Pragmatische Kategorien
Form, Funktion und Diachronie

Akten der Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen
Gesellschaft vom 24. bis 26. September 2007
in Marburg

Herausgegeben von
Elisabeth Rieken und Paul Widmer

Inhaltsverzeichnis

Anna Bauer

The present paper investigates the scope of the -*a*- pronouns in Middle Hittite. Several different aspects are considered: (i) the frequency of the forms, (ii) the scope (for both distance to the lexical referent and saliency despite a lack of continued reference), (iii) the types of clauses used and (iv) possible ambiguity. The main findings are that the scope usually extends over one up to three clause boundaries, and that texts from the written domain (instructions and indictment) show greater complexity than others (letters and prayers); thus it is reasonable to consider the latter as being closer to spoken language.

Bettina Bock

If the speaker determines the facts which permit the listener the identification of an object or a person in the restrictive relative clause as eventual / future or possible, the listener can understand a causal relation with the feature [- real]: The facts in the relative clause can be probable, possible or desirable. Conditional interpretation is possible, if the facts are prior or contemporaneous to those in the main clause. If the facts are later, consecutive and final (with the feature [+ voluntial]) interpretation is possible.

Anna Bonifazi

The author suggests a new reading of some adverbs as they are used in the Homeric epic. Such a reading profits from the notion of "discourse markers" – used in current studies in pragmatics and in discourse analysis –, which is here introduced. The specific adverbs under consideration are αὖ, αὖτε and αὐτάρ. The proposed analysis highlights notable discourse functions, such as the marking of upcoming discourse segments and of different kinds of shifts to visual details. Overall, the findings lend support to pragmatic accounts of other ancient Greek particles as well.

Eystein Dahl

This paper discusses the semantics of the Old Indo-Aryan Perfect Indicative from a synchronic and a diachronic perspective. Adopting a Neo-Reichenbachian framework, I argue that the Perfect Indicative represents a present anterior category in the earliest books of the Rigveda, while it has a past perfective character in the later books which in turn develops into a more general past character in the later stages of Vedic. I also claim that the inferential reading associated with the Perfect Indicative in the most recent stages of Vedic can be understood as the conventionalization of a pragmatic implicature, originating in the use of this category in intensional contexts.

Alexandra Daues

The syntax of Lycian funeral inscriptions is influenced by their function: (A) the frequently attested topicalization (left dislocation) has a pragmatic, exophoric function, while the rarely attested non-funeral inscriptions do not show this phenomenon. (B) Another characteristic feature of the funeral inscriptions is the preposition *hrppi*, which is used as a marker for the one who the grave is dedicated to (right dislocation). This usage of *hrppi* is caused by language contact. (C) In non-funeral inscriptions, *hrppi* functions as a local preverb with the meaning

bear the same thematic role. The data surveyed show that information structure has no role to play in licencing null pronouns.

In this article a case is made for a linguistic approach to Latin which considers the discourse pragmatic category of Act (rather than the semantico-syntactic category of Clause) as the basic unit of linguistic analysis. By discussing a number of linguistic phenomena in Latin, in particular the Latin particle *quidem*, it is demonstrated that the linguistic relevance of distinguishing units of analysis that are essentially communicative in nature. By way of theoretical background the main principles of Functional Discourse Grammar are introduced, a theory of language in which formal properties of language are directly and explicitly related to the communicative aims and strategies of the language user.

The article discusses two interrelated methodological questions concerning the diachrony of Latin discourse particles: (i) whether, and under what conditions, it is possible to make use in diachronic research of the discourse-pragmatic framework proposed by C. Kroon for the basically synchronic analysis of these particles; (ii) to what extent it is possible to differentiate between those variations in the usage of discourse particles across different texts which are caused by a diachronic development and those conditioned by other factors. Several sources of variation in particle usage are examined, namely (i) discourse structure, (ii) the traditions of literary genres, and (iii) individual factors, such as educational or sociolectal background.

In Vedic there are unstressed and stressed particles in the Wackernagel position. Hitherto it is unknown which function the stressed particles have. Information structure plays an important role here. While focus particles are confined to the actual sentence, the stressed particles are genuine discourse particles by being beyond the scope of the sentence. They appeal to the hearer to activate common knowledge which is required for the discourse and they function as background particles. Foreground particles, on the other hand, may belong to another kind of Wackernagel particles. The particles demonstrate the importance of the left sentence periphery for information structure.

