

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

**Bell & Howell Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600**

UMI[®]

A Synchronic and Diachronic Functional Analysis of Hittite *-ma*

by

Michael David Meacham

**B.A. (University of Colorado, Boulder) 1985
M.A. (University of California, Berkeley) 1992**

**A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the
requirements for the degree of**

**Doctor of Philosophy
in**

Linguistics

in the

GRADUATE DIVISION

of the

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

Committee in charge:

**Professor Gary B. Holland, Chair
Professor Eve E. Sweetser
Professor Ruggero Stefanini**

Fall 2000

UMI Number: 3002196

UMI[®]

UMI Microform 3002196

Copyright 2001 by Bell & Howell Information and Learning Company.

All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

Bell & Howell Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

A Synchronic and Diachronic Functional Analysis of Hittite *-ma*

© 2000

by

Michael David Meacham

Acknowledgments

The process of writing a dissertation can take place only with the aid of others. I am very grateful to the members of my committee for the guidance and assistance with which they provided me in preparing this study: Gary Holland, my very patient and supportive adviser, who made suggestions informed by wide knowledge and intellectual clarity that were always to my benefit; Eve Sweetser, whose thoughtful and thought-provoking comments without doubt improved the work; and Ruggero Stefanini, who introduced me to Hittite, and who made many helpful recommendations that strengthened the study. To these scholars goes my deepest gratitude.

To the staff of the Linguistics Department I owe many thanks, especially to Belén Flores and Esther Weiss.

For taking action that sustained me throughout the period of writing I am grateful to Ardy and Ernie Ballard, Jeanette and Arvin Billings, Ed Doran, Maggie Law, A. C. Liang, Jo Meacham, Dave Stewart, Laurel Sutton and Quentin Tuck, and Mark Watrous-Heyliger. For their help in equipping me for the task I thank Spencer Ballard and Paul Pogorzelski, Debbie Jan, and Laurel Sutton.

I am very appreciative of the assistance offered me by several individuals at key points in the process: Bette Anton, Spencer Ballard and Paul Pogorzelski, Barbara De Marco, Madelaine Plauché, Madalene Rodriguez, and Bill Weigel. Their actions might have seemed trivial to them, but they helped me immensely.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments	i
Table of Contents	ii
List of Abbreviations and Symbols	vi
Notes on Translation and Glossing	viii
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
1.1 Impetus and Inquiry	1
1.2 Previous Treatments	5
1.3 Pragmatic Preliminaries	10
1.3.1 Topic	13
1.3.2 Focus	17
1.3.3 Backgrounding	19
1.4 Brief Sketch of Hittite Clause Syntax	19
1.4.1 Basic Syntax with regard to <i>-ma</i>	22
1.4.2 The Form of <i>-ma</i>	23
1.5 Corpus	23
1.6 Prospect	26
Notes to Chapter 1	28
Chapter 2: <i>-ma</i> in Old Hittite	33
2.0 Introduction	33
2.0.1 Texts and Data	34
2.1 Phonological Distribution	34
2.2 Syntax	38
2.3 Pragmatics	42
2.3.1 Topic	42
2.3.2 Focus	47
2.3.2.1 Contrast	49
2.3.2.2 New Referents	53
2.3.3 Orientation	57
2.3.4 Summary	61
2.4 <i>-ma</i> and the Other Enclitic Conjunctions	63
2.4.1 <i>-a</i> vs. <i>-a/-ya</i>	64
2.4.2 <i>-a</i> and <i>-ma</i>	73
2.4.2.1 Phonological Distribution	74

	iii
2.4.2.2 Syntax	74
2.4.2.3 Functional Contexts	77
2.4.2.4 More on <i>-a</i> and <i>-a/-ya</i>	85
2.4.2.5 Scope of <i>-ma</i> and <i>-a</i>	88
2.4.3 Summary	94
2.5 More on Adversative Marking in Conditional Clauses	95
2.6 Response to Starke and Luraghi	103
Notes to Chapter 2	107
Chapter 3: <i>-ma</i> in Neo-Hittite	117
3.0 Introduction	117
3.0.1 Texts and Data	117
3.1 Phonological Distribution	119
3.2 Syntax	122
3.2.1 <i>-ma</i> with <i>mān</i>	123
3.2.2 <i>-ma</i> with <i>nu</i>	125
3.2.3 <i>-ma</i> with Akkadograms and Sumerograms	125
3.2.4 Further Host Syntax	129
3.2.5 Syntax with respect to Neighboring Clauses	130
3.3 Pragmatics	135
3.3.1 Focus	135
3.3.1.1 Contrast	135
3.3.1.1.1 Strong Contrast; Repeated Form	135
3.3.1.1.2 Weak Contrast	141
3.3.1.1.3 Series	143
3.3.1.1.4 Counterexpectation	148
3.3.1.2 New Referents	152
3.3.1.3 Emphasis	156
3.3.1.3.1 Variant Word Order	156
3.3.1.3.2 Orthotonic Personal Pronouns	159
3.3.1.4 <i>-ma</i> 's Attachment to Focal Elements	160
3.3.2 Orientation	160
3.3.2.1 Paragraph-Initial <i>-ma</i>	166
3.3.3 Subject Switch	168
3.4 A Brief Look at Neo-Hittite Clause-Connective <i>-a/-ya</i>	171
3.4.1 Frequency, Phonological Distribution, and Syntactic Distribution	172
3.4.2 Functional Contexts	176

	iv
3.5 Conclusion	182
Notes to Chapter 3	185
Chapter 4: <i>-ma</i> in Middle Hittite	191
4.0 Introduction	191
4.0.1 Texts and Data	192
4.1 Phonological Distribution	194
4.2 Syntactic Distribution	194
4.2.1 <i>-ma</i> with <i>mān</i>	195
4.2.2 <i>-ma</i> with <i>nu</i>	196
4.2.3 <i>-ma</i> with Akkadograms and Sumerograms	196
4.2.4 Further Host Syntax	197
4.2.5 Syntax with respect to Neighboring Clauses	198
4.3 Pragmatics	199
4.3.1 Focus	199
4.3.1.1 Contrast	199
4.3.1.1.1 Series	202
4.3.1.1.2 Counterexpectation	203
4.3.1.2 New Referents	205
4.3.1.3 Emphasis (Special Focus)	206
4.3.2 Orientation	207
4.3.2.1 Paragraph-Initial <i>-ma</i>	208
4.3.3 Subject Switch	209
4.4 <i>-a</i> in the Maṣat Letters	210
4.5 A Brief Look at Clause-Connective <i>-a/-ya</i> in the Maṣat Letters	213
4.5.1 Frequency, Phonological Distribution, and Syntactic Distribution	213
4.5.2 Functional Contexts	216
4.6 Conclusion	218
Notes to Chapter 4	220
Chapter 5: Diachronic Interpretation	227
5.0 Introduction	227
5.1 Changes in Frequency and in Phonological and Syntactic Distribution	228
5.1.1 Overall Frequency	228
5.1.2 Phonological Distribution	229
5.1.3 Syntactic Distribution	231
5.2 Changes in Pragmatic Distribution	236
5.3 Confirmation of Method	244

	v
5.4 <i>-ma</i> in the Chicago Hittite Dictionary	246
5.5 Unusual Placement of <i>-ma</i>	252
5.6 Comparative and Etymological Issues	256
5.7 Summary	261
Notes to Chapter 5	264
Chapter 6: Conclusion	268
Bibliography	274
Appendix	291
Old Hittite Data	291
Neo-Hittite Data	305
Middle Hittite Data	316

List of Abbreviations

- abl: ablative
- ABoT: *Ankara Arkeoloji Müzesinde bulunan Boğazköy tabletleri*
- AH: Apology of Hattusili = Otten 1981
- a.k.: alt kenar 'lower edge'
- all.: allative (cf. CHD L-N:xii-xiii)
- AM: Annals of Mursili = Götze 1933
- ay.: arkayüz 'reverse'
- BoTU: *Die Boghazköi-Texte in Umschrift* (Emil Forrer, 1922-26, Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft 41-42, Leipzig.)
- BT: Bronze Tablet = Otten 1988
- C: consonant
- CHD: *Chicago Hittite Dictionary* = Güterbock and Hoffner 1980ff.
- CTH: *Catalogue des textes hittites* = Laroche 1971, 1972
- DC: dependent clause
- HBM: *Hethitische Briefe aus Maşat-Höyük* = Alp 1991a
- HFAC: Hittite fragments in American collections (Gary Beckman and Harry A. Hoffner, Jr., 1985, *Journal of cuneiform studies* 37, Philadelphia.)
- HKM: *Hethitische Keilschrifttafeln aus Maşat-Höyük* = Alp 1991b
- IBoT: *İstanbul Arkeoloji Müzelerinde bulunan Boğazköy tabletleri*
- IC: independent clause
- IG: *Inscriptiones Graecae consilio et auctoritate Academiae litterarum regiae Borussicae editae*. v.9, pt.2: *Inscriptiones Thessaliae*, ed. Otto Kern. Berolini: G. Reimer, 1908 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1966).
- ILMS: Instruction to the LÚ.MEŠSAG = von Schuler 1957:22-34
- KBo: *Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi*
- KUB: *Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi*
- KZ: *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung*
- LPK: Letter of Puduhepa to a King = KUB 21.38 (Stefanini 1964, Helck 1963)
- MC: main clause
- MH: Middle Hittite (ca. 1450-1380 BCE)
- NBC: Nies Babylonian Collection, Yale University
- NH: Neo-Hittite (ca. 1380-1200 BCE)
- obv.: obverse
- oCTH: *Catalogue of Hittite Texts* online

- OH: Old Hittite (ca. 1600-1450 BCE)
- öy.: önyüz 'obverse'
- Rs.: Rückseite 'reverse'
- s.k.: sol kenar 'left edge'
- StBoT: Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten
- StBoT 8: Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 8 = Otten and Souček 1969
- SvKK: Staatsvertrag mit Kupanta-^dKAL = Friedrich 1926:95-179
- ü.k.: üst kenar 'upper edge'
- u. Rd.: unterer Rand 'lower edge'
- V: 1) vowel; 2) verb
- Vs.: Vorderseite 'obverse'
- / indicates the end of a line on a tablet, or its approximate equivalent in a translation
- § indicates a paragraph divider on tablet
- §x where x is a numeral, indicates a section of the text, or a law
- (x) where x is a numeral, indicates an example within the text
- #x where x is a numeral, indicates an example in the data in the appendix
 $1 \leq x \leq 100$ Old Hittite attestations of *-ma* and *-a*
 $1001 \leq x \leq 1412$ Neo-Hittite attestations of *-ma*
 $3001 \leq x \leq 3069$ NH attestations of unsure or broken *-ma*
 $4001 \leq x \leq 4108$ NH attestations of *-a/-ya*
 $5001 \leq x \leq 5032$ NH attestations of unsure or broken *-a/-ya*
 $6001 \leq x \leq 6070$ Middle Hittite attestations of *-ma*
 $7001 \leq x \leq 7030$ MH attestations of unsure or broken *-ma*
 $8001 \leq x \leq 8023$ MH attestations of *-a/-ya*
 $9001 \leq x \leq 9013$ MH attestations of unsure or broken *-a/-ya*
- <> text omitted by scribe, whether due to practice or error; also occasionally indicates a graphic entity
- × indicates an illegible sign

Symbols such as brackets [], parentheses (), half-brackets (¹ and ₁), and others are in general used following the conventions as described in CHD (L-N:xxix-xxx).

Notes on Translation and Glossing

In general, Hittite text is presented line by line as it occurs on its tablet. When text or its translation is instead presented as continuous text, line breaks on the tablet are each represented with a slash '/'. Wrapping lines of continuous text are indented after the first, although glosses may cause some lines to be indented. The symbol '§' indicates a line on the tablet which divides the text into sections. These sections are often called *paragraphs*, and this line is commonly called a *paragraph divider*.

Translations are ordinarily quite literal and often follow an edition of the text (as given in §2.0.1, §3.0.1, §4.0.1) or one of the standard research tools (CHD, Friedrich 1952-66, Friedrich and Kammenhuber 1975ff., Puhvel 1984ff., and Tischler 1977ff.). Where additional material is adduced, it is noted with the passage in the appendix or in the notes.

Occasionally, when the adversativity in a passage does not seem strong enough to me to warrant translation with 'but', *-ma* or *-a* is rendered with 'and'. This 'and' should be construed as having of measure of adversative meaning in addition to its connective function.

An acute accent over the stressed vowel of a word is occasionally used to indicate the prosodic peak associated with a focus in English. I regret not having been able to observe gender neutrality in all translations.

References to examples within the text are indicated with numerals enclosed in parentheses, e.g., (52). References to examples in the appendix are indicated with a numeral preceded by a number sign, e.g., #52.

Readers will find cuneiform sign values that are not the most recent ones offered in Rüster and Neu 1989. These are old friends that it is difficult to do without. (Compare a less sentimental Puhvel 1984ff. 1-2:ix.)

Predeterminers will have form *predeterminer:lexical item*.

Singular number is unmarked; plural is specified with a *p*.

Symbols used in glosses are the following:

A	accusative
AB	ablative
AL	allative
c	common gender—specified only when agreement needs to be indicated
CC	clause connector
DET	postdeterminer
DL	dative/locative
G	genitive
I	instrumental
MOD	modal
N	nominative
n	neuter gender—specified only when agreement needs to be indicated
OB	objective: accusative and dative-locative forms identical and case not clear
p	plural
PPL	participle
PV	enclitic preverb
QU	quotative particle
QUOT	quotative particle
REL	relative
RFL	‘reflexive particle’
SUP	supine
V	vocative
x!	imperative verb, or negative used with imperatives

Chapter 1

Introduction

§1.1 Impetus and Inquiry

Often in linguistic study, the more common a form, the more difficult it is to describe. Consider the difficulty in developing a linguistic definition of the *word* or the *paragraph*. Grammatical articles, pervasive in many languages, can carry surprisingly complicated notions of identifiability, givenness, and referential importance (Chafe 1994:93-107). Conjunctions, too, eminently grammatical entities, are ubiquitous, but despite their commonness, they signify relationships that can be extremely complex (cf. Sweetser 1990:76-112).

Hittite, an Indo-European language of ancient Anatolia, has a large number of so-called coordinating conjunctions (see §1.4). In reality they are perhaps better termed *connectors* than conjunctions, since they function with less reference to grammatical (in)dependency than those elements we conventionally think of as conjunctions (*and* or *but*). In treating these connectors, Hittitologists have also encountered difficulties in coming to terms with their meanings and their functions.

Hittite clauses are, naturally, often linked by means of these connectors (see §1.4). One connector is *-ma*, commonly considered adversative and glossed with ‘but’ or German ‘aber’.

(1) AM II.7.A Vs. I 12-14; #1069 ¹

nu=za kāsma aú ^dU NIR.GÁL=mu *BELI-YA* mahḥan piran
 ḥūiyanza nu=mu idālaui parā *ŪL* tamāi
 āššauī= **ma**=mu parā tarmān ḥarzi
 { good.DL *-ma* me forth left has }

‘Now behold, how the mighty Storm-god, my lord, is supportive of me; he does not deliver me to evil, / **but** has delivered me to good’

(2) StBoT 8 Rs. IV 11-13; #31

§ [m]ān LUGAL-uš SAL.LUGAL-ašš=a taranzi ta DUMUMEŠ-an parna paimi
 [tak]u natta=ma taranzi nu natta paimi ...
 { if not -ma they say CC not I go }

‘§ [W]hen the king and queen say (so), I go to the house of the children.
 But [i]f they do not say (so), then I do not go. ...’

However, -ma sometimes seems to mean ‘and’:

(3) StBoT 8 Rs. III 3-6; #29

§ ta namma MUŠENḫāranan nēpiša tarnahḫi
 āppan-anda=ma=šše kē mēmahḫi natta=an ūk
 { after -in -ma to it these I say }
 tarnahḫun LUGAL-š=an SAL.LUGAL-š=a tarnas ...

‘§ Then I release the eagle into heaven
 and after(wards) I say these (words) to it: “Not I have
 released it, the king and queen have released it. ...”’

(4) AM I.A Vs. II 7-10; #1012

§ namma URUPalḫuiššaz EGIR-pa /NA URUKÙ.BABBAR-ti úwanun
 nu=za ERÍN.MEŠ ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ nininkun namma apēdani MU-ti /NA KUR
 Arzauwa / iyanniyanun=pat ANA mŪḫḫa-LÚ=ma LUṬEMA uiyanun / nu=šši ḫatrānun
 { to Ūḫḫaziti -ma messenger I sent }

‘§ Then from Palḫuišša I came back to Ḫattuša,
 and I raised an army and a (force of) chariotry. Furthermore in that year I also marched to
 Arzawa. And to Ūḫḫaziti I sent a messenger, / and wrote to him: ...’

The equivalent ‘aber’ for -ma was the first early translation that gained wide acceptance in Hittitology, and it is this meaning that predominates in text editions and other research, including examples (2) and (4) ((1) is rendered with the even stronger ‘sondern’, Götze 1933:149). Some prominent scholars use it almost exclusively even now. Yet occasionally one will find translations of -ma with ‘and’ or ‘und’, as in the case of example (3) (Otten and Souček 1969:31). Hints of ‘and’ connotations are also present when Greek

dé has been used as a gloss for *-ma*, to the extent that *dé* can be rendered with ‘and’.² And Friedrich (1929) recognized that *-ma* did not mean ‘aber’ in all situations. With one exception, *-ma* itself has not been the object of directed study; consequently, it is understandable if, aside from Friedrich’s comments and a few observations on its syntax, the primary descriptions we have for the particle are glosses. Nevertheless, if *-ma* seems to mean ‘but’ in some cases and ‘and’ in others, the connector does not always appear to function as a prototypically strong adversative. This suggests the need for a principled reinvestigation of the semantics and uses of *-ma*.

While the translations we see in editions of texts may not be linguistic descriptions per se, they invite inferences about the meaning and the function of *-ma*. From these we understand *-ma* to be a conjunction that links clauses, most often with a connotation of adversativity. Specifying the lexical semantics of basic conjunctions can be a difficult task; providing a meaning for a grammatical item like a conjunction without resorting to glosses probably always requires some appeal to the item’s function. Compare, for example, Sweetser’s account of the semantics of *but*, which is closely associated with a description of that conjunction’s function (1990:100-111). If a form’s meaning is grammatical, and if grammar is how a language works, then specifying the form’s meaning may well entail specifying its function.

As stated above, most Hittitologists have accepted for *-ma* the conjunctive function and the adversative meaning that translations with ‘but’ or ‘aber’ imply. However, in the last 25 years newer linguistic descriptions have been proposed. In this period *-ma* has been characterized as a subordinating conjunction with no adversative meaning, a coordinating conjunction with pragmatically subordinating effect, a marker of correlation, a marker of discontinuity, and as an emphatic particle, a contrastive focus marker, and a topic marker (see §1.2 below). Interesting here are the virtually opposite views attributing to *-ma* the marking of foregrounded information (particularly *focus*) and of backgrounded information (‘pragmatically subordinating’). The lack of consensus among linguists as to

-ma's function makes the particle a suitable subject for research and reiterates the need for a principled investigation into its use.

The goal of this study is to determine whether *-ma* marks pragmatic categories as put forth in the new descriptions of its function. The primary strategy for meeting this goal is to examine the contexts in which it occurs.

The theoretical question implicit in this investigation is whether it is possible to apply contemporary pragmatic concepts, like *topic*, *focus*, and *background*, to a language such as Hittite, which is less well preserved and understood than Latin and Greek. We cannot, for example, carry out fine-grained investigations like those undertaken by Pinkster, Bolkestein, and others.³ Although fairly well understood and with a respectable amount of textual evidence, Hittite in no way compares in these categories to the Classical languages. But researchers investigating Hittite pragmatics share with their counterparts in Classics certain limitations in their work. It is not possible to ask native speakers about their intuitions about linguistic forms or to witness the interactions of speakers. Informative qualities like intonation are only occasionally inferable. The evidence, being written, does not preserve language as it was actually spoken, but a conventionalized form of the language (which may nonetheless be more convenient for contemporary linguists). While my results may not be as robust as those obtaining from the investigation of a living language, or of Latin or Greek, some are informative.

