


3 Cf. ‘wenn in den Jahren aber, die dazwischen vergangen sind, der König nirgendwohin in den Kampf gezogen ist, dann ist auch kein Opfer vorhanden’ (Wegner 1995: 36); also ‘(Pour ces territoires, l’offrande n’a pas lieu en l’honneur de la Dame de la steppe à savoir la puissante, de Mursili; on lui a adressé un salut au cours de la (fête) en l’honneur d’Istar de la steppe de Samuha.) Mais s’il y a des années qui se sont écoulées et que le roi n’est allé nulle part en campagne, alors aucune offrande n’a lieu (on reprend uniquement la cérémonie de l’année en cours; par contre, cette année où le roi part en expédition, il célèbre la divinité cette année)’ (Lebrun 1980: 86).
1. uppeššarḫi-tha-šma-ru [[(uppiški)]uwan ti[(e)]r
    gift.ACC.PLN-but.me send.IPF.SUP put.3PL.PST
2. uppeššarḫi-tha-šma-ru kue [[(uppiški)]ka-nzi
    gift.ACC.PLN-but.me which.ACC.PLN send.IPFV.3PL.PRS
3. n-at ANA ABBAḪI Ī ABBA ABBAḪI [(UL
    conn-them to fathers and fathers fathers NEG
    ku)]edanikki [(up)]p-ir
    anyone.DAT.SG send-3PL.PST

‘(1) They began sending me gifts, (2) but the gifts that they send me, (3) they never sent to any (of my) fathers and grandfathers.’

In this example the contrast is between cls. (1) and (2–3) on the whole, but *m*a has a prosodic host within the first relative clause (cl. 2) of the second sentence (2–3). There is nothing in cl. (2) itself that would be contrastive to the previous context.

    (If a male slave runs away and goes to the land of Luwiya, (his owner)
shalt pay six shekels of silver to whoever brings him back. If a male
slave runs away and goes into an enemy country,
1. kui-š-an āppa-ma uwate-zzi
    who-NOM.SG.him back-but bring-3SG.PRS
2. n-an-z-a apā-š-pat dā-[i]
    conn-him-refl that-NOM.SG.CFOC take-3SG.PRS

‘(1) but whoever brings him back, (2) he (and not the owner) shall take
him instead (of receiving a financial reward).’

Meacham (2000: 94) convincingly argues that here there is no contrast in the relative clause to the previous context. All the contrast lies in the main clause, yet *m*a is placed in the relative clause (1) that linearly precedes the main clause (2). See also for a very careful analysis of the context Goedegebuure (2014: 359 & 400).

We see the same for the direct speech particle *wa(r) in the following example:

(11) NS (CTH 390.A) KUB 7.1+ obv. ii 32–33, cf. CHD (P: 95); HED (H: 132);
F. Fuscagni (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 390 (TX 20.03.2017, TRde 20.03.
2017):
1. ḫuišaš-⸗wa  
   panzakittiš  
   GIM–an   weḥatta  
   spindle.Gen.SG=QUOT   whorl.NOM.SG.C   as   turn.3SG.PRS.MED

2. DUMU–liya  
   idālaueš  
   karāteš  
   arha  apenieššan  
   son.DAT.SG=and   bad.NOM.PL.C   innards.NOM.PL.C   away   likewise  
   waḥandu  
   turn.3PL.PRS.MED

3. Ša  
   G1-ma-⸗wa  
   ḫapušaššanza  
   mahhan  ḫapušašša  
   GEN   arrow=but=QUOT   shaft.ERG.SG   as   shaft.ACC.SG  
   wemia-zi  
   find-3SG.PRS

4. DUMU–ann-a  
   idalaueš  
   karāteš  
   QATAMMA lē  
   son.ACC.SG=and   bad.NOM.PL.C   innard.NOM.PL.C   likewise   PROH  
   wemiyanzi  
   find.3PL.PRS

   ‘(1) Just as the whorl of the spindle turns, (2) may bad innards likewise turn away from the child (3) As a shaft of an arrow does not find another shaft, (4) may likewise bad innards not find the child.’

Here we see that ḫwa(r) is present once in each of the two independent syntactic units (1–2 and 3–4, respectively). Each sentence has the identical structure of dependent clause—main clause. ḫwa(r) marks each sentence and is used once at its leftmost clause, which is in this case the dependent clause (cl. 1 and 3, respectively).

What is more interesting, though, is that in ex. (9) above the conditional mān ‘if’ does not host ḫ(m)a, even though it also scopes over the whole sentence, not just over the relative clause whose prosodic domain it belongs to (hosting the enclitic of the relative clause). Instead, it precedes the nominal of the embedded relative clause that hosts ḫ(m)a. This placement of the conditional mān ‘if’ vis-à-vis ḫ(m)a is typical of Old and Middle Hittite texts and also occurs in New Hittite texts; see Meacham (2000); Kloekhorst (2014); Sideltsev & Molina (2015). Thus both mān ‘if’ and ḫ(m)a scope over the whole complex sentence made up of clauses (3–4), but, according to common rules of placement, are positioned in front of the first clause of the sentence. As ḫ(m)a cannot cliticize to mān ‘if’, it cliticizes to the first word of the relative clause.

The following examples are likely to belong to the same type, even though they can be alternatively analyzed as ‘or if there is some Hittite border commander and you request infantry and chariotry from him’. However, the parallelism of the clause which functions as the main clause for the relative clause (2) with the first clause (i: ‘or if you request infantry and chariotry from My
Majesty’) makes it likely that here we have another example of a mismatch sentence—‘or if you request from a Hittite border commander who is in your vicinity’:

(12) NH/INS (CTH 67) KBo 5.4 rev. 25–26, cf. Friedrich (1926: 64–65):

1. \[na\]šma \(\text{ÉRIN}^{\text{MES}}\) \(\text{ANŠE.KUR.RA}^{\text{MES}}\) \(\text{ANA}\) \(\text{dUTU-Š-I}\) \(\text{wēk-}t\)i
   or troops horses to sun-my ask-2SG.PRS

2a. \(\text{našma-}t\)ta
   or-if-you.DAT

3. \(\text{URU-}KÚ.BABBAR-ŠAŠ\) \(\text{ZAG-aš}\) \(\text{kui-š}\) \(\text{BELU}\)
   Hattusa.gen.SG border-gen.SG who-nom.SG.C lord
   \(\text{manink[uwan]}\)
   close

2b. \(\text{nu} \ \text{ÉRIN}^{\text{MES}}\) \(\text{ANŠE.KUR.RA}^{\text{MES}}\) \(\text{apēdani}\) \(\text{wēk-}t\)i
   CONN troops horses that.dat.SG ask-2SG.PRS

‘(1) Or if you request infantry and chariotry from My Majesty, (2a) or if (2b) you request infantry and chariotry from a Hittite border commander (3) who is in your vicinity.’

Here the relative clause (3) is resumed by the stressed pronoun \(\text{apēdani}\) in the main part of the conditional clause (cl. 2b). The clause boundary between the relative clause (cl. 3) and its main clause (cl. 2b) is again marked by \(\text{nu}\). The clause boundary between the first part of the conditional clause (2a) and the relative clause (3) is unmarked. The enclitic pronoun \(\text{t}t\)ta is after the first word of the main clause (2a), yet it belongs to the relative clause (3).

The following example is analogous to the previous mismatch sentences:

(13) NH/NS (CTH 123) KBo 4.14 obv. ii 30–32:

1. \(\text{mānn-a-}t\)ka\(\text{kkan}\) \(\text{Lū}\) \(\text{KUR}^{\text{URU}}\) Hatti kuškì
   if-and-you.locp man land Hatti someone.nom.sg.c
   \(\text{apēdani}\) \([\text{mēhuni}]\)
   \(\text{EGIR-}panda\) tìya-zi
   that.dat.sg matter-dat.sg back step-3SG.PRS

2a. \(\text{našma-}t\)ta
   or-if-you.DAT

3. \(\text{karū}\) \(\text{ku[i-}ē\text{s]}\)
   \(\text{linky}-aš\) \(\text{UN}^{\text{MES}-uš}\) \(\text{eš-}ir\)
   already who-nom.plc oath-gen.sg men-nom.plc be-3pl.pst

2b. \(\text{nu-}t\)ta \(\text{kiššan}\) \([\text{kuiškì}]\)
   \(\text{mema-i}\)
   CONN-you.dat thus someone.nom.sg.c speak-3SG.PRS

‘(1) If some Hittite comes to you on that matter (2a) or (if) (2b) some (of those) (3) who were formerly your sworn allies (2b) speaks to you as follows.’
In this sentence, the relative clause (cl. 3) is not resumed in its main clause (cl. 2b) by an enclitic personal pronoun, because there may be a coreferential indefinite pronoun in the main clause (although it is restored and thus not certain), but the clause boundary between the relative clause (cl. 3) and the main part of its main clause (cl. 2b) is again marked by *nu*. The relative clause is also not nominal, differently from all the previous examples, but contains a finite verb form *ešir* ‘were’. There is again no clause boundary between the initial part of the conditional clause (2a) and the relative clause (3); the enclitic of the relative clause *-tta* is in the first part of the conditional clause on the subordinator (2a). Here the alternative understanding of cl. (2) ‘if there were formerly some of your sworn allies’ is inferior to the relative clause assessment above as follows from the clumsiness of the rendering involving bare indefinite understanding of *ku*[iēš]:

*If some Hittite comes to you on that matter or if there were formerly some of your sworn allies and some (of them) speaks to you as follows*.

Finally, I will list yet another example which cannot be interpreted as containing a bare indefinite because what functions as the main clause for the relative clause here has temporal semantics ‘when’ and the situation is episodic in the past, not habitual. Thus, the context cannot license a bare indefinite:

1a. *mānn-a-mu* when-and-me
2. *mUrhi-₃₁₀-upaš kui-š* AŠŠUM EN-UTT[I ...
   Urhi-Tessub.NOM.SG.C who-NOM.SG.C for lordship
1b. *[n-aš]₃-mu ANA KUR *₃₃₃₃₃Urri Nerik šer *₃₃₃₃₃HUL-ʾišt[a]
   CONN-he-me to land Nerik because_of get_evil.3SG.PST
   ‘(1a) When (2) Urhi-Tessub, who [kept pursuing(?)] me because of the lordship, (1b) became alienated from me over the land of Nerik, (my friends and associates kept intimidating me saying: “For Nerik you will perish.”’)

Yet another reason for attributing this example to relative clauses within conditional clauses, and not to bare indefinites, is the fact that a definite description (*mUrhi-₃₁₀-upaš* ‘Urhi-Tessub’) is meant, and not ‘some person’, as would be the case with the bare indefinite. In all other respects the example is also a typical
mismatch structure: the enclitic «*mu of the relative clause (2) is within the first part of its main clause (1a), and there is no clause boundary between the first part of the main clause (1a) and the relative clause (2), but there is a clause boundary between the relative clause (2) and the main part of the main clause (1b). The enclitics of the main clause are within the second part of the main clause (1b).

Thus far, I have presented evidence that the structure labelled here as mismatch sentences cannot be assessed as involving a bare indefinite phrase within a conditional clause as: (a) at least some of the nominals in the relative clauses within conditional clauses are definite descriptions; (b) some of the contexts involve temporal and not conditional clauses as the main clause for the relative clause; (c) some of the contexts involve a finite verb form in the relative clause, thus invalidating their analysis as a bare indefinite phrase; (d) the relative clause in a mismatch sentence is demonstrably a different clause, and not a nominal in the conditional clause — there is a clause boundary between the clauses, and resumption of the relative phrase in the main clause. I hold the sum of the evidence as irrefutable, even though not all the four properties are attested in every clause.

4.1.1 *namma preceding relative pronouns

The following cases also argue against the analysis of relative clauses in mismatch sentences as bare indefinites for the simple reason that they occur not within subordinate clauses, but rather within main clauses. They are thus different from the examples assessed in the previous section, which involved relative clauses within temporal and conditional clauses. Nevertheless, they are identical to the examples above in the mismatch between syntax and prosody.

The following cases contain *namma followed directly by the relative pronoun. This *namma belongs syntactically and semantically to the main clause and not to the relative clause. In ex. (15a), it follows from the broader context, given here in translation: in the preceding context, *namma ‘then’ (bolded in the translation) is used to order different actions within the ritual; thus in the context under discussion *namma introduces yet another ritual action (1b), and not a relative clause (2):

   (Then they hold forth one set of precious garments (and) one vessel of baked clay with fine oil to the deceased. Then they put them into the hearth. [...]
1a. \textit{namma} \\
then

2. \textit{kui-š antuḫša-š ŠA MÂŠ-ŠU} \\
who-NOM.SG.C man-NOM.SG.C GEN family-his

1b. \textit{nu-za PAŠU KÛ.BABBAR ŠA 20 GÎN dāi} \\
CONN-REFL axe silver GEN 20 sekel take.3SG.PRS

‘(1) Then (2) a man, who (belongs) to his family, (1) takes a silver axe (weighing) twenty shekels (and he cut[s] the grapevine).’