Hittite *-ma* is not a focus particle, but a conjunction that links a specific constituent or an entire clause to a preceding clause. Its basic function is to mark a change in the direction of the discourse: new information, contrastive content, or merely the elevation of old information to topic status ("anaphoric" use). Since the constituent linked by *-ma* has a certain prominence, its use is regularly accompanied by "fronting", but "fronting" itself marks saliency more generally. The use of *-ma* in a given instance is not grammatically, but pragmatically conditioned, depending on how the speaker/author wishes to structure the discourse.

The article deals with two IE verbs that changed meaning by the influence of pragmatics. The first is the verbal composite *$\underset{\textstyle .}{u}o$-$tk^u$- 'run away, run down', being itself of IE age and continued

of a different (re)analysis of the pragmatic context and/or for pure syntactic reasons within Hittite, but somehow connected to the textual and pragmatic properties of both Hattic and Hittite. Cataphoric pronominal clitics are also of interest for Hittite sentence structure.

Reconstructing the syntactic system of a proto-language is possible, if several daughter languages have a uniform syntax. For Proto-Indoeuropean (based on Germanic, Latin, Greek) we can find a basic word order Subject–Object–Adjuncts–Verb with optional verb fronting and a top position for sentence mood markers. So Proto-Indoeuropean was no non-configurational language. The basic word order is, however, often obscured by information structurally motivated re-orderings, in which scene-setting elements are at the front, followed by topics. Poset-elements do not show uniform behaviour; they probably had no positional preferences in Proto-Indoeuropean.

The OSV word order is cross-linguistically particularly rare, and is often considered as being an exceptional arrangement due to poetic license in the grammars of the early IE languages. Here we perform a quantitative analysis of OSV in the Rig-Veda, the earliest Vedic text, where word order is syntactically flexible. It is found that this word order occurs in a consistent set of situations, where the object is presented as a more salient piece of information with respect to the subject. Such information structure is at odds with that of the usual transitive clause, and this may explain the diachronic decay of OSV in Old Indian.

In this paper, it is argued that, on the text level, the characteristic Middle and Neo-Hittite connector *nu* serves to connect overtly the two parts of topic-comment constructions. On a less complex interclausal level, it combines clauses to form a coherent chain of expectancy, in which the propositions basically conform to the current state of the common ground. *-(i̯)a* 'also, and' and *-(m)a* 'in addition; but' sharply contrast with *nu* in that the propositions they connect prototypically do not combine to form a complex sequential event, and by the fact that they signal that the common ground needs to be accomodated at the present stage of disourse by selecting relevant entities out of a set of alternatives.

Discourse Conditioned Use of Hittite *-ma*

H. Craig MELCHERT (University of California, Los Angeles)

The following study takes as its premise that the Hittite clitic *-ma* links constituents interclausally and that any analysis of its functions thus requires study of units larger than the single clause. After some necessary preliminary observations about its form and definition, I will attempt to give a unitary account of its functions, based on an exhaustive study of its use in one of the best-preserved larger texts in Hittite, the so-called Apology of Hattusili III.[1] For reasons that will become clear it is necessary to study also the behavior of the Hittite clitic *-ya* 'also'.

The Hittite clitics *-ya* and *-ma* each have two allomorphs. The former appears as *-ya* postvocalically and as *-a* postconsonantally, in which case it geminates the preceding consonant.[2] The latter appears in Old Hittite as *-ma* postvocalically and as *-a* post-consonantally, but crucially does *not* geminate the preceding consonant (see HOUWINK TEN CATE 1973 and MELCHERT 1984: 30[9]). In late Middle Hittite *-ma* begins to replace non-geminating *-a*, and in Neo-Hittite only *-ma* occurs (see MELCHERT 2007: 526).[3] I will for the sake of simplicity refer in what follows merely to *-ya* and *-ma*, but one will also find examples of the geminating *-a* variant of *-ya* in some of the examples.

Hittite *-ya* and *-ma* are not "focus particles", contrary to the claim of HOUWINK TEN CATE (1973: 128) and others. They are clause-linking conjunctions, as correctly stated by GÜTERBOCK & HOFFNER (1980–89) and RIEKEN (2000).[4] One clear piece of evidence for their status as conjunctions is their absence in discourse-initial clauses (thus RIEKEN 2000: 416).

However, neither *-ma* nor *-ya* is used for simple parataxis. They do usually express linkage of a particular constituent of one clause (to which they are cliticized) to a preceding clause. This function is clearest for clause-linking *-ya,* which does not mean merely 'and', as it is often mistranslated, but is equivalent to English 'also', German 'auch', etc. Like its comparanda, Hittite *-ya* marks an additional element in the discourse whose role runs *parallel* to the preceding state or action: i. e., the added element continues the discourse in the same direction (cf. RIEKEN 2000: 413[8]). For example, it is infelicitous to say in English: **My wife's father likes me; her mother also thinks I am an idiot.* One finds rather *My wife's father likes me; her mother also approves of my behavior.*

In Hittite, however, unlike English, *-ya* must be attached to the constituent that is being linked (over which it has "scope"). In English the clause *the queen also libates beer* is felicitous after *the king libates beer* (subject scope), *the queen libates wine* (object scope) or *the queen drinks beer* (verb scope). In Hittite the clause MUNUS.LUGAL=*ya*

---

1 For the data base used see http://www.linguistics.ucla.edu/people/Melchert/Index.htm (click on link "Hattusili"). I cite this text henceforth simply as "Hatt." The text is edited by OTTEN (1981).