In the remainder of chapter 1, I will review the literature on *-ma*, including the recent suggestions concerning its function. I will then define the pragmatic terms used in my investigation. After this I will offer a brief sketch of Hittite syntax and basic statements concerning *-ma*'s syntax and form. The following section deals with the selection of the texts used in analysis, and the final section lays out the course of the study.

§1.2 Previous Treatments

With one exception, *-ma* has received rather little attention in Hittitological studies—treatments in textual commentaries and grammatical investigations have for the most part been limited to glosses and extremely brief characterizations. This convention begins with the earliest grammatical descriptions and continues over the next five decades.

In the first such work to appear, a preliminary report on the progress of linguistic research into the finds from Boghazköi, Friedrich Hrozný (1915:34) suggests the meaning „dann, ferner“ for *-ma* and gives the first equation with Greek *dé* (via Thessalian *má*). In *Die Sprache der Hethiter*, the first book-length grammatical study to appear, Hrozný (1917) presents Hittite morphological classes and adduces Indo-European comparisons when possible. For *-ma* he gives the equivalence ‘enklit. „dann, ferner; aber“ ’ (1917:185, 231). In fact, he translates *-ma* in his examples most often with ‘ferner’, for he understands *-ma* as primarily continuative: ‘*-ma* führt wohl gewöhnlich die Erzählung weiter, bedeutet somit etwa „dann, ferner“, gelegentlich auch wohl „aber“ u. ä.’ (1917:102 n.4). Variations on this basic theme are often to be found in later scholars’ work. Hrozný continues to understand *-ma* so in his edition of the Hittite laws (1922). Here he translates *-ma* with French ‘alors’ (pp.9, 19), ‘puis’ (p.9), ‘mais’ (p.19), and also ‘et’ (p.31).

Ferdinand Sommer (1920) offers interpretations of selected topics in Hittite texts: Aryan numeral constructions, *nāwi* (‘noch nicht’), and *gimmanza* (‘Winter’), some of these diverging from Hrozný’s opinions. In discussing an example of the numerals, he writes, ‘*-ma*-, enklitische Partikel, bedeutet „aber“ ’ (1920:4); indeed, he asserts that *-ma* ‘nach meiner Prüfung an allen deutbaren Stellen „aber“ heißt’, and harshly criticizes Hrozný’s ‘bequem und charakterlos’ (convenient and without character) translation with ‘ferner’ (1920:4 n.1). Sommer expands the translational equivalents to include ‘doch’ and ‘sondern’ (1932:414) in his impressive examination of documents relating to the still unidentified land of Ahhiyawa. He also notes delay of *-ma* and double placement (see summary of Ungnad 1925 below), and he identifies a special use of *-ma* (not found in my

study), double questions (1932:77-78; cf. CHD 92-93), where *-ma* marks the second of a pair of questions posing contrasting alternatives.

As part of working out the details of enclitic chains (see §1.4), Arthur Ungnad (1920) analyzes the form *naš* as a combination of the clause-introductory particle *nu* and the enclitic 3.sg. pronoun *-aš*. He briefly reviews the particles involved in clause linkage, including ‘das anreihende *nu* ..., das fortführende *namma* ..., und das mehr adversative *-ma*’, as well as *-a* ‘and’, and terms these four ‘konjuntionale Partikeln’ (1920:417). So here appears for the first time the label *adversativ* with reference to *-ma*.⁴

Ungnad (1925) offers the first explicit description of the syntax of *-ma*, namely that *-ma* and *-a* as a rule occur enclitic to the first ‘Wortkomplex’ in the clause and precede particles of other types occurring in the enclitic string (1925:104). The main thrust of his article is to show the syntax of delayed *-ma* and *-a* (see §2.2 below). Here *-ma* and *-a* attach to the second word of the clause when the clause begins with *takku* ‘if’ or *mān* ‘when; if’, as well as with *kuiš* ‘who(ever)’, *kuššan* ‘when’, and *našma* ‘or’. Ungnad also observes that *-ma* can occur twice in the clause, attaching in delayed position as just described, and attaching also to the delaying conjunction (see §3.2.1 below).

In spite of Ungnad’s explicitly linguistic accounts of *-ma*, scholars preferred to employ Sommer’s short and simple equivalent. His gloss ‘aber’, with a reference to his 1920 article, became the standard translation of *-ma* in literary and linguistic investigations in the early decades of Hittitology. Reference to Ungnad’s account of the enclitic syntax (1920) was often given immediately thereafter.⁵ Even with this standard, however, it was clear to some that *-ma* was not so simply dispensed with. In an article concerning hypothetical constructions, Johannes Friedrich (1929) explained the use of the modal particle *man*: with past-tense verbs, *man* renders the clause counterfactual; *man* with present/future verbs gives the potential. In a note relating to his discussion of antithesis in such constructions (which he finds weaker than in Classical types), Friedrich writes: ‘Andererseits entspricht das heth. *-ma* unserem „aber“ zwar in den meisten, jedoch

keineswegs in allen Fällen, and Ähnliches gilt von anderen Konjunktionen. Eine Sonderuntersuchung darüber wäre am Platze' (1929:293 n.3).

Albrecht Götze, in his editions of the Madduwatta text (1928) and of the Annals of Mursili (1933), distinguishes occasional emphatic occurrence of *-ma* ('zur Hervorhebung e[ines] Wortes') from the usual clause-connective use. In the latter work he also indicated that he would in future write on *-ma*, 'die eine neue Person einführt' (1933:198; cf. Houwink ten Cate 1973:134 with n.83). Hans Ehelolf (1926) noticed *-ma* marking complementary concepts.

Edgar Sturtevant (1936) provided the first English glossary of forms occurring in Hittite texts. Under the entry for *-ma* one sees: '(precedes other enclitics) 'aber, [dē]'; English idiom sometimes requires 'but', sometimes 'and', and frequently no English translation is possible' (1936:95), which is a synthesis of equivalents given in his comparative grammar (1933). A similar entry is given in Sturtevant and Bechtel (1935:90).

In the section on *-ma*, Friedrich (1960:161-162 §§318-319 (=1940:93 §§321-322 with very minor revisions)) also gives such an equivalent in his grammar: '*-ma* entspricht unserem „aber“, ist aber gelegentlich etwas schwächer (wie griech. [dē])'. Sometimes it is so weak as to be left unexpressed in translation, as in apodoses. Friedrich's grammar is the only work available which covers a broad range of grammatical topics in a manageable size; treatments are typically brief yet very informative. As such, the second edition (1960) has remained an indispensable reference for Hittite studies, even though it is based primarily on data from Neo-Hittite. Friedrich also presents syntactic descriptions for *-ma*. Here the particle is a coordinating conjunction and usually occurs enclitic to the first stressed word of the clause, but can conditionally be delayed to the second word. Friedrich also notes *-ma*'s infrequent occurrence in apodoses and in clauses with *nu*, its double occurrence within a clause, and its occurrence in double questions (1960:147 §285 for the last). We see, then, a useful collection of previous observations.

In Friedrich's dictionary we find nearly the same equivalent for *-ma* as in the grammar: '(enklitische Konj.) „aber“ ... oft schwächer und ähnlich griech. [*dē*]' (1952-66:132). Also like the grammar, the dictionary is a succinct but still indispensable tool for Hittite research, primarily because, in addition to lexical material from the other languages found in Hittite texts, it contains vocabulary from the entire Hittite alphabet, in contrast to more recent, detailed studies.

Reinhard Sternemann (1966) discusses the semantics, functions, and syntax of several Hittite subordinating conjunctions, such as *mān* 'when; if', *takku* 'if', and *maḥḥan* 'as, when'. In the section on syntax, he also describes the placement of stressed and enclitic clause connectives in subordinating contexts and notes their increased frequency in the later language. Here Sternemann glosses *-ma* with 'aber, [*dē*]' and confirms others' statements on syntactic distribution, including the observations that *-ma* attaches to *mān* less frequently than to the word following *mān*, and that it never attaches to *takku* (1966:398ff.).

In his examination of Anatolian clause-introductory particles, Onofrio Carruba discusses the spatiotemporal particles *-kan*, *-šan*, *-ašta*, and *-apa*, but does not really treat most conjunctions, e.g., *-ma* and *-a*. Nevertheless it is here that we see the first attempts at a new kind of description. Comparing the two types of particle, Carruba notes that *nu*, *-ma*, and *-a* occur at the beginning of new action, distinct from the preceding action, where their function as coordinating and continuative ('fortführende') conjunctions is clear. While these three 'einen tieferen Abschnitt der Handlung und/oder des Gedankenganges kennzeichne[n], etwa unseren längeren Pausen (Punkt) entsprechend', the other particles he investigates describe the spatial and temporal underpinnings of the predication (1969:18). The conjunctions thus signal a break with the preceding. Further on, Carruba may somewhat contradict his earlier acceptance of *-ma* as continuative when he compares Lycian *me* with 'dem leicht adversativen *-ma* ... [which appears] ... ohne Fortschritt in der Handlung zu bezeichnen' (1969:76). In more recent work on the same topic, Carruba

presents a brief characterization of *-ma*, which here ‘eine leicht emphatische Funktion hat, und oft, vor allem in Texten aus dem Großreich mehr oder weniger leicht adversativ anmutet’ (1985:82). Unfortunately, he does not discuss this emphatic function further.

Philo Houwink ten Cate (1973) establishes that non-geminating *-a* was a separate linguistic entity from geminating *-a/-ya*, i.e., an adversative emphatic enclitic. He sees an emphatic function as possible for *-ma*, similar to that of his primary subject, but leans toward classifying *-ma* as a sentence connective (pp.129-130). Houwink ten Cate also observes that *-ma* serves to introduce a new subject in apodoses (p.134). Given the very closely related subject matter of Houwink ten Cate’s article, I will make frequent reference to it in this study.

In Frank Starke’s study of Old Hittite grammatical cases expressing physical (as opposed to logical) relations, he makes observations on many topics, including some tangentially related to his investigation. For example, he initially sees *-ma* as a non-adversative particle marking parallel, but subsidiary, action, and later strengthens this somewhat to an element with ‘exclusively subordinating, explanatory function’ translatable with ‘while’ (1977:37, 74).⁶ So here we have the first description of *-ma* as serving to background information. I believe there is an element of truth here, but that Starke’s position is too extreme, and I respond to it in §2.6.

The Chicago Hittite Dictionary presents the first study specifically about *-ma* (L-N:91-99). In CHD, *-ma* is a conjunction which marks a correlation between two words or phrases in adjacent clauses, or between clauses or paragraphs. On their view *-ma* does not function as a subordinating or coordinating conjunction. CHD offers many examples showing the different structures which *-ma* ‘correlates’, e.g., double questions. CHD presents the syntax, and many examples, of *-ma* attaching to the second word of the clause, as well as a few of placement later in the clause. I hold different views of the phenomena discussed in the article, but our presentations are complementary. I respond in detail to CHD’s treatment of *-ma* in §5.4.

H. Craig Melchert (1985), in working out the etymology of Hittite *imma* ‘moreover, indeed, etc.’, appropriates Schwyzer’s (1950 2:562) description of Greek *dé* to serve for *-ma* (and *-a*): ‘Es bezeichnet, daß (gegenüber dem Vorhergehenden) etwas Anderes, Neues kommt ...’, which description in fact coincides with my findings.

In her account of Old Hittite syntax, Silvia Luraghi (1990) considers *-ma* to be an e conjunction and observes its special syntax (p.14). As I understand her position, she holds that *-ma* indicates textual discontinuity, as in parenthetical remarks and backgrounded information, and that the enclitic frequently expresses adversativity by indicating situations that are contrary to expectations (pp.50-54). Concerning the former, she follows Starke’s ideas of the backgrounding and explanatory function of *-ma*. I disagree with many of Luraghi’s views, and I respond to her also in §2.6.

Finally, in his study of Anatolian pronominal clitics, Andrew Garrett (1990), with reference to all of Hittite, acknowledges some clause-connective function of *-ma*, but suggests that it is primarily an emphatic particle with word-scope, more specifically a contrastive focus marker (1990:15-18, 247). Garrett (1996) has also classed *-ma* as a topic marker, about which see §1.3.1.

§1.3 Pragmatic Preliminaries

Several concepts arise from reviewing the scholarly treatments and opinions of *-ma* (§1.2): *-ma* as adversative conjunction (most descriptions up to 1973), *-ma* as referent-introducing form (Götze 1933), *-ma* as emphatic particle (Götze 1933, a possibility per Houwink ten Cate 1973), *-ma* as backgrounding form (Starke 1977, Luraghi 1990), *-ma* as contrastive focus particle (Garrett 1990, 1992), *-ma* as marker of discontinuity, specifically counterexpectational (Luraghi 1990), and *-ma* as topic marker (Garrett 1996). These concepts are pragmatic in nature, and it is the goal of this study to determine whether *-ma* is used specifically to mark any of these pragmatic categories, and if so, then how it marks the category, or if not, then what it does mark (or how it does function). To achieve

this goal I will analyze texts while employing relevant concepts that have been identified in pragmatic theory. I organize the concepts mentioned above as follows: a) topic; b) focus, including contrast and adversativity, new referents, emphasis, and counterexpectation; and c) background.

The properties and structure of discourse have been the object of much research, and the body of literature has become great,⁷ but some basic themes run throughout, e.g., what is being talked about, what is being said about it, whether it is known to both speaker and hearer, whether information is in the foreground or background, etc. For the purposes of this study, basic definitions of these concepts will suffice, because it is a first attempt at such analysis, and because the absence of native speakers limits our inquiry (see below).

Of the many researchers it would be possible to follow in identifying workable definitions of these pragmatic concepts, Chafe (1994) presents a reasonable approach, appealing by virtue of his attention to actual language production.⁸ Chafe's primary concern is the interaction between consciousness and language in speaking and writing. His conclusions are based on observations of English, and he acknowledges that they will not all hold for all languages. He demonstrates, for example, that his notion *subject* is not relevant for Seneca. But most properties he identifies are of a general enough nature that it would be surprising if they did not apply to all languages. Nevertheless he does not include as relevant parameters some of the areas that need to be investigated here, e.g., *topic* and *focus* per se, and it is thus necessary to include the ideas of other scholars. Such concepts are employed here at such a rudimentary level that differences among the theories used should be minimal. While I favor the approach of Chafe, there is no reason the same or similar results could not have been achieved by using the work of Prince or Lambrecht, for instance. Below are brief characterizations of the pragmatic concepts bearing on this investigation of Hittite.

An important concept in studies of discourse and information structure is the status of information in the mind of the hearer, as judged by the speaker. Chafe terms this

‘activation cost’ (1994:73), i.e., whether a discourse referent is *given*, *accessible*, or *new* determines the degree of mental effort required for it to become given for the hearer. Given information is what the speaker assumes to be active in the hearer’s focal consciousness. It is typically expressed by weak accent and pronouns. The speaker assumes new information to be inactive in the hearer’s consciousness at the time of its introduction into the discourse. It is typically expressed with noun phrases and with primary accent. Accessible information is judged to be semiactive in the hearer’s consciousness: it was either previously active in the discourse, is directly associated with an idea previously or currently active in the discourse, or is associated with the non-linguistic environment of the discourse. Accessible information is typically expressed with noun phrases, and with accent, which is often secondary (Chafe 1994:71-87).

Chafe’s activation states/costs correspond in most cases to categories developed by Prince under the title *assumed familiarity* (which she favors over *shared knowledge* and the point-of-view of omniscient observer that that term implies to her). Chafe’s *given* corresponds to Prince’s *evoked* (in the text), but her *situationally evoked* seems to compare with one of Chafe’s possibilities for *accessible*, being associated with the non-linguistic environment of the discourse. Chafe’s *new* corresponds to three categories of Prince: *brand-new*, *brand-new-anchored*, and *unused*. Brand-new entities are entirely new to the hearer at their introduction. Brand-new-anchored entities have the additional feature of being linked to another discourse entity, as with a relative clause. Unused entities are assumed to be known to the hearer at their introduction into the discourse. Prince also proposes the category of *inferable* (with two subtypes): a discourse entity is inferable if the speaker assumes the hearer can infer it, by logical or plausible reasoning, from other already evoked or inferable discourse entities (Prince 1981b:232-237). This category would correspond to Chafe’s *accessible*.

Prince’s categories certainly form a reasonable taxonomy of information status, but some are not possible to use when investigating Hittite texts. It is as good as impossible

for us to determine whether an entity was, for instance, brand-new or unused, since we do not know for certain to what audience an author was addressing his text, or, *a fortiori*, what the information status of entities would have been for this audience.⁹ These complications would also affect the identification of inferrable entities. Given the fact that most texts contain substantial gaps due to breaks in tablets, we do well in most cases to accurately identify an entity as new. We might be able to identify brand-new-anchored entities should they occur in a relative clause. We would have a good chance of detecting evoked entities if tablet breaks do not interfere. For most cases, Chafe's taxonomy is adequate.

Chafe also finds *identifiability* to be an important discourse parameter, approximately equivalent to, but more consistent than, the notion of *definiteness* found in other studies. Formally definite expressions may in fact be generic (The grizzly bear *is an omnivore*) or indefinite (*So this guy comes up...*). A referent is identifiable if knowledge of it is directly or indirectly shared by the hearer, if the hearer can categorize it, given the speaker's verbalization, and if it is contextually salient (Chafe 1994:92-107). Its relevance to the present study is unclear, however, because it is also difficult here to determine accurately what in a Hittite text would have been identifiable to the audience for whom the text was produced.

§1.3.1 Topic

Concerning the term *topic*, one may note that it can have at least two meanings in the current context, the first referring to a referent at the clause-level in a discourse (*sentence topic*), and the second referring to larger thematic concepts of a discourse (*discourse topic*) (Givón 1983:7-8, Lambrecht 1994:117 with further references).¹⁰ In this study I will use the term *topic* to refer to sentence topics and the phrase *discourse topic* to refer to discourse topics.

Lambrecht carefully defines the topic as the referent that a proposition in a given situation 'is construed as being about'; this proposition expresses 'information which is relevant to and which increases the addressee's knowledge of' the referent (1994:131). In an earlier article Reinhart presents a similar, though formal, analysis of topic and 'aboutness' (1981:78-87).

Reinhart also observes that non-subject topics exist, and that sometimes it is difficult to determine which of two equally given referring expressions is *the* topic. Givón recognizes that more than one referent can be topical in a discourse at a given point, and has devised measures for the degree of topicality of a given referent, depending on how often and how far away it occurs in the preceding and succeeding context (1983, 1990). Although these three scholars have different approaches and different concerns, common to their work is the acknowledgment that the sentence topic is a relevant notion and that sentence topics have to do with entities (rather than events or states).

Following these scholars, whose work grew out of a long tradition of research into discourse (see Givón 1990:900), I will understand *topic* to be the referent that a given clause 'is about', although, in light of Lambrecht's idea of topic, this brief description should include the notion that a proposition underlies the clause. Determination of a topic should be made with reference to more than one clause.

Givón observes that the more topical a referent, the less phonological material is necessary to (en)code it, and he presents a scale of topic instantiation that proceeds from greater to lesser topicality: zero anaphora, unstressed pronouns, stressed pronouns, full NPs (1983:18). This scale is consistent with the observation that topics are more often given, definite entities and less commonly new, indefinite ones. I will use Givón's scale as a guide in the identification of topics.

Having determined a rudimentary, usable definition of topic, I will briefly state that I do not follow Halliday's notion of *theme*, the first item in a sentence and that with which the sentence is concerned (1985). Forms other than referents, e.g., adverbs, may be

construed as the *theme* under this definition, so it is inconsistent with my idea of topic.

Another idea of topic is found in Garrett (1992), an analysis of the Lycian topic construction. Here *topic* is a 'syntactically defined notion', presumably following Hale's (1987) proposed phrase structure for Indo-European, where TOP[ic] and COMP[lement] positions precede the main part of the clause. If this same notion of *topic* underlies the description of *-ma* as a 'topic marker' (Garrett 1996), then this use of *topic* is obviously also incompatible with my notion of the term.

The construction Garrett (1992) analyzes concerns left-dislocation, where a referring expression occurs to the left of, i.e., before, the clause and is also 'resumed' by a pronoun in the clause proper. Prince has devoted much study to left-dislocation and to the syntactically similar topicalization, where a referring expression that is a constituent occurs to the left of its clause, but is not resumed by a pronoun within the clause (1981a, 1992, 1997, 1998, Ward and Prince 1991). In general, however, Prince does not make use of the category *topic* except to compare how it does or does not coincide with her analysis (e.g., Prince 1992, 1998). For instance, Prince (1998) finds that neither left-dislocated nor topicalized forms in English involve topics. Givón categorizes the two constructions as 'marked topic constructions', and finds that left-dislocation and (contrastive) topicalization do involve topics (1990:752-760).