In this case yet again, the clause boundary between the relative clause (2) and its main clause (1b) is marked by the clause connective \textit{nu}. There is no resumption of the relative phrase as the verb of the main clause is transitive, thus no resumption by an enclitic pronoun is possible in Hittite. There is also once again no clause boundary marked between the first part of the main clause (1a) and the relative clause (2). The reflexive enclitic \textit{za} which is part of the main clause occurs not after the first word of the first part of the main clause (1a), but rather after the first word of its second part (1b). This contradicts the common pattern according to which clitics of the main clause are hosted by the first word of the main clause that follows the relative (or another subordinate) clause, as very clearly seen in (5) of the following example (15b). Thus, if ex. (15a) were a regular complex sentence, \textit{za} would be expected to be hosted after the first word of the main clause, i.e., in (1a) of ex. (15a), but (15a) is not arranged as a common complex sentence, so all we can say is that it deviates in clitic placement from regular complex sentences.


1a. \textit{namma} \\
furthermore

2. \textit{šumenzan DINGIRMEŠ-aš kue ALAMH₂-A⁴ KUNU} \\
your gods GEN.PL which.NOM.PL.N images-your ŠA KÛ.BABBAR GUŠKIN \\
GEN silver gold

CONN-LOC.P which.LOC.SG god.LOC.SG which-NOM.SG.N

\textit{tuēkkī-ššī anda wezz[(a)]pan} \\
body.LOC.SG-his.LOC.SG in grow_old.PTCP.NOM.SG.N
4. **DINGIRMESŠ-Š-a kue UNUTEMESŠ**
gods.GEN.PL.-but which.NOM.PL.N utensils
wezzapanta
grow_old.PTCP.NOM.SG.N

1b. **n-at anzel iwar EGIS-pa UL kuiški**
CONN-them our like again NEG anyone.NOM.SG.C
neuwahhan ḫar-ta
renew.PTCP.NOM.SG.N have-3SG.PST

5. **nammašmaš-ša[n sís]KURNLX-aš parkuyannaš**
furthermore-you.DAT.PL-LOCP rituals.GEN.PL purity.GEN.SG
uddan-i nahšaratt-an kisšan UL kuiški
matter.LOC.SG respect-ACC.SG thus NEG anyone.NOM.SG.C
țiyan ḫar-ta
put.PTCP.NOM.SG.N have-3SG.PST

‘(1a) Furthermore, (2) your divine images which are of silver and gold,
(3) whatever had grown old on any god’s body, (4) which objects of the
gods had grown old, (1b) no one had ever renewed them as we have. #
(5) Furthermore, no one had established such respect in the matter of
the purity of the rituals (var.: recitations) for you [...]’

Here we see a very neat contrast between two sentences with *namma*. The
first sentence comprises cls. (1–4). In (1a), *namma* precedes the series of rel-
ative clauses (2–4) and does not host the enclitic *-at* of the main clause (1b),
although it scopes over it. *Nammas* in (1a) is also separated from (1b), of which
it is syntactically and semantically part, by a clause boundary *nu*. There is no
critic in the relative clause (2), thus there is nothing to cliticize to *namma* in
(1a); nevertheless, the available material indicates that the structure (1a-2-1b) is
a mismatch sentence. The mismatch is determined in all unambiguous cases
by combination of syntax, semantics, and prosody. Whereas not all its com-
ponents may be present in a given case, scope and clause devision warrant
the taxonomic attribution in this particular case. The sentence (1–4) is first in
a series of sentences, each introduced by *namma*. In the second sentence of
the series, constituted by cl. (5), *namma* is within the clause it scopes over and
hosts its enclitics (*-šmaš-ša[n]*)). This latter case proves beyond any doubt that
*namma* can easily host enclitics in independent main clauses and that *namma*
in (1a) scopes over (1b), which subordinates clauses (2–4).

Prosodically, just as in the cases where relative clauses were within another
subordinate clause, when *namma* precedes the relative clause it hosts the en-
clitics of the relative clause. This was not seen in exx. (15a–b) because there are
no enclitics in the relative clause, but is seen in:

1a. namma-za
then=REFL

2. Ezen₂⁴⁴ᵈᵃⁿ−ya kuvapi ūssahḫun
festivals.ACC.PL.N when make.IPFV.1SG.PST

1b. nu ANA DINGIR��n²⁴⁴ᵈᵃⁿ ḫûmandaš p[(er)]àn [(EGI)]R−pa
CONN to gods all.DAT.PL before back
iyahḥat
go.1SG.PST.MED

‘(1a) Then, (2) when I celebrated the festivals, (1b) I busied myself for all the gods.’

Here namma scopes over the entire sentence (including (1b), where it syntactically belongs), but it hosts the enclitic ʷza of the subordinate clause (2). Thus, syntactically and semantically it is part of the main clause (1b), whereas prosodically it is part of the relative clause (2) and is available as the host for its clitics. That this is not the only option is demonstrated by cases like cl. (5) of ex. (15b), where namma is inside the main clause and hosts the enclitics of the main clause. The only clause boundary that is marked in ex. (15c) is between the relative clause (2) and the main part of the matrix clause (1b).

This example shows that the clause within the main clause need not necessarily be relative. It can be temporal or, as in the following case, conditional:


1a. namma
then

2. mān ḫantezzia-š kui-š kui-t
if first-NOM.SG.C which-NOM.SG.C which-ACC.SG.N
tarna-i
allow-3SG.PRS

3. naššu ANŠE.KUR.RAⁿ²⁴⁴ᵈᵃ¼ našma tatrant-an GU⁴
either horses or rage.PTCP-ACC.SG.C ox

1b. n−at ḫantezzi-aš waštul
CONN=it first- GEN.SG sin.NOM.SG.N

4. mān appezzia-š-ma kui-š kui-t
if first-NOM.SG.C-but which-NOM.SG.C which-ACC.SG.N
tarna-i
allow-3SG.PRS
5. \text{n[=a]t appezzi-[aš] waštul}

\text{CONN-it first-GEN.SG sin.NOM.SG.N}

‘(1a) Further, (2) if one of the forward men allows something in (to the procession), (3) either horses or aggressive cattle, (1b) then it is the forward man’s fault; (4) if, however, one of the rear men allows something in (to the procession), (5) then it is the rear man’s fault.

All the properties characteristic of mismatch sentences are available here too: no clause boundary between the first part of the main clause (1a) and the conditional clause (2), but a clear clause boundary between the conditional clause and the main part of its main clause (1b), marked by the clause connective \text{nu} and second-position enclitic \text{=at}.

The clause within the main clause in the same construction can also be one of manner:

(17) \text{MH/MS (CTH 7OLCV1.A) KUB 45.3+ obv. i 7–8, cf. D. Bawanypeck & S. Görke (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 7OLCV1 (INTR 2010-11-04):}

(They bring a sheep in and hold it for the client of the ritual. The AZU-Priest puts cedar on his head and says to the singers: “Sing the Stormgod!”)

1a. \text{namma-kan}
then-LOC

2. \text{xx mahhan šipant-i}
xx as sacrifice-3SG.PRS

1b. \text{kunn-a-kan QATAMMA-pat šipant-i}
this.ACC.SG.C=and-LOC the-FOC sacrifice-3SG.PRS

‘(1a) Then, (2) as (s)he sacrifices the goat? (1b) (s)he sacrifices also this (sheep).’

It is only to be expected that there can be several subordinate clauses within the main clause, in linear word order between the sentence-initial \text{namma} (syntactically belonging to the main clause, but prosodically part of the first subordinate clause) and the rest of the main clause, as is the case in:


(And the daily bread which I, My Majesty, bring for the deity, you priests must prepare as follows [...]. As soon as evening arrives, he places the lamps and they pull the temple (gate) shut. A priest and a diviner, though, sleep in front of the gate [end of paragraph])

1a. \text{[n]ammas-ya}
then=and
2. *ku-e* ÉMEŠ DINGIRMES
   which-NOM.PL.N houses gods

   CONN when early priest diviner-and go.3PL.PRS

1b. *nu–kan* ÉMEŠ DING[1RMEŠ ar(ahzanda w)]eḫandu
   CONN-LOCP houses gods around turn.3PL.IMP

4. *namma–at–kan* parā š[(anḫandu)]
   then-LOCP out sweep.3PL.IMP

5. [(pa)ppar]aššandu
   sprinkle.3PL.IMP

   CONN-then-LOCP out draw-3PL.PRS

‘(1a) And further, (2) whatever temples there are, (3) as soon as the priest and the diviner go (there) early in the morning, (1b) they must take a look around outside the temples. (4) Further, they must sweep them out (5) (and) sprinkle them, (6) then they pull them shut.’

In this context two actions are arranged temporally/logically: ‘they must take a look around outside the temples’ (cl. 1b) and ‘Further, they must sweep them out (and) sprinkle them, then they pull them shut’ (cls. 4–6). Whereas the placement of *namma* is straightforward in cls. (4–6), it is not at all so obvious in cls. (1–3). Here *namma* precedes both subordinate clauses which are dependent on main clause (1b), namely the relative (cl. 2) and temporal (cl. 3) clauses. However, it does not narrowly scope only over them; in cl. (2) it is not ‘what further temples there are’, and in cl. (3) it is not ‘as soon as the priest and the diviner further go there early’. So *namma* is not part of either of the clauses, but instead belongs to the main clause (1b) syntactically and semantically. Yet it precedes the leftmost subordinate clause (2).

*Namma* is not the only adverbial that can precede relative (and other subordinate) clauses in mismatch sentences. Virtually any other adverbial with analogous temporal semantics (and occupying the same structural position, see below) can be attested in the same construction:

   (In the past, Hatti, with the help of the Sun-goddess of Arinna, used to maul the surrounding lands like a lion.)

1a. *nu* parā
   CONN moreover
2. **uruḪalpan** _KÁ.DINGIR.RA-an kui-uš_  
Halpa.ACC.SG.C Babylon-ACC.SG.C which-ACC.PL.C
harminkelšet
destroy.IPVF.3SG.PST

1b. _nu KUR-e-aš hűmand-a[(š) āšš]u_ KÜ.BABBAR
conn land.GEN.PL all-GEN.PL good.ACC.SG.N silver
GUŠKIN DINGIRMEŠŠY[a] da-[...]
gold gods-and take[...]

3. _nat PANI ḏUṬU URU Arinna [(zikk)]er_
conn it before Sun-goddess Arinna put.IPVF.3PL.PST

ʻ(1a) Moreover, (2) Aleppo and Babylon which he destroyed, (1b) they took their goods—silver, gold, and gods—of all the lands, (3) and they deposited it before the Sun-goddess of Arinna.ʻ


1a. _EGIR-anda-mašma[(š)]_
then-but them

2. _[(kui-ēš)] DINGIRMESŠ āššaw-eš_
which-NOM.PL.C gods good-NOM.PL.C

1b. _nu ap[(ūš) DINGIRMESŠ a(kkuškanzi)]_
conn that.ACC.PL.C gods drink.IPVF.3PL.PRS

3. _namma-at-za arha i[NA? EMESŠUNU pānzi]_
then-they-REFL away to houses-their go.3PL.PRS

ʻ(1a) Then (2) the gods who are favorable to them, (1b) they drink them. (3) Then they go away into their houses.ʻ


1a. _hūdāk_
suddenly

2. _mahḫan INA URUGaṣga UL šA 1–EN tapariy-aš_
when in Kaska NEG GEN one command-GEN.SG
eš-ta
be-3SG.PST

1b. _ašima ṣPihhuniya-š šA LUGAL–UTTIM_
this.NOM.SG.C-but Pihhuniya-NOM.SG.C GEN kingship
iwar tapar-ta
like rule-3SG.PST
'(2) When in Kaška there had never been a single ruler, (1a) suddenly (1b) this Pihḫuniya ruled like a king.'

The following example attests still another adverbial anda-ma ‘furthermore’ and simultaneously yet again shows what happens if there are multiple clauses within the main clause between the sentence-initial adverbial and the rest of the main clause and if the second subordinate clause of the two has enclitics: the enclitics of the second subordinate clause remain within this clause, but the enclitics of the first subordinate clause, coordinated with the second, are hosted by the sentence-initial adverbial, which syntactically belongs to the main clause:


1a. anda-ma-ašta
    in-but-LOC
2. mān karšattar kuwapi karš-teni
    if selection.ACC.SG.N when select-2PL.PRS
3. n-at DINGIRMESŠ-āš ANA ENMESŠKUNU ūnnanzi
    CONN-them gods-DAT.PL to lords-their drive.3PL.PRS
1b. nu karšaddani GAM-an LŐ SIPAD.GU4 LŐ SIPAD.UDU-ya
    CONN selection.LOC.SG down cowherd shepherd-and
    iyantaru
    go.3PL.IMP.MED

‘(1a) Furthermore: (2) If you select at some point a selection (of the animals), (3) and they drive them to the deities, your lords, (1b) then the cowherds and the shepherds shall go along with the selection.'

Here the enclitic of the first conditional subordinate clause (2) (ašta) is hosted by the first word of the main clause (1a), whereas the enclitic of the second conditional clause (3) (at) is within that clause (3).