2 By a scribal convention 'also' appears consistently as *-ya* after a word written as a logogram, regardless of what form it would take if the word were written out phonetically.

3 In Neo-Hittite *kinuna* survives marginally as a clause-initial variant of *kinun=ma* 'but now', but one cannot realistically speak of *-a* in this instance as a recognizable distinct morpheme.

4 I am ignoring here the quite distinct use of *-ya/-a* to link noun phrases.

KAŠ *šipanti* 'the queen also libates beer' can only be read with subject scope and is only felicitous after LUGAL-*uš* KAŠ *šipanti* 'the king libates beer.' For object scope one must say MUNUS.LUGAL KAŠ=*ya šipanti*, felicitous after MUNUS.LUGAL GEŠTIN *šipanti* 'the queen libates wine'. Although such examples are rare, we can safely predict that for verb scope one would have to say MUNUS.LUGAL GEŠTIN *šipanti=ya,* felicitous after MUNUS.LUGAL GEŠTIN *ekuzi* 'the queen drinks beer.'

Occasionally, an entire clause is linked to a preceding one, in which case -*ma* and -*ya* are cliticized to the clause-initial word or the first word that follows a clause-initial conjunction and any clitics. Such an example for -*ya* 'also' is:

(1)　Hatt. i 24–25

　　nu=mu ŠEŠ=*YA ANA* GAL *MEŠEDIUTTIM tittanut* KUR.UGU=*ya=mu mani-yaḫḫanni pešta*

　　'My brother installed me in the position of chief of the bodyguard, and he also gave the Upper Land into my administration.'

Here it is the entire content of the second clause that is viewed as an additional action that is parallel to that of the first, not just 'the Upper Land'. For a similar example with -*ma* see citation (7) below.

In attempting to determine the meaning of -*ma*, it is crucial to bear in mind that the use of both -*ma* and -*ya* is fundamentally independent of that of "fronting", despite their very frequent co-occurrence. The phenomenon of "fronting" in Hittite requires much further study. For present purposes it will suffice to define it formally as: appearance of any non-subject constituent in absolute clause-initial position or immediately after a sentence-initial conjunction and any attached clitics.[5] One should take note of certain complications in identifying instances of fronting. First, fronting is strictly provable only in the presence of an overt nominal subject – instances of fronting are hence surely undercounted. Second, I assume that all absolute clause-initial examples with -*ma* and -*ya* have been fronted. Obviously, this assumption is not strictly provable for subjects or conjunctions that typically occur clause-initially (e. g. *maḫḫan* 'when').

We may provisionally define the function of "fronting" as being to mark salience or prominence of a constituent. It is important to note that unlike "topicalization" in English, fronting in Hittite can apply to more than one constituent in single clause:

(2)　Kurunta Treaty iv 30–43

　　ṬUPPA ANNIYAM | *INA* ^URU*Tāwa* | *ANA PANI* ^m*Neriqqaili* DUMU.LUGAL ... (+ 33 more witnesses) | ^m*Ḫalwaziti* ^LÚDUB.SAR DUMU ^m*Lupakki* LÚ ^URU*Ukkiya EL-ṬUR*

　　'This tablet | in Tawa | in the presence of Neriqqaili the prince ... | Halwaziti the scribe, son of Lupakki, a man of Ukkiya, inscribed.'

Whatever the precise nuances, it is clear enough that the tablet on which the text of the treaty was inscribed, the place where it was promulgated, and the witnesses to it were all considered more salient than the name of the scribe who inscribed the text on the tablet.

Since an element marked by -*ya* or -*ma* as the link with a preceding clause is by definition salient, there is very frequent fronting of constituents marked by these conjunctions, but -*ya* does not require fronting:

5　I am with this wording intentionally avoiding taking a stand on the issue of whether the fronted constituent has or has not actually undergone syntactic movement.

(3) Hatt. iii 15–16

nu=za ᵈ*IŠTAR* GAŠAN=*YA* [(*parā ḫandandatar apēd*)]*ani=ya meḫuni tikkušša-n*[(*ut*)]

'Ishtar, My Lady, displayed her providence <u>also at that time</u>.'