Whichever view one follows, left-dislocation in Hittite is exceedingly rare and occurs in only one possible example in my corpus, that is, marked with *-ma* (see chapter 2, example (21)). Topicalized forms must occur, but detecting them is difficult because 1) clauses in general do not contain all the constituents necessary to qualify the clause as a case of topicalization (e.g., orthotonic direct object placed clause-initially before orthotonic subject), and because 2) clausal constituents in general conform to a dominant order. In some cases, clausal syntax that does not adhere to a dominant order indicates to the reader the presence of a marked construction, e.g., topicalization. Beyond this, detecting cases of topicalization would be dependent either on intonational cues, making for a difficult

situation in the absence of native Hittite speakers, or on the sensitivity of the modern-day reader. Whether these cases then actually involve topics, as opposed to focal elements, for example, remains to be determined.

Chafe does not find that inquiries into the nature of topic have contributed to our knowledge about English and questions its relevance for English and other languages (1994:84). For some languages, though, in particular some Asian ones, he recognizes topic as a relevant notion. He reserves the term *topic* for use with the concept of discourse topic (see note 10). Chafe finds that the notion *subject* is more relevant for studying English. For him a subject is a starting point, a hitching post for new contributions, and he believes the starting-point role has been grammaticalized in the subject (pp.82-92). The subject would thus have both syntactic and pragmatic function in English.

I am not convinced that the notion of topic is irrelevant in English, especially when it receives coherent treatment compatible with the notion of subject. Lambrecht (and others) understand subjects as unmarked, or default, topics (1994:136; cf. Givón 1990:901-902); the subject of a sentence will most often be the topic as well, but this convention can be overridden.¹¹ There is, after all, a resemblance between Chafe's description of those starting points that are given in the discourse and about which a new contribution is made and between Lambrecht's description of (subject) topics that are given and about which a comment is made (p.164).

Consistent with both views, whatever the importance of the topic, is the characterization of English as a subject-prominent language (as opposed to a topic-prominent language (Li and Thompson 1976)). As far as I can determine, Hittite is like English in that subjects and topics correlate highly. Justus (1976) views Hittite as being topic-prominent, and I address this matter in §2.3.1.

If the function of *-ma* is to mark topics, then we may expect it to cooccur with a change of topic, since we do not see the connector in every clause with a topic. Given the

high correlation between topics and subjects, we would then expect to see *-ma* marking a change of subject as well.

§1.3.2 Focus

As with the term *topic*, Chafe avoids using *focus*, another term with a storied past (1994:78). Lambrecht defines *focus* non-technically as ‘the UNPREDICTABLE or pragmatically NON-RECOVERABLE element in an utterance’ (1994:207). Givón holds a similar view and states that ‘(t)he majority of sentences/clauses in connected discourse will have only one chunk—be it a nominal, predicate (verb, adjective) or adverbial word/phrase—under the scope of asserted new information’ (1984:258),¹² and that this new information is ‘communicatively most salient—i.e., the focus of new information’ (p.260). One might say that the focus is the *informative* element in an utterance, that which *informs* or adds to the knowledge of the hearer, but its activation state need not be new—it may be given or accessible (cf. Lambrecht 1994:43-50). To the extent that Lambrecht or Givón’s new or non-recoverable information is actually new (inactive in the hearer’s consciousness), these descriptions are comparable to Chafe’s *one new idea constraint*, which limits each intonation unit in spoken language to containing no more than one new referent, event, or state (1994:108-119).

Each clause should have a focus (convey information), but since we can lack some cues, like intonation, that would have guided a Hittite audience in understanding an author’s intentions, we may not identify all foci correctly here. If *-ma*’s function is to mark the focus, it can signal only a subset of foci, for we do not encounter *-ma* in every clause. I therefore consider only certain salient contexts whose elements are more likely to function as clausal foci and which Hittite speakers might have considered special enough to mark overtly with *-ma*. These contexts contain a new referent, as described just above, or they are *emphatic, contrastive, or counterexpectational*.

I will understand as emphatic elements forms that are stressed in some way by the author. One cue to emphasis would be intonation, but since we do not have access to the intonation that a Hittite audience would have had, whether directly or via their *Sprachgefühl*, this cue is of limited use to us (although in some cases we can be almost certain of where in a clause prosodic prominence lay). Another cue is variant syntax, where forms do not take their 'usual' place in the clause as determined by a dominant order. A further cue to emphasis is an orthotonic personal pronoun. Hittite had enclitic pronouns, and these presumably mark topical referents; orthotonic personal pronouns are presumably focal. And a final cue to an emphasized form would be an emphatic particle, either *-pat*, an enclitic 'of specification, limitation, and identity' meaning 'the same; only; also' and the like (CHD P:212-230), or *-a/-ya* 'even, also', which marks single focal elements in addition to conjoining elements. This function is particularly clear when its host is not clause-initial.

Forms that stand in opposition will be said to contrast. Chafe has called the relation between the two (or more) forms a 'focus of contrast' (1976:35). The contrasted forms need not be focal, however, as topics may be contrasted in constructions with more than one focus of contrast (Lambrecht 1994:291-295). But, in general, contrasted forms will fall under the scope of assertion and be focal (Chafe p.35, Givón 1990:699-702). Contrast functions independently of activation state, as well, since contrasted forms may be given, accessible, or new (Chafe p.35). I follow Givón (pp.699-700) and Lambrecht (pp.290-291) and find that contrast is scalar, such that some contrasts will be stronger than others.

Clauses (or the propositions underlying them) will be said to be contrary to expectation if their semantic-pragmatic meaning is surprising or goes against that which the audience would conclude, based on having taken in the preceding context. This surprisingness or contrariety is what I understand to be equivalent to the clash or contrast of clauses conjoined with *but* in English, as analyzed by Sweetser (1990:100-111). The clash in the Hittite examples would consist in incompatibility between the premises

presented and the conclusion that is actually offered. I regard the clash as informative, thus focal. Identifying instances of counterexpectation depends on understanding well the intentions of the author—counterexpectation is less obvious than mere contrast—and it may be that I correctly identify only the most obvious cases.

§1.3.3 Backgrounding

Narrative discourse reports remembered or imagined experience (Chafe 1994:231), experience which typically occurs independently of the situation in which the narrative, whether spoken or written, is conveyed (Chafe's *displacement*, p.32). The speaker (or author) is in the advantageous position of knowing the 'full set of events (of the narrative) and their relationships' (p.231), and can therefore give more prominence to some events, less to others. The former have been called *foregrounded* information, the latter *backgrounded* information. A particularly important type of backgrounded information is *orientation*.

The speaker (or author) must orient the hearer (or audience) with respect to time, space, participants, and ongoing states and events, otherwise the consciousness of the hearer (or audience) will not function properly (pp.128-129). Orientation with respect to time and space seem to be especially important. Temporal and spatial expressions may, for example, be adverbials or adverbial clauses. Ongoing conditions may find expression in conditional or causal clauses, among others.¹³ Such expressions of orientation, or *setting*, often occur at the beginning of clauses (p.168) or at the beginning of portions of text with a new or different discourse topic (p.202).

§1.4 Brief Sketch of Hittite Clause Syntax¹⁴

Hittite phrase structure is basically head-final. The major elements of the clause are ordered Subject–Object–Verb, thus Verb following Object. Additionally, possessed Nouns follow possessor Genitives, modified Nouns follow attributive Adjectives, Postpositions

follow Nouns they govern, Finite Verbs follow Non-Finite Verbal forms, and Main Clauses follow Dependent Clauses. The dominant order of clausal constituents proposed by Luraghi (1990), with reference only to Old Hittite, may provisionally be accepted in the absence of such proposals for Middle or Neo-Hittite, although it is the rare example that would see all (especially NP) positions filled:

(5) # Adv_{temp} Adv_{loc} S DO/Compl IO/Compl Adv_{manner/purp/instr} V #¹⁵
(Luraghi 1990:45)

The boundaries of Hittite clauses are clearly delineated, with the finite verb at the end of the clause and with one of a small number of structures at the beginning of the clause. The most obvious of these is an initial clause connector, *nu* (or, in Old Hittite, *šu* or *ta*) ‘and’, but such a form is not required, and regular accented words may also occur as the first constituent (or part of the first constituent phrase) at the beginning of the clause. In such a case the word (or phrase) occurs in *initial position*, a syntactic position inherited from Proto-Indo-European that was available for placement of communicatively salient information (*topicalization*).¹⁶ When an accented clause connector occurs clause-initially, the next constituent occurs in *modified initial position*, a functional variant of *initial position*.¹⁷

In addition to their primary functions, any of a large number of enclitics placed after the first accented element in the clause (Wackernagel’s Law position)¹⁸ also serve through such placement to signal the beginning of clauses. These enclitics are of six types and occur in a particular order, sometimes in rather long strings. In first place may come the clause-connective enclitics: *-a/-ya* ‘and’, *-ma* ‘but, and’, and, mostly in Old Hittite, *-a* ‘but, and’. In the next position could come *-man*, a particle of the optative, irrealis, and potential that also has an orthotonic variant (CHD L-N:139-143).¹⁹ The quotative particle *-wa(r)* may occupy the following position. Next would come the personal pronouns, nominative, accusative, and dative (Friedrich 1960:63 §§100, 102); these are subject to

particular sub-ordering and cooccurrence restrictions (Laroche (1957-58:161), Watkins (1963:42), Hoffner (1986:93-94)). Following these would be the so-called reflexive particle *-z(a)*. In the last position in the enclitic string may be found one of the spatiotemporal clausal adverbs, *-kan*, *-ašta*, *-šan*, *-an*, or *-apa*, which, although not entirely understood, probably indicate direction, aspect, and the like (Carruba 1969, 1985, Josephson 1972, among others). Only one of the clause-connectors, and only one of the spatiotemporal adverbs may occur in a string. (Friedrich 1960:147-148 §288)

Independent clauses may be linked with one of the orthotonic or enclitic connectors described above, with the coordinating conjunction *našma* 'or', or with asyndeton. The typical dependent clause is preposed. Subordinating conjunctions include *mān* 'when; if', *takku* 'if', *kuit* '(seeing) that, because, since', *kuwapi* 'when', *maḥḥan* 'when, as', *kuitman* 'while (preposed clause); until (postposed clause)', and to these should be added the relative pronominal and adjectival form *kui-*. Traditional correlative structures include clauses marked with *naššu...našma* 'either...or' and *-a/-ya...-a/-ya* 'both...and'. It may be noted that the orthotonic and enclitic connectors may also connect a main clause to its preceding dependent clause, thus they are not coordinating conjunctions in the traditional sense (cf. Friedrich 1960:154-162, §§302-319).

Here follow a few very general comments on miscellaneous syntactic topics. Concerning nouns, there are two genders, common and neuter; two numbers, singular and plural; and six cases, nominative, accusative, dative/locative, genitive, ablative, and instrumental (as well as a small number of vocatives) (Friedrich 1960:42-60 §§54-92, 119-127 §§197-220). In Old Hittite there was also an allative case. A verb may be basically active or mediopassive and is inflected for past or present/future tense or imperative mood. Non-finite forms include participles, supines, infinitives, and verbal nouns, the first three of which occur in a number of verbal periphrastic constructions (Friedrich 1960:73-114 §§135-188, 135-145 §§254-277).

Negative forms ordinarily precede the form they negate, and the default clausal negation is preverbal. The indicative (and default) negator is *natta* ‘not’; negative imperatives are formed with *lē* ‘not’ plus indicative²⁰ (Friedrich 1960:145-146 §§279-283, Hoffner 1986).

The remaining enclitic particles are not WL clitics. They attach to their host wherever it may occur in the clause. These enclitics are *-pat* ‘the same; only; also (etc.)’, which specifies, limits, and indicates identity (CHD P:212-230); *-a/-ya* ‘and; also, even’, which is used both as a conjunction and as a particle whose function is most readily identifiable as to focus the element to which it attaches; and enclitic possessive pronouns, which were more common in the older language but which are mostly replaced with orthotonic genitive personal pronouns in the later language (Friedrich 1960:64-66 §§106-109).

§1.4.1 Basic Syntax with regard to *-ma*

As one of the class of enclitic clause connectors, *-ma* most often attaches directly to the first accented word of the clause (even if this is part of a constituent phrase), occurring before any other enclitics (§2.2, §3.2, §4.2).

(6) AH I 66-72; #1141

kaniššūwar=	ma=	mu	ŠA	ŠTAR=	pat	GAŠAN-YA	ēšta
{ favor	-ma	me	of Ištar	herself	lady	my	was }

‘and the favor of Ištar herself, my lady, was on me’

When *-ma* occurs in the same clause as one of a few function words, it is delayed to the word following the function word. These postponing forms are *mān* ‘when; if’, *takku* ‘if’, the relative form *kui-*, *nu* ‘and’, and occasionally *našma* ‘or’ (§2.2, §3.2.1-2, §4.2.1-2).

(7) Laws I §10 (A Vs. I 18'); #2

mān= aš lazziat= **ma**
 {when he recovers -*ma*}

‘and when he recovers’

-*ma*’s with apparently exceptional placement after Sumerographic and/or Akkadographic writing were probably read with the Hittite lexical items and syntax, -*ma* attaching in its usual place (Friedrich 1960:21-22 §3; see also §3.2.3 of the present study).

In terms of interclausal syntax, -*ma* may occur (in Wackernagel’s Law position) at the beginning of a grammatically independent clause or a grammatically dependent clause (preposed to its main clause), both of which might be termed *sentence-initial*. Less frequently -*ma* will occur at the beginning of a main clause preceded by a grammatically dependent clause. (See §2.2, §3.2.5, §4.2.5.)

§1.4.2 The Form of -*ma*

The enclitic -*ma* is represented with the cuneiform sign MA:



It presumably had a phonetic form that was something like [m^a]. In only three attestations out of many hundreds of occurrences, the vowel of -*ma* was elided (see §5.4).

§1.5 Corpus

Conducting an investigation into the pragmatics of linguistic form like -*ma* in three linguistic periods requires that suitable texts meet two important criteria: They must be securely dated, and they must contain sufficient material.

The first criterion for establishing a corpus was secure dating. Securely dated texts are imperative for determining how Hittite forms functioned at given stages in the language’s history and how they changed over time (cf. Melchert 1984b:79). A manuscript is typically dated to Old, Middle, or Neo-Hittite periods based on the epigraphic, orthographic, and grammatical features it shows.²¹ It is possible to find a mix of such

features associated with different periods, as many manuscripts from earlier periods were copied or recopied later. Textual content may also be used as an indicator, but is not as reliable, especially when it concerns events from earlier periods or involves non-historical genres. While only a few manuscripts have been dated absolutely to within 25 years of their composition, e.g., the Maşat letters (Alp 1991a:109-112) and the Bronze Tablet (Otten 1988:3), many have been given fairly secure relative datings. This is due to the work of several scholars, among them Otten (1953, 1973, Otten and Souček 1969), Rüster (1972), Neu (1970, 1974, Neu and Rüster 1973, 1975), Houwink ten Cate (1970), Kammenhuber and her students (Heinhold-Krahmer et al. 1979), Oettinger (1979), and Melchert (1984b).

To select texts for this study, I correlated the determinations for texts as found in Oettinger (1979),²² who mainly follows Otten, Neu, and Rüster; Heinhold-Krahmer et al. (1979); Melchert (1984b), who follows Oettinger in part; and Yoshida (1990) and Garrett (1990), both of whom mainly follow Melchert. The Maşat letters and the Bronze Tablet, discovered relatively recently, are also included. My goal was to have a corpus comprised of texts whose dating was agreed upon by all these scholars, and so to preempt any controversy on this point. The dating of Middle Hittite texts is controversial (usually with Heinhold-Krahmer et al. against everyone else), but the dating of the Maşat letters should be above criticism.

The second major criterion for text selection was the amount of material each text offered that could be analyzed with relative confidence. Studying *-ma* requires more textual material per occurrence than studies of orthography, phonology, or syntax. This meant I needed manuscripts with large portions of clear, complete text. The ideal situation would be a complete, securely dated text, but such are a distinct minority of Hittite texts in general. I examined the Hittite autographs of the securely dated texts chosen by the method described above in order to identify those texts which were complete or contained significant portions of complete text.²³

In general, I accepted any Old Hittite text of respectable size. I included any Maṣat letter that was complete or that preserved a significant amount of text for which the context was understandable. Since there exist several lengthy Neo-Hittite texts, I excluded a number of short texts (< 20 lines) securely dated to that period. I included reconstructed texts or portions of texts only if the reconstruction was based on a contemporary copy, as in the Annals of Mursili, the Apology of Hattusili, or the Old Hittite Ritual for the Royal Couple. The texts which met both the dating and completeness criteria are listed in (8).

(8) **Securely dated and sufficiently preserved texts**
(arranged by period and CTH number):

Old Hittite:

- 1.A Proclamation of Anitta (Neu 1974)
- 3 Story of Zalpa: KBo 22.2 (Otten 1973)
- 272²⁴ Instruction (Archi 1979)
- 291.I.a Laws, Series one (Friedrich 1959, Hoffner 1997)
- 416 Ritual for the Royal Couple (Otten and Souček 1969, Neu 1980)
- 669.30 Festival (Neu 1980)

Middle Hittite:

- Uncat. Maṣat Letters (Alp 1991a, b)

Neo-Hittite:²⁵

- 61 Annals of Mursili (Götze 1933)
- 68 Treaty with Kupanta-^dKAL (Friedrich 1926)
- 81 Apology of Hattusili (Otten 1981)
- 176 Letter of Puduhepa to the King of Alasiya (Stefanini 1964)
- 255 Instructions to the LÚ.MEŠSAG (von Schuler 1957)
- Uncat. Treaty of Tuthaliya with Kurunta (Bronze Tablet) (Otten 1988)

The criteria regarding dating and completeness severely restrict the number of texts investigated. Initially I intended to control for variation across textual genres by including a representative of each genre from each period, but this was not entirely possible because of gaps in the preserved Hittite corpus and the necessity of maintaining the two criteria for textual selection. See (9). There are no letters or acceptable treaties among the Old Hittite texts. In Neo-Hittite, there is no thoroughly modern redaction of the laws. Since the language of rituals and festivals is questionable with regard to which features are truly archaic or contemporary (Melchert 1984b:80), none has been included for Neo-Hittite.²⁶ Whether the gaps in the corpus compromise my findings depends on whether *-ma* was used differently in different genres. This is a very interesting question, but one that must await further study.

(9) **Texts Arranged by Genre, Period, CTH Number**

Hist.Narr	Treaties	Letters	Administration	Laws	Rituals	Festivals
Old Hittite:						
1.A			272	291.I.a	416	669.30
3						
Middle Hittite:						
		Maşat				
Neo-Hittite:						
61	68	176	255			
81	Kurunta					

§1.6 Prospect

Having established the basis for studying *-ma*'s function, we may now turn to the study itself.

In chapter 2, I present the findings regarding *-ma*'s function in Old Hittite. The particle is seen to cooccur with new referents, contrasted elements, and expressions of setting. *-ma*'s occurrence with topic switch was exceeded by its occurrence with subject

switch. My findings support the proposal that *-ma* and non-geminating *-a* are suppletive allomorphs, functioning together differently from geminating *-a/-ya*. Finally, *-ma* is shown to systematically mark contrasting conditions in the Laws.

In chapter 3, I present the findings about how *-ma* functions in Neo-Hittite. The enclitic continues to occur in contexts of contrast, referent-introduction, setting, and subject switch, but it also is abundantly attested in environments expressing counterexpectation, in pair- and series-marking, with paragraph-initial setting expressions, and in contexts expressing emphasis with variant syntax or with orthotonic personal pronouns. *-ma* has replaced its suppletive allomorph *-a*, which nevertheless lives on in isolated forms.

In chapter 4, I present the findings concerning *-ma*'s function in Middle Hittite, specifically the Maşat letters. Middle Hittite *-ma* functions more like Neo-Hittite *-ma* than like Old Hittite *-ma*; that is, it occurs more frequently and in a wider range of contexts. Conspicuous in the epistolary register is *-ma*'s use in a formula that explicitly sets the discourse topic.

