

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

WIESBADEN 2009
REICHERT VERLAG

Inhaltsverzeichnis

Vorwort der Herausgeber xi–xii

ANNA BAUER

Der phorische Skopus des hethitischen Pronomens vom Stamm *-a-* 1–13

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

Relativsätze mit Nebensinn in altindogermanischen Sprachen 15–28

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 pragmatic meanings of some discourse markers in Homer 29–36

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 *αὔ*, *αὔτε* 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

Semantische und pragmatisch-kontextuelle Faktoren
in der Entwicklung des altindoarischen Perfekts 37–52

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

Form und Funktion – die Wortstellung in den lykischen Grabinschriften 53–63

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

‘upon’. Within the funeral inscriptions, the position of *hrppi* also marks its function (preverbal position: local use, prepositional position: transferred use).

GISELLA FERRARESI

Die Funktion der präverbalen Positionen der Adverbkonnektoren im Deutschen:
Anmerkungen aus synchroner und diachroner Sicht 65–77

This article deals with those positions in the *Vorfeld* where so-called adverbial connectors can appear in Modern German. After a comparison (of the latter) with coordinating conjunction(s) and focus particle(s), it is shown how the different positions preceding the finite verb with adverbial connectors have either been newly added in the course of the development from adverbials to connectors (e. g. the so-called *Nacherstposition*, which has the function of contrasting the topics preceding it), or acquired an entirely new function, like the null position, which is followed by independent illocutions in Modern German.

JOSÉ LUIS GARCÍA RAMÓN

Primär- und Sekundärendungen im Konjunktiv im Vedischen:
Deixis und Sprechakt 79–91

The occurrence of primary and secondary endings in the subjunctive in Vedic has defied explanation so far. In fact, in the *-s*-aorists a complementary distribution may now be stated, namely 2.sg. **-s-a-si*, whence **-s-i* by haplology (primary ending) :: 3.sg. **-s-a-t* (secondary ending), e. g. *dárṣi* (and *dárṣasi*) vs. *dárṣat*. This distribution is conditioned by the interaction of deixis and speech: the second person is addressed (“der Angesprochene”) and its form has the *-i*-deixis, whereas the third person, who is spoken about (“der Besprochene”), stands further outside of the sphere of the speaker. This complementary distribution may be inherited, as the haplology itself, which has led to the so-called **-si*-imperatives.

PETRA GOODEGEBUURE

Focus in Hittite and the stressed pronoun *apā-*: in search of a method 93–112

Hittite *apāš* as a Replacing or Selecting Focus constituent is overwhelmingly found in immediately preverbal position. Thus, the main function of the stressed pronoun *apāš* is to mark a highly topical referent as the Contrastive Focus of a clause (as opposed to the enclitic pronoun *-a-*), falsifying claims that stressed pronouns select less topical or cognitively accessible discourse referents. This surprising result was reached using the onomasiological approach, which maps forms on well-defined meanings or functions.

GRAHAM R. ISAAC

Die Urgeschichte der verbalen Morphosyntax im Keltischen:
eine Schnittstelle zwischen Grammatik, Semantik und Pragmatik 113–123

The contrast in Celtic between absolute and conjunct verbal flexion is traced to the distinction between tonic sentence-initial verbs and atonic sentence-medial/final verbs in Proto-Indo-European. Given the origin of the Celtic double flexion in a functional system, it is assigned synchronic functionality in the extant languages themselves. The distribution of the double flexion is shown to correlate with the features of scalar transitivity posited by Hopper and Thompson. Celtic verb-initial basic order is explained as arising in prehistory through the complete cliticisation of the verb due to strongly falling sentence-intonation.