See also Hatt. iv 18–19 and iv 23–24 for further non-fronted examples.

The independence of fronting is also shown by the fact that it often occurs without *-ma* or *-ya* (thirteen times in the Apology, six clause-initial, seven after the conjunction *nu* plus clitics). One also finds instances of two fronted constituents in the same clause, one with and one without conjunction:

(4) Hatt. iv 81–82

[(*kui*)]*š=ma=kan* ⸢*ziladuwa* NUMUN ᵐ*Hattušili* ᶠ*Puduḫepa* [(*AN*)]*A* ᵈ*IŠTAR* ARAD-*anni arḫa dāi*

'<u>But whoever</u> <u>in the future</u> takes away the descendance of Hattusili and Puduhepa from the service of Ishtar ...'

See for a similar example with *-ya* Hatt. iv 86–88: <u>*kuišš=a=kan* ⸢*ziladuwa*</u> ... '<u>Who also in the future</u> ...'.

Fronting with *-ma* appears for the most part to be obligatory, but there are exceptions. There is no fronting when *-ma* marks the second of two alternatives in double questions (see GÜTERBOCK & HOFFNER 1980–89: 92 and 99):

(5) KUB 22.70 Ro 51–53

n=at pānzi ANA DINGIR-*LIM IŠTU* NA₄ *pianzi* ... *n=at ANA* DINGIR-*LIM IŠTU* KÙ.GI=*ma pianzi*

'Shall they proceed to give it to the deity with gems ... (or) shall they give it to the deity <u>with gold</u>?'

There are also some further non-fronted examples in Neo-Hittite oracular inquiries whose motivation still requires explanation:

(6) KUB 5.1 iii 28–29; NH/NS

nu DINGIR.MEŠ-*za* <u>*kī=ma*</u> *malān* ᵁᴿᵁ*Neriqa=za=kan karapmi nu laḫiyauanzi* ᵁᴿᵁ*Tanizilan pean arnumi*

'Is <u>this</u> approved by the gods? (That) I "raise" Nerik and send the city of Tanizila in advance to campaign?'

See also KUB 5.1 i 60–61, 5.4 + iii 1–2, 5.3 + i 58, 22.70 Ro 55 (two constituents marked with *-ma*!), 50.6 + iii 38, VSNF 12.27 iii 11 (also two!), and KBo 2.2 i 41 and iii 2.[6]

We may now turn to the uses of *-ma* as illustrated in the Apology of Hattusili. All of these may easily be identified as showing well-established functions of the conjunction. First, *-ma* is used to introduce a new element or a change of topic in the narrative (26× in Hatt.). It thus often marks a change of subject (GÖTZE 1967: 138), but more broadly a change of topic (RIEKEN 2000: 415):

---

6 That these exceptions are not exclusive to oracular inquiries is shown by at least one exception elsewhere, in the Madduwatta text (KUB 14.1 Ro 79): *nu=wa ANA* ᵐ*Ma*[*dd*]*uwatta* ᵐ*Kupanta*-ᵈLAMMA-*aš* <u>*kē=ma*</u> *menaḫḫanta lingan ḫarzi* 'Kupanta-Kuruntiya has sworn <u>these</u> (words) vis-à-vis Madduwatta.' Since the two examples I have cited involve *ka-* 'this', one might suppose that there is no fronting with *-ma* when the reference is cataphoric, and this factor may well be responsible for these cases, but some other motivation must be sought for the other exceptions.

(7) Hatt. i 22; also i 61.75, ii 69.74.79, iii 14.54
     maḫḫan=ma=za ABU=YA ᵐM[(urš)]*iliš* DINGIR-*LIM-iš kišat*
     'But when my father Mursili became a god ...'

One should note that in this example it is the entire clause that is being presented as a change of topic (compare (1) above with *-ya*). Citation (7) is typical for such whole-clause instances in that it belongs to a subtype where a subordinate temporal clause introduces the background for a new episode in the narrative. There are nine such examples in the Apology. The change in topic is usually, but not always, also marked by a new paragraph.

In defining this use of *-ma*, two caveats are in order. First, the conjunction *-ya* also often introduces a new element in the discourse, so this feature is not unique to *-ma*. Second, "change of topic" here actually means: a new subtopic in the connected narrative. Shift to a truly new topic that is totally unconnected with anything in the previous discourse is marked rather by asyndeton (see e.g. Hatt. i 4, where the autobiography of the king begins, following the opening proemium to Ishtar).