In chapter 5, I summarize the findings of the previous chapters and report on the changes that have occurred with regard to *-ma* from Old Hittite to Neo-Hittite. *-ma*'s function actually remained fairly stable over the period of attested Hittite, although it increased in general frequency and went from incipient to frequent use in two contexts. While *-ma* does cooccur with pragmatic categories, it seems that the definitions of *-ma*'s function as marking these categories are not accurate. It appears to be more cogent to say that *-ma* is a clause-connector signaling difference and shows an affinity for contexts containing a salient change in the discourse.

Finally, in chapter 6, I present a brief conclusion.

Notes to Chapter 1

¹Please see the List of Abbreviations and the Notes on Translation and Glossing in the front matter.

²As in Sturtevant's glossary (1936) and Friedrich's grammar (1940) and his glossary (1952-66). See §1.2. Bakker (1993) frequently translates *dé* with 'and' in cases of clausal boundary marking.

³Research such as Pinkster (1990), Bolkestein (1991), Kroon (1994), and Risselada (1993).

⁴The label *adversative*, as a naive and pre-theoretical notion, has been applied to *-ma* since Ungnad's description. Fairly naive and pre-theoretical myself, I consider *adversative* to be more or less synonymous with *contrastive*, with the possibility of weaker and stronger connotations of opposition; for me, *adversative* is a more general term than *contrastive*. *Adversativity* in this study, then, does not immediately imply counterexpectation, as it seems to do for Halliday and Hasan (1976:250).

Beyond the definition of *adversativity* is another consideration not explored in this study, namely the assumed equatability of contemporary English *adversative* with German *adversativ*, either of today or of 1920. Similarly, have German *aber* and *und* shifted in meaning during the past 100 years, and are their meanings directly comparable to those of English *but* and *and* during the same period?

⁵For example, Sommer and Ehelolf (1924), Götze (1925, 1928*, 1933), Friedrich (1930*), and Götze and Pedersen (1934). (The asterisk indicates reference only to Sommer.)

⁶'Die Partikel *=ma* hat, soweit ich sehe, keine adversative Bedeutung („aber“). Vielmehr drückt der *=ma*-Satz eine zur Haupthandlung parallel verlaufende, meist untergeordnete Nebenhandlung aus...' (Starke 1977:31 fn.32). In contrast to *=a* 'hat *=ma* ausschließlich subordinierende, erläuternde Funktion. So finden *=ma*-Sätze vor allem in der Ritualliteratur häufige Verwendung, da hier Vorgänge und Zustände nicht nur genannt

sondern auch ausführlich erläutert werden müssen. Sofern der *=ma*-Satz nicht zugleich durch eine konditionale oder temporale Konjunktion oder durch ein Relativpronomen gekennzeichnet ist, läßt er sich mit „indem“ oder „während“ an den übergeordneten Satz anschließen. Auf Beispiele muß hier aus Raumgründen verzichtet werden, doch läßt sich die subordinierende, erläuternde Funktion von *=ma* leicht in jedem beliebigen Text nachprüfen' (Starke 1977:74).

⁷Since the body of scholarship is so great, and my needs are rather modest, i.e., workable definitions of basic concepts, I refer to but a few of the many scholars who have studied discourse: Firbas (1966a,b, 1986, 1992), following the tradition of the Prague School; Halliday (1967, 1985); Chafe (1976, 1994); Prince (1981b, 1998); Reinhart (1981); Givón (1983, 1984, 1990); and Lambrecht (1994).

⁸At least one study of boundary marking in a dead language has been based on the work of Chafe, Bakker's examination of Homeric and Classical Greek *dé* (1993).

⁹I will use the term *author* to refer to the person who produced the text, and the term *audience* to refer to the person or persons for whom the text was produced and who were intended to understand it. These terms are intended to correspond to the more common *speaker* and *hearer*. I use *author-audience* as an adaptation of the *speaker-hearer* relationship to the Hittite situation.

¹⁰Givón and Lambrecht distinguish between sentence topic and discourse topic (although Givón's terminology differs). In studying English, Chafe reserves the term *topic* or *discourse topic* for the 'aggregate of coherently related events, states, and referents that are held together in some form in the speaker's semiactive consciousness' (1994:121). In this way the term is consistent 'with such expressions as *the topic of a paragraph*, *changing the topic*, and the like' (p.120). For what I am thinking of as discourse topic Givón uses the term *theme*, which thematic paragraphs (chains of clauses combined into larger thematic units) are about (1983:7-8).

¹¹Lambrecht would say that subjects are unmarked topic *expressions*, since the topic is actually a referent, not a linguistic form like the subject.

¹²Lambrecht's technical definition of *focus* invokes pragmatic presupposition and pragmatic assertion: 'The semantic component of a pragmatically structured proposition whereby the assertion differs from the presupposition' (1994:213).

¹³Mental spaces theory would term the items in this section *space-builders* (Fauconnier 1988), and while I do not do so in this study, investigating *-ma*'s occurrence from this perspective could yield very interesting results, e.g., perhaps its function is to signal the building of spaces in a discourse. See also Dancygier and Sweetser (1997, 2000) for studies on conditional and causal clauses as space-builders.

¹⁴As with any such sketch, exceptions to generalizations will obtain. With Hittite, pragmatic factors may underlie variant occurrence, for example, or minor rules may be in play, as when the adjective *humant-* 'each, all' functions as an indefinite and follows its noun. Sumerograms and Akkadograms often follow the syntax of their respective languages, leading to apparent exceptions.

¹⁵*Compl* in the order indicates a predicative complement or a complement of direction, location, or source (Luraghi 1990:43-44).

¹⁶Regarding Indo-European topicalization, see, for example, Watkins 1963, Dressler 1969, Holland 1980. The traditional view of topicalization in IE scholarship is that it involves full lexical items that occur in initial position and are thus emphasized in some way, so IE topicalization, at least on the surface, appears to involve focal elements rather than topical elements (in the senses used in §1.3).

¹⁷For another view of Proto-Indo-European and Anatolian/Hittite phrase structure, see Hale (1987) and Garrett (1990). While Garrett's account of Hittite phrase structure holds for many or most cases, it does not appear to account for the placement of the sometimes causal complementizer *kuit* late in the clause (cf. Holland ms.), nor does it seem to account

for the delayed placement of *-ma* that occurs with certain function words (cf. §1.4.1, §2.2, §3.2.1-2, §4.2.1-2).

¹⁸See Wackernagel (1892). According to Garrett, Hale's (1987) revised WL rules regarding positioning of enclitics have been collapsed from PIE to Anatolian (1990:38-39).

¹⁹Since enclitic *-man* reportedly does not cooccur with *-ma*, it has been said to occur first in the enclitic chain, after the first accented word plus its own possessive or emphatic enclitics. The only examples of such enclitics usually offered in descriptions are with the 'emphatic' enclitic *-a*, which I regard as a clause-connector (Houwink ten Cate 1973:129 fn.45, CHD L-N:142, Luraghi 1990:129 n.11).

²⁰Old Hittite texts preserve examples of *lē* plus imperative (Friedrich 1960:145 §280b, CHD L-N:56).

²¹Dates for the linguistic periods of Hittite vary. I follow Neu and Rüster (1975:VII) in suggesting the following: Old Hittite—ca. 1570-1450 BCE, Middle Hittite—ca. 1450-1380 BCE, Neo-Hittite—ca. 1380-1200 BCE. These dates are approximately equivalent to those indicated by Heinhold-Krahmer et al. (1979:313-315). Gurney (1990:181-182) implies lower dates for the Neo-Hittite period based on revised Egyptian chronology.

²²Oettinger includes OH texts in MH script with MH texts (1979:576-579), but as Melchert points out (1984b:80), these must be distinguished.

²³I reviewed the editions of the Annals of Mursili (Götze 1933), Mursili's Treaty with Kupanta-^dKAL (Friedrich 1926), and the Apology of Hattusili (Otten 1981) to determine the degree of completeness of each. The context of each *-ma* was confirmed against the cuneiform autograph, however.

²⁴Considered uncatalogued by some scholars.

²⁵Due to considerations of time, I have not included some texts that might otherwise have met the criteria for inclusion, e.g., the Deeds of Suppiluliuma (CTH 40), the *Staatsverträge* other than that with Kupanta-^dKAL (Friedrich 1926, 1930), the second Plague Prayer of Mursili (CTH 378.II), or the Prayer of Muwatalli to the Storm God (CTH 381). These

remain the object of possible later study. NH texts are nonetheless well represented in this corpus.

²⁶Although Melchert does not find appropriate for inclusion CTH 486, the Aphasia of Mursili, both Yoshida and Garrett do include it in their corpora.

Chapter 2

-ma in Old Hittite

§2.0 Introduction

Following the newer proposals for *-ma*'s meaning and function (cf. §1.2), my investigation into the function of *-ma* in Old Hittite will center on three areas of pragmatics, namely topic, focus, and orientation. The notion of topic, discussed in §2.3.1, will be shown to be less prominent than the notion of grammatical subject for Hittite, and we will see that there is some correlation between subject switch and occurrence of *-ma*. Contexts expressing focus will be examined in §2.3.2, and it will be shown that *-ma* can occur in contrastive contexts and aid in signaling the introduction of new referents. In §2.3.3, we will see a fairly high correlation between *-ma* and contexts which establish the orientation for propositions.

Prior to this examination of pragmatics, the preliminary sections §§2.0.1-2.2 will deal with the OH sources for *-ma*, its phonological distribution, and syntax. Particularly interesting here is *-ma*'s nearly complete restriction to occurrence after vowels.

After *-ma*'s function has been investigated in §2.3, attention turns to the other enclitic conjunctions in §2.4. A comparison between the non-geminating conjunction *-a* and the geminating conjunction *-a/-ya* will demonstrate the difference between the two. This is followed by a comparison of *-a* with *-ma* which will show that the two function as suppletive allomorphs, as Melchert has suggested (1984a, 1985).

In §2.5 I look at conditional clauses in the Laws, with the goal of showing that *-ma* and *-a* systematically aid in signaling alternate conditions in laws with complex structure.

Section §2.6 is a brief response to the views of Starke (1977) and Luraghi (1990), both of whom deal with Old Hittite.

§2.0.1 Texts and Data

Old Hittite is generally accepted as being the language recorded ca. 1600-1450 BCE. As described in §1.5, the texts found to be acceptable for inclusion in this study were a ritual for the royal couple, here abbreviated ‘StBoT 8’ (Otten and Souček 1969 and Neu 1980, no.2-7) and a *Festritual*, KBo 20.10+ (Neu 1980, no.59); historical texts: the Anitta text (Neu 1974, text A) and the story of Zalpa (Otten 1973, text A); the Laws (Friedrich 1959 and Hoffner 1997, text A); and an instruction, KBo 22.1 (Archi 1979).¹

From these sources, 32 examples of *-ma* were found in contexts complete enough for confident interpretation. The number of secure and questionable attestations follows:

(1) Attestations of <i>-ma</i> ^{1a}		
Text	Secure	Context Broken or Questionable
StBoT 8	15	4
KBo 20.10+	1	-
Anitta	4	3
Zalpa	-	-
Laws	11	1
KBo 22.1	<u>1</u>	<u>-</u>
Total	32	8

As can be seen from this table, the secure examples of *-ma* came from only five texts.

§2.1 Phonological Distribution

Melchert has briefly observed that in Old Hittite *-ma* and adversative, non-geminating *-a* were in complementary distribution (except for a few conditioned exceptions)² and suggests that they were suppletive allomorphs (1984a:30 with fn.9 and p.32 fn.13; 1985:202). In the OH corpus I reviewed, *-ma* occurred only after vowels (31/32) and one Akkadogram.³ *-a* occurred only after consonants.⁴ Non-adversative *-a/-ya* occurred as *-a* after geminate consonants, and as *-ya* after vowels and Sumerograms. The following are representative occurrences of these enclitics.⁵

(2) Laws I §10 (A Vs. I 17'); #1

pēdi= šši= **ma** LÚ.ULÙLU-an pāi
 {place.DL- his.DL -*ma* person.A he gives}

‘**and** in his place he shall provide a person’

(3) Laws I §46 (A Vs. II 40'); #9

IŠTU É ABI- ŠU=ma ka[rpianzi]
 {from house father- his -*ma* they? render }

‘**but** [they shall] re[nder] (it) from the house of his father’

(4) StBoT 8 Vs. I 21'-22'; #55

weš=a namma anda [p]aiwani
 {we-*a* again in we go }

‘**and** we go in again’

(5) StBoT 8 Rs. IV 27; cf. #61

šinann=a ḫarmi
 {figure.A-*a* I hold }

‘**and** I hold a figure’

(6) StBoT 8 Rs. IV 23; cf. #33

III NINDA ḫaršaeš išpantuzzi=ya marnuan kitta
 {3 bread thick.N libation and *marnuan* lie }

‘three thick breads **and** the libation (of) *marnuan* lie (ready)’

(7) StBoT 8 Vs. I 29'; cf. #26

SAL.LUGAL=ya Q[A]TAMMA pāi
 {queen and in that way he gives}

‘**and** to the queen he gives the same’

This distribution holds for nearly the entire OH corpus. Using the corpus of OH texts as listed in Yoshida (1990:7-9), I collected the examples of *-ma* and observed the following distribution:⁶

(8)	-V=ma	93
	-C=ma	3
	Akkadogram=ma	1
	indeterminate ma	8 ⁷

All three post-consonantal *-ma*'s occur after *-š* and before another clitic (Melchert's few conditioned exceptions?), an enclitic string which allows more than one parsing. Two of these post-consonantal *-ma*'s, both from OH ritual fragments, are in broken contexts that make it impossible to determine the composition of the string with certainty:

(9) KBo 17.22 Vs. II x+1 (Neu 1980:207)

]x-Aḫ-ḫa-aš-ma-az x[

The sequence can be analyzed two ways: $^{\circ}\text{ḫḫaš}=\text{ma}=z$ and $^{\circ}\text{ḫḫa}=\text{šma}=z$, and no decision can be reached without a join or some parallel passage. On the basis of several instances of *la-a-aḫ-ḫa* 'to battle (all.sg.)', Neu suggests a possible restoration *la-]a¹-aḫ-ḫa-aš-ma-az* and opts for the first parsing above since he takes the MA as the enclitic conjunction, thus approximately 'but to battles (dat./loc.pl.) in ...'s own interest'. The alternate reading, *laḫḫa=šma=z* 'to their battle in ...'s own interest', seems no worse.

(10) KUB 29.3 Vs. I 7'-11' (Neu 1980:3)

nu an-ku GIŠ^{H1.A} LUGAL-uš ta-al-l[i-
ḫe-e-a-u-e-eš-ma-aš ša-a[l-la-nu-uš-kir
ša-al-la-nu-uš-kir x[
ša-al-la-nu-uš-k[i-
§₁ne₁-e-₁pí-ša-aš₁ k[at-

The sequence *he-e-a-u-e-š-ma-aš* is also ambiguous, between $^{\circ}\dot{s} = ma = a\dot{s}$ and $^{\circ}\langle\dot{s}\rangle = \dot{s}ma\dot{s}$, giving ‘but the rains made them great’ and ‘the rains made you (pl.) great’. The first reading requires interpretation as *-aš* as a 3.pl.acc. form, the only such occurrence in the OH ritual corpus of Neu (1983:5 with n.16). This peculiarity is counterbalanced by the only occurrence in the corpus of *-aš* as a 3.pl.nom. form (Neu 1983:5 with n.12), also in conjunction with *-ma*: *ka-ru-ú-ma-aš tarkuanzi* ‘but already they dance’ (Neu 1980:90). Such occurrences become less strange if one considers them to be positional variants of *-uš* and *-e*, respectively, the only two OH clitics that have neither initial *a*-vocalism nor initial consonant. Nevertheless, the second reading, *hēauē⟨š⟩ = šmaš* ‘rain⟨s⟩ you (pl.)’, should not be discounted since the trees are probably addressed directly beginning with 1.11’. Compare the later copy, despite differences in this passage, including reduction of at least three clauses (11.8’-10’ above) to one clause: *nu GIŠH^{1A} LUGAL-uš ^dU-ni wēkzi hēyauēš kuit tašnuškir šallanuškir § nepišaš kattan uliliškiddumat* ‘And the king requests trees of the Storm-god, since rains made (them) strong (and) made (them) great. § Under the heavens you have grown’ (KUB 29.1 Vs. I 26-28; Neu 1980:3).

The third attestation, from the Zukraši text, is undoubtedly *-ma* after consonant.

(11) Zukraši KBo 7.14 Rs. 3’ (Otten 1953)

]Hatt^{ue1} uit URU^{Ha}-at-tu-az-ma- aš UR^{U1}×[
{Hattu.DL came Hattu.AB *-ma* he ... }

‘...came to Hattu, and he ... from Hattu (to) the city of ...’

Thus an analysis *Hattuaz = ma = aš*. Although parsing the sequence as *Hattuaz = ⟨š⟩maš* is a formal possibility, giving ‘...came to Hattu. From Hattu (he) ... (to) you/to them ... the city of ...’, it seems much less likely.

In this last example we are probably seeing *-ma*’s first steps toward conditionless distribution. Given the tremendous disparity in the distribution of post-vocalic and post-

consonantal *-ma*, however, it is worth examining whether the isofunctionality Melchert suggested for *-ma* and *-a* obtains. Such an examination is undertaken in §2.4.

§2.2 Syntax

The data in the OH corpus under examination follow the rules for placement of *-ma* as described above in §1.4.1. Six forms are interesting in this respect.

First are two examples where *-ma* occurs one word later than expected, but where this word is the second of two apparently forming a tight semi-lexicalized phrase:

(12) StBoT 8 Rs. III 3-6; #29

āppan-anda=ma=šše kē mēmahhi
 {after-in -ma it.DL these.A I say }

‘and after(wards) I say these (words) to it: ...’

Here *-ma* appears to attach to the second word in a clause not introduced with a subordinating conjunction. Given the word space in the autograph and the placement of the clitics, *appan-anda* ‘after(wards)’ apparently consists of two words functioning as one constituent.⁸ Another example from a copy of an OH text shows the same syntax, *katta-šarā=ma* ‘and up from below’ at KUB 43.23 Rs. 17’, which incidentally shows no word space.

As noted in §1.4.1, *-ma* attaches to the second word in the clause if the first is occupied by *takku*. In (13) however, *-ma* cliticizes to the third word, which leads to the analysis of A.ŠÀ^{HLA} *kulei* ‘unused? land’ as a syntactic unit. Hoffner even takes the Sumerogram as predeterminer (1997:54-57, 190f.).

(13) Laws I §47b (A Vs. II 47’); #10

takku A.ŠÀ^{HLA} kulei=ma ārki
 {if land idle? -ma divides }

‘but if he subdivides idle? land’

In (14) another syntactic unit may underlie *IŠTU É ABI-ŠU* ‘from the house of his father’, which should have had the Hittite form *attaš =šaš parnaz*.

(14) Laws I §46 (A Vs. II 40’); #9

IŠTU É ABI- ŠU=ma ka[rpianzi]
 { from house father- his -*ma* they? render }

‘but [they shall] re[nder] (it) from the house of his father’

However, it is difficult to know just how the Hittites would have read the form and thus where they would have placed *-ma* (but see §3.2.3). This is the only occurrence of *-ma* after Akkado- or Sumerogram in the OH data.

Following the rule for delayed placement, where *-ma* is placed on the second stressed word of the clause when certain grammatical items occur clause-initially (§1.4.1), *-ma* occurs on the second stressed word in (15), the only example in the OH data here in which it cooccurs with a clause-introductory particle.

(15) Anitta A Vs. 3; #15

n= ašta dIM-unni= ma mān āššuš ēšta
 { CC PV Storm-god.DL-*ma* as dear.N he was }

‘but as he was dear to the Storm-god’

Also following rule of delayed placement, the *-ma* in (16) attaches not to the clause-initial indefinite relative pronoun *kuiš* ‘whoever’, but to the next stressed word.

(16) Laws I §23 (A Vs. I 53’); #3

kuiš= an āppa=ma uwatezzi
 { who.N him.A back-*ma* brings }

‘but whoever brings him back’

The occurrence of *-ma* in this example may be determined in part by the suppletion described above: *-ma* cannot attach to *kuiš* because it ends in a consonant, and *-a* cannot attach to *kuiš* because being followed by *-an* ‘him’, it would be imperceptible. This example is discussed further in §2.3.2.1.