GÖTZ KEYDANA

Latente Objekte und altindische Diskursgrammatik 125–142

This paper deals with latent objects in Vedic. In the first part an inventory of latent objects in Vedic is given: Ellipses, operator chains, and null pronouns can be identified. The last are shown to follow binding principle B. The second part is an investigation into discourse grammatical constraints on the use of anaphoric null pronouns. The most important of these is an adjacency constraint. In Vedic narrative prose this constraint can be violated if antecedent and anaphor

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

CAROLINE KROON

Latin Linguistics between Grammar and Discourse.

Units of Analysis, Levels of Analysis 143–158

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.

BARBORA KRYLOVÁ

Zur Diachronie der lateinischen Diskurspartikeln:

methodologische Überlegungen 159–172

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.

ROSEMARIE LÜHR

P2-Partikeln in indogermanischen Sprachen 173–186

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.

H. CRAIG MELCHERT

Discourse Conditioned Use of Hittite *-ma* 187–195

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.

NORBERT OETTINGER

Semantik und Pragmatik indogermanischer Verben:

hethitisch *ninink-* ‘heben’ und anderes 197–203

The article deals with two IE verbs that changed meaning by the influence of pragmatics. The first is the verbal composite **yo-tkʷ-* ‘run away, run down’, being itself of IE age and continued

in Hittite *watku-* ‘run away, jump’. Secondly, an attempt is made to show that the original meaning of Hittite *ninink-* was both ‘lift’ and ‘lift something from its place’. For pragmatic reasons the verb is often found in contexts with somehow negative connotations, which changed its meaning to ‘lift in an aggressive way (active), rise in an aggressive way (middle)’. This development may have started in PIE times already.

ANNA ORLANDINI – PAOLO POCSETTI

Semantisch-pragmatische Beziehungen zwischen koordinierenden adversativen
Strukturen im Lateinischen und in den Sprachen Altitaliens 205–219

This paper examines adversative coordination and provides an exemplary demonstration of pragmatic analysis, which is a necessity for the correct interpretation of any text. Romance adversative particles such as French *mais*, Italian *ma* which replaced various Latin particles such as *sed*, *at*, *autem* etc. derive from the Latin *magis*. The fundamental functions of *magis* are: a) the quantitative function with an additive meaning which works like a connective particle (equivalent to Spanish *sino*, German *aber*); and b) the corrective function with a disjunctive meaning which is close to an exclusive particle (equivalent to Spanish *sino*, German *sondern*).

GEORGES-JEAN PINAULT

On the formation of the Tocharian demonstratives 221–245

The demonstratives of the Tocharian languages (A and B) are used both as independent pronouns and as determiners. On the formal side, the seven paradigms (three in Toch. A and four in Toch. B) share the same basic inflexional system, which is based ultimately on the PIE demonstrative pronoun **so/to-*. In synchrony, the demonstrative sets are differentiated by the final vowel or consonant. From the diachronic point of view, Common Tocharian and the two Toch. languages have redistributed through several steps the reflexes of different PIE stems, while keeping the threefold opposition between anaphora, near-deixis and far-deixis.

ERICH POPPE

The pragmatics of Middle Welsh word order:
Some conceptual and descriptive problems 247–264

Word-order patterns in positive main clauses in Middle Welsh (prose) have conventionally been classified as either ‘abnormal’ or ‘mixed’; the two types have been assigned distinct pragmatic characteristics, but there is considerable formal overlap between them. My paper argues against an unambiguous mapping of syntactic form on pragmatic function and the discreteness of the pragmatic functions ‘topic’ and ‘focus’, and in favour of a pragmatic cline with ‘topic’ and ‘focus’ as polar values. Other issues briefly addressed concern the rise of a specifically Breton type of cleft construction and the changing syntax of Middle Welsh *canys*.