The second function of *-ma* is to mark contrast (some 28× in Hatt.):

(8) Hatt. ii 36–37
     nu=mu 1 *ME* 20 Ṣ[(*IMTUM* ANŠE.KUR.RA)].MEŠ *pešta* [(ÉRIN.MEŠ-*a*)]*z=ma*
     =*mu* 1 LÚ=*ya katta*[(*n ŪL ē*)]*šta*
     'He gave me 120 teams of horses, but as for troops, not even one man was with me.'

Since new elements are often contrastive, there is some overlap between this use and the first cited above, and some examples could be assigned to either.[7]

The third function of *-ma* in the Apology is what GÜTERBOCK & HOFFNER (1980–89: 96) label "anaphoric" (see also RIEKEN 2000: 416, who compares a similar use of "tail-head marking" in other languages). A good illustration is the following:

(9) Hatt. iv 41–43
     nu=za DUMU.LUGAL *ešun nu=za* G[(AL)] / *MEŠEDI kišḫaḫat*[- -] GAL *MEŠE-*
     DI =ma=*za* LUGAL KUR *Ḫakp*[(*išš*)]*a kišḫaḫat* LUGAL KUR [*Ḫak(piš=ma=*
     za)] LUGAL.GAL *namma kišḫaḫ*[(*a*)]*t*
     'I was a prince, and I became chief of the bodyguard. As chief of the bodyguard, I became King of the Land of Hakpissa. As King of the land of Hakpissa, I became in turn Great King.'

As is typical for this usage, the king's status as chief of the bodyguard is introduced as new information in the second clause, in an unmarked clausal position. The third clause is then linked to the preceding by fronting the constituent containing established information and marking it with *-ma*, and Hattusili's promotion to being King of Hakpissa is introduced as new information. In the last clause the procedure is repeated, with the kingship of Hakpissa as the linking element fronted and marked with *-ma*, and the final promotion to the position of Great King introduced as new information.

In an SOV language like Hittite, where the predicate regularly comes last, "tail-head linking" is in fact an apt label for instances like (9), where the linked clauses are consecutive.

---

7 As Dieter Gunkel has pointed out to me, just as one finds two clauses introduced by *-ya ... -ya* to indicate 'both ... and', one also occasionally finds double *-ma ... -ma* to mark contrast, a usage comparable to Greek μέν ... δέ. An example from the Apology is Hatt. ii 34–35 ANŠE.KUR.RA.ME.EŠ=*ma* 8 *ME* [(ṢIMTUM *ēšta* ÉRIN)].MEŠ-*TI=ma=kan kappuwauwar Ū*[(*L ēšta*)] 'Of horses (i.e. chariotry) there were eight hundred teams, while of infantry there was no counting.'

The resulting pattern of A B Verb B=*ma* C Verb is quite common in Hittite prose. However, the Apology shows that such anaphoric use of -*ma* can also be long-distance, sometimes startlingly so:

(10) Hatt. i 66–67
      nu=mu ^d*IŠTAR* GAŠAN=*YA* GIM-*an* <u>*kaniššan*</u> *ḫarta*

      'As Ishtar, My Lady, had <u>recognized</u> me . . .'

      Hatt. i 70; after 3 intervening clauses
      <u>*kaniššūwar=ma*</u>=*mu* ŠA ^d*IŠTAR=pat* GAŠAN=*YA* *ēšta*

      '(It) was the <u>recognition</u> of me of **Ishtar**, My Lady!' (and no one else: -*pat*)

(11) Hatt. ii 45
      nu=mu apiya=ya ŠA ^d*IŠTAR* GAŠAN=*YA* <u>*kan*[(*ešš*)]*ūwar*</u> *ēšta*

      'Also at that time I had the <u>recognition</u> of Ishtar, My Lady.'

      Hatt. iii 8; after 47 intervening clauses!
      <u>*kaniššūwar=ma*</u>=*at* ŠA ^d*IŠTAR* GAŠAN=*YA* *ēšta*

      'It was the <u>recognition</u> of Ishtar, My Lady.'

I stress that no other function of -*ma* can explain these two instances. The conjunction here cannot possibly be marking a new element in the discourse, since the running theme of the entire narrative of the Apology is precisely the benign intervention of Ishtar in Hattusili's life. Nor is -*ma* here contrastive, since again it is Ishtar's favor that explains the events described in the clauses preceding those cited. Rather, the phrase *kaniššūwar=ma* is an explicit reminder inserted at intervals to assure that the reader/listener does not forget that all of Hattusili's success is due to Ishtar's special recognition of him. See further citation (22) below for a more extensive illustration of long-distance anaphoric -*ma*.