The last of the syntactically interesting examples is (17), where *-ma* has attached to what appears to be the clitic *-a*, exceptional because *-ma* in all other cases attaches to a fully stressed lexical item which hosts at most one enclitic possessive pronoun, as in (2).

(17) Laws I §24 (A I 55’); #4

SAL-š= a=ma kušan ITU.I.KAM VI GÍN K[Û.BABBAR] pāi
 {woman.G-a -ma wage.A month.1.DET 6 shekel silver he gives}

‘but he shall pay a woman’s wage (for) one month (of) 6 s[ilver] shekels’

It is not clear what the <a> represents. It might be merely graphic like the representation of the particle /-ts/ with *-za*, here an optional or intentional strategy employed to indicate the genitive case as distinct from the nominative. There are few other examples of the sequence *=a=ma*. From OH ritual fragments we have *LÚNAR-ši-ya-ša-ma* ‘and the musician?’, if the MA is not to be read BA, giving the enclitic preverb *-apa* (*-a-pá*), as is possible according to Neu (1983:257, 112 n. 392; 1980:104 n. 342). The only other example seen in the data for all periods is *hingan=a=ma=pa* ‘and death [enclitic preverb]’ (from the archaizing Prayer of Kantuzzili; see §5.5). There is no doubt about the morphosyntax of *hingan* (neut.nom.sg.), and this clear example supports the phonological reality of the <a> in (17). It also allows us to rule out occurrence of *-a/-ya* in (17), an *a priori* possibility when a word is written with Sumerogram and minimal phonetic complementation. Most likely *-ma* is serving to reinforce *-a* in these examples (see §5.5).

-ma is not particular in terms of what grammatical category can serve as its host.

The tables in (18) and (19) summarize some basic facts of *-ma*’s distribution whose relevance will become apparent in the course of examining the enclitics *-a* and *-a/-ya* (§2.4).

(18) **Syntactic Categories of *-ma*'s Hosts**

Host Position in Clause	Host Syntactic Category						<u>Total</u>
	<u>NP</u>	<u>DemPron</u>	<u>Neg</u>	<u>Adv</u>	<u>PreV</u>	<u>V</u>	
First	8	3	-	4	-	3	18
Second	4	-	2	1	1	5	13
Third	<u>1</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>1</u>
Total!	13	3	2	5	1	8	32

(19) **Conjunctions and Relatives Cooccurring with Postponed *-ma*****Host Position Postponing Conjunction or Relative
in Clause**

	<i>takku</i>	<i>mān</i>	<i>n(u)</i>	<i>kuiš</i>	Total
Second	4	7	1	1	13
Third	<u>1</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>1</u>
Total	5	7	1	1	14

Houwink ten Cate (1973:128) examined four interclausal environments for enclitic conjunctions, 1a) between two independent or 1b) between two dependent clauses; 2) at the beginning of a main clause preceded by a subordinate clause; and 3) at the beginning of subordinate clause preceding a main clause. He found that *-ma* occurred in environments 1a-b) and 3), but not in 2) (p.134).⁹ My results, which include instances of delayed *-ma*, confirm this finding: 18 (independent) and 0 (dependent) of type 1, 0 of type 2, and 13 of type 3 (see also (70) in §2.4.2.3). In (16) *-ma* occurs at the beginning of a dependent clause preceding a main clause (environment 3), yet that dependent clause is the beginning of the apodosis following a protasis with coordinated members. It is thus also like type 2. To accommodate such examples, I distinguish a fifth environment, 2/3. In §2.4.2.5, I discuss the scope of *-ma*.

kuiški ‘someone’ is introduced in the first clause and treated as topic in the second, indicated by zero-anaphora. Its referent persists as topic for two more clauses, at which point the second *LÚ.ULÙLU-an* ‘person’, having been introduced in the clause concerning provision of temporary labor, assumes the role of topic (works in the injured party’s house). This referent is also indicated by zero-anaphora. Next, the injured party becomes topic, indicated with the enclitic personal pronoun *-aš*, in the clauses about recovery. This referent has remained topical since its introduction; beginning with the second clause, the referent is expressed by accusative and dative/locative enclitic and accusative orthotonic personal pronouns: *-an*, *apūn*, *-šši*, *-šši*. Last, the injurer is recalled to serve as topic in the final two clauses regarding restitution and payment. This referent is indicated in the first with zero-anaphora and in the second with the emphatic *apāš* ‘that one’.

Another example, (21), is notable in that a new referent is abruptly introduced into the text:

(21) StBoT 8 Rs. IV 26-29; #34, #61

ta kalulupu<š>=šmuš gāpinit ḫulāliemi
 ŠA QATI-ŠUNU ug=a ḫāḫḫal ḫarmi šinann=a ḫarmi
 GIŠḫarpa= ma I-anta LUGAL-aš GÌR=ši kitta SAL.LUGAL-š=a I-anta
 {wood:woodpiles-*ma* 1.pN king.G foot-his.DL lies}
 kitta ...

‘Then I wind their fingers with the thread,
 (i.e. fingers) of their hand(s). And I hold a twig and I hold a figurine.
But (as for) woodpiles, one lies at the king’s foot and one lies (at) the queen’s.’

GIŠḫarpa ‘woodpiles’ is a referent that was previously inactive in the discourse.¹¹ It is the only example in the clauses with *-ma* considered here in which a new, non-pronominal noun phrase stands in initial position and functions as topic. This makes its appearance mildly surprising, as topics are usually already active in the discourse. Once this new topic is established, the information follows: ‘(But woodpiles, one) lies at the king’s foot’.¹²

Twenty of the 32 OH examples with *-ma* have topics and a ‘topic–information’ structure,¹³ although none is as elaborate as (20) above, or as striking as (21). With three of the remaining 12 it is not possible to determine the topic with certainty because of obscure grammar (#29.5) or incomplete predications (#9, #21). The other nine have no topic. Three of the nine arethetic clauses, where the proposition concerns the event itself rather than a referent (Lambrecht 1994:144), as in (22):

(22) StBoT 8 Rs. IV 23-25; #33

§ III NINDA ḫaršaeš išpantuzzi=ya marnuan kitta
 mān luggatta=ma nu LUÚ.ḪÍB-za ūgg=a
 {when dawns -ma }
 paiwani t=u<š>=šta šarā tumeni ...

‘Three thick breads and the *marnuan* libation lie (ready).
 And when it dawns, a deaf man and I / go, and we take them up.’

The other two examples are #28 and #30, both with *mān lukkatta=ma*. Six of the nine examples without topic are presentational structures introducing referents into the discourse. These fall into two groups: the first contains three nominal sentences with a deictic pronoun as subject, as seen in (23) (cf. also #5 and #6).

(23) KBo 22.1 Vs. 7', 12'-13'; #20

§ mTāš LUÍŠ URUKūluppa ...
 VI PA ZÍD.DA ZÍZ ANA NINDA.KASKAL daškizzi
 § ki= ma ḫenkuwaš=šaš L NINDA^{HLA} ...
 {this.N-ma allotment.G-his.G 50 breads }

‘§ Tā, the chariot-fighter of Kuluppa ... / has been taking [list of people]
 (and) as provisions ... 6 half-measures of emmer meal.
 § But this is (part) of his allotment: 50 (loaves of) bread ... ’

The second group has an initial locative expression with a new subject, as seen in (24) (cf. also #26 and #27 (where the subject is distantly accessible)).

(24) StBoT 8 Vs. I 7'-8'; #22

§ [ug]=a arḫari nu ḫurtiyallan ḫarmi
 ḫurtiyali= **ma** / [AN.B]AR-aš nēpiš I-EN kitta URUDU-ašš=a I-EN kitta
 { bowl.DL -*ma* iron.G heaven.N I.N lies }

‘§ But [I] am standing and I have a bowl. And in the bowl
 lies one heaven of [ir]on, and one of copper lies (therein).’

Thus about a third of the clear examples in the OH data here (9/29) have *-ma* but no topic. Occurrence of *-ma*, then, would appear not to be determined by the occurrence, or rather, existence of topic. Moreover *-ma* cannot mark every topic, otherwise it would occur with much higher frequency.

Since *-ma* has been associated with adversativity, I examined whether the particle might mark topic switch, but found a similar result: Although the two cooccur, topic switch does not determine where *-ma* occurs. Topic switch was defined as a topical referent either leaving the discourse or being replaced by a less topical referent. Seven of the 20 examples with topics exhibit topic switch (35%), and 13 exhibit no switch (65%). Even with an expanded definition of switch, the results remain undramatic: Allowing the 9 examples without topics, where the switch is understood as occurring from topic to no-topic, 16 of 29 have switch (55.2%), and 13 of 29 have none (44.8%).¹⁴ See (20) for examples with *-ma* without topic switch.

Justus (1976) uses examples such as (20) to argue that Old Hittite was a topic-prominent language rather than a subject-prominent language, following Li and Thompson (1976). But I disagree with her identification of some topics, and it seems to me that the Hittite data she adduces could be argued to show subject prominence in the categories she cites: noun-verb agreement, initial position in the clause, deletion of a referent, pronominalization, and reflexivization. Example (20) demonstrates very well that Hittite was quite tolerant of subject-deletion and -resumption. While interpretation from sense is necessary to understand the passage, it is only through identification of the subject of a

given verb (as the referent likely to perform that action) that we can identify what (i.e., who) is being talked about, that is, the topic. As is often the case in IE languages, the subject of a clause tends to be its topic as well.

In the 20 *-ma*-clauses with identifiable topics, topics correlate highly with subjects according to Justus' criteria: noun-verb agreement (19/20), deletion of a referent (16/16), pronominalization (1/1), and initial position within the clause: one of the three topics/subjects that are expressed is initial (#34); the one subject pronoun that occurs is in Wackernagel's Law position (#2); and the one remaining subject is the first NP in the clause, although not in initial position as the clause has a special focus structure (#23). (The only non-subject topic involves a non-relativized referent in a relative protasis.) Every topic switch coincides with a subject switch, and it is the same referent in each case.

There is only one case among the clauses with *-ma* in which topic functions independently of subject, but subjects often operate independently of topics, as the 6 presentational examples given above demonstrate. So while 20 of the 29 clear examples have topics, 26 have subjects. Subject switch occurs in 14 of the 29 examples under discussion (48.3%), as compared with 7 showing topic switch (24.1%), and in 17 of 29 (58.6%) with an expanded definition of subject switch, where switch includes subject to no subject. Again, 16 of these 17 were also found for topic switch.¹⁵ Although the rates of *-ma*'s occurrence with topic switch and with subject switch are about equal when expanded definitions of switch are used, *-ma* occurs twice as often in contexts with 'positive' subject switch (switch from one subject to another) as it does in contexts with 'positive' topic switch (switch from one topic to another).

This discussion falls short of proof, but Hittite appears to be subject-prominent, and the role of topic correlates very highly with the role of subject, similar to Chafe's proposal for English (1994:82-84).

While the notion of subject appears to be more prominent than the notion of topic in Hittite grammatical structure, mere existence of a subject does not correlate with occurrence

semiactive. Contrast involves ideas opposed to other ideas. New or contrasted items have obvious potential for being highly informative in a text.¹⁷

Typical examples showing foci with inactive and semiactive statuses in audience consciousness are these.

(26) Anitta A Rs. 45-48; #16, #48

... š=an tālahhun măn=aš
 appezziyan=a kištanziattat š=an dHalmaš[uitti]
 dŠiuš=miš parā paiš š=an išpandi
 nakkit dāhhun pēdi= šši= ma ZÀ.AH.LI-an ani'e'[(nun] §
 {place.DL-its.DL -ma weeds.A I sowed }

‘ ... I left it. But when it / later suffered starvation, my god Šiu delivered it [to] the Thr[one] god. And in the night I took it by force. And in its place I so[wed] weeds. §’

(27) Anitta A Rs. 73-77; #17

§ măn × × [(lahha pāun)]
 nu LÚ URUPurušha[(nda katti=mi henku-×^{17a})]
 šu=mu I GIŠŠÚ.A AN.BAR I PA.GAM AN.BAR [(hengur udaš)]
 măn āppa=ma URUNēša [uwan(un)]
 {when back -ma Neša.AL I came }
 nu LÚ URUPurušhanda katti=mmi [(pēhutenun)]

‘§ When I [] went to battle, / the man of Purušhanda with me offer^o[]. He brought me one iron throne and one iron scepter as gift(s). And when I [cam]e back to Neša, / I brought the man of Purušhanda with me.’

In (26) ZÀ.AH.LI-an ‘weeds’ is first mentioned in the text and is thus new at this occurrence. The city Nesa is mentioned several times throughout the Anitta text. After going on campaign, Anitta returns to Nesa, and the referent is recalled from semiactive to active status, as seen in (27).

In the 32 clauses containing -ma, 30 were found to contain obvious foci. Of these 30, 14 contained an idea new to the discourse, and 16 were judged to have accessible foci. Twelve of the 30 foci served as -ma’s host.¹⁸ The high correlation in occurrence of -ma

and focus is unsurprising as most clauses with and without *-ma* will have a focus.

However, *-ma* occurs in 17 examples where the foci are signalled in special ways. Seven clauses involve the introduction of new referents into the discourse, and ten examples express strong contrast.

§2.3.2.1 Contrast

Of the 17 clauses with *-ma* which emphasize elements in special ways, ten show strong contrast. Most examples occur in the Laws (8/10), which may be expected with the presentation of different cases and various conditions. Two contrasted expressions were new, and eight were accessible. All were among the 30 foci found in the data. The item hosting *-ma* was the contrast of focus in nine of the ten examples.¹⁹ The expressions occurred as verbs opposed semantically (#5.5) and through negation (#13, #31); nouns functioning as direct object (#10), goal (#7), and genitive specifier (#4); demonstrative pronouns functioning as subject (#5, #6, #20), and an adverb of direction (#3).

Typical examples of contrasted foci are the following. In (28) *parna...kuelqa* ‘someone’s property’ is opposed to *ukturiaš* ‘incineration dumps’. *parna...kuelqa* is also the new information.

(28) Laws I §44b (A Vs. II 34’-35’); #7

§ takku LÚ.ULÛ^{LU}-an kuiški parkunuzzi [(k)]uptarr=a uk[(tūriaš pēda)i]
 takkuw=at= an parna= **ma** kuēlka peššiezzi
 {if it.A PV house.AL *-ma* someone.G throws}
 alu[(wanzatar DI.KUD LUGAL)] §

‘§ If someone (ritually) purifies a person, he shall convey also the remnants to the incineration dumps.

But if he throws them away onto someone’s property (lit. house), (it is) sorcery, (and is) a case for the king. §’

(29) Laws I §24 (A Vs. I 54'-55'); #4

§[(ta)]kku ÌR-aš našma [(GEME)]-aš huwāi išḥaš=šiš=an kuēl ḥaššī wemi[(yazi)]
 LÚ-naš kuššan ITU.I.KAM XII GÍN KÙ.BABBAR pāi
 SAL-š= a=ma kušan ITU.I.KAM VI GÍN K[Ù.BABBAR] pāi
 {woman.G-a -ma wage.A month.1.DET 6 shekel silver he gives}

‘§ If a male slave or a female slave runs away, at whose hearth his or her owner finds him or her, / he (the harbinger) shall pay a man’s wage (for) one month (of) 12 silver shekels, but he shall pay a wóman’s wage (for) one month (of) 6 (sík) s[silver] shekels. §’

In (29) the contrasted idea SAL-š ‘(a) woman’s’ is accessible by direct association of the quality of being female with the previously activated idea GEME-aš ‘female slave’.

Certain structures and lexical items tend to express contrastive focus when they cooccur with *-ma*. There are nine obvious cases of parallel structure between clauses in the *-ma*-oriented data, and in seven of these a clause with *-ma* follows and expresses contrast.²⁰ Example (29) demonstrates this, as well as the fact that often the vocabulary used in contrasted clauses is nearly identical.

All three instances of demonstrative pronouns functioning as subject are contrasted, and two occur in identical contexts (cf. #5). All five occurrences of *takku* ‘if’ in a clause with *-ma* express contrast, and three are in parallel or nearly parallel environments, as in (30) and (31).²¹ In (30) *taranzi* ‘say (so)’ is opposed to *natta taranzi* ‘not say (so)’. In (31) dividing *kulei*-land is opposed to buying regular land.

(30) StBoT 8 Rs. IV 11-13; #31-#32, #59

§ [m]ān LUGAL-uš SAL.LUGAL-ašš=a taranzi ta DUMU^{MEŠ}-an parna paimi
 [takk]u natta=ma taranzi nu natta paimi karū=ma
 {if not -ma they say} {earlier-ma }
 [ŠÀ?] É DUMU^{MEŠ}-an paišgaḥat kinun=a natta kuwāpikki pāun §
 {in house children.G I went }

‘§ [W]hen the king and queen say (so), I go to the house of the children.
But [i]f they do not say (so), then I do not go. **But** previously,
 I used to go [in?] the house of the children, but now I have not gone at all. §’

(31) Laws I §47b (A Vs. II 45'-48'); #10

§ takku LÚ GĪŠTUKUL-aš A.ŠÀĤĪA-ŠU ḥūmandan kuiški wāši luzzi [(karp)]iezzi
 takku A.ŠÀĤĪA-n=a mekkī wāši luzzi natta karpiezzi
 takku A.ŠÀĤĪA kulēi=ma ārki našma LÚMEŠ URU-LIM pianzi
 { if land idle? -ma divides }
 ta luzzi karpiezzi §

‘§ If someone buys all the land of a GĪŠTUKUL man, he shall render the *luzzi* service.
 But if he buys (only) the large(r part of the) land, he shall not render the *luzzi* service.
But if he subdivides unused? land or the men of the city give (him land),
 he shall render the *luzzi* service. §’

It seems that *takku X=ma* ‘but if X’ is a formula for posing an alternative condition to one or more already expressed. Such is the case in four of five examples where the formula occurs (cf. again (30) and (31) above; the other two examples are #5.5 and #13).²² The fifth example is (28) above, in which the *takku X=ma* clause is contrasted with the apodosis of the preceding condition. *takku natta=ma* ‘but if not’ occurs in two (#13 and (30)) of the three instances when a verb is contrasted. The third case is lexically contrasted: *mimmai* ‘refuses’, instead of *natta tezzi* ‘does not say’ (#5.5). For more findings about conditional clauses with -ma in the Laws, see §2.5.

Parallel structure allows more than one corresponding element to be contrasted. Compare again (29) above, where the genitive specifiers *a man’s* and *a woman’s* are opposed, as well the wages themselves, *12* and *6 shekels*. Compare also (32), in which both subject (*ki* ‘this’) and predicate noun (*šahḥa<n>=mit* ‘my *šahḥan* obligation’) are contrasted with the subject (*ki*) and predicate noun (GĪŠTUKUL-li=met ‘GĪŠTUKUL-li obligation’) of the previous clause.

(32) Laws I §40 (A Vs. II 18'-20'); #5

§^r takku LÚ¹[(GIŠT)UKUL ḥar(akzi)] Û LÚ *ILKI* tittianza nu LÚ *ILKI* tezzi
 kī GIŠTUKU[(L)-l(i=met k)]ī= **ma** šaḥḥa<n>=mit A.ŠÀHLA ŠA LÚ GIŠTUKUL anda
 šittariezzi {this.N-*ma* šaḥḥan.N-my.N}
 GIŠTUKUL-li=ya ḥar[(zi š)]aḥḥann=a iššai ...

‘§ If a GIŠT[UKUL] man [di]es (or disappears) and an *ILKU* man is designated, and the *ILKU* man says, / “This is my GIŠTUKUL-[/i] (obligation), **but** this (other) is my *šaḥḥan* (obligation),” and he registers the field(s) of the GIŠTUKUL man, / he shall both hold the GIŠTUKUL-li and perform the *šaḥḥan*. ...’²³

Contrast in parallel structures provides a very interesting example in which the focus of contrast appears to be an entire clause.