Finally, I believe that a semantically slightly divergent type also belongs here:


1a. luk〈kat〉ta-ma INA UD 2KAM
    morning.DAT.SG-but on day second
2. kuitman dUTU-uš núa ar-tari
    while Sun-god.NOM.SG.C still stand-3SG.PRS.MED
(1b) \( nu \) \( apēl \) \( išTU \) \( é \) \( en \) \( síSKUR \) \( kī \)

\( \text{CONN this.gen.sg from house lord ritual this.acc.sg.n} \)

\( \text{danza} \)

\( \text{take.3pl.prs} \)

‘(1a) (Then) on the morning, on the second day, (2) while the sun still stands, (1b) they take these (things) from the house of the ritual patron: ...

Still, it is not completely assured that the adverbial cannot semantically belong to the relative clause, see, e.g., the different interpretation of Collins (1997: 174): ‘Then on the morning of the second day the Sun God has not yet risen’, even though her translation is rather liberal with respect to the Hittite text. Actually, there are contexts when adverbials are in the scope of the temporal clause:


1. \( [ma]ḥhan-ma \) \( INA \) \( UD \) \( 2^{\text{KAM}} \) \( nēkuz \) \( me₇ur \)

when-but on day second evening time.acc.sg.n

\( \text{mul–aš watku-zi} \)

star.nom.sg.c jump-3sg.prs

2. \( [nu] \) \( \text{en} \) \( síSKUR \) \( \text{INA} \) \( é \) \( DINGIR–LI \) \( ui-žži \)

\( \text{CONN lord ritual to house god come-3sg.prs} \)

‘(1) And when a star appears on the evening of the 2nd day, (2) the ritual patron comes into the temple (, and he bows to the deity).’

But a possible argument for understanding the initial adverbial in ex. (21) as belonging to the main clause is the fact that \( \text{kuitman} \) is commonly clause-initial (HED K: 227; Hoffner & Melchert 2008: 416–417) with one exception. Referring \( \text{lukkatta} \) and \( \text{ina} \) \( \text{ud} \) \( 2^{\text{KAM}} \) syntactically to the main clause will make \( \text{kuitman} \) first in its own clause, as is normal for it. Ex. (21) deviates from other mismatch sentences in that the first part of the main clause (1a) is not a one-word constituent, but rather two constituents. We will see later that this is important.

To conclude, it is important to note that this subtype dominates both among mismatch sentences and in cases when both \( \text{namma} \) (or another adverbial) and relative (or another subordinate) clause are simultaneously attested within a complex sentence.

4.1.2 Left dislocations preceding relative pronouns?

The material that can precede the relative clause is not limited to conditional or temporal subordinators or \( \text{namma} \) and other adverbials. There are also
several cases where it is a noun phrase that belongs to the main clause which stands in front of the relative clause:


(She puts (its) hand to human gods)

1a. \[uzu \text{muḫrain-n-} ⟨\text{a}⟩ \text{but} \]

2. \[dTarpa[tt]\text{aššan kui-š} \text{peran weh-atta} \]

\[T\text{.ACC.SG.C who-NOM.SG.C before turn-3SG.PRS.MED} \]

1b. \[n행 ⟨p⟩ \text{ēdani dāi} \]

\[\text{CONN-it that.DAT.SG put.3SG.PRS} \]

‘(1a) But (1b) he puts (1a) the muḫrai-bodypart (2) to Tarpatassa who spins in front.’

Here \[uzu \text{muḫrain ‘muḫrai-bodypart’} \] in (1a) is left-dislocated out of the main clause (1b), \[n행 ⟨p⟩ \text{ēdani dāi} \]. As is regular in left dislocation structures, it is separated from the main clause by a clause boundary (marked by the clause connective \[nu \] and the second-position enclitic pronoun \[⟨p⟩ \] at the beginning of (1b)) and is resumed in the main clause by the anaphoric enclitic pronoun \[⟨p⟩ \]. Unusually, however, nothing separates the left-dislocated phrase from the relative clause (2). This is seen in the lack of clause boundary between the left-dislocated noun phrase and the relative clause; there is no marking of it either by a clause connective \[nu \] or by enclitics. Curiously, the relative phrase is also resumed by the anaphoric pronoun \[⟨p⟩ \text{ēdani ‘to him’} \] in the main clause.\(^4\)

\[⟨m⟩a \] on the left-dislocated \[uzu \text{muḫrain ‘muḫrai-bodypart’} \] contrasts the event described in clauses (1–3) of the context with the previous context, given here in translation. There are two bearers of narrow contrast here, the recipient of the sacrifice and the sacrificed body part; thus \[⟨m⟩a \] has wide scope and scopes over the whole sentence consisting of clauses (1–3). It is thus placed in the first part of the sentence, as expected. However, here we face a problem. Normally, left-dislocated nominals do not host \[⟨m⟩a \], as the collection in Vai (2011) clearly shows. Instead, \[⟨m⟩a \] is hosted by the main clause. All these differences set ex. (23) apart from prototypical left dislocations. Thus the marked clause boundary at the beginning of cl. (1b) may in reality separate not the left-

\(^4\) \[dTarpatt\text{aššan} \] is obviously a scribal mistake with case attraction to the previous noun phrase \[uzu \text{muḫrain ‘muḫrai-bodypart’} \].
dislocated nominal from its main clause (1b), but rather it may separate the relative clause (2) from its main clause (1b). In any case, the enclitic pronoun ⸗an in cl. (1b) resumes the left-dislocated nominal in cl. (1a), just as in regular left dislocations. Thus the placement of ⸗(m)a on the left-dislocated nominal contradicts common left dislocation patterns and testifies to the fact that the structure is rather amenable to the syntax of relative clauses inside other clauses, where $^{\text{UZU}}$muḫrain ‘muḫrai’-bodypart’ forms one prosodic domain with the relative clause (2) and thus nothing prevents placing ⸗(m)a after it. We saw something similar in many cases above, where a subordinator that belonged semantically to the following clause was prosodically part of the relative clause. Most notably, it was revealed by the placement of second-position sentential clitics of the relative clause after the subordinator of the main clause and the clause boundary after the relative clause that effectively separated not only the relative clause from its main clause (a regular phenomenon), but also separated the subordinator from the clause it was part of!

What is also highly significant is that, differently from prototypical left dislocations that never preserve the case that is assigned by the verb of the main clause and are in the nominative, this example preserves the accusative case of what appears at first sight as a left dislocation. Nevertheless, even though the material to the left of the relative clause is difficult to taxonomize, the sentence definitely falls into the mismatch type.

The structure of ex. (23) is all the more evident in the light of a regular relative clause from the same text:

\[(24)\] NS (CTH 391.1.A) KUB 9.25+ rev. iv 13’–14’:

1. $^{\text{Tarpattašši-š}} [\text{kui-š per}]\text{an weh-atta} \quad T$-\text{NOM.SG.C}-but who-\text{NOM.SG.C} before turn-\text{3SG.PRS.MED}
2. \text{nu} $^{\text{ḫùmand-aš DINGIRMES[-aš ši]}G_{5}}$-\text{in memi-ški} \quad \text{CONN all-DAT.PL} \text{gods-DAT.PL} \text{well} \text{speak-IPFV.2SG.IMP}

‘(1) Tarpatassa, who spins in front, (2) speak well to all the gods!’

The following case is identical to ex. (23), but with left dislocation:

\[(25)\] NH/NS (CTH 525.3) KUB 25.23 l.e. b 1–2, cf. Hazenbos (2003: 35 & 40):

1a. $^{\text{NINDA KAŠ}}$ *....*

bread beer

2. $^{\text{LÚMEŠ URU\text{DU}_{6} LÚ\text{.HUB}}}$ araḫzanda kuēš

men tell deaf around who-\text{NOM.PL.C}

1b. \text{nu} $^{\text{apušš-a SUM-anzi}}$

\text{CONN they.NOM.PL.C} and give-\text{3PL.PRS}
‘(1a) Bread and beer, (2) the men who (are living) around the Deaf Man’s Tell, (1b) they too deliver (it).’

Again, there is no clause boundary marked between the left dislocation (1a) and the relative clause (2), but there is an explicit clause boundary between the relative clause (2) and its main clause (1b), marked by *nu*. The left-dislocated phrase is not resumed in the main clause by anything, if one follows Hazenbos (2003: 40), whose translation I follow. This implies reading *apuš* as they.NOM.PL.C, a regular possibility for late New Hittite (Hoffner & Melchert 2008: 143).\(^5\)

The data from this section furnishes additional arguments against the analysis of relative clauses in mismatch sentences as bare indefinite noun phrases, as the contexts do not involve conditional clauses that can licence bare indefinites. However, it has to be borne in mind that the cases are extremely rare and one of them, ex. (23), is extraordinary in many respects.

### 4.1.3 Material preceding subordinate clauses and types of subordinate clauses

The data from the preceding sections is important in that it not only convincingly shows that relative clauses in mismatch sentences cannot be assessed as bare indefinites, but also in broadening the array of words that can occur to the left of the relative clause while belonging to the clause that functions as the main clause for that relative clause. Nevertheless, based on the position of clitics, these words are prosodically part of the relative clause and are separated from the rest of the subordinate clause (= main clause for the relative clause) by a clause boundary, together with the relative clause. It was originally suggested in section 3 that these are commonly conditional subordinators. However, it follows from the previous sections that the class is not limited to subordinators, but also includes sentential adverbials like *namma* ‘then’ and even left dislocations.\(^6\)

It is also important that relative clauses do not exhaust the array of subordinate clauses that can occur in mismatch sentences. Virtually any other type of

---

\(^5\) It is suggested by an anonymous reviewer that it is in principle possible to interpret the stressed pronoun *apuš* as they.ACC.PL.C. In this case *apuš* will resume the left dislocation. However, I think this is unlikely, as left dislocations are not resumed by stressed pronouns.

\(^6\) This uncommon behavior of adverbs behaving like *namma* was already observed by Garrett (1994), who termed them s-adverbs; see his discussion of his ex. (35b) and see also Probert (2006: 72–73). He did not, however, realize that the class of constituents with analogous syntax was much broader.
subordinate clause can appear within the structure (with the possible exception of complement clauses, but these are notoriously rare in Hittite in any case).

Having laid out the data that I interpret as mismatch sentences, I would like to stress a very important property of the type, namely that it cannot really be defined by exactly what subordinate clause is inside exactly what main clause. Any subordinate clause can be in a position that is descriptively within any other type of clause that serves as the main clause for it. The only constraint is that there is a one-word constituent syntactically and semantically belonging to the main clause that stands to the left of the subordinate clause, while the rest of the main clause follows the subordinate clause. The second important property of mismatch sentences is that clitics of the subordinate clause (if available) cliticize to the part of the main clause to its left, whereas clitics of the main clause cliticize within the part of the main clause that stands to the right of the subordinate clause. Both of these characteristics determine the prosody/syntax mismatch observed in this structure. Although I will deal with the structural position occupied by clitics in such sentences in another paper, their evidence is crucial for the descriptive adequacy of mismatch sentences as a distinct taxonomic unit of Hittite syntax.

4.2 Mismatch sentences or embedded clauses?
The question that I posit in this section is whether the cases treated above as a special taxonomical entity, namely relative clauses within another subordinate or main clause (mismatch sentences), can simply be subsumed into the category of relative clauses embedded in other dependent clauses or in the main clause. Such embedded relative clauses have been previously described for Hittite:

Very rarely, forms of relative kui- stand for unexpressed clauses of the type ‘who (is/are there)’, in which case kui- stands in the main clause itself:

UMMA dUTU-ŠI-MA ANA mKuikuisanduwa kuedaš QIBI-MA ‘thus says His Majesty: say to Kuikuisandu (and) who(ever are also there)!’ (Ortaköy 90/1400 1–3 [letter], cited in Süel 1992: 491 [...]).

HOFFNER & MELCHERT 2008: 426

The most large-scale analysis of some relative clauses as embedded clauses is that of Probert (2006); see also Huggard (2015: 160 & 172–173). Probert (2006: 38) suggests analyzing Old Hittite clauses containing no conjunctions and no explicit resumptive pronouns like ex. (26) as embedded relative clauses:
(26) OH/OS (CTH 291.Ia.A) KBo 6.2 obv. i 57 (§ 25):

\[
\text{paprezzi kui-š 3 GÍN KÚ.BABBAR pāī}
\]

be_impure-3SG.PRS who-NOM.SG.C 3 shekel silver give:3SG.PRS

‘(The one) who is impure gives three shekels of silver.’

The relative clause here is \textit{paprezzi kuiš} ‘who is impure’, and the main clause is \textit{3 GÍN KÚ.BABBAR pāī} ‘gives three shekels of silver’. Here there is no marker of the clause boundary between the relative clause and the main clause, nor resumption of the relative noun phrase in the main clause; the relative clause functions as a phrase within the main clause, directly serving the function of subject in this particular case.

My dataset supplements and expands Probert’s data from NH/NS texts. In what follows, I provide examples.