   Another kind of anaphoric use of -*ma* is seen in *parā=ma* 'further(more)', expressing continuation of an action or state of affairs (GÜTERBOCK & HOFFNER 1980–89: 96–97, also with other adverbs):

(12) Hatt. ii 2–4
      EGI[(R-*az=ma*)] KUR *Ga*[(*šga*^HI.A *ḫūmanteš* KUR) ^URU(*P*)]*išḫuru* KUR ^UR[(^U*Da-išt*)]*ip*[(*ašš=a*)] BAL *iy*[(*a*)]*t*

      'But afterwards all the Kaska lands – the land of P. and the land of D. – made rebellion.'

      Hatt. ii 16–18
      [(*parā=ma*)] MU.KAM.HI.A-*aš kuedaš* [(ŠEŠ=*YA* ^m NIR.GÁL-*iš* *INA* KUR ^URU*Ḫatt*)]*i ēšta* [[(*nu* KUR ^URU*Gašga*^HI.A *ḫūmanteš kurur*)]*iyaḫḫer*

      '<u>Furthermore</u>, in the years in which my brother Muwattalli was in the Land of Hatti all the Kaska lands waged war.'

This portion of the narrative first describes the depredations of the rebellious Kaska lands while the brother Muwattalli was away in the Lower Land, but these continued even after he returned to the Land of Hatti, and this linkage is expressed by *parā=ma* 'furthermore'. Once again the context precludes interpreting -*ma* as marking either contrast or a change of topic.

   As noted above, none of the three functions of -*ma* observed in the Apology is a new discovery. My main point here is that none of these uses is grammatically conditioned. The speaker/author is free to choose whether to employ them or not, depending on how he or she wishes to structure the discourse. The motivation for the appearance of -*ma* is thus

pragmatic. One can find for each usage passages where the conjunction could have been chosen, but was not.

For the context of a change of topic I may cite the following:

(13) Hatt. ii 48

   nu=mu ŠEŠ=*YA* ᵐNIR.GÁL EGIR-*anda uet*

   'My brother Muwattalli came behind me.'

The last action of Hattusili's brother in this portion of the narrative was at ii 35–36. The clause cited is preceded by fourteen clauses of uninterrupted narrative of actions by Hattusili, Ishtar, and others. It is even marked by a new paragraph! Nothing would have prevented ŠEŠ=*YA=ma=mu* ᵐNIR.GÁL EGIR-*anda uet.* But in fact this clause is treated merely as part of one continuous narrative that goes on for twenty-one more clauses.[8] I submit that the reason is that Hattusili wished to keep the focus entirely upon his own exploits in this part of the narrative and thus chose not to give the appearance by his brother the prominence it would have been lent by marking it with *-ma* and fronting.

Nor is the use of *-ma* to mark contrast by any means grammatically obligatory. There is no discernible grammatical difference to account for the appearance vs. non-appearance of *-ma* in the following:

(14) Hatt. ii 65

   nu=za LÚ.KÚR.ME.EŠ *kuiēš taraḫḫun kuiēš=ma=mu takšulāir*

   'I conquered some of the enemies, while some of them made peace with me.'

(15) Hatt. iv 45–46

   nu kuiēš [(*IŠTU* ᴳᴵˢTUKUL *eker*)] *kuiēš* UD-*azza* [(*eker*)]

   'Some died by a weapon, while some died by the day.' (i. e. a natural death on their appointed day)

There are no grounds for supposing that the omission of *-ma* in the second example is an error.

As for "anaphoric" *-ma,* one should note the choice *not* to use "tail-head linking" in the second clause of (9) cited above. Complete consistency would have called for: *nu=za* <u>DUMU.LUGAL</u> *ešun nu=za* <u>DUMU.LUGAL=*ma*</u> G[(AL)] *MEŠEDI kišḫaḫat* 'I was <u>a prince</u>, and <u>as a prince,</u> I became chief of the bodyguard.' The difference in rhetorical effect between (14) and (15) or between the use and non-use of "tail-head linking" is too subtle for us to discern. For an example where the motivation for long-distance use of anaphoric *-ma* seems clearer, see (22) below.

No one has to my knowledge addressed the apparent contradiction between the use of *-ma* to mark a new element or shift in the narrative versus its "anaphoric" use. Since as noted the use of *-ma* is virtually always accompanied by fronting, we must first look to *-ya* 'also' to see if we can tease apart the role of the conjunction and that of fronting. I have found that in the Apology all twenty examples of *-ya* that introduce a new element in the discourse are also fronted, whereas in anaphoric use *-ya* may be fronted or not. For the latter compare:

(16) Hatt. ii 45

   nu=mu <u>*apiya=ya*</u> ŠA ᵈ*IŠTAR* GAŠAN=*YA kan*[(*ešš*)]*ūwar ēšta*

   '<u>Also then</u> I had the recognition of Ishtar, My Lady.'

---

(17) Hatt. iv 18–19

nu=za ^d*IŠTAR* GAŠAN=*YA parā ḫandandatar* a[(p)]iya=ya *mekki tekkuš*[(*šanu*)]*t*

'Ishtar, My Lady, <u>also then</u> much displayed her providence.'

For fronting with -*ya* see also Hatt. i 37-39 (two examples). For non-fronting see also Hatt. iii 15–16 and iv 23–24. The examples in Hatt. iii 58 and iv 69 are strictly speaking ambiguous due to the lack of an overt nominal subject. The use of -*ya* in the special sense 'even' does not show fronting. Note the position of 1 LÚ=*ya* 'even one man' in citation (8) above.

These generalizations also are valid for the text of the bronze tablet, the treaty of Tuthaliya IV with Kurunta. Citation (18) shows fronting with -*ya* introducing a new element in the narrative:

(18) Bo 86/299 ii 4

<u>ZAG KUR</u> ^URU.d^U-*tašša=ya kuiš* KUR ^ÍD^*Ḫūlayaš*

'And the Hulaya River Land that is <u>also a boundary territory of the Land of Tarhuntassa</u>.'

All other twenty-eight examples with a new element likewise show fronting (a few are strictly speaking ambiguous): i 63.68.81.89.91.99, ii 5.6.8.13.15.17.19.21.23.64.74.75.81.82.84, iii 11.32.32.43.47.65.70, iv 25.

Anaphoric -*ya* predictably shows non-fronting (19) or fronting (20):

(19) Bo 86/299 ii 54–55

^m.d^LAMMA-*aš=ma=mu* <u>apēdani=ya mēḫuni</u> *šer akta*

'But Kurunta died for me <u>also at that time</u>.' (i. e. was willing to die)

(20) Bo 86/299 ii 94–95

^m.d^LAMMA-*an kēdani memiyani lē kuiški taparriyaizzi* <u>ANA ^m.d^LAMMA</u>=ya *ANA* DUMU=*ŠU* DUMU.DUMU=*ŠU kī išḫiūl ēšdu*

'Let no one command Kurunta in this matter. <u>Also for Kurunta</u>, for his son, (and) his grandson let there be this stipulation.'

In the special sense 'even' there is no fronting with -*ya*:

(21) Bo 86/299 ii 38–39

ABU=KA=wa=tta mān LUGAL-*eznani* <u>ŪL=ya</u> *tittanuzi*

'<u>Even</u> if your father does <u>not</u> install you in the kingship.'

See also for 'even' Bo 86/299 ii 75.100. iii 18–19. iv 20.

An exhaustive survey of the Hittite text corpus obviously would be needed to confirm fully these generalizations. However, a cursory examination of the Neo-Hittite texts CTH 62–89 (texts of Mursili II, Muwattalli and Hattusili III), the Middle-Hittite Maşat Letters (HKM 1–96) and the Madduwatta text, and paragraphs 1–100 of the Old Hittite Laws has found no counterexamples. There is ample further positive evidence for the consistent fronting of -*ya* when it marks a new element and for its non-fronting in the sense 'even'. Most instances of anaphoric -*ya* show fronting, but non-fronting is also attested. Noteworthy is the Old Hittite example in § 56 of the Laws (KBo 22.62 + 6.2 iii 22): ^LÚ.MEŠ^NU.GIŠ.KIRI₆

ḫūmanti=ya=pat luzzi karpianzi 'the gardeners render the *luzzi* service <u>also in all</u> the same (*-pat*) (kinds of work).'[9]

What conclusions may we draw from these facts? As per above, *-ya* marks an additional element whose role runs *parallel* to the previous action or state of affairs. When that element is new, it appears in fronted position. When the element has been previously mentioned in the discourse (anaphoric), fronting appears to be optional. This distribution suggests that it is the status of the constituent as being new that conditions fronting. In the case of something previously mentioned, it is up to the speaker to decide whether the fact that some additional action is being performed on the familiar element is enough to count as "new".

As for *-ma*, Rieken (2000: 416) has correctly emphasized that *-ma* marks a *change in direction* from the previous discourse (compare the familiar phrase "a turn of events"). Since such a change is by definition "new" (NB even if it involves something already mentioned), fronting is effectively obligatory. I follow Rieken in assuming that in the case of "anaphoric" *-ma*, the change consists in the very shift of the constituent from non-topic to topic status.

I wish to stress again in conclusion that the choice to promote an element to topic status or not remains at the discretion of the speaker and is thus ultimately pragmatically conditioned. I cite as evidence the full context of one instance of long-distance anaphoric *-ma* in the Apology where the pragmatic motivation for the delayed promotion to topic seems reasonably clear:

(22)   Hatt. iv 65–73

      nu=<u>mu</u> šallai pedi ANA KUR ^{URU}*Ḫatti* LUGAL-*eznani* [(*ti*)]*ttanut* <u>*ammuk=ma*</u> *ANA* ^d*IŠTAR* GAŠAN=*YA* <u>É ^{m.d}SIN.^dU</u> *ADDIN* [*n=a*]*t=kan* EGIR-*an tarnaḫ-ḫun n=at parā peḫḫun* [*an*]*nallan kuit ēšta apāt=ši parā peḫḫun ammuqq=a kuit ḫarkun apadda=ya parā peḫḫun n=at=kan* EGIR-*an tarnaḫḫun n=at ANA* DINGIR-*LIM parā ADDIN* <u>É ^{m.d}SIN.^dU</u>=*ma=šši kuit ADDIN nu* URU.DIDLI. ḪI.A *kuiēš kuiēš* [*Š*]*A* ^{m.d}SIN.^dU *n=an=kan ḫūmanti=ya=pat* EGIR-*an* ^{NA₄}ZI. KIN [*t*]*ittanuškanzi* ^{DUG}*ḫaršiyali=ya=kan išḫuiškanzi*

      'She installed <u>me</u> in a high position, the kingship of Hatti, and <u>I</u> gave Ishtar, My Lady, <u>the house of Arma-Tarhunta</u>. I granted it in perpetuity. I gave it away. That which existed before, that I gave away to her. Also what I had, I also gave that away. I granted it in perpetuity. I gave it away to the goddess. <u>As for the house of Arma-Tarhunta</u> that I gave to her—(in) whatever cities belonged to Arma-Tarhunta they will also set her up as a cult stone behind each and every one, and they will also pour out the pithoi.'

The *ammuk=ma* of the second clause is an ordinary instance of anaphoric *-ma*, where 'I' resumes the *-mu* 'me' of the first clause in typical "tail-head linking". However, the new information introduced in the second clause, namely 'the house of Arma-Tarhunta' is not promoted to topic status until after eight further intervening clauses! This postponement is due to the fact that Hattusili first wishes to insist at length, with numbing repetition, upon the fact that he gave away the acquired house and everything else to the goddess unconditionally and granted it to her forever. Only after this self-aggrandizement does he

---

9 Also of interest is the use of *-ya* with cataphoric *kiššan* 'as follows' (followed by direct speech) in the Middle Hittite letter HKM 60. The first instance (lines 10–11) shows no fronting: *kāša=mu* ^m*Tarḫunmiyaš* <u>*kiššann=a*</u> *memišta* 'Tarhunmiya has spoken to me <u>also as follows</u>'. The second (line 21) has fronting: <u>*kiššann=a*</u>=*mu memiš*[*ta*] 'He <u>also</u> spoke to me as <u>follows</u>'. I emphasize that nothing would have prevented a structure *nu=mu kiššann=a memišta*. The co-occurrence of these two examples in a single text confirms that the conditioning for fronting with anaphoric or cataphoric *-ya* is not grammatical, but rhetorical.

finally make the house of Arma-Tarhunta the topic and provide further details about its disposition.

Many questions regarding the functions of *-ma* remain to be answered. We need among other things an explanation for the examples cited above where *-ma* is not accompanied by the usual fronting. I am confident that the solution to this problem and others is also to be sought in the pragmatic factors that condition how a speaker/author chooses to structure a given discourse.

References

Götze, Albrecht 1967. *Die Annalen des Muršiliš.* ²Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Güterbock, Hans G. & Harry A. Hoffner, Jr. 1980–89. *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. Volume L–N.* Chicago: The Oriental Institute.

Houwink ten Cate, Philo H. J. 1973. The particle *-a* and its usage with respect to the personal pronoun. In: E. Neu & C. Rüster (eds.), *Festschrift Heinrich Otten.* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 119–139.

Melchert, H. Craig 1984. Notes on Palaic. *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung* 97.22–43.

——— 2007. Middle Hittite Revisited. In: A. Archi & R. Francia (eds.), *VI Congresso Internazionale di Ittitologia, 5–9 settembre 2005.* Rome: CNR, 525–531.

Otten, Heinrich 1981. *Die Apologie Hattušilis III.* (*StBoT* 24). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Rieken, Elisabeth 2000. Die Partikeln *-a, -i̯a, -ma* im Althethischen und das Akkadogram *Ù.* In: M. Ofitsch & C. Zinko (eds.), *125 Jahre Indogermanistik in Graz.* Graz: Leykam, 411–419.