(33) Laws I §23 (A Vs. I 51'-53'); #3

§[(ta)]kku ÌR-aš ḥuwāi n=aš ANA KUR Luwiya paizzi kuiš=an āppa ^ruwat¹[(ezzi)]
 nu=šše 6 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR pāi takku ÌR-aš ḥuwāi n=aš ANA KUR kūruri an[da]
 paizzi kuiš= an āppa=**ma** uwatezzi n=an=za apāš=pat dāi §
 {who.N him.A back -*ma* brings }

‘§ If a male slave runs away and he goes to the land of Luwiya, whoever brings him back, (the owner) shall give him 6 silver shekels. If a male slave runs away and he goes in[to] an enemy / country, whoever (= *ma*) brings him back, that same one shall take him for himself. §’²⁴

The structures are rather complicated in that the protases consist of coordinated clauses and the apodoses consist of relative structures. There are two points of contrast, the land to which the slave flees (the country of Luwiya vs. the country of an enemy), and the reward which the person returning the slave will receive (money vs. the slave himself). Notice that *-ma* occurs in a clause with no contrasted referents. It occurs in the relative presentation of the second apodosis, which, apart from *-ma*, is identical to the corresponding presentation in the apodosis of the first case, *kuiš=an appa uwatezzi* ‘whoever brings him back’. This clause has a different subject, a different direction, and a different action from the preceding clause, and so at a local level is an appropriate environment for *-ma*. *-ma* is nonetheless helping to mark the contrast between the two cases. The particle does not signal contrast

between both cases in their entirety, otherwise we would expect to see it in the protasis of the second case. Rather, it aids in signaling the contrast between the reward clauses of the two cases. This signaling is effected over some distance, as often occurs in conditional protases, but this follows more from the repeated structure of the text itself than it does from any property of *-ma*, which simply signals a difference.

§2.3.2.2 New Referents

It is possible to identify special syntax devoted to focusing a new referent. Luraghi has suggested that the dominant order of constituents in the Old Hittite clause is the following:

(34) # Adv_{temp} Adv_{loc} S DO/Compl IO/Compl Adv_{manner/purp/instr} V #
(Luraghi 1990:45)

There are three examples with *-ma* in the OH data considered here which deviate from this order. It appears that focussed new entities may be signaled by being placed late in their clauses. Another four examples have new referents late in the clause, although they adhere to the proposed dominant order.

Most new referents in the Ritual for the Royal Couple appear as direct objects marked with the accusative, or as oblique complements.²⁵ New referents that were subjects were in the minority: 22 of 101 new referents were subjects, as compared with 79 non-subject new referents. Fourteen of these 22 new subjects stood in initial position, and one other occurred in modified initial position. Two new subjects appeared late in their clauses. In one example the direct object (SAL.LUGAL-*ann=a* ‘and the queen’) apparently stood in initial position, contrasting with the direct object LUGAL-*un* ‘king’ in the previous clause (see §2.4.1 (58)). In the other example the new subject occurred in a nominal sentence with a topicalized predicate adjective. The last 5 examples had initial locative expressions, with new subjects appearing later in the clause.

Whereas *-ma* occurred in only 1 of the 15 examples with initial new subject ((21), discussed above, §2.3.1), it occurred in 3 of the 5 examples with initial locative expressions and non-initial new subjects (and *-a* occurred in a fourth example, #56, which occurs in the following example; see also §2.4.2.3). Compare (35).

(35) StBoT 8 Vs. I 27'-32'; #26, #56

... DUMU.É.GAL-iš / ^dHant[aš]epan LUGAL-i kišarī dāi
 teššumm[e]nn=a pāi SAL.LUGAL=ya Q[A]TAMMA pāi
 NINDAšarrui= **ma**=ššan ERÍNMEŠ-az ēšzi
 {bread:šarruwa.DL -*ma* PV troop.N sits}
 § šer=šemet=a [G]ÍR ZABAR kitta apatt=a=[a]n? anda / pētumeni ...

‘ ... The page / sets a *Hantašepa* divinity in the king's hand / and gives (him) a cup. To the queen he gives likewise. / **But** on a *šarruwa* bread sits a troop.
 § *And* over them lies a bronze dagger. And (all) that we carry in. ... ’

The other examples are (24) (in §2.3.1) and #21. It is possible to interpret the syntax of these examples as focussing the new subject, since most new subjects occur in initial (or modified initial) position and since only 6 of the 15 clauses with these new subjects have location specified at all. One may adduce (25) here (see §2.3.1), also with an initial locative expression hosting *-ma*, the difference being that the subject is not new, but accessible. However, the *GÍR* ‘dagger’ was introduced approximately one entire column before (in the text preserved), so its occurrence in this structure, apparently with a referent-introducing function, is not inappropriate.

This LOC=*ma*-NP-V structure seems to favor introduction of new referents. In another three examples, new direct objects are introduced in clauses with such syntax, making 6 out of 8 occurrences of the structure which introduce new referents. Two of the three new direct objects were presented in §2.3.1 above, LÚ.ULÛ^{LU}-*an* ‘person’ in (20), and ZÀ.AḪ.LI-*an* ‘weeds’ in (26), both in clauses introduced by *pedi*=šši=*ma* ‘and in his/its place’. The third new direct object is *ke* ‘these (words)’, given in (37) below in §2.3.3. These examples adhere to Luraghi’s dominant order, as do the examples with new

subjects. The latter likely register as special because most new subjects occur clause-initially.

Special syntax is also associated with focussing new direct object nouns, and *-ma* occurs here, too. The examples are the much discussed clauses beginning with the verbs *ḥarkanzi*, *weššanda*, and *tarueni*:

(36) StBoT 8 Vs. I 21'-28'; #23-#25, #55

§ apūš ḥantezumni tēḥḥi weš=a namma anda
 [p]aiwani II ḫantašepuš ḥarwani GIŠ-aš ḥarkanzi=ma=an
 ḫantašepes anduḥšaš ḥaršār=a GIŠŠUKUR^{HLA}=ya
 šakuwa=šmet išḥaškanta weššanda=ma
 išḥarwantuš TÚG^{HLA}-uš putaliyantešš=a
 § anda=kan ḥalīnaš teššummiuš tarlipit šuwamuš
 II-ṭki₁ pētumini tarueni=ma=at ēšḥar DUMU.É.GAL-iš
 ḫant[aš]jepan LUGAL-i kišārī dāi

‘§ I lay those in the forecourt. And we go back in. / We have two Ḫantašepa divinities of wood. **But** the Ḫantašepa divinities / have both human heads and lances. / Their eyes (are) bloodied. **And** they are wearing blood-red garments and (are) girded.
 § Twice we bring in clay cups / full of *tarlipa* liquid. **And** we call it blood. The page / sets a Ḫantašepa divinity in the king’s hand.’

These three clauses show word order which varies from the dominant order suggested by Luraghi. Specifically, the difference is that in each clause the tensed verb occurs in initial position. This has the effect of emphasizing constituents in each clause, especially direct objects and the fronted verbs themselves. Holland (1980:41) has identified six categories of clause with verb-fronting in Hittite, four of which often occur with *-ma*: clauses with subject switch, those showing strong contrast with a preceding verb, those with contrasting or complementary pairs of verbs, and those having double accusatives and certain verbs of naming and calling.

The three examples in (36), which were among the data that Holland analyzed, can be assigned to one or more of these verb-fronting categories. The clause with *ḥarkanzi* ‘they have (or hold)’ switches subject, and this is emphasized by the occurrence of the full

noun subject ^d*Hantašepeš*. Fronting *harkanzi* opposes the act of having/holding by the *Hantašepa* divinities to the having/holding by the 1.pl. subject of the previous clause. It also causes the direct objects, *anduhšaš haršarr=a* ^{GIŠ}*ŠUKUR*^{HL.A}*ya* ‘human heads and lances’, to occur clause-finally, and their occurrence in this non-standard position signals their importance.

In the next instance, fronting *weššanda* ‘they wear’ opposes the *Hantašepas*’ act of wearing to their having/holding (although I do not perceive the contrast strongly enough to translate *-ma* with ‘but’). Subject switch occurs here as well. Again the focussed new direct object is placed clause-finally, and this emphasizes the significance of the blood-red garments.

The last instance of a fronted verb exemplifies another of Holland’s categories, double accusatives with verbs of naming, here *tar-* ‘name, call’. Given the highly emphasized nature of the preceding two examples, the unusual syntax here should also connote emphasis and importance, but it is not clear to me whether the naming of blood is, for example, a transubstantiation proclamation or simply an announcement. Again the new direct object *ešhar* ‘blood’ is located clause-finally, marking its significance. The naming also brings to a close the discussion of blood-related referents, after which the ritual activities proceed. Verb-fronting at such a pivotal point, marking a culmination in a series of actions, is another of Holland’s categories.

These claims reflect an interpretation of the passage very different from that of Luraghi (and presumably Starke), who sees backgrounded information in the descriptions of the *Hantašepa* divinities and in the treatment of the *tarlipa* (1990:51-52; see §2.6). However, it seems ill-considered to conclude that descriptions of blood-red items and activities introducing blood in a ritual context are not in fact central to the proceedings.

In summary, clauses with *-ma* can contain contrastive or new information, that is, focussed information. *-ma* nearly always attaches to the focus of contrast, and when *-ma* occurs in clauses with parallel structure and repeated vocabulary or with certain lexical

items (*ki*, *takku*), the clauses tend to express contrast. *-ma* also tends to occur in clauses in which a new referent is focussed by being located late in its clause. Although *-ma* occurs in these special structures associated with emphasizing focussed information, outside these there is no particular reason to associate the particle with the notion of focus.

§2.3.3 Orientation

-ma often occurs with or within expressions which modify or specify the conditions within which the action of the text takes place, the *orientation* or *setting*. These expressions include adverbials and oblique nouns, as well as temporal subordinate clauses.

Twenty of the 32 examples with *-ma* contained orienting expressions.²⁶ Nine settings were temporal (eight clauses with *mān* ‘when’ and one with an adverb), and 11 settings were locational (seven oblique nouns and four adverbs). Three of the locational orientations were metaphorical: *pedi=šši* ‘in his place’ (#1), which concerns the injured party’s role more than his location; and *anda=ma* ‘in addition’ (#29.5 and likely #21). In all 12 clauses without *mān*, *-ma* cliticizes to the backgrounding specifier. Some examples are the following, with adverbials:

(37) StBoT 8 Rs. III 3-6; #29

§ ta namma MUŠEN_hāranan nēpiša tarnah_hi
 āppan-anda=*ma*=šše kē mēmah_hi natta=*an* ūk
 { after-in *-ma* it.DL these.A I say }
 tarnah_hi LUGAL-š=*an* SAL.LUGAL-š=*a* tamaš ...

‘§ Then I release the eagle into heaven
 and after(wards) I say these (words) to it: “Not I have
 released it, the king and queen have released it. ...” ’

(38) StBoT 8 Rs. IV 11-13; #31-#32, #59

§ [m]ān LUGAL-uš SAL.LUGAL-ašš=a taranzi ta DUMU^{MEŠ}-an pama paimi
 [takku]u natta=ma taranzi nu natta paimi karū=ma
 {if not -ma they say} {earlier-ma }
 [ŠÀ?] É DUMU^{MEŠ}-an paišgaḥat kinun=a natta kuwāpikki pāun §
 {in house children.G I went }

‘§ [W]hen the king and queen say (so), I go to the house of the children.

But [i]f they do not say (so), then I do not go. **But** previously,

I used to go [in?] the house of the children, but now I have not gone at all. §’

In (37) *appan-anda* indicates the direction towards which the speaking is done. In (38) *karu* signals a change in the temporal setting for going to the house of children from a time that is hypothetical but concurrent with the composition of the text to a time prior to composition. It may seem that *-ma* and *-a* function correlatively here (see §2.4.2 for functions of *-a*), each signaling a change by attaching to a temporal adverb and thus presenting a structure of balanced contrast. However, I interpret the *-ma* as relating its clause to the not-going of the preceding clause (see also §5.4 under usage c.), and I believe the *-a* relates its clause to the prior going of the clause preceding it. There are 10 instances of *karu–kinun=a* pairs in the Laws, and none of these examples of *karu* hosts *-ma*. The clauses with *karu* begin apodotes, and they thus occur at syntactic and pragmatic breaks where asyndesis is more common than overt conjunction (Hoffner 1997:11). In a sense, then, there is no preceding situation relative to which *-ma* could indicate a change. That is not the case in (38).

Examples of *-ma* with orientation specifiers in the form of oblique nouns are these:

(39) StBoT 8 Vs. I 27'-31'; #26

... DUMU.É.GAL-iš / ^dHant[aš]epan LUGAL-i kišarī dāi
 teššumm[e]nn=a pāi SAL.LUGAL=ya Q[A]TAMMA pāi
 NINDAšarrui= ma=ššan ERÍNMEŠ-az ēšzi §
 {bread:šarruwa.DL -ma PV troop.N sits}

‘ ... The page / sets a Hantašepa divinity in the king’s hand / and gives (him) a cup. To the queen he gives likewise. / **But** on a šarruwa bread sits a troop. §’

(40) Laws I §10 (A Vs. I 16'-18'); #1

§[(takk)]u LÚ.ULÙ^{LU}-an kuiški hūnikzi t=an išarnikzi nu apūn
 [(šāk)]¹ tēizzi¹ pēdi= šši= ma LÚ.ULÙ^{LU}-an pāi nu É-ri=šši / anniškizzi
 {place.DL- his.DL -ma person.A he gives}

‘ § If someone injures a person and does him harm, he shall take care of / that (person).
And in his place he shall provide a person (who) shall work / in his household ... ’

In (39) the setting changes to ‘above the bread’ from the dealings around the king and queen. In (40) *pēdi=šši* specifies the domain into which the substitute is provided, the work role of the injured party. Temporal clauses are exemplified with the following:

(41) Laws I §10 (A Vs. I 17'-19'); #2

... nu É-ri=šši / anniškizzi kuitmān=aš lāzziatta mān= aš lazziatta=ma
 {when he recovers-ma}
 nu=šše VI GÍN KÙ.BABBAR pā[(i)] LÚA.ZU=ya kuššan apāš=pat pāi §

‘ ... (who) shall work / in his household until he (the injured person) recovers. **And** when he recovers, / (the injurer) shall pay him 6 shekels of silver, and to the doctor that same one (the injurer) shall pay the fee. §’

(42) StBoT 8 Rs. IV 23-25; #33

§ III NINDA ḥaršaeš išpantuzzi=ya marnuan kitta
 mān luggatta=ma nu LÚÚ.ḤÚB-za ūgg=a / paiwani
 {when dawns -ma}

‘ § Three thick breads and the *marnuan* libation lie (ready).
But when it dawns, a deaf man and I / go ... ’

Clauses with *mān* (*X=ma*) overtly establish the time in the clause as the time for the action of the discourse.

We see then that the clauses with *-ma* can indicate or contain establishment of a new background. Eight of the 20 examples are clauses with *mān*, clauses whose purpose it is to modify the temporal orientation of the text. The proposition expressed in these clauses serves as background for following events. But in the remaining examples it is really only the orientation-establishing adverbial or oblique noun that functions as background. Ten examples with a backgrounding specifier contain foregrounded new or accessible information,²⁷ cf. (39)-(41) above. The remaining two examples involve backgrounding specifiers which are themselves foregrounded through contrast. One is (28), given above in §2.3.2.1. The other is (43); here the source for providing *luzzi* service, instead of specifying a domain for activity in the clause, is opposed to another source, the partial landholdings.

(43) Laws I §46 (A Vs. II 38'-40'); #9

§ takku URU-ri A.ŠÀ^{HL}A-an iwāru kuiški ḫarzi takku=šše A.ŠÀ^H[(^{LA} dapian)za]
 piyanza luzzi karpīezzi takku=šše A.ŠÀ^{HL}A-š=a te[(^{pa}ieš pi)yanteš]
 luzzi natta karpīezzi IŠTU É ABI- ŠU=*ma* ka[rpianzi]
 { from house father- his *-ma* they² render }

‘§ If in a city someone holds land as an inheritance gift, if al[l] the land is given to him, he shall render the *luzzi* service. But if the small(er portion of the) fields (is) gi[ven] to him, / he shall not render the *luzzi* service, **but** [they shall] re[nder] it from the house of his father.’²⁸

So while *-ma* occurs with expressions that change the orientation for subsequent events described in subsequent clauses, it also occurs with expressions that change the orientation for the events already in the same clause.

The occurrence of *-ma* in clauses that modify orientation increases when we include conditional protases. The condition set forth in a protasis could be viewed as the new

orientation of the discourse. This would bring the total of setting-changing *-ma*'s to 24 out of 32.

-ma occurred fairly frequently in clause-initial expressions of setting in general.

The OH corpus analyzed here included 49 securely interpretable expressions of orientation which occurred in clause-initial position, or in second position with *mān*, *takku*, or *kuiš* in initial position. Expressions in modified initial position were excluded. *-ma* occurred in 21 of the 49 (42.9%) clause-initial examples of setting change (28/49, or 57.1%, including examples with *-a*). Such a frequency is robust when one considers that *-ma* occurs in only 4.2% of clauses in general (8.8% with *-a*).

In sum, *-ma* often occurs in clauses which adjust the temporal orientation for subsequent states and events. The particle also occurs in clauses that have an initial expression that adjusts the temporal or spatial orientation for states and events in the same (and subsequent) clause(s).

§2.3.4 Summary

Previous sections demonstrated that *-ma* occurs in clauses with specially focussed (new or contrasted) ideas (53% of *-ma*-clauses). *-ma* also occurs in clauses with subject switch (59% of *-ma*-clauses). And just above, it was shown that *-ma* occurs in clauses that adjust or contain an adjustment to the setting of the text (63-75% of *-ma*-clauses). The discussion in each section has centered on one functional category and has not made clear what these percentages imply, namely that a given clause with *-ma* will often exhibit more than one of the functional notions at one time. We see simultaneous membership in more than one category in examples (44) and (45):

(44) Laws I §99 (A Rs. IV 56'-58'); #13, #44

§[(takk)]u ĪR-aš É-er lukkezzi išhāš=šiš=[(a še)r=ši]t' šarnikzi
 [(ŠA Ī)]R KA×KAK-ŠU UZNĀ-ŠU kukku[(raškanzi) n(=an E)]GIR-pa išhi=šši
 [(pian)]zi takku natta=**ma** šarnik[(zi) n(u apūn=pat šuwi)]zzi §
 { if not *-ma* he compensates }

‘§ If a male slave sets fire to a house, and his owner makes compensation for [hi]m, they shall cut (off?) the slave’s nose and ears [and] give him back to his owner.

But if (the owner) does not make compensation, he shall forfeit that very (slave). §’

In example (44) the verb *šarnikzi* ‘makes compensation’ in the conditional protasis with *-ma* is contrasted through (repetition and) negation with the verb *šarnikzi* in the first protasis of the law. There is also a change in subject in the clause with *-ma*, from generic 3.pl. to 3.sg. (45) is an example with the special referent-introducing syntax and so exhibits a clause-initial expression of orientation, *hurtiyali* ‘in the vessel’, a referent repeated from the preceding clause; introduction of the new subject *nēpiš* ‘heaven’; and, obviously, subject switch.

(45) StBoT 8 Vs. I 7'-8'; #22

§ [ug]=a arhari nu hurtiyallan harmi
 hurtiyali= **ma** / [AN.B]AR-aš nēpiš I-EN kitta URUDU-ašš=a I-EN kitta
 { bowl.DL *-ma* iron.G heaven.N 1.N lies }

‘§ But [I] am standing and I have a bowl. **And** in the bowl lies one heaven of [ir]on, and one of copper lies (therein).’

The majority of clauses with *-ma* contain more than one of these functional notions (21/32). Of the 11 clauses with one of the notions, 5 also introduce new referents into the text (without special syntax), and the remaining 6 exhibit prototypical contrast or orientation adjustment.³⁰ The environments in which *-ma* occurs, then, abound with the differences which it is *-ma*’s function to signal.

§2.4 *-ma* and the Other Enclitic Conjunctions

It has been known since the beginning of Hittitological studies that the enclitic coordinative particle meaning 'and' had two forms, *-a* after consonants, and *-ya* after vowels and logograms. It was also known that occasionally *-a/-ya* meant 'but', and that *-a* was sometimes not preceded by gemination of the consonant (e.g., Friedrich 1952-66:17, 1960:154f. §§302-305). Otten and Souček then noticed a distributional difference in *-a*'s occurrence: instances of *-a* attached to orthotonic clause-initial personal pronouns were written without gemination and construed as adversative, and instances of *-a* attached to orthotonic clause-internal personal pronouns appeared with gemination and were coordinated (1969:68f.). Houwink ten Cate's (1973) research showed a functional difference between the two forms along the lines suggested by Otten and Souček which was evident in Old Hittite but which fell out of common use in Middle and Neo-Hittite. Houwink ten Cate considered adversative *-a* to be an emphatic clitic, rather than a conjunction. That there were two particles in Hittite, *-a* and *-a/-ya*, is now generally recognized (e.g., Puhvel 1984, Carruba 1985, Garrett 1990, Luraghi 1990; Kammenhuber reports the then recent findings without overtly taking a position in Friedrich and Kammenhuber 1975:43). Adding to this interesting situation, Melchert observed that *-a* and *-ma* seem to be in complementary distribution in Old Hittite, save for some conditioned exceptions (see note 2). He has suggested, although very briefly, that *-a* and *-ma* had the same adversative function (Melchert 1984a:30 with fn.9, p.32 fn.13; 1985:202). If this is accepted, then we have an understanding of *-a* which is nearly opposite to what it was 30 years ago.

It is important to determine the meaning and function of a particle like *-ma* not just by studying the contexts in which the conjunction itself occurs, but also by finding out how it works within the system of conjunctions. Some idea of the ways in which *-ma* contrasts with other conjunctions, especially the enclitic conjunctions, would help define and delimit

its function. In order to help understand the use of *-ma*, as well as evaluate Melchert's claim, I look at conjunctive *-a* and *-a/-ya*.

§2.4.1 *-a* vs. *-a/-ya*

I collected samples of *-a* and *-a/-ya* from the corpus of OH texts I used for *-ma*. Attestations were collected in the same manner as before. However, Sumerograms were excluded from consideration because their forms are frequently ambiguous on precisely the point in which we are interested, gemination vs. non-gemination of the consonant preceding a word-final *⟨a⟩*. For example, in SAL.LUGAL-š_a 'queen + [*-a* or *-a/-ya*]' it is unclear whether the *⟨š⟩* represents the only consonant or the second of two. Once results concerning gemination are obtained for clear forms, we might then attempt identification of these ambiguous forms.

-a/-ya occurs clause-internally and in Wackernagel's Law position and appears to conjoin both words and clauses; *-a* occurs in Wackernagel's Law position and thus appears to me always to link clauses, contrary to Houwink ten Cate's view of the particle (1973). We are thus interested in seeing the distribution of the two types of function, clause conjunction and word conjunction, with regard to the two graphic representations of the final consonant preceding *-a*. The following table reports my findings. Given the functional equivalence of geminating *-a* and *-ya*, I include the tallies for forms with *-ya*. The clauses in conjoined correlative structures were considered as a separate type because of their mutual dependence.

(46) Occurrences of *-a* and *-a/-ya* after Syllabic Writing

Text	Word Conjunction				Clause Conjunction				Correlative Structures	
	$^{\circ}C=a$	$^{\circ}CC=a$	$^{\circ}V=ya$	$^{\circ}a$	$^{\circ}C=a^{31}$?	$^{\circ}CC=a$	$^{\circ}V=ya$?	
StBoT 8	(2) ^b	35	2	6	10 ^c	3	14	2	2	4
KBo 20.10+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
Anitta	-	1	-	-	4	-	-	-	2	-
Zalpa	-	1	-	-	4	-	-	-	1	-
Laws	-	1	-	-	18 ^d	1	3	23 ^e	2	1
KBo 22.1	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	1	1
Total	(2) ^b	38	3	6	37^{cd}	4	17	27^e	8	6

a) Columns headed by question marks contain the tallies for unclear attestations. b) Includes 1 conjunct of a correlative pair (in both copies) and 1 conjoined word (in one of 2 copies—the other copy has a geminate). c) Includes 1 clause with *-a/-ya* use. d) Includes 10 instances of *kinun=a*. e) Includes 23 instances of *parna=šše=a šuwaizzi*. See below for discussions of items in b)-e).

Gemination of the consonant clearly predominates in word conjunction and confirms the occurrence of *-a/-ya* in that function. The two word-joining, non-geminating forms referred to in the first column of the table are unusual. One occurs in a much discussed correlative construction, which would be expected to contain *-a/-ya* and have the form *X-(y)a Y-(y)a* ‘both X and Y’ (Friedrich 1960:155 §304b), as in *haršarr=a* *GIŠŠUKUR^{HLA}=ya* ‘both heads and lances’ (cf. (36)).

(47) StBoT 8 Rs. IV 30-32; (follows #33-34)

ta *hāhhallit* / *gāpinan dāhhe kalulupi=šmi hūlalian kuit=a* anda
halkiyaš=a ZÍZ^{HLA}=š=a haršarr=a nu apatt=a *GÌR-ŠUNU* kitta §
 {barley.G and emmer.G and heads.N and}

‘And with the twig I take the thread, *what(ever)* is wound around their finger(s), *and* the “heads” of **both** barley **and** emmer, also that lies at their foot. §’

halkiyaš=a clearly occurs as the first member in the correlative ‘of both barley and emmer’ but is written without gemination. On this point the status of *kuit=a* is questionable. An acceptable sense can be rendered with either the indefinite relative pronoun *kuit=a*

‘what(ever)’ or the pronoun *kuit=a* ‘everything’, which would be written here without gemination. Another important question for its interpretation is whether it is anaphoric or cataphoric. Most scholars accept it as anaphoric, but if it is cataphoric, it is resumed nicely by *apatt=a* ‘also that’ in l.32. Questions about its syntax also exist, for example, whether or not it is clause-initial. This follows from the other big question concerning this passage, the clausal affiliation of *hulalian* ‘wound’. Most scholars accept *kalulupi=šmi hulalian kuit=a anda* as a clause because it renders an acceptable sense, but I have seen no comment on its extremely unusual syntax, particularly the clause-second position of *hulalian*, which ordinarily would occur clause-finally, or clause-initially when emphasized. A definitive treatment of the passage has yet to appear (cf. Otten and Souček 1969:39; Rosenkranz 1973:322; Starke 1977:52, 178-9).

Rosenkranz (ibid.) suggests that expected geminate writings appear as single-consonant writings because of limitations of space on the tablet. Lack of space is a possible factor for the non-geminate spellings in this passage in one copy of the text (KBo 17.3), but the duplicate at KBo 17.1 Rs. IV 33 has [(*halki*)]*yaš=a ZÍZ^{HL.A}-ašš=a haršā[(rr=a)]*. The space obviously allowed geminate writing of *-a/-ya*, but after the Sumerogram instead of after phonetically written *halkiyaš*.

It is not clear that space constraints precipitated the other single-consonant word-joining example, which also occurs in KBo 17.3:

(48) KBo 17.3 Vs. II 8’ (=StBoT 8 Vs. II 51)

[(*mān* MUŠEN_hāra_{na})]n ERÍN^{MEŠ}-tan=a III-iš waḥnūm[i
{ when bird:eagle.A troop.A and thrice I wave }

‘When I wave the eagle **and** the troop thrice’

KBo 17.1 Vs. II 37’ reads ERÍN^{MEŠ}-ann=a ‘**and** the troop’, with the usual gemination. Indicating word coordination with geminate consonants was clearly preferred, but this rule could apparently be suspended on occasion; the context should have clarified any confusion

from such spellings (so Rosenkranz implies, p.322). There is also at least one case of non-geminating *-a/-ya* clause coordination (discussed below).

In (46) differentiation of *-a* and *-a/-ya* in clause conjunction at first seems less clear since about half of the total involve *-a/-ya*. However, examination reveals that in all examples of clause conjunction with *-a/-ya*, there is a connection between the two clauses that ranges from extremely close, with the same actors, objects, and actions (as noted by Rosenkranz, p.323), to fairly close, with, for example, the same actor performing parts of a larger action. Nine examples with *-a/-ya*, all from the Ritual for the Royal Couple, deal with situations where there is an extremely close connection between two ideas in the clauses—objects of the same type are handled, actions of the same type are performed, two closely connected participants, the king and queen, are treated similarly. Examples showing this:

(49) StBoT 8 Rs. IV 19-20

... ḫalkiaš ḫaršār iṣḫiyanda / ZÍZ^{HL.A}-ašš=a ḫaršār iṣḫiyanda ...
 { barley.G heads.Nn bound.PPL.pNn emmer.G and heads.Nn bound.PPL.pNn }

‘ ... The “heads” of barley (are) bound **and** the “heads” of emmer (are) bound. ... ’

We saw above in (47) that barley and emmer are used together. Throughout the ritual, the king and queen act together and are ‘processed’ together:

(50) StBoT 8 Vs. I 36’; (at #57)

LUGAL-uš ERÍN^{MEŠ}-an III-Š[U alla]ppaḫḫi SAL.LUGAL-ašš=a III-ŠU all[app]aḫḫi
 { king.N troop.A thrice he spits queen.N and thrice she spits }

‘The king [sp]its (on) the troop thrice, **and** the queen sp[i]ts thrice.

(51) StBoT 8 Rs. IV 26-29; (at #34, #61)

ta kalulupu<š>=šmuš gāpinit ḫulāliemi

ŠA QATI-ŠUNU ug=a ḫāḫḫal ḫarmi šīnann=a a ḫarmi
 {figurine.A and I hold }

GIŠḫarpa= ma I-anta LUGAL-aš GÌR=ši kitta SAL.LUGAL-š=a I-anta
 {wood:woodpiles-*ma* 1.pN king.G foot-his.DL lies}
 kitta ...

‘Then I wind their fingers with the thread,
 (i.e. fingers) of their hand(s). And I hold a twig **and** I hold a figurine.
But woodpiles, one lies at the king’s foot and one lies (at) the queen’s. ... ’

We see in the actions following the introduction of the *ḫāḫḫal* and the figure that they are used in close conjunction in the ceremony. For the other examples, see StBoT 8 Vs. I 5’, I 8’ (cf. (45)), I 29’ (cf. between #25 and #26), II 26, Rs. III 26, and III 31.

The one case of non-geminating clause coordination, c) in example (46), occurs in a situation with closely connected participants and actions, where we would expect *-a/-ya*. We probably in fact have *-a/-ya* written without gemination. Rosenkranz attributes this spelling to space constraints (pp.323-324):

(52) StBoT 8 Rs. III 30-33 (=StBoT 25.4 Rs. III 30-32, Neu 1980:16)

I-EN zuwāluwal / ANA LUGAL [tēḫḫe] tiššumminn=a ḫalīnaš pēḫḫe
 {cup.A and clay.G I give }

Û I-EN z[uwāluwal] ANA SAL.LUGAL t[ēḫḫ]e tiššummin=a šše / pēḫḫe §
 {cup.A and her.DL I give }

‘[I place] one *zuwāluwal* by the king, **and** I give (him) a cup of clay.
 And I p[lace] one z[*uwāluwal*] by the queen, **and** I give her a cup.

Notice the spelling with gemination in the line above the spelling without gemination. We are again reminded that the extremely consistent orthographic convention of geminating the consonant preceding *-a/-ya* is suspendable on rare occasions. Here limited space as a motivation for non-geminate writing is more plausible.

Rosenkranz describes this use of *-a/-ya* in clauses with closely connected ideas as word-conjoining: a word can be related to a 'parallel word' in the preceding clause (1973:323-324). This implicitly denies any clause-conjunctive function. It might be an adequate description of the situation if we had only examples like those just above, but there is a range in the closeness of the connection between the two clauses:

First, in approximate order of close to less close, we see the same subject performing actions that, while part of the same overall process, are not identical, as they are above. We see this often in the Laws. For example, 23 of the 44 clear occurrences of clause-conjoining *-a/-ya* are in the formula *parna=šše=a šuwaīzzi*, the precise meaning of which has not yet been determined.³² This formula always occurs as the second (or later) clause of the reward section of a law; in the previous clause a party is directed to give a sum of money (or equivalent).

(53) Laws I §5 (A Vs. I 3'-6')

§ [t]akku ^{LÚ}DAM.GAR kuiški kuēnzi I ME MA.NA KÙ.BABBAR pāi parna=šše=ea
 šuwaīzzi
 takku /NA KUR Luwiya našma /NA KUR ^{URU}Palā I ME MA.NA KÙ.BABBAR pāi
 āššu=ššet=a šarnikzi našma /NA KUR ^{URU}Ḫatti / nu=zza unattallan=pat arnuzzi §

'§ If someone kills a merchant, he shall pay 100 minas of silver, and he shall look[?] to (his own) house (to provide it) for him (his estate).
 If (it is) in the land of Luwiya or in the land of Pala, he shall pay 100 minas of silver, and he shall make compensation for his (the merchant's) goods; or (if it is) in the land of Ḫatti, / he shall deliver the very (body of the) merchant. §'³³

(53) includes another example of related, although not identical, action, namely *āššu=ššet=a šarnikzi* 'and he shall make compensation for his goods', which also follows a clause specifying the amount to be paid. A similar example also occurs in Law §76.

Also from the Laws we have an example concerning land ownership:

(54) Laws I §41 (A Vs. II 23'-25'); #6

§ takku LÚ *ILKI* ḫarakzi Û LÚ GĪŠTUKUL tittianza LÚ GĪŠTUKUL tezzi
 kī GĪŠTUKUL-li=met kī=ma šahḫa<n>=met nu A.ŠÀ^{HL.A} ŠA LÚ *ILKI* anda šittariezz[(i)]
 GĪŠTUKUL-li ḫarzi šahḫann=a iššai ...
 {šahḫan.A and performs }

‘§ If an *ILKU* man dies (or disappears) and a GĪŠTUKUL man is designated, and the GĪŠTUKUL man says, / “This is my GĪŠTUKUL-li (obligation), but this (other) is my šahḫan (obligation),” and he registers the field(s) of the *ILKU* man, / he shall hold the GĪŠTUKUL-li and perform the šahḫan. ...’²³

That the arrangement for holding land and performance of šahḫan are closely related is supported by the occurrence of these two clauses in a correlative structure in Law §40:

GĪŠTUKUL-li ḫarzi=ya šahḫann=a iššai ‘he **both** holds the GĪŠTUKUL-li and performs the šahḫan obligation’.

Also closely related are the verb and participle describing the dress of the Ḫantašepa divinities, but the forms are not morphologically parallel:

(55) StBoT 8 Vs. I 24'-25'; #24

wēššanda=ma / išḫarwantuš TÚG^{HL.A}-uš putaliyantešš=a
 {girded.pNc and }

‘And they are wearing / blood-red garments **and** (are) girded.’

Next we have subsequent action performed by the same subject where it is less clear that the two clauses are part of a whole. Compare *pattarr=a ḫarmi* ‘and I hold a basket’ in the broken example (56), which takes place among general preparations of ritual objects:

In this example there is a less clear connection between carrying the eagle away and the events in the clauses that come before and after:

(59) StBoT 8 Vs. II 33'-43'

... [ERÍN^{MEŠ}-]ti=ma=ššan šēr GÍR ZABAR
 kitta MUŠEN^{hāran}[an] ERÍN^{MEŠ}-an[n]=a LUGAL-aš SAL.LUGAL-ašš=a šēr=šemet
 waḥnumeni II DUMU^{MEŠ}.É.GAL [a]randari kāšš=a GIŠŠUKUR ZAB[AR ḥarzi]
 kāšš=a GIŠŠUKUR ZABAR ḥarzi [n=e II]I-ŠU walḥanzi
 § MUŠEN^{hārana}[nn]=a=ašta [pa-ra-]a pētanzi DUMU.É.GAL
 {bird:eagle.A and PV forth they carry }
 LUGAL-aš SAL.LUGAL-ašš=a kiššar[az]=<š>met teššummiuš dāi
 ḥalmaššuittaḥ ḥašš[az ap]ē?=a dāi ta=ššan
 NINDAšarruwanti ERÍN^{MEŠ}-ti šēr d[ā]i [ERÍN^{MEŠ}-an teššummiuš=[a]
 Ū GIŠŠUKUR ZABAR ANA É.ŠÀ-na pe-[t]a LUGAL SAL.LUGAL-ašš=a
 kitkar=šamet dāi MUŠEN^{hāran}[a]nn=a parā ḥilam[na] / pētumeni ta šašueni §
 {bird:eagle.A and forth gate.AL we carry }

‘ ... But above [the troo]p lies a bronze
 dagger. We wave the eag[le] and the troop over the king and queen.
 Two pages are standing. Both the one [holds] a bron[ze] spear,
 and the other holds a bronze spear. [And] they strike [them thr]ice.
 § And the eagl[e] they carry [awa]y. The page
 takes the cups [fr]om the hands of the king and queen.
 He takes also [th]ose? from the throne (and) [from] the hearth, and he s[et]s
 (them) over the troop on the šarruwant-bread. [He?] ca[rries?]
 the [tro]op a[nd] the cups and the bronze spear to the inner room, [a]nd sets (them)
 at the head of the king and queen. And the eagle we carry out
 [to] the gate. And we sleep. §’

Neither clause in which the eagle is carried away is closely related in terms of actors or actions with the clauses that come before or after, a situation rather unlike the first examples in this section. This is not to say that carrying the eagle away is not the proper thing to do at these points in the ritual; in that sense, the action is related to the other actions in its environment. It is simply less closely related.

There are also three examples where -a/-ya signals word emphasis in clause-initial position. One occurs in a correlative comparison structure (Law §55), and another heads

an apodosis (Law §44b). These do not necessarily bear on the discussion of clause conjunction. But the last example does seem to be relevant:

(60) StBoT 8 Vs. I 30'-32'; #26, #56

NINDAšarrui=ma=ššan ERÍNMEŠ-az ēšzi
 § šer=šemet=a [G]ÍR ZABAR kitta apatt=a=[a]n? anda / pētumeni ...
 { that.A and PV in we carry }

‘But on a *šarruwa* bread sits a troop.

§ And over them lies a bronze dagger. **And** (all) that we carry in. ...’

Unlike the two instances in the Laws, where the structures in which the *-a/-ya*’s occur allow clear interpretation of word emphasis, (60) shows ambiguity between word emphasis and clause conjunction. This example and the clause with MUŠEN^h*haranann=a=šta* in (59) have brought us some distance from the closely related examples seen at the beginning of the section. While those clearly show *-a/-ya* functioning in a narrowly conscribed domain, these last examples demonstrate that *-a/-ya* already functioned in Old Hittite to coordinate clauses that are less closely related. With the possible exceptions of these last two, however, the environments where we find *-a/-ya* are not the same as those where we find non-geminating *-a*.

§2.4.2 *-a* and *-ma*

We have seen that *-a/-ya* most often conjoins clauses that have a rather close connection. In contrast, *-a* occurs in situations like those in which *-ma* occurs. Before considering these contexts, however, presentation of some basic facts of *-a*’s distribution is in order.

The occurrences of *-a* in the OH corpus here number 36 and were summarized in the fifth column of the table in (46). They are repeated here for the reader’s convenience.

(61) Attestations of -a		
Text	Secure	Context Broken or Questionable
StBoT 8	9	3
KBo 20.10+	-	-
Anitta	4	-
Zalpa	4	-
Laws	18	1
KBo 22.1	<u>1</u>	<u>-</u>
Total	36	4

§2.4.2.1 Phonological Distribution

As mentioned in §2.1, *-a* occurred word-finally after single consonants.⁴ In fact, all occurrences of either A or YA after a vowel in clause-conjunctive contexts were consistent with the use of *-a/-ya*.

§2.4.2.2 Syntax

-a typically occurs in Wackernagel's Law position. In a clause beginning with a temporal or conditional conjunction, however, it cliticizes to the second word in the clause. Its syntax is thus like *-ma*'s syntax. (62) can be compared with (63).

(62) StBoT 8 Rs. IV 13; #59

kinun=a natta kuwāpikki pāun
 { now-*a* not at all I went }

'**But** now I have not gone at all.'

(63) StBoT 8 Rs. IV 12-13; #32

kāru= ma / [ŠÀ?] É DUMUMES-an paišgaḥat
 { earlier-*ma* in house children.G I went }

'**But** previously I used to go [in?] the house of the children.'

(64) can be compared to (65). *-a* cliticizes to the word following *takku* 'if'.

(64) Laws I §41 (A Vs. II 25'); #36

takku šaḥḥan= a mimmaṭi,
{if šaḥḥan.A -a he refuses }

'But if he refuses the šaḥḥan'

(65) Laws I §40 (A Vs. II 20'); #5.5

takku ^{GIŠ}TUKUL-li= ma mimmai
{if ^{GIŠ}TUKUL-li.A -ma he refuses }

'But if he refuses the ^{GIŠ}TUKUL-li'

Compare (66) with (67). Like *-ma*, *-a* attaches to the second word in the clause, while a pronominal clitic attaches to *mān* 'when' in Wackernagel's Law position.

(66) Anitta A Rs. 45-46; #48

mān= aš appezziyan=a kištanziattat
{when it.Nc later -a starved }

'But when it later suffered starvation'

(67) Laws I §10 (A Vs. I 18'); #2

mān= aš lazziatta=ma
{when he recovers-*ma*}

'And when he recovers'

I found no example in which *-a* cooccurred with a clause introductory particle. However, one example shows *-a* cliticizing to a genitive form of the relative pronoun, but this is likely to be a generalizing form of the indefinite (gen.sg. of *kuiša*), rather than a freely productive clause-conjoining *-a*.

(68) Laws I §50.61-62 (A Vs. II 61'-62'); [#40]

... nu apē[^l É- ZU] / kuel(=)a ^{Glš}eyan āški= šši šakuwān a[rāuwan] §
 { CC that.G house-his who.G-a tree:eyan gate.DL-his.DL visible? exempt }

‘ ... then [the house of] that one?, / whoever *eyan* tree? (is) visible? at his gate, (shall be) e[xempt]. §’

Unfortunately the passage is broken. *kuel(=)a* ‘whosoever’ is probably clause-initial, but the break prevents us from being certain. The situation is doubly unfortunate since the relative clause appears to be embedded.

-a attaches to hosts of several syntactic types (compare table (18) in §2.2):

(69) **Syntactic Categories of *-a*’s Hosts**

Host Position in Clause	Host Syntactic Category									
	Pronouns									
	<u>NP</u>	<u>Adj</u>	<u>Pers</u>	<u>Dem</u>	<u>Rel</u>	<u>Neg</u>	<u>Adv</u>	<u>PreV</u>	<u>V</u>	<u>Total</u>
First	11	1	4	2	-	-	15	-	-	33
Second	<u>2</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>3</u>
Total	13	1	4	2	0	0	16	0	0	36

Examination of the syntactic environments in Houwink ten Cate (1973:128; cf. §2.2 above) yielded the following results for *-a*, with tallies of *-ma* and *-a/-ya* for convenient comparison.

(70)	Environment	<i>-a</i>	<i>-ma</i>	<i>-a/-ya</i>
1a	in an independent clause	29	18	45 ^a
1b	in a protasis following another protasis	1	-	-
2	in an apodosis	1	-	(1) ^b
3	in a protasis	5	13	-
2/3	in the protasis of a complex apodosis	<u>-</u>	<u>1</u> ^c	<u>-</u>
	Total	36	32	45 ^a

a) Includes one non-geminate form, (52) above. b) *-a/-ya* interpreted as having word-scope, cf. *kuptarr=a* ‘also the remnants’ in #7. c) #3 = (33).

Turning to the contexts in which *-a* occurs, we find the particle in the same environments as those in which *-ma* occurs. Also similar is its frequent occurrence in more than one functional context at one time.

(71) StBoT 8 Vs. I 21'-22'; #55

‘§ I lay those in the forecourt. **And** we go in again. We have two **Hantašepa** divinities of wood. ...’

In (72) we see the subject change with *Happi*, and it changes to generic 3.pl. in the next clause. *Tamnaššu* contrasts with *Happi*, as do the events of the two clauses, escaping and capturing:

§ LUGAL-š=a *IŠME* š=aš yanniš URU^uHarahšū=aš ārša Û ERÍN^{MEŠ} URU^uZalpa
menahḥanda uit š=an LUGAL-uš ḥullit ^mHāppiš=a išparzašta
{Happi.N-a escaped}
^mTamnaššun=a ḥušuwantan *IŠBATU* š=an URU^uHattuša uwatet §
{Tamnaššū.Ac-a living.Ac they captured}

‘§ But the king heard (about this), and he marched. He arrived at Ḫaraḫšu. And the army of Zalpa / came against (him). And the king defeated them. **But** Ḫappi escaped; **but** Tamnaššu they took alive. And (they) brought him to Ḫattuša. §’

In (73) we see subject switch from *ḥantezziaš* ‘first, oldest’ to *appezziyaš* ‘last, youngest’ and contrast between them:

(73) Zalpa A Vs. 16-19; #51

... nu AMA-ŠUNU
 [o o -u]š? natta ganešzi nu=zza DUMU.SAL^{MEŠ}-ŠA ANA DUMU.NITA^{MEŠ}-ŠA paiš
 [ḥante]zziaš DUMU^{MEŠ} niku<š>=šmuš natta ganeššir appezziyaš=a=ššan
 {last.N -a PV }
]x-uš-za neku<š>=šummuš daškēuen[i n]u lē šaliktumari

‘ ... And their mother / does not recognize [the]m?, and she gave her daughters to her sons.
 [The old]er sons did not recognize their sisters. But the youngest (son)
 [said?: “Let] (us) [not] take our sisters. [] Do not approach? (them). ... ’

appezziyaš is also a new subject. Another new subject is introduced into the text in example (74), which is like the special referent-introducing construction seen above, in which *-ma* occurs with an initial orientation expression (cf. (35) and (45) and §2.3.2.2 above):

(74) StBoT 8 Vs. I 30’-32’; #26, #56

NINDAšarrui=ma=ššan ERÍN^{MEŠ}-az ešzi
 § šer=šemet=a [G]ÍR ZABAR kitta apatt=a=[a]n? anda / pētumēni ...
 {over-their.n-a dagger bronze lies}

‘But on a *šarruwa* bread sits a troop.
 § And over them lies a bronze dagger. And (all) that we carry in. ... ’

The bronze dagger has not appeared in the text before this point. The unmarked version of the construction appears in (75), where a new direct object, the cloth, is introduced, comparable to examples discussed in §2.3.2.2.

(75) StBoT 8 Rs. IV 20-22; #60

... kē=šan hūmanda
 [p]addanī tēhhi n=e LUGAL-aš SAL.LUGAL-ašš=a kitkar=šamet tēhhi
 šēr= a=ššan GAD-an peššiemī š=uš LÚ-aš natta aušzi §
 { over -a PV cloth.A I throw }

‘... All these / I put in a basket and set them at the head of the king and queen.
And over (them) I throw a cloth, and no man will (lit. a man will not) see them. §’

In (76) a clause-initial adverbial changes the setting from the general situation concerning the house to its interior. The subject also switches from the man to *kuit* ‘that which’.

(76) Laws I §98 (A Rs. IV 53’-55’); #43

§ takku LÚ-aš *ELLUM* É-er lukkezz[(i É-er) EG(IR-pa we)]tezzi
 andan=a É-ri kuit ḫarakzi LÚ.U[(LÚ^{LU}-ku GUD-ku) UD(U-ku)]
 { inside-a house.DL which.N dies }
 ‘e¹-eš-za nakkuš / n=at [šamīk]za §

‘§ If a free man sets fire to a house, he shall [r]ebuild the house.
And that which perishes inside the house, whether it be people or cattle or sheep, (it is) damage?; / he shall [make compensation for] it. §’

Example (77) contains the adverb *appezzian* ‘later’ that modifies the time of the discourse from ‘before’ (*karu*). The two adverbs also stand in contrast to one another, as do the two subjects, King Uḫna and King Anitta, and the cities to and from which the divine image is conveyed.

(77) Anitta A Vs. 39-42; #46

karū mUḥnaš LUGAL URUZālpuwa dŠiu<n>šumm[in]
 [UR]UNēšaz URUZālpuwa pēd[aš]
 [app]ezzian=a mAnittaš LUGAL.GAL dŠiu<n>šum[m(min)]
 {later -a Anitta.N king. great Šiu.A- our.A}
 [(U)RUZ]ālpuwaz āppa URUNēša pē[taḥḥun]
 { Zalpuwa.AB back Neša.AL I conveyed }

‘Earlier Uḥna, King of Zalpuwa, t[oo]k
 (the statue of) ou[r] god Šiu from Neša to Zalpuwa.
But [lat]er I, Anitta, Great King, con[veyed]
 (the statue of) o[u]r god Šiu from Zalpuwa back to Neša.

In (78) we see background establishment of time in a clause with *mān* and *appezziyan*

‘later’, as well as subject switch to -aš ‘it, sie’, referring to the city:

(78) Anitta A u.Rd. 44-Rs. 48; #16, #48

... URUHattuša-× ×[] / [ta]k?kišta š=an tālahḥun mān=aš
 { when it.Nc }
 appezziyan=a kištanziattat š=an dḤalmaš[uitti] / dŠiuš=miš parā paiš š=an išpandi
 {later -a starved }
 nakkit dāḥḥun pēdi=šši=ma ZÀ.AḤ.LI-an ani'e¹[nun] §

‘ ... Hattuša ... [] / [in]flicted?. I left it. **But** when it
 later suffered starvation, my god Šiu / delivered it [to] the Thr[one] god. And in the night
 I took it by force. And in its place I so[wed] weeds. §’

Note also that -a in this example occurs in an exact parallel to the formula *mān X=ma* ‘but when X’ (cf. ##2, 17-18, 20.5, 28, 30, 33).

Contrast can be seen here between adverbials which establish the setting, *karu* and *kinun*:

(79) Laws I §7 (A Vs. I 9'-10'); #35

§ takku LÚ.ULÚ^{LU}-an *ELLAM* kuiški dašuwahḥi našma KA×UD-ŠU lāki
 karū I MA.NA KÙ.BABBAR peškir
 kinun=a XX GÍN KÙ.BABBAR pāi parna=šše=a šuwaizzi §
 {now -a 20 shekel silver he gives}

‘§ If someone blinds a free person or knocks (out) his tooth,
 previously they would pay 1 mina of silver, **but** now he shall pay 20 shekels of silver, and
 he shall look² to (his own) house (to provide it) for him. §’

In the Laws there are 8 further examples where a clause with *karu* precedes a clause with
kinun=a, and two probable occurrences where the contexts are broken.³⁴ Another example
 contrasting these adverbs occurs in the Royal Couple Ritual, seen above in (38).

(80) shows contrast between the rich man and the poor man and between the ways
 in which the addressees treat them:

(80) KBo 22.1 Rs. 26'-32'; #45

§ LÚ.MEŠNAŠI ŠÍDITI₄-ŠU natta punuštēni
 ta LÚḥappinandaš ištēni
 parna=šša paiši ēzši eukši piyanazzi=⟨y⟩a=tta
 LÚašiwandan=a šiēt dātti
 {poor-man.A-a his².A you take}
 DIN-ŠU natta punušši ...

‘§ You do not question his provision bearers. / You do (the will) of the rich man,
 you* go to his house, you eat, you drink, and he rewards you,
but (from) the poor man you take (what is) his². / You do not investigate his case. ...’
 *From this point to the end of the passage as it is given here, the addressee(s) are 2.sg.,
 having previously been 2.pl.

-a also occurs in two conditional clauses with *takku* ‘if’. Both show contrast.

(81) Laws I §42 (A Vs. II 27'-29'); #38

§ takku LÚ.ULÛ^{LU}-an kuiški kuššanizzi n=aš laḥḥa paizzi n=J[(aš aki)]
 takku kuššan piyān šarnikzil [NU.GÁL]
 takku kuššan=a natta piyān I SAG.DU [(pāi)] §
 {if wage.An-a not given.An}

‘§ If someone hires a person and he goes on campaign and he dies,
 if the wage (has been) paid, [there is no] compensation,
 but if the wage (has) not (been) paid, he shall give one person (lit. head). §’

In (81) the participle *piyan* ‘given’ is contrasted with its negated form. See #13 and #31 for comparable examples with *-ma*. The other example with *takku* and *-a* is in (83), which is very like that in (82).²³

(82) Laws I §40 (A Vs. II 18'-22'); #5-#5.5

§ takku LÚ¹[(GIŠT)UKUL ḥar(akzi)] Û LÚ *ILKI* tittianza nu LÚ *ILKI* tezzi
 kī GIŠTUKU[(L)-l(i=met k)]i=ma šahḥa<n>=mit A.ŠÀ^{HL.A} ŠA LÚ GIŠTUKUL anda
 šittariezzi
 GIŠTUKUL-li=ya ḥar[(zi š)]ahḥann=a iššai takku GIŠTUKUL-li=ma mimmai
 {if GIŠTUKUL-li -ma he refuses }
 LÚ GIŠTUKUL-š=a! A.ŠÀ^{HL.A} ḥarkantaš taranzi n=an=za LÚ^{MEŠ} URU-*LIM*
 anniškanz[(i)]
 takku LUGAL-š=a NAM.RA^{HL.A}-an pāi nu=šše A.ŠÀ^{HL.A}-an pianzi t=aš GIŠTUKUL-li
 kīš[(ari)] §

‘§ If a GIŠT[UKUL] man [di]es (or disappears) and an *ILKU* man is designated, and the *ILKU* man says, / “This is my GIŠTUKUL-[l]i (obligation), but this (other) is my *šahḥan* (obligation),” and he registers the field(s) of the GIŠTUKUL man, / he shall both hold the GIŠTUKUL-li and perform the *šahḥan*. But if he refuses the GIŠTUKUL-li, / they shall declare the field(s) of the GIŠTUKUL man vacant, and the men of the city shall work it for themselves. / But if the king gives a person, they shall give him the land, and it shall become a GIŠTUKUL-li (arrangement). §’³⁵

(83) Laws I §41 (A Vs. II 23'-26'); #6, #36-#37

§ takku LÚ *ILKI* ḫarakzi Û LÚ ^{GIŠ}TUKUL titianza LÚ ^{GIŠ}TUKUL tezzi
 kī ^{GIŠ}TUKUL-li=met kī=ma šaḫḫa-n>=met nu A.ŠÀ^{HIA} ŠA LÚ *ILKI* anda šittariezz[(i)]
^{GIŠ}TUKUL-li ḫarzi šaḫḫann=a iššai takku šaḫḫan=a mimma_i
 {if *šaḫḫan* -a he refuses }
 A.ŠÀ^{HIA} ŠA LÚ *ILKI* ANA É.GAL-*LIM* danzi šaḫḫan=a ḫarak[(zi)] §

‘§ If an *ILKU* man dies (or disappears) and a ^{GIŠ}TUKUL man is designated, and the ^{GIŠ}TUKUL man says, / “This is my ^{GIŠ}TUKUL-*li* (obligation), but this (other) is my *šaḫḫan* (obligation),” and he registers the field(s) of the *ILKU* man, / he shall hold the ^{GIŠ}TUKUL-*li* and perform the *šaḫḫan*. But if he refuses the *šaḫḫan*, / they shall take the field(s) of the *ILKU* man for the palace, and the *šaḫḫan* shall cease. §’

This example is particularly valuable because the linguistic situation in the two laws is so very similar, and the alternation between *-ma* and *-a* cannot reasonably be attributed to the differences we see. There is little variation between the two laws up to and including the conditional protasis in which we are interested. The roles of the ^{GIŠ}TUKUL man and the *ILKU* man are reversed from the first to the second law, and in the first ^{GIŠ}TUKUL-*li* obligation is refused, while in the second the *šaḫḫan* obligation is refused. (The correlative in the first law is of no direct importance for occurrence of *-ma* or *-a*.) We also see *-ma* attached to a vowel-final form, and *-a* attached to a consonant-final form, but they clearly function in the same way in these nearly identical environments, namely to help signal the contrast between accepting and refusing land and its obligations. *-ma* and *-a* are thus found to function the same way in conditional protases and in temporal clauses with *mān*, but *-a/-ya* is found in neither environment.^{35a}

The contexts in which *-ma* and *-a* are found can be summarized in the following table. I have also included tallies for *-a/-ya* for purposes of comparison.

(84) Contexts in which *-ma* and *-a* Occur

	<u>-ma</u>	<u>-a^a</u>	<u>-CC-a</u>	<u>-ya</u>
Total occurrences	32	36 ^b	18 ^c	27 ^d
<u>Context:</u>				
Subject switch	17	29 ^e	9	2
New subject	5	9	1	-
Orientation	20	16 ^b	1	2
with <i>mān</i>	8	1	-	-
<i>takku</i> -protasis	5	2	-	-
Focus-contrast	10	21 ^b	1 ^f	2 ^f
special syntax	7	1	-	-

a) See note 36 for which examples are of the various types. b) Includes 10 examples with *kinun=a* from the Laws. c) Includes 1 non-geminating form in *-a/-ya* use, (52). d) Includes 23 examples with *parna=šše=a šuwaīzzi* from the Laws. e) Includes 8 examples with *kinun=a* from the Laws; see note 37. f) Excludes 10 occurrences with geminating *-a* and 1 with *-ya* that show weak contrast (opposition of closely associated referents).

Subject switch is more common with *-a*, and orientation changes with locative expressions are more common with *-ma*. This distribution may be expected with the different phonological environments in which the two particles occur—more subjects in the nominative case have consonant-final forms, where we find *-a*, and more (sg.) oblique nouns in the dative/locative and allative cases have vowel-final forms, where we find *-ma*. Present/future verbal forms and the negative marker *natta* also end in vowels, so we can expect *-ma* rather than *-a* to occur with them. This distribution may obscure the similarity in the function of the two particles, hence the frequent association of *-a* with subject switch. The table in (85) shows the distribution of *-ma* and *-a* by the grammatical case of the nouns, pronouns, and adjectives, and by the negative, adverbial, and verbal forms that host the particles. Occurrences for *-a/-ya* are given for comparison.

(85) **Distribution of Enclitic Conjunctions by Grammatical Case of Host**

Grammatical Case or Category	<u>-ma</u>	<u>-a</u>	<u>-CC-a</u>	<u>-ya</u>
Nominative	4	15 ^a	3	1
Accusative	2	5	11	-
Genitive	1 ^b	[1] ^c	2	-
Dative/Loc.	6	-	-	23 ^d
Allative	2	-	-	-
Negative	2	-	-	-
Adverb	6	16 ^e	1	1
Verb	<u>8</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>1</u> ^f	<u>1</u>
Total	31^g	36	18	27

a) Includes 5 subject pronouns, 2 of 1.sg., 2 of 1.pl., and 1 of 3.sg. b) *-ma* cliticized to a genitive with an <a> of uncertain status, #4. c) Possibly generalizing, indefinite *-a* attached to a relative pronoun in broken context, #40. d) Includes 23 occurrences of *parna = šše = a šuwaizzi* in the Laws. e) Includes 10 instances of *kinun = a* in the Laws. f) A participle (rather than a tensed verb). g) Excludes the one Akkadographic host, #9.

We see for *-a* functions very like those we saw for *-ma*. The primary differences between the two are their phonological forms and their distribution associated with those forms. Given the similarities in their function, syntax, and host cliticization, and their phonologically-based complementary distribution, it is not unreasonable to conclude that they were (probably suppletive) allomorphs performing the same function in Old Hittite: linking clauses while signaling a difference between their clause and the preceding text (so Melchert 1984a:30 with fn.9, and 32 fn.13; 1985:202-203).

§2.4.2.4 More on *-a* and *-a/-ya*

While *-a* seems to have the same function as *-ma*, some examples with *-a* exhibit uses that approach the degree of content-similarity involved in some of the uses we saw in examples of clause conjunction with *-a/-ya*. The reader will recall that some of the examples of clause conjunction with *-a/-ya*, e.g., (58)-(60), concerned clauses that were

somewhat less intimately connected with each other than in the prototypical examples described above ((49)-(51)) and in Rosenkranz (1973). Examples of *-a* with related, but less closely connected actions are these:

(86) StBoT 8 Vs. I 36'-38'; #57

LUGAL-uš ERÍN^{MEŠ}-an III-Š[U alla]ppaḥḥi SAL.LUGAL-ašš=a III-ŠU all[app]aḥḥi
 šāwataras=a a ḥalzā'i DUMU.É.¹GAL LUGAL-aš SAL.LUGAL-ašš=a ki[ššara-...]
 {horn-player-*a* calls }
^dḤantašepuš teššumiušš=a dāi ...

'The king [sp]its (on) the troop thrice[e], and the queen sp[i]ts thrice.
And the horn-player calls (out). The page takes
 the Ḥantašepa divinities and the cups [from] the ha[nds] of the king and queen. ...'

(87) StBoT 8 Vs. II 19-20; #58

§ mān MