**Relative Clauses in Indo-European Anatolian Languages**

For more than quarter century the standard doctrine regarding Hittite relative clauses followed the findings of Warren Held (1957), as elaborated and formalized by Mark Hale (1987) and Andrew Garrett (1994), duly enshrined in the grammar of Hoffner and Melchert (2008). By this analysis, Hittite (like Vedic Sanskrit and Homeric Greek) has “overt wh-movement” by which a wh-word is obligatorily fronted in its clause. Most Hittite RCs are preposed correlatives, and word order encodes a contrast between “determinate” RCs in which prior existence of the referent and reality of the predication are established and “indeterminate” RCs where they are not. Per Garrett, there are also a few postposed Hittite RCs that are non-restrictive or indefinite. Recent research by Probert (2006), Goedegebuure (2009), and Huggard (2011 and 2015) has entirely demolished this synchronic picture. I will briefly review evidence from all of the I-E Anatolian languages showing that there is no overt wh-movement and no grammatical contrast between “determinate” and “indeterminate” RCs. On the other hand, there are embedded RCs, including some that split the main clause, and postposed restrictive and free RCs in addition to the non-restrictive and indefinite types. There are also “nested” preposed correlative RCs. The entire history of RC syntax in Anatolian thus needs to be rewritten.