ELISABETH RIEKEN

Hethitisch *kāša*, *kāšma*, *kāšat(t)a*: drei verkannte deiktische Partikeln 265–273

The function of the three Hittite particles *kāša*, *kāšma* and *kāšat(t)a* has been analysed by Hoffner as adding a temporal immediacy to the verbal action. In this article, it is argued that the deictic force is not a temporal, but a local one. The particle *kāša* indicates that the verbal action takes place in the local sphere of the speaker, while *kāšma* (in Middle and Neo-Hittite) and *kāšat(t)a* (in Old Hittite) mark the action as being located in the sphere of the addressee. This result has been achieved by using a combination of philological analysis and a heuristic method developed by Kroon for the discovery of pragmatic categories in corpus languages.

ALFREDO RIZZA

Left and right periphery in Hittite. The case of the translations from Hattic 275–286

This paper is about pronominal clitics with “cataphoric use” that can be found in Hattic-Hittite and Hurrian-Hittite bilinguals. The massive presence of cataphoric pronominal clitics in texts of translation from Hattic is not determined by some morphosyntactic properties of the Hattian verb (this seems to be the interpretation of, e. g., Schuster), but they emerge as a consequence

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.

AUGUSTIN SPEYER

Versuch zur Syntax im Proto-Indoeuropäischen 287–305

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.

CARLOTTA VITI

A quantitative analysis of the OSV word order in Vedic 307–322

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.

PAUL WIDMER

Hethitisch *nu* als Mittel der informationsstrukturellen
und syntaktischen Verknüpfung 323–335

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. *-(i)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 accommodated at the present stage of discourse 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* postvocally and as *-a* postconsonantly, in which case it geminates the preceding consonant.² The latter appears in Old Hittite as *-ma* postvocally and as *-a* postconsonantly, but crucially does *not* geminate the preceding consonant (see HOUWINK TEN CATE 1973 and MELCHERT 1984: 30⁹). 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: 413⁸). 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 MEŠEDIUTTİM tittanut KUR.UGU=ya=mu mani-
yahhanni 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. *mahhan* ‘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 URUTāwa | ANA PANI mNeriqqaili DUMU.LUGAL . . .
(+ 33 more witnesses) | mHalwaziti LÚDUB.SAR DUMU mLupakki 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 handandatar apēd*)]*ani=ya meḫuni tikkuššan*[(*ut*)]
 ‘Ishtar, My Lady, displayed her providence also at that time.’

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* ^š*ziladuwa* NUMUN ^m*Hattušili* ^ḫ*Puduḫepa* [(AN)]A ^d*IŠTAR*
 ARAD-*anni arḫa dāi*
 ‘But whoever in the future takes away the descendance of Hattusili and Puduḫepa from the service of Ishtar ...’

See for a similar example with *-ya* Hatt. iv 86–88: *kuišš=a=kan* ^š*ziladuwa* ... ‘Who also in the future ...’.

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* KÜ.GI=*ma* *pianzi*
 ‘Shall they proceed to give it to the deity with gems ... (or) shall they give it to the deity with gold?’

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 kī=ma* *malān* ^{URU}*Neriqa=za=kan* *karapmi nu laḫiyauanzi*
^{URU}*Tanizilan* *pean arnumi*
 ‘Is this 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 kē=ma menaḫanta lingan ḫarzi* ‘Kupanta-Kuruntiya has sworn these (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
mahhan=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 *š*[(*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 *kišhaḫat*[-] GAL MEŠE-
DI=*ma*=za LUGAL KUR *Hakp*[(*išš*)]*a kišhaḫat* LUGAL KUR [*Hak*(*piš=ma*=
za)] LUGAL.GAL *namma kišhaḫ*[(*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 [(*šIMTUM ēšta* *ÉRIN*)].MEŠ-TI=*ma*=kan *kappuwawwar 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 kaniššan harta*
 ‘As Ishtar, My Lady, had recognized me . . .’
 Hatt. i 70; after 3 intervening clauses
kaniššūwar=ma=mu ŠA ^d*IŠTAR=pat* GAŠAN=*YA ēšta*
 ‘(It) was the recognition of me of **Ishtar**, My Lady!’ (and no one else: *-pat*)
- (11) Hatt. ii 45
nu=mu apiya=ya ŠA ^d*IŠTAR* GAŠAN=*YA kan[(ešš)]ūwar ēšta*
 ‘Also at that time I had the recognition of Ishtar, My Lady.’
 Hatt. iii 8; after 47 intervening clauses!
kaniššūwar=ma=at ŠA ^d*IŠTAR* GAŠAN=*YA ēšta*
 ‘It was the recognition 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^{HLA} hūmanteš KUR)^{URU}(P)]išhuru* 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* ^mNIR.GÁL-*iš INA* KUR ^{URU}*Hatt*)]*i ēšta* [(*nu* KUR ^{URU}*Gašga^{HLA} hūmanteš kurur*)]*iyahher*
 ‘Furthermore, 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 tarahḫun 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 GIŠTUKUL 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 DUMU.LUGAL ešun nu=za DUMU.LUGAL=ma G[(AL)] MEŠEDI kišḫaḫat* ‘I was a prince, and as a prince, 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 apiya=ya ŠA dIŠTAR GAŠAN=YA kan[(ešš)]ūwar ešta
 ‘Also then I had the recognition of Ishtar, My Lady.’

⁸ A narrative in which there are *no* instances of *-ma* introducing a new topic, only two instances where it is used to mark contrast.

- (17) Hatt. iv 18–19
nu=za ^dIS^TAR GAŠAN=YA *parā ḫandandatar a[(p)]iya=ya mekki tekkuš[(šanu)]t*
 ‘Ishtar, My Lady, also then 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
ZAG KUR ^{URU.d}U-*tašša=ya kuiš KUR* ^{ÍD}Hūlayaš
 ‘And the Hulaya River Land that is also a boundary territory of the Land of Tarhuntassa.’

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 apēdani=ya mēḫuni šer akta*
 ‘But Kurunta died for me also at that time.’ (i. e. was willing to die)
- (20) Bo 86/299 ii 94–95
^{m.d}LAMMA-*an kēdani memiyani lē kuiški taparriyaizzi ANA* ^{m.d}LAMMA=*ya ANA DUMU=ŠU DUMU.DUMU=ŠU kī išḫiūl ēšdu*
 ‘Let no one command Kurunta in this matter. Also for Kurunta, 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-ēznani ŪL=ya tittanuzi
 ‘Even if your father does not 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 Maṣat 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 also in all 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=mu šallai pedi ANA KUR^{URU} Hatti LUGAL-eznani [(ti)]ttanut ammuk=ma ANA^d IŠTAR GAŠAN=YA É^{m.d} SIN.^d U ADDIN [n=a]t=kan EGIR-an tarnahḫun 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 tarnahḫun n=at ANA DINGIR-LIM parā ADDIN É^{m.d} SIN.^d U=ma=šši kuit ADDIN nu URU.DIDLI. ḪI.A kuiēš kuiēš [Š]A^{m.d} SIN.^d U n=an=kan ḫūmanti=ya=pat EGIR-an^{NA4} ZI. KIN [t]ittanuškanzi^{DUG} ḫaršiyali=ya=kan išḫuiškanzi

‘She installed me in a high position, the kingship of Hatti, and I gave Ishtar, My Lady, the house of Arma-Tarhunta. 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. As for the house of Arma-Tarhunta 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 kiššan=a memišta* ‘Tarḫunmiya has spoken to me also as follows’. The second (line 21) has fronting: *kiššan=a=mu memiš[ta]* ‘He also spoke to me as follows’. I emphasize that nothing would have prevented a structure *nu=mu kiššan=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. FRANCA (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*, *-ja*, *-ma* im Althethischen und das Akkadogram \dot{U} . In: M. OFITSCH & C. ZINKO (eds.), *125 Jahre Indogermanistik in Graz*. Graz: Leykam, 411–419.