4.2.1 Embedded relative clauses

Outside the Old Hittite examples collected by Probert (2006), the clearest type is the one where there is no explicit clause boundary between the finite verb of the relative clause and that of the main clause, marked either by clause connectives like \textit{nu} or clause-second enclitics:

(27) a. NS (CTH 391.A) KUB 9.25+ rev. iii 50–51:

\[
1 \text{NINDA.GUR₄-R.A} \text{dTarpattaššan kui-š} \quad \text{[peran]}
\]

1 loaf_fat T.-ACC.SG.C who-NOM.SG.C before
\[
1 \text{w[eh-atta]} \quad \text{[1 NINDA.G]UR₄-R.A} \text{dMama-ya paršiya}
\]

turn-3SG.PRS.MED 1 loaf_fat Mamma-who and break.3SG.PRS

‘She breaks one fat loaf for T. who spins in front and 1 fat loaf for Mamma.’

In ex. (27a), the relative pronoun does not attest the case which is required by the clause it is embedded in, although this is completely expected in an embedded clause. This is particularly clear in the light of a relative clause from the same text which is not embedded, but is part of the regular correlative structure:

(27) b. NS (CTH 391.A) KUB 9.25+ rev. iv 13’–14’:

\[
1. \text{dTarpattašši-š} \quad \text{[kui-š} \quad \text{per]an weh-atta}
\]

T.-NOM.SG.C who-NOM.SG.C before turn-3SG.PRS.MED
\[
2. \text{nu } \text{ḫúmand-aš dingirMEŠ-[aš SI]G₅-in memi-ški}
\]

CONN all-DAT.PL gods-DAT.PL well speak-1PFV.2SG.IMP

‘(1) Tarapatassa, who turns himself in front, (2) speak well to all the gods!’
This relative clause shows a clear clause boundary marked by the clause connective *nu* between it and the main clause that follows it.

The following case is identical to the embedded relative clause in ex. (27a):


1. LUG1.7-aš LÚ-aš kui-[s] peran
   hunter-NOM.SG.C man.NOM.SG.C who-NOM.PL.C before
   *ueḫ-anda*
   turn-3PL.PRS.MED
d 1 bread_flat *miyanit* EME *paršiya*

2. 1 NINDA.SIG dankuwai *takn-i* *paršiya*
   1 bread_flat *dark.DAT.SG* earth-DAT.SG *break.3SG.PRS*

‘(1) The hunter breaks one unleavened bread with the ‘*miyanit* tongue’
   to those who are turned (to him), (2) she breaks one unleavened bread
   to the Dark Earth.’

Ex. (27c) is a clear case of an embedded relative clause, as the relative clause *kui-[s]* *peran ueḫanda* stands between two parts of the main clause, preceded by *LUG1.7-aš LÚ-aš* and followed by 1 NINDA.SIG *miyanit EME paršiya*. It is significant that there is no clause boundary between the two finite verbs, the one in the relative clause and the one in the main clause. The sign that it is a separate clause is that the case of the relative pronoun is not the case which is required by the verb of the main clause *paršiya* ‘break’, but rather the case required by the verb of the relative clause *ueḫanda* ‘turn’. This case marking is expected of an embedded clause, but not of a phrase.

The following cases also unambiguously attest an embedded relative clause:


   *nu* [4] NINDA.mulāti-n pittalwan MUN-an
   conn 4 *m.-bread-ACC.SG.C* plain.ACC.SG.C salt-NOM.SG.C
   *kuedani* UL išhwān memal-a
   which.LOC.SG NEG pour.PTCP.NOM.SG.C groats.ACC.SG.N-and
   pittalwan dāi
   plain.ACC.SG.N take.3SG.PRS

   ‘He takes 4 plain *mulāti*-breads on which no salt is poured and plain
   groats.’

The clause MUN-an *kuedani UL išhwān* is likely to be a finite clause with passive verb form and zero copula. This follows from the word order, which is typical of finite clauses and not of phrases with participles. The participle *išhwān* agrees with the subject of the clause in number and gender. As is the norm for
the analytical passive in Hittite, it is marked for nominative, which is identical with the accusative case in neuter gender.

(27) e. NH/NS (CTH 61.11.7.A) KBo 5.8 obv. ii 18–22, cf. Goetze (1933: 152–153):

1. Ḫūtupianzan-ša dumu.lugal dumu št ša Zidāš gal lū mešedi
   H.acc.sg.c but prince son Z. big bodyguard
   M.Zidāš kui-š ana abi-ya šēš-šu
   Z.nom.sg.c who-nom.sg.c to father-my brother-his
   eš-ta
   be-3sg.pst

2. nu abi-ya uni Ḫūtupianzan dumu št ša Zidāš gal
   Conn father-my this.acc.sg.c H.acc.sg.c son Z. big
   lū mešedi ina kur uru Palā watarnah-ta
   bodyguard to land Pala order-3sg.pst

‘(1) (As for) Hutupianza, a prince, son of Zida chief of the bodyguard, the Zida who was brother to my father, (2) my father ordered that Hutupianza, son of Zida chief of the bodyguard, into the land of Pala’ (translation from Huggard 2015: 172).

These two examples are judged to be embedded by Huggard (2015: 172).

The last example (27e) is so clumsy, however, that a pure performance error suggests itself; in other words, the structure is very likely to be not an embedded relative clause, but rather a false start structure. This is also independently favored by the fact that Ḫūtupianzan-ša dumu.lugal dumu št ša Zidāš gal lū mešedi ‘Hutupianza, a prince, son of Zida chief of the bodyguard’ is actually repeated within the main clause (2) and not referred to by a resumptive anaphoric pronoun, as left dislocations usually are. It is also noteworthy that unlike prototypical left dislocations, which never preserve the case that is assigned by the verb of the main clause and are in the nominative, this example preserves the accusative case. This makes this example very different from prototypical left dislocations, despite its qualification as such by Huggard (2015: 172). However, this does not concern the relative clause, which might indeed be embedded within the false start Ḫūtupianzan-ša dumu.lugal dumu št ša Zidāš gal lū mešedi ‘Hutupianza, a prince, son of Zida chief of the bodyguard’, although the resulting structure is very uncommon.

The following cases are similar, but here the embedded relative clause follows the main clause and is not within it. Once again, there is no marker of clause boundary between the main and the embedded clauses:
(27) f. INS (CTH 386.1.A) KUB 36.90 obv. 18’–21’, cf. CHD (P 333):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ēḫu} & \quad \text{IŠTU HUR.SAG} \\
\text{Ḫaḫruwa} & \quad \text{tuedaz} \\
\text{āššiyant-aza} & \quad \text{beloved-ABL} \\
\text{tuel} & \quad \text{nī.TE ZI-KA-ya} \\
\text{kuedani} & \quad \text{pedi} \\
\end{align*}
\]

Come.2SG.IMP from H. your.ABL.SG beloved-ABL.SG your body soul-your and which.LOC.SG place.LOC.SG

‘Come from your beloved Mt. Hahruwa to the place where your body and your soul are’.

(27) g. MH/MS (CTH 458.1.1.A) KBo 20.73+ rev. iv 7–9:

1. \[\text{arḫa-ма-at tarnandu kēl} \quad \text{DUMU.LŪ.U₁₉.LU} \quad \text{12} \]

away-but-them release.3PL.IMP this.GEN.SG mortal 12

\[\text{uzu} \quad \text{úr} \quad \text{ḫi} \quad \text{a} \quad \text{bodyparts which-NOM.PL.C god-NOM.PL.C which-NOM.PL.C ũatištantiyaš h.GEN.SG} \]

‘(1) Let them release them, 12 bodyparts of this mortal, which are (of) gods’ (origin) (and) which (appeared as) sorcery; (2) let them go back to the 12 bodyparts of the ass.’

(27) h. OH/OS (CTH 416.A) KBo 17.1+ rev. iii 25–27:

1. \[\text{1 māš.gal-р-i} \quad \text{garau[n-i]-ši} \quad \text{muriyaleš} \quad \text{1 billy.goat-LOC.SG horn-LOC.SG-his m.-bread.NOM.PL.C gang-ant-eš} \quad \text{hang-PTCP-NOM.PL.C} \]

\[\text{gang-ant-eš} \quad \text{hang-PTCP-NOM.PL.C} \]

2. \[\text{kēt-а} \quad \text{ga[raun-i]-ši} \quad \text{muriyaleš} \quad \text{thisINST.SG-but horn-LOC.SG-his m.-bread.NOM.PL.C gang-ant-eš} \quad \text{hang-PTCP-NOM.PL.C} \]

2. \[\text{anda-mа} \quad \text{9 muri[yala]n} \quad \text{išgar-and-an} \quad \text{ūk} \quad \text{in-but} \quad \text{9 m.-bread.ACC.SG.C pierce-PTCP-ACC.SG.C I} \quad \text{kui-n} \quad \text{ḥar-mi} \quad \text{which-ACC.SG.C have-1SG.PRS} \]

‘(1) M.-breads are hung on the horn of one billy goat, (2) and on this side m.-breads are hung on the horn of (another, lit. on its horn). (3) In addition (there are) nine perforated(?) m.-breads which I have.’
These cases need not be embedded, as it is known that in a minority of cases relative clauses which are regular adjoined clauses do follow the main clause. However, the fact that there are no explicitly marked clause boundaries argues in favor of the embedded type.

Summing up the evidence of the embedded clauses presented so far, it should be observed that none of the embedded clauses has any enclitics of their own.

Embedded non-relative clauses are also attested, if only very rarely. They are close to and obviously derived from relative clauses by sporadic analogy. It is also possible to assess them as *bona fide* relative clauses introduced by a locative correlative pronoun.


1. ŠÚ.A \[^{d两类-aš}\] eḫu
   throne sun-gen.sg come.2sg.imp
2. HUR.SAG kuwapit-a-za eḫu
   mountain where-but-refl come.2sg.imp
3. iŠTU KUR u[GU] eḫu
   from land upper come.2sg.imp

‘(1) Come from the west (lit. the throne of the Sun-god), (2) Come from whichever mountain you are on (3) Come from the Upper Land!’

This is the first case where the embedded clause has enclitics of its own. Unfortunately, the example is not very revealing, as the embedded relative clause is first in a complex sentence.

The clauses that I have assessed in this section provide an exact parallel to the Old Hittite data mentioned above and described by Probert (2006). Curiously, Probert (2006: 71–78) originally suggested that such clauses fall out of use in Middle Hittite. However, later in Probert (2014) she retracted the idea and suggested that embedded relative clauses might be attested in post-OH times as well, referring to work by Huggard which was still unpublished at the time. Huggard (2015: 172–173) provides two examples (also occurring in my corpus; see above, (27d) and (27e)) from MH and NH texts.

4.2.2 Are relative clauses within other clauses simply embedded?
After reviewing the evidence for embedded relative clauses, I now return to the question to what extent the material assembled above in sections 1, 3, and 4 as (in purely descriptive terms) clauses within other clauses can also be classified as embedded relative clauses.
I argue that they cannot. I will start from the descriptive linear evidence. The first difference is that in the majority of cases there is a clear demarcation of clause boundary between the relative clause and the main clause in the case of relative clauses in mismatch sentences, but the part of the main clause which precedes the relative clause is never set off by clause boundaries. In contrast, no marking of clause boundary is ever attested either before or after embedded relative clauses. Another clear difference between relative clauses in mismatch sentences and embedded relative clauses is that the former are resumed in the main clause by an anaphoric pronoun (as regular relative clauses in Hittite are), whereas the latter are never resumed. The third difference is that relative clauses in mismatch sentences are highly restricted in their distribution: they occur only after one constituent, which semantically and syntactically belongs to the clause that otherwise follows the relative clause (either a main clause or a subordinate, mostly conditional clause, but always the main clause to the relative clause). These constituents include the conditional and temporal subordinators, a dislocated noun phrase, or namma ‘then’ (and other temporal adverbials). Embedded relative clauses do not show such a restricted distribution; their distribution is identical to that of noun phrases with the same syntactic function, whether subject, object, or adjunct. Finally, in mismatch sentences the clitics of the main clause occur within the part of the main clause that follows the relative clause, whereas the clitics of the relative clause are hosted by the portion of the main clause which precedes the relative clause. Consequently, this first portion of the main clause and the relative clause form a single prosodic domain. The same pattern is never attested in embedded relative clauses: we simply lack data on how clitics of the relative clause behave vis-à-vis the main clause, but clitics of the main clause are not sensitive to the embedded relative clause and are hosted by the first word of the main clause, although the only case attested in the corpus involves *(m)a.

Thus, even from a descriptive viewpoint the mismatch sentences examined above in sections 1, 3, and 4 cannot be subsumed under embedded clauses and must therefore represent a different taxonomical unit. Instead, we have in sections 1, 3, and 4 a very curious structure which is obviously similar to prototypical embedded relative clauses, but attests 1) a very clear demarcation of clause boundaries between a subordinate (relative) clause and another

---

7 It is important to note that taken by themselves, relative (and other subordinate) clauses within mismatch sentences are no different from relative clauses within the common correlative structure or from embedded relative clauses.
subordinate (mostly conditional) clause or the main clause, and 2) resumption of the relative phrase in the relative clause by a pronoun in the main clause.

Consequently, it is obvious that the peculiarity of the construction under discussion in the present study does not lie in the syntactic structure of the relative clause, which is a regular relative clause. The uncommon property of this structure lies exclusively in the fact that there is some material that semantically and syntactically pertains to the clause that follows the relative clause and which serves as the main clause for it, but which is placed not within that clause, but rather in front of the relative clause. This material is not just in front of the relative clause, it is also prosodically part of the relative clause: it can host enclitics of the relative clause and is not separated by a clause boundary from the relative clause.

Schematically, the differences between mismatch sentences and embedded relative clauses can be represented as follows:

a. (relative) clauses in mismatch sentences (as seen in exx. 1, 6, 8–9, 12–20, 23, 25 above):
   - subordinator of clause 1/adverb/left dislocation—clause 2 # (clause boundary)—clause 1 (with resumption of the relative phrase);

b. embedded relative clauses (as seen in exx. 26–28 above):
   - clause 1 (no clause boundary)—clause 2 (no clause boundary)—clause 1 (no resumption of the relative phrase);
   - This type allows some variation:
     - clause 2 (no clause boundary)—clause 1 (no resumption of the relative phrase);
     - clause 1 (no clause boundary)—clause 2 (no clause boundary).

Until now, comparisons of relative clauses in mismatch sentences and embedded relative clauses have suffered from terminological confusion, as the labels “relative clauses within other clauses” or “relative clauses in mismatch sentences” or “mismatch sentences” were defined in terms of purely linear surface syntax, whereas “embedded relative clause” is a structurally defined term. It has been argued above on the basis of purely surface structures that mismatch sentences are in fact distinct from embedded relative clauses. The following section will proceed to define the two classes structurally.
5 Structural properties of mismatch sentences

Embedded relative clauses are CPs adjoining a zero NP which is in the position
and case required by the verb of the main clause; i.e., they adjoin to TP in the
main clause if they are subjects and are in other positions which correspond to
their syntactic role if they are not subjects, e.g., complement of VP if they are
objects, etc. They thus simply adjoin to the syntactic position reserved for their
syntactic function (subject, direct object, indirect object, adjunct) and are not
in this respect different from any other NP.

In comparison with embedded relative clauses, mismatch sentences are
structurally more heterogenous.

5.1 Three structural types of mismatch sentences

The most common subtype of mismatch sentences—subordinate (mostly rel-
ative) clauses following namma and other temporal adverbials in the main
clause—are CPs adjoining to the CP of the main clause. They are thus sim-
ply regular relative clauses for Hittite (see Huggard 2015, Lyutikova & Sidelt-
tsev 2021). Their particularity lies in the syntactic context in which they occur:
whereas relative clauses are usually the highest adjunct and so linearly pre-
cede all the material of their main clause, in this case there is a yet another
higher adjunct, namely namma or a temporal adverbial. Thus adjoining rela-
tive clauses are in surface syntax within the main clause, following this higher
adjunct and preceding the rest of the main clause:

(29) a. CP
    namma CP
    CP rel./cond. clause CP

Their syntactic position makes them distinct from embedded relative
clauses, whose position is identical to that of any other case-marked NP. Rel-
ative clauses in mismatch sentences are distinguished from regular relative
clauses only by the fact that there is a still higher adjunct to their left.

To take an example of the type, sentence (15a) above would structurally
look as follows, with [] marking relevant syntactic constituents and () prosodic
domains:
Another type of mismatch sentence, however, cannot be structurally analyzed along the same lines. When relative clauses follow the conditional or temporal subordinator, they cannot be construed as adjoining to CP at the same height as the previous type, as they would then precede in linear word order the subordinator in C, which is not the case. The relative clauses following the clause-initial subordinator require a complex reanalysis of the original structure where the relative clause is in Spec,FinP;\(^8\) for a sketch, see Lyutikova & Sideltsev (2021). Here I will just reproduce the outline of their analysis: because the relative clause is located low enough in the structure of the conditional clause and due to the fact that conditional clauses contain an overt clause-initial subordinator C\(_{in}\), whereas the relative clause contains overt constituents in the position of C\(_{prev}\), there is an opportunity to reanalyze the adjoining relative clause as the complement of the initial subordinator, as represented schematically in

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(29) c.} & \quad [\text{ForceP} \ C_{in} \ [\text{FinP} \ RC \ [\text{FinP} \ Y \ [...]])] \rightarrow [\text{ForceP} \ C_{in} \ [\text{FinP} \ RC]] \ # \ [ZP \ Y \ [...]]
\end{align*}
\]

To take (9) as an example,

\(^8\) This entails that relative clauses in Hittite adjoin at different levels, namely at Spec,FinP, Spec,ForceP, and Spec,HTopP (Lyutikova & Sideltsev 2021). Cf. Huggard (2015), who thinks that relative clauses are always adjuncts to CP, but does not consider the material treated in this paper. These data make it unavoidable to posit several structural positions of relative clauses, but discussion of this issue must be reserved for a future occasion.
If this happens, the rest of the conditional clause may be seen as a separate full-scale clause (CP) (Lyutikova & Sideltsev 2021). The result is the type in which relative clauses are linearly preceded by the initial subordinator and followed by a clause boundary.

There is yet another structural type of mismatch sentence, which involves elements before relative clauses that are supraCP. Of the material presented above, left dislocations belong here, as they are obviously above CP in Hittite; see Sideltsev (2021) with previous literature. To take (25) as an example,
‘(1a) Bread and beer, (2) the men who (are living) around the Deaf Man’s Tell, (1b) they too deliver (it).’

It has to be explicitly observed that there are so few relevant examples and the best of them, ex. (23), is so difficult of interpretation that this part of the analysis must remain very provisional; it will be dealt with at greater length in my paper on clitic climbing (Sideltsev 2023).

The most important consequence of this structural analysis is that it is impossible to characterize mismatch sentences as a single class in structural terms in view of their heterogeneity, so one might have to continue using purely descriptive terms such as “relative clauses within other clauses.” Yet as all the structures share a number of surface properties—the most conspicuous being the mismatch between prosodic domain and syntax/semantics with respect to clitic and clause boundary placement—I believe a common label is justified.

6 Parenthetical clauses?

It was suggested by an anonymous reviewer that some of the examples I taxonomize as relative clauses in mismatch sentences are actually parenthetical clauses. To see if this is really so, I will first look at some prototypical examples of parenthetical clauses.

There are two common types of parentheticals attested in Hittite texts: the type inserted between clauses (ex. 30) and the type inserted inside a clause in lists (ex. 31):


1. \text{GUDU}_1{}_{12} \text{Zalinu-n} \text{kui-š} \text{har-zi}
   \text{GUDU-priest} \text{Zalinu-ACC.SG.C which-NOM.SG.C have-3SG.PRS}

2. \text{nu} \text{wattarwa šer} \text{NAŠU.U ŠÚ.A ki-tta}
   \text{CONN spring} \text{above throne basalt lie-3SG.PRS.MED}

3. \text{n-aš-šan} \text{apiya eš-āri}
   \text{CONN-he-LOC.P there sit-3SG.PRS.MED}

‘(1) Whichever GUDU-priest holds (the image of) Zaliyanu—(2) a basalt throne is set above the spring/basin—(3) he will be seated there.’

Here the parenthetical clause (2) is inserted within the correlative structure (1, 3), but it is inserted between the two sentences, not within one of them.

1a. 2 GİŞGAN.KAL 2 GİŞBANSUR 2 GİŞKANNUM GİŞ 1–NUTIM
   2 offering table 2 table 2 stand wood 1
   GİŞkişîta pargaštî 6 šekan
   throne height LOC SG 6 sekam

2. n-at 2–šu pazzanan
   CONN they twice NOM PLN

1b. 1–NUTIM GİŞkişîta ašannaš 1 GİŞGİR.GUB 1–NUTIM
   1 throne sitting GEN SG 1 footstool 1
   GİŞ tarmalla
   tarmalla

'(1a) 2 offering-tables, 2 tables, 2 stands of wood, 1 throne 6 šekan in height—(2) they are double-pazzanan; (1b) 1 throne for sitting, 1 footstool and 1 set of tarmalla.'

Here the parenthetical clause (2) is inserted within the enumeration of ritual paraphernalia. Differently from the mismatch sentences that I have treated above, the clause boundary is marked to the left of the parenthetical clause. I keep such lists separate from other contexts, as it is shown by Sideltsev (2010) that their syntax is very peculiar and that they do not easily fit the definition of a clause in Hittite.

As both types of parenthetical clauses are demonstrably different from the structure that I am dealing with in this paper, there is no danger of confusion between them. It is the much rarer parenthetical clauses inserted in another clause, not in a list, that may appear to be identical to mismatch sentences. In the remainder of this section, I will list the examples and discuss them vis-à-vis mismatch sentences.

The first example is:

(32) a. NS (CTH 323.1.A) VBoT 58 obv. i 10‘–11’:

1a. HUR.SAGMEŠ-aš widar GISKIRI6HLA
   mountains GEN PL water NOM PLN gardens
   wê[l]u
   meadows NOM PLN

2. nu tuel [w]aršula-šteš?
   CONN your fragrance NOM SG C-your NOM SG C
   pai-šga-taru
   go-IPFV-3SG IMP MED

1b. nuš lê tinnu-zi
   CONN them PROH paralyze-3SG PRS
‘(1a) The waters of the mountains, the gardens, the meadow(s)—(2) let your refreshment go—(1b) but let it (i.e., hahhima-) not paralyze them (i.e., waters of the mountains, the gardens, the meadow(s))’ (essentially following E. Rieken et al. (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 323.1 (TX 2009-08-26, TRde 2009-08-26)).

The analysis of (1a) ḫur-sag-mes-äš widär giš-kir-eš-wel[l]u ‘the waters of the mountains, the gardens, the meadow(s)’ as a left dislocation (out of clause 1b) and not as a vocative is independently strengthened by the fact that no direct address is available in the context, whereas the nominals are resumed in the main clause, a typical property of left dislocations never attested with vocatives. The possessive second person pronoun tuel in clause (2) is not coreferential with the dislocated nouns in cl. (1a). Clause (2) is thus parenthetical within clause (1).

This parenthetical clause is very different from the relative clauses in mismatch sentences assessed in the paper, however: its clause boundaries are marked by nu on both sides of the clause. The same applies to the following example, although here only the initial clause boundary is marked:

(32) b. OH/NS (CTH 429.1) KBo 10.37 obv. ii 7’–9’, cf. Christiansen (2006: 192–193); B. Christiansen (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 429.1 (TX 27.03.2017, TRde 08.02.2017); CHD (Š 125):

1a. nu dUTU-uš d₁₀-aš
   CONN Sun-god.nom.sg.c Storm-god.nom.sg.c
dLAMMA-aš d₁[NGIRMes dapiant-eš]
   protective_deity.nom.sg.c gods all-nom.pl.c

2. nu giš-PAN-it gi-it šiye[wenti]₁⁰
   CONN bow-inst arrow-inst shoot1pl.pl.pr.s

---

9 Similarly ‘Die Gewässer der Berge, die Gärten, die Weiden! Deine Gnade soll (weiter-) gehen, damit sie nicht (länger) erstarren!’ (Haas 2006: 118). Often cl. (2) is understood as the main clause to (1a). This implies introducing a pronoun into cl. (2) which is not there in Hittite: ‘The waters of the mountains, the gardens, the meadow(s)—let your refreshing go (through) the lands—but let it (i.e., hahhima-) not paralyze them’ (Hoffner 1998: 27); ‘L’eau des montagnes, les jardins, la prairie, que ton haleine les traverse et que (le Gel) ne les immobilise pas’ (Mazoyer 2003: 167 & 178); ‘La tua essenza divina spiri sulle acque delle montagne, sui frutteti e sui prati, cosicché il gelo non possa paralizzarli!’ (Pecchioli Daddi & Polvani 1990: 64). Cf. very differently HEG (T 375).

   ‘Und mit Bogen und Pfeil schieß[t sie.?—:]’
1b. awān arḫa paraḫ-ten EMEMEŠ ḤU[L–lamuš ...] away away chase-2PL.IMP tongues bad.ACC.PL.C šommenanduš create?’.PTCP.ACC.PL.C

'(1a) Sun-god, Storm-god, Protective deity, all the gods,—(2) we shoot with bow and arrow—(1b) drive away the evil tongues which are created [from ...].'

Cf. a lexically identical example without the parenthetical clause:

nu dUTU d1O dLAMMA ḤUL–lun EME
CONN Sun-god Storm-god protective_deity evil.ACC.SG.C tongue
ANA DUMU–RU a[wan] arḫa paraḫ-ten
to son away away chase-2PL.IMP
'Sun-god, Storm-god, Protective deity, drive away the evil tongues from the child!'

1a. nu uwa-mi ANA dLiliwani GAŠAN-YA ALAM
CONN come-1SG.PRS to Liliwani lady-my statue
KÙ.BABBAR šA Ḥattušili
silver GEN Hattusili
2. Ḥattušili-š mašiwanza
Hattusili-NOM.SG.C as_big.as.NOM.SG.C
1b. SAG.DU=ZU šU[enseš]Ú GİRMEŠŠÚ ŠA GUŠKIN iya-mi
head its hands its feet its GEN gold make-1SG.PRS
'(1) I shall come and make for Liliwani, my lady, a silver statue of Hattusili—(2) as big as Hattusili himself—(1b) with its head, its hands and its feet of gold.'

This case differs from typical mismatch sentences in that it attests the parenthetical clause after much more than one constituent at the beginning of the main clause. Instead, the parenthetical clause immediately follows the noun phrase it modifies. The example does not at all mark the clause boundary after the parenthetical clause either; there are no enclitics.
Following the argument of the editors of the text, example (32e) most likely attests two coordinated clauses (1b) and (3), preceded by a vocative (1a). This is the structure attested elsewhere in the same text, as suggested by S. Melzer & S. Görke (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 400.1 (TX 20.04.2017, TRde 20.04.2017):


1a. *wappu-.mit*
   bank.VOC.SG=my.VOC.SG

2a. *n-an-za*
   CONN=him=REFL

1b. *kuwat uwanun*
   why come.ISG.PST

3. *kuit dariyahnun*
   why exert.ISG.PST

2b. *nu uuwandu*
   CONN see.3PLIMP

4. [{k}a]riüli-ēš [DINGI]RMEŠ kui-ē[š e]šhar
   ancient-NOM.PL.C gods who-NOM.PL.C blood.ACC.SG.N

   NIŠ DINGIR.–L[ī] [p]angau[waš EM]E ūr
   oath god multitude.ACC.SG tongue

   parkumu[škanzi]
   purify.IPFV.3PL.PRS

‘(1a) My riverbank! (1b) Why did I come? (3) Why did I exert myself? May (4) the ancient gods who purify the blood, the perjury (and) the tongue of the multitude (2b) see (2a) him.’
‘(1a) All you big and small mountains, (1b) why did I come in the inaccessible valleys? (2) Why did I exert myself? (3) They threw a human child behind the corral like a bull. (4) And also you, mountains, join me!’

Ex. (32f) makes it likely that in ex. (32e) it is clause (2a–b) that is parenthetical. This conclusion is also supported by the fact that there is a *nu* between the vocative ‘clause’ (1a) and (2a) in ex. (32e)—a very unusual property for sentences with vocatives (see Sideltsev 2021)—making it likely that cl. (2a–b) is parenthetical. However, this clause is itself split by the coordinated clauses (1b) and (3), which are thus good candidates for being parenthetical themselves. If understood thus, this case is similar to mismatch sentences in that it marks the clause boundary after the parenthetical clause (in 2b), but it is different from mismatch sentences in that the clitics of the main clause are to the left of the parenthetical clause (in 2a). However, the context in ex. (32e) is so complex that a definitive conclusion is hard to reach on its basis.

   1a. *nu* kā-š UR.TUR conn this-NOM.SG.C puppy
   2. uzū ūr-za šalli-š limb-ABL big-NOM.SG.C
   3. ša-šur-wa šalli heart-its-QUOT big-NOM.SG.N
   1b. namma-wa-aš anšē-āš karpiyattallaš then-QUOT-it ass.NOM.SG.C carrier.NOM.SG.C

‘(1a) This little puppy—(2) big as to (its) limb, (3) big as to its heart—(1b) then it is the carrier (of evil) (like) an ass.’

This case is similar to mismatch sentences in that the enclitics of the main clause (1b) come after the parenthetical clauses (2–3), but it differs once again from mismatch sentences in that the NP (*kāš UR.TUR ‘this puppy’) in the main clause to the left of the parenthetical clause (in 1a) is resumed by a coreferent enclitic pronoun (*āš ‘it’) in the main clause (1b)—something never attested with mismatch sentences. The resumption can occur with left dislocations, but the semantics of (1a) here is not that of a typical left dislocation. Besides, left dislocations are never preceded by a marked clause boundary, as is the case here. Thus this case is more likely to be a real false start.11

11 The quotative enclitic of the second parenthetical clause (3) is within the clause, not in

1a. *nu-šši lūš.à.tam giš.ban huittian*  
    CONN-him administrator bow draw.PTCP.ACC.SG.N

2. *and[a-m]a-at-kan kuš.pardugganni tarnan*  
    in-bu-it-LOC.PCP bow_case.LOC.SG release.PTCP.NOM.SG.N

1b. 1 *kuš.ē.mā.uru₃.uru-ši ēʔ/šaʔ lūʔ ṭiʔ x ištu giʔ.gag.ū.tag.ga*  
    quiver-him x with arrow

    šūntan pāi
    fill.PTCP.ACC.SG.C give.3SG.PRS

‘(1a) The administrator gives him a strung bow—(2) it is, however,  
inserted into a bow case—(1b) (and) one quiver [...] full of arrows.’

Here clause (2) is fully parenthetical, as was already seen by Güterbock & van den Hout (1991: 52). After the clause, there is no clause boundary and the main clause is simply continued (in 1b) as if nothing had intervened. It is also important that the enclitics of the main clause are at its left edge (*šši* in 1a), even though they are also doubled in 1b (*ši*). This plainly contradicts what we saw in mismatch sentences above. Both *(m)a* and the Wackernagel enclitics are within the parenthetical clause (2), not in the main clause (1a) to the left of the clause, another property never attested in mismatch sentences. Thus this case is again demonstrably different from mismatch sentences.

(32) i. MH/NS (CTH 258.2) KUB 13.7 obv. i 14–16, cf. Miller (2013: 140–141):

1. *mān-at išḥan-āš-a uthār*  
    if-it blood-GEN.SG but matter.NOM.SG.N

2a. *antuwaḫḫa-š*  
    man-NOM.SG.C

3. *naššu beℓ dinu-šu*  
    or lord court-his

4. *našma-šši kattavanalli-š*  
    or-him avenger-NOM.SG.C

2b. *apā-š-a-kan lugal-un karap-zi ...*  
    that-NOM.SG.C but-LOC.PCP king.ACC.SG.C raise-3SG.PRS

the first part of the main clause (1a), but this is not different from mismatch sentences as only the enclitics of the first subordinate clause turn up on the first part of the main clause. Clitics of the second subordinate clause remain within the clause in mismatch sentences.
‘(1) If it (i.e., the law case) is a matter of blood(shed), though, (2a) (and) a man (3)—either his legal opponent (4) or his avenger—(2b) that (man) impedes the king, ...’

Here the clause (2a) is not simply continued by (2b), as there is a clause boundary marked after the parenthetical clauses (3) and (4) by a sentential enclitic ⸗-kan (in 2b). This is seemingly identical to mismatch sentences, but the NP antuwaḥḥaš ‘a man’ from the first part of the clause (2a) is resumed by the demonstrative pronoun apāš ‘that’ in the ‘continuation’ of the main clause (2b) after the parenthetical clauses (3) and (4). This again sets the case apart from mismatch sentences. (2a) would appear to be left-dislocated, but left dislocations are not resumed by stressed pronouns. Thus this case is more like a false start. The parenthetical clauses (3–4) immediately follow the noun they refer to and are a typical ‘either ... or ...’ parenthetical, otherwise very commonly attested between clauses. We observe yet another case of ‘either ... or ...’ parenthetical in the following example:


1a. mān andurza-ma kuiški  \textit{itti} du-tu-š-i naššu
   if inside-but someone.NOM.SG.C with sun-my or LÚ.GAL našma ĖRINMEŠ ANŠE.KUR.RAMMEŠ
   lord or infantry chariotsry
2. našma-aš kui-š  \textit{imma} kui-š
   or-he who-NOM.SG.C even who-NOM.SG.C \textit{antuḥhaš}
   man-NOM.SG.C
1b. \textit{itti} du-tu-š-i BAL ḳya-zi
   with sun-my revolt do-3SG.PRS

‘(1a) But if domestically someone (1b) carries out a revolt against My Majesty, whether a nobleman, a unit of the infantry or chariotsry (2) or whatever sort of person it might be, (if I, My Majesty, put things right, then I will capture that person or that unit of the infantry or chariotsry.)’

In (32j), the parenthetical clause is (2) našma-aš kuiš \textit{imma} kuiš antuḥhaš ‘or whatever sort of person it might be’. It is inserted quite low down in the main clause, following the nominal that it modifies. There is no clause boundary marked either before or after the clause, but it has its own enclitic (\textit{aš}). There are other contexts like this in my corpus, e.g., NH/NS (CTH 42.A) KBo 5.3+ obv. i 14–15.
However, the following example is different:

(32) k. NS (CTH 472.A) KBo 23.1+ obv. i 58–59, cf. Lebrun (1979: 143); Strauß (2006: 262 & 267); R. Strauß (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 472 (TX 03.11.2010, TRde 03.11.2010):
1a. \[\text{[(luk)]katti-ma-kan}\] morning.LOC.SG but LOC.P  
2. \text{ud-[[(az \ iš)]tarna pai-z[\{zi\}]} \ 
\text{day.NOM.SG.C inside go-3SG.PRS} \ 
1b. \[\text{[nu\textsuperscript{12} (šehilliya)\langle\text{	extasciitilde}s\rangle wedar dan[\{zi\}]}\] \ 
\text{CONN purification.GEN.SG water.ACC.PL.N take:3PL.PRS}  
‘(1a) On the next day—(2) the day passes in between—(1b) they take waters of purification.’

Here clause (2) is unambiguously parenthetical (Strauß 2006: 262 & 267; R. Strauß (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 472 (TX 03.11.2010, TRde 03.11.2010).\textsuperscript{13} Cf. the lexically identical clause in the following example, which is a regular main clause:

(32) l. NH/NS (CTH 476) KBo 5.1 rev. iv 34–36, cf. CHD (Š 400); A. Mouton (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 476 (TX 07.05.2012, TRfr 15.11.2009):
1. \text{ud--az-ma-kan} \ 
\text{ištarna pai-zzi} \ 
\text{day.NOM.SG.C but LOC.P inside go-3SG.PRS} \ 
2. \text{nu} \ 
\text{šiptamiya} \ 
\text{teriyalla} \ 
\text{šipandanzi} \ 
\text{three part beverage.ACC.PL.N offer:3PL.PRS} \ 
‘(1) The day passes in between. (2) They libate/offer the seven-part beverage (and) three-part beverage.’

\textsuperscript{12} Strauß (2006: 262) has \{[nu]\}, but it follows from R. Strauß (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 472 (TX 03.11.2010, TRde 03.11.2010)) that ex. D, preserved at this point, does not attest nu. Nu is restored in both exx. A obv. 59 and B rev. 17, which are not preserved at this point, by the required number of signs in the lacunas. Lebrun (1979: 143) does not restore nu. In any case, the use of clause connective is not obligatory in this context in mismatch sentences.

\textsuperscript{13} Cf. CHD (L-N 77a) who freely translate ‘on the morrow, when the day reaches its midpoint (noon?).’ Cf. Lebrun (1979: 151) who simply translates at face value.
This regular example is also important in that it clearly shows that the locative enclitic *kan in (1a) of ex. (32k) belongs to the parenthetical clause, not the main clause (1b), although in (32k) it is hosted by the first word of the main clause (1b).

Thus ex. (32k) is the only parenthetical clause that is completely identical to mismatch sentences—here the clause boundary is marked after the parenthetical clause (2), not before it. Furthermore, the clitics of the parenthetical clause (2) cliticize to the part of the main clause which is to the left of it (1a). As these features set this example apart from the rest of the parenthetical clauses and make it identical to relative clauses inside other clauses, I consider the context relevant for mismatch sentences and taxonomize it as a non-subordinate clause in a mismatch sentence, a uniquely rare extention of the type.

The following context is frequently assessed as parenthetical:


1a. nu  gišMÁ māḥḥan
    CONN boat like
2. kuitman ḫatantiya ār-ḥi
   when land.LOC.SG come-1SG.PRS

1b. nu  UL IDI
    CONN NEG know

‘(1a) Like a boat, (1b) I do not know (2) when will I arrive at land.’

The parenthetical understanding is based on the Akkadian parallel version (see Singer 2002: 456). However, nothing in Hittite forces us to adopt a parenthetical reading, and I still think it can be assessed within Hittite as ‘when I like a boat arrive at land.’ The context should then be analyzed as:

(32) m₂ MH/NS (CTH 374.C) KUB 36.75+ rev. iii 21’–23’:

1. nu  gišMÁ māḥḥan kuitman ḫatantiya ār-ḥi
    CONN boat like when land.LOC.SG come-1SG.PRS
2. nu  UL IDI
    CONN NEG know

‘(2) I do not know (1) when I arrive at land like a boat.’

If it is still assessed as a parenthetical structure, it would constitute yet another case which might be identical to mismatch sentences, even though here the inserted clause is temporal, not relative, and there are no enclitics.
Summing up this section, I conclude that parenthetical clauses are demonstrably different from mismatch sentences with respect to the marking of clause boundaries and the position of enclitics. There is exactly one context which by both of these parameters is identical to mismatch sentences. I put this sole context into the same category as mismatch sentences and consequently set it apart from the rest of the parenthetical clauses. The results of this analysis once again support the claim that mismatch sentences are a separate taxonomic class, not amenable to any other type of complex sentences in Hittite.

Another important contribution of this section is that it shows that clause boundaries can be marked not only after the clause within another clause, which we already saw above in sections 2 and 3, but also before the clause within another clause, as is the case with several parenthetical clauses. This is important new information. Typically, clause connectives in Hittite simultaneously mark the beginning of one clause and the end of another. However, parenthetical clauses show that only the beginning of a clause can be marked by a clause connective, even if the previous clause is not yet over. Quite importantly, there is also a conspicuous lack of contexts testifying to nu marking only the end of a clause.\textsuperscript{14} This supplements the material from mismatch sentences and clearly shows that in mismatch sentences the first part of the main clause and the subordinate clause do form a single prosodic domain (differently from parenthetical clauses), whereas the second part of the main clause is prosodically a domain of its own.

This section has also shown that parenthetical clauses can contain their own enclitics within them in the part of the main clause that stands to the left of the parenthetical clause. Moreover, if there is a parenthetical clause within a main clause, the clitics of the main clause are hosted by the first part of the main clause (although they may be doubled by the second part of the main clause). Both of these properties show that the behavior of Wackernagel clitics in mismatch sentences is nontrivial.

Finally, it is significant that the part of the main clause to the left of the parenthetical clause is longer than the part of the main clause to the left of the relative clause in mismatch sentences. In the case of parentheticals, the first part of the main clause always consists of several constituents, whereas in the case of mismatch sentences there is always just a one-word constituent in the first part of the main clause. The only case of a mismatch sentence from my corpus where there are two constituents in the part of the main clause to the left of the relative clause is:

\textsuperscript{14} In exx. (23 & 25) above nu in front of the second part of the main clause may follow the left dislocation (which it optionally does elsewhere).
It must be admitted that, due to the absence of *nu* between (1a) and (2) or clitics belonging to (2), it is also thinkable to refer *ABU*YA ‘my father’ in (1a) to the relative clause (2). However, this would put *kui* ‘which’ in the relative clause (2) into third position rather than second, which would be unexpected; thus I suppose that *ABU*YA should belong to the first part of the main clause (1a). However, since this case lacks enclitics in the relative clause, we simply do not know what would happen to enclitics in such cases. We will return to this question in the following section.

7 Other types of mismatch sentences

The material I have analyzed above does not exhaust the available types of mismatch sentences. Besides the complex sentence I outlined above as:

(34) a. *mān namma*  
LD  
-(*m)a  
-wa(*r)*  
relative clause  
conditional clause  
(= main clause for the relative clause)/  
main clause,

there are structures where the subordinator occurs twice, at the left edge of the whole sentence and before the subordinate conditional clause:
(34) b. mān
relative clause
mān conditional clause
(= main clause for the relative clause).

7.1 The sequence relative clause—main clause with doubling of ‘if’
There are several subtypes of the doubling pattern, the most common of which
involves repetition of the conditional subordinator mān ‘if’.

The doubling of mān has been observed before. It was described in CHD
(L–N 144 & 157 sub 7j) ‘as temporal and relative clauses inserted in conditional
clauses, with repetition of mān “if”:

1a. mān
if
2. UNU[(TE)]MEŠ GIŠ–ŠI UNUTEMEŠ GIR₄ ku-e
utensils wood utensils ceramic which-ACC.PL.N
ḥar-teni
have-2PL.PRS
1b. n-ašta mān šAH–aš UR.GI₇–aš kuwapikki
CONN-LOC-P if pig.NOM.SG.C dog.NOM.SG.C ever
anda šālika₄
in touch.3SG.PRS
‘(1a) If (1b) a pig (or) a dog ever does touch (2) the wooden utensils (or)
the ceramic wares that you have, (but the kitchen foreman does not
throw them out, and he gives the deities to eat from unclean (uten-
sils/wares), then the deities will give him feces (and) urine to eat (and)
drink.)’

In this example only the subordinator is repeated, but there can also be rep-
etition of longer sequences. Thus, in the following example we observe the
repetition of mān ‘if’ plus the enclitic from cl. (1b) in (1a):

(35) b. NH/NS (CTH 584.1) KUB 15.1+ obv. ii 28–30, cf. de Roos (2007: 92 &
100):
1a. mānn-a-mu 2 dLUGAL–manni-š 1
if-and-me 2 Sarrummanni-NOM.SG.C 1
Allanzunni-šš-a
Allanzunni-NOM.SG.C>and
2. **ANA DINGIR-LI-kan kui-ēš** 
   **ginuwaz ar-ša**
   to god-LOC.PL who-NOM.PL.C womb-ABL.SG away
   **uwa-tten**
   come-2PL.PST

   **1b. nu-mu mān kūn**
   CONN-me if this.ACC.SG.C matter.ACC.SG.C listen-2PL.PRS

   ‘(1a) And if for me you two, o 2 Sarrumanni-s and 1 Allanzunni, (2) you
   who from the womb of the god are sprung, (1b) if for me you listen to
   this matter.’

The repetition of the subordinator is observed by the editor of the text (de Roos 2007: 100): “With *nu-mu mān* the *mān* of line 28 is taken up once more after
the relative subordinate clause.” Unlike the examples above, where the enclitics
on the subordinator were of the relative clause, the enclitic in (1a) cannot
belong to the relative clause.

This example is particularly interesting as, apart from the repetition of
the conditional subordinator, the address to the gods (marked by the nominative
case) 2 *dUGAL-manniš* 1 *Allanzunni-šš-a* ‘2 Sarrumanni’s and 1 Allanzunni’ is
separated from the rest of the conditional clause (1b) by the relative clause
(2). Such addresses are not supraCP (see Hoffner & Melchert 2008; Sidelt-
tsev 2021), but an appositional phrase to the zero 2PL pronoun in (1b). These
appositional phrases have free distribution in a clause, but it is important that
they are intraCP, differently from morphologically marked vocatives, which
are supraCP. Thus ex. (35b) is a rare mismatch sentence with some material
other than the conditional or temporal subordinator in the part of the sen-
tence to the left of the relative clause (there is just one other secure case, for
which see ex. (33) above). This indirectly supports the structural analysis of
this type of mismatch sentence put forward in Lyutikova & Sideltsev (2021),
which implies that there is space for other constituents between the subordi-
nator and the relative clause and that its absence in the majority of cases is
accidental.

But what is most significant about this example is that it complements the
analysis of ex. (33), which also attested two constituents in the first part of the
main clause, but no enclitics of the relative clause. Ex. (35b) not only also
displays two constituents in the first part of the main clause, it finally shows what
happens to enclitics of the subordinate clause in such cases. In contrast to mis-
match sentences with just one constituent to the left of the subordinate clause,
and similarly to the parenthetical clauses in the previous sections with more
than two constituents preceding the parenthetical clause, the enclitics remain
within the subordinate clause and do not surface in the first part of the main
clause. I will discuss how to capture this strange distribution in a separate paper on clitic climbing (Sideltsev 2023).

7.1.1 Temporal clauses within conditional clauses with repetition of ‘if’

Turning back to subordinator doubling in mismatch sentences, it should be observed that here again we have not only relative, but also temporal clauses within conditional clauses:

(36) a. INS/NH (CTH 561) KUB 51+ rev. iii 79–80:
   1a. **be–an-ma**  
      if-but  
   2. **kuitman āTU–š-a TA KASKAL KUR Aššur EGIR–pa**  
      while sun-my x way land Assur back  
      **ui-zzi**  
      go-3SG.PRS

   1b. **be–an-ma-kan uniuš ZAGULU UL neantari**  
      if-but-LOCP that.NOM.PL.C borders NEG turn.3PL.PRS.MED

   ‘(1a) If, (2) while My Majesty come back from a fieldtrip to Assur, (1b) those border lands will not defect (from us, and the situation will not become threatening for Nerik).’

This example is instructive as to the material that can be repeated. Whereas mān ‘if’ (spelt be-an in the example) is repeated together with ⸗(m)a in (1a), the other clitic in (1b), locatival ⸗kan, is not repeated in (1a). The explanation is simple: only material that scopes over an entire complex sentence can be repeated at its left edge, whereas material that scopes only over the conditional clause is never repeated at the beginning of a complex sentence.

   1a. **mān-ma-za-kan**  
      if-but-REFL-LOC
   2. **kuitman i[UTU–š-I LUGAL–i]znan-i eš-ari**  
      while sun-my kingship-LOC.SG sit-3SG.PRS.MED
   3. **kuitman-kan ANA LU[iGAL–iznan-i]**  
      while-LOC to kingship-LOC.SG

      then if-but gods to sun-my illness  
      **GAM–an UL kuinki šek-teni**  
      down NEG some.ACC.SG.C know-2PL.PRS

   ‘(1a) If, (2) until His Majesty will sit down in kingship (3) for as
long as he will be in kingship (1b) afterwards if then, o gods, you do not foresee for His Majesty any illness, ...’

This example shows particularly beautifully that the first conditional subordinator in cl. (1a) hosts the clitics that belong to the temporal subordinate clause (2); cl. (3) shows that the locative clitic -kan belongs to it, whereas in the parallel and virtually identical cl. (2) the enclitic is absent, being found instead in cl. (1). The reflexive -za is consistently used with eš- ‘sit’, so when it occurs in cl. (1a), it mostly likely belongs syntactically to cl. (2). But the example shows again that one of the clitics is repeated in cl. (1a) and (1b), namely -(m)a, which scopes over the entire complex sentence as in ex. (36a). It is also interesting that only the subordinator is repeated, but not the sentential adverb [egi]r-panda ‘then’, which remains in its original position in the conditional clause.

A very similar context from the same text, with the same distribution of clitics, is found in the following example:

(36) c. NH/NS (CTH 569) KUB 50.77+ r.col. 6’–9’, cf. van den Hout (1998: 114–115):
1a. mān-MA-[a-kan]
    if-but REFLOCP
2.  kuītman dUTU[−ŠI LUGAL−IZMAN−I] eš-ari
   while sun-my kingship-LOC.SG sit-3SG.PRS.MED
3.  kuītman-kan apī[y[a EGI-R-panda]
   while-LOC.P then back
1b. mān-MA dUTU−ŠI hadduli-Š ANA [SAG.DU−ŠU UL]
    if-but sun-my healthy-NOM.SG.C to head-his NEG
    kuītki huŠ-ueni
    something.ACC.SG.N fear-1PL.PRS
‘(1a) If, (then), (2) until His Majesty sits down in kingship (3) and for as long as (he will be) there afterwards, (1b) if then, His Majesty (will be) in good health (and) his person we will have nothing to fear.’

7.1.2 Manner clauses within conditional clauses with repetition of ‘if’
In the following example, we observe the repetition of mān ‘if’ in (2a) and (2b) as well as (5a) and (5b), but this time around manner clauses (cls. 3 & 6–7), not relative clauses:
(37) eNH/NS (CTH 42.A) KBo 5.3+ obv. i 18–26, cf. Beckman (1996: 24):

1. zig-a mān  mḪukkanā-š dUTU-š-I z[ila]tiya [INA you-but if Hukkana-NOM.SG.C sun= my in_future in EG]R UD-MI aššuli UL paḫḥaš-ti back day favorably NEG protect-2SG.PRS

2a. nu-tta mān
CON-N you if

3. tuel maḫḫan SAG.DU=KA nakki-š
your as head-your important-NOM.SG.C

2b. nu-tta mān SAG.DU dUTU-š-I QATAMMA UL
CON-N you if head sun=my likewise NEG nakki-š important-NOM.SG.C

4. perann-a-tta ša dUTU-š-I UL wahnu-an
before-and-you GEN sun=my NEG turn-PTCP.NOM.SG.N ḫar-zi have-3SG.PRS

5a. nu-za mān
CON-REFL if

6. tuel maḫḫan ANA SAG.DU=KA ZI=KA ū ANA RAMANI=KA
your as to head-your soul-your and to person-your genzu ḫar-ši mercy.ACC.SG.N have-2SG.PRS

7. ŠUḪ-I-a-uš-Za a-raḫzanda ḫar-ši
hands-ACC.PL.C-REFL around hold-2SG.PRS

5b. nu mān ANA SAG.DU dUTU-š-I ZI dUTU-š-I RAMAN
CON if to head sun=my soul sun=my person dUTU-š-I genzu QATAMMA U[L] ḫar-ši sun=my mercy.ACC.SG.N likewise NEG have-2SG.PRS

8. ŠUḪ-Iャ-KA-ya-mu a-raḫzanda QATAMMA UL ḫar-ši
hands-your and-me around likewise NEG hold-2SG.PRS

9. perann-a-tta ša dUTU-š-I UL wahnuw-an
before-and-you GEN sun=my NEG turn-PTCP.NOM.SG.N ḫar-zi have-3SG.PRS

‘(1) If you, Huqqana, do not in the future benevolently protect My Majesty (2) and if the person of My Majesty is not as dear to you (3) as your own person is dear to you (4) and the concerns of My Majesty have not taken precedence for you, (5) and if you are not well-disposed to the person of My Majesty, the soul of My Majesty, and the body of My Majesty (8) and do
not hold me in a protective embrace. (6) as you are well-disposed to your own person, soul, and body, (7) and hold yourself in a protective embrace (9) (and if) the concerns of My Majesty have not taken precedence for you ...'

This example shows particularly clearly that mān ‘if’ in (2a) is prosodically part of subordinate clause (3) as it follows the clause connective nu + the enclitic tta from the manner clause (3). The same is seen in cl. (5): mān ‘if’ in (5a) hosts the enclitic za of the subordinate clauses (6) and (7).

7.2  
Repetition of the irrealis particle man

The cases which attest double placement of the conditional subordinator mān ‘if’ are curiously and precisely paralleled by double placement of the irrealis/optative particle man/mān, as in (38):

(38) MH/MS (CTH 789) KBo 32.14 obv. ii 47–48:
1a. mān-wa-mu
IRR-QUOT-me
2. läḫu-š  kui-š
cast-3SG.PST who-NOM.SG.C
1b. man-wa-šši-kan  kiššara-š  arḫa  duwarna-ttari
IRR-QUOT-him-LOC.P hand-NOM.SG.C away break-3SG.PRS.MED
‘(1a) If only (1b) the hand of him (2) who cast me (1b) would be broken.’

Here again, just as in the examples above, man in (1a) belongs semantically and syntactically to the subordinate clause (1b) (which is the main clause for the relative clause (2)), but prosodically it is part of the subordinate relative clause (2) as it hosts its second-position clitic mu ‘me’. The direct speech particle in (1a) may be repeated from cl. (1b), or it may belong to cl. (2). Cf. from the same text, with the single irrealis marker placed before the main clause:

(39) MH/MS (CTH 789) KBo 32.14 rev. iii 43:
1. wete-t-wa-mu  kui-š
build-3SG.PST-QUOT-me who-NOM.SG.C
2. man-wa-šši-kan  kiššar-aš  arḫa  duwarn[ar-tt]ari
IRR-QUOT-him-LOC.P hand-NOM.SG.C away break-3SG.PRS.MED
‘(2) If only the arm of him (1) who built me (2) would be broken.’
We also observe double use of the irrealis/optative particle in:

\[
\begin{align*}
(40) & & \text{MH/MS (CTH 190) HKM 55 rev. 33–35:} \\
1a. & \text{man-kan} & \text{IRR-LOC}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
2. & \text{kui-t \ māḫḫan anda} & \text{what-ACC.SG.N how in}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
1b. & \text{man-mu ḫūman ḫatre-ške-ši} & \text{IRR-me all.ACC.SG.N write-IPFV-2SG.PRS}
\end{align*}
\]

‘(1) If only you would keep writing me everything (2) about how it is there.’

The double use of irrealis man in ex. (41) was already observed by Hoffner (2009: 202):

The ma-an is merely anticipating the ma-an in line 34 and need not be translated in the first clause. Literally: “If only—how it is there—if only you would keep writing ...” Interrupted thoughts in the wording are usually a sign that the letter was not drafted by a scribe from preliminary notes, but was either dictated directly or—if the writer is himself a scribe—composed as it was being written.

Differently from Hoffner, I rather consider the structure planned, for which see the arguments above. The locative enclitic -kan in cl. (1a) is syntactically the enclitic of cl. (2).

7.3 Double vs single position of subordinator: diachrony

There are thus two distinct structures. In the first, some constituents semantically and syntactically belonging to the conditional clause (= main clause for the relative clause) occur within the relative clause:

\[
\begin{align*}
(41) & & \text{mān} \\
& & \text{namma} \\
& & \text{LD} \\
& & -(m)a \\
& & -wa(r)
\end{align*}
\]

relative clause conditional clause

(= main clause for the relative clause)/ main clause.
The second construction involves doubling of the conditional subordinator at the left edge of the whole sentence and in the conditional clause (= main clause for the relative clause). The same pattern is attested for the irrealis marker:

(41) b. mān

relative clause

mān conditional clause

(= main clause for the relative clause).

Can we order the two alternatives diachronically?

Possible evidence that the type with double mān before the subordinate and main clause arose earlier than single mān prosodically within the relative clause is that the former shows more variety: it is attested much more frequently with various kinds of subordinate clauses, not only relative, but also temporal and manner clauses. However, a more convincing chronological argument is lacking, as both types are attested in MH/MS texts as well as in later NH/NS texts (no attestations in OH/OS texts are known to me).

Thus the diachrony does not give us a clear answer as to which strategy was the original one—the one with spell-out of only of the higher copy or that with spell-out of both copies. Both are attested at the same time, starting from the Middle Hittite period.

In view of the structural analysis of mismatch sentences with conditional subordinators above, I follow Lyutikova & Sideltsev (2021) in taking both types (41a) and (41b) to have come about as (different) results of the reanalysis of the original structure where the relative clause is in Spec,FinP. Because the relative clause is located low enough in the structure of the conditional clause and conditional clauses contain an overt clause-initial subordinator C\textsubscript{in}, whereas the relative clause contains overt constituents in the position of C\textsubscript{prev}, there is an opportunity to reanalyze the adjoining relative clause as the complement of the initial subordinator, as represented schematically in

\[(42) \ [\text{ForceP} \ C_{\text{in}} \ [\text{FinP} \ Y \ [\ldots]]] \rightarrow [\text{ForceP} \ C_{\text{in}} \ [\text{FinP} \ RC]] \# [ZP \ Y \ [\ldots]]\]

If this happens, the rest of the conditional clause may be treated as a separate full-scale clause (CP) (Lyutikova & Sideltsev 2021). This produces type (42a) without repetition of the subordinator. But if ZP is analyzed as an incomplete clause (FinP), then it is identical to the structure of two coordinated FinPs, dominated by ForceP; subordinator doubling in this case results from restoring the head in the second conjunct (Lyutikova & Sideltsev 2021). Thus we get (41b).
It is also significant that clausal scope conjunctions (\(\text{ṣ}(m)a\) and \(\text{ṣ}(y)a\)) are always doubled together with the subordinator save one case where \(\text{ṣ}(y)a\) is present only on the higher copy of the subordinator (ex. 35b). It is never only on the lower copy of the subordinator. All the cases are attested in texts where \(\text{ṣ}(m)a\), \(\text{ṣ}(y)a\) cliticize to mān ‘if’. As argued in Lyutikova & Sideltsev (2021), the most common variant (with doubling of \(\text{ṣ}(m)a\), \(\text{ṣ}(y)a\)) results from (a) \(\text{ṣ}(m)a\), \(\text{ṣ}(y)a\) in Disc lowering to the nearest head, the initial subordinator of the main clause, and (b) restoration of the material in the second adjunct:

\[
[\text{Disc+}C_{IN} \ldots \text{[... RC ...]} \& \text{[... main ...]}]]
\]
\[
# [\text{Disc+}C_{IN} \ldots \text{[... RC ...]}] # [\text{Disc+}C_{IN} \text{[... main ...]}].
\]

8 Conclusion

It has been demonstrated that Hittite attests a taxonomically separate subtype of complex sentences, called here “mismatch sentences”, in which (mostly) relative clauses occur within other subordinate (conditional, more rarely temporal) clauses or main clauses. The relative clause may be preceded by a very limited array of constituents from the matrix clause:

\[mān\]
\[\text{nammma}\]
\[\text{LD}\]
\[-(m)a\]
\[-wa(r)\]

relative clause
conditional clause
(= main clause for the relative clause)/
main clause.

There are also sentences of the same type which attest the conditional subordinator and the irrealis particle in two positions simultaneously, at the left edge of the sentence and in the conditional clause (= main clause for the relative clause). It was shown than the type is not reducible to other constructions standardly recognized for Hittite such as bare indefinites, embedded relative clauses, or parenthetical clauses.

Structurally, mismatch sentences are heterogenous and of three types. The subordinate (mostly relative) clauses in these structures are themselves common Hittite adjoining relatives, although they adjoin at different levels (rele-
vant for the paper are Spec,FinP and Spec,ForceP). The three types differ by the material occurring before the relative clause as well as structurally:

a. *namma* (and other temporal adverbials) to the left of the relative clause; relative clauses following *namma* adjoin to the CP of the main clause, *namma* adjoins to CP higher than the relative clause;

b. conditional or temporal subordinator to the left of the relative clause; this type came about due to a complex reanalysis of the original structure with the relative clause in Spec,FinP: $[\text{ForceP} \text{C}_{\text{IN}} [\text{FinP RC} [\text{FinP Y} \ldots]]] \rightarrow [\text{ForceP C}_{\text{IN}} [\text{FinP RC}]] # [\text{ZP Y} \ldots]$ (Lyutikova & Sideltsev 2021);

c. left dislocations: the direct speech particle *wa(r)* and discourse markers *(m)a, *(y)a* to the left of relative clauses; these elements are supraCP, relative clauses following them adjoin to the CP of the main clause.

Since all three structures share a number of surface properties, I believe that a common label is justified. The most conspicuous property is an intriguing mismatch between prosodic domains and syntax/semantics: the constituent to the left of the subordinate clause that is part of the main clause from a semantic and syntactic perspective is prosodically part of the subordinate clause. Thus syntactically, there are two CPs, whereas for clitics and for *mu* there are two prosodic domains, labelled below (a) and (b):

(a) $[\text{CP}_1 \text{Spec,CP} \text{namma} [\text{Spec,CP}_2 \text{relative clause} [\text{CP}_2]] # (b) \text{C}_1^0 [\text{TP}]]$.

The clause boundary (#) is here marked not between the two CPs, but after one of the CPs. In contrast, the syntactic boundary between the two CPs is in another place, before (a₁) and after (a₂):

# (a₁) $[\text{CP}_1 (b) [\text{Spec,CP}_2 [\text{relative clause} (\text{CP}_2)] (a₂) \text{C}_1^0 [\text{TP}]])$ #.

Prosodically, there is a clause boundary delimiting the end of the subordinate clause within the main clause; thus the clause boundary is syntactically within the main clause as well.

It is important that all of these subtypes of mismatch sentences are attested only if there is a one-word constituent in the main clause to the left of the subordinate clause. If there are two constituents in the first part of the main clause, the enclitics of the subordinate clause remain within the subordinate clause and do not surface in the first part of the main clause. Clitics of the second subordinate clause also always remain within the clause.

The new evidence allows us to obtain a fuller understanding of the Hittite left periphery than was previously possible, including the structure of the left periphery in CP and supraCP. It thus offers an important window into the
underlying structure of the complex sentence in Hittite and thereby illustrates the value of this language, with its rich and diverse corpus, for theoretical as well as comparative syntax.

Appendix: Corpus for this study

This study has been based on the following corpus.

OH/OS texts: Anitta text (Neu 1974); tale of Zalpa (Otten 1973); OS fragment of the Palace chronicle (Dardano 1997); rituals and myths (Otten & Souček 1969; Neu 1970, 1980, 1983); Royal Reprimand of the Dignitaries (Miller 2013: 73–75); Laws (Hoffner 1997); oracle letter KBo 18.151 (Soysal 2000).


Complete body of MH/MS texts.

New Hittite originals and copies of earlier texts: rituals, myths, and prayers as at http://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/HPM/index.php as well as Mursili I’s prayer concerning the misdeeds and the ousting of Tawananna (Miller 2014); instructions (Miller 2013); letters (Hoffner 2009; Hagenbuchner 1989; Mora & Giorgieri 2004); court proceedings (Werner 1967); dreams and vows (Mouton 2007; de Roos 2007); deeds of Suppiluliumma (de Monte 2009); deeds of Mursili (Goetze 1933; Grélois 1988) with subsequent additions; Apology of Hattusili III (Otten 1981); other texts relating to Hattusili III (Ünal 1974); restoration of Nerik (Cornil & Lebrun 1972); Memorandum concerning Mursili III (Cammarosano 2009); bronze tablet (Otten 1988); dictate of Mursili II (Miller 2007); catalogue entries (Dardano 2006); cult inventories (Hazenbos 2003); oracles (Ünal 1978; Berman 1983; Lebrun 1994; van den Hout 1998; Imparati 1999; Beckman et al. 2011: 183–209); treaties (Friedrich 1926...
& 1930; del Monte 1986; González Salazar 1994); Ulmitešub treaty (van den Hout 1995 & http://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_sv/txht_svh/textindex.php?g=svh&x=x); hippological texts (Kammenhuner 1961); medical texts (Burde 1974); liver models (De Vos 2013); Tunnawi ritual (Goetze 1938; Hutter 1988) with subsequent additions; texts of the cult of tutelary deities (McMahon 1991); funerary ritual (Kassian et al. 2002); Muwalanni ritual (Lebrun 1996); ritual against depression (Beckman 2007); birth rituals (Beckman 1983); ritual for the infernal deities (Otten 1961); purification rituals (Strauß 2006); Ambazzi’s ritual CTH 463 (Christiansen 2006); KLLAM festival (Singer 1984); ritual for the protective deity of the fleece (Bawanypeck 2005); rituals of the Hurrian cultural layer (Haas 1984; Salvini & Wegner 1986; Wegner 1995; Wegner & Salvini 1991; Wegner 2002); rituals of the Hattian cultural layer (Klinger 1996); Hittite speech in Luwian rituals (Starke 1985); as well as some other rituals (Lebrun 1977); texts from Ras Shamra (Laroche 1968).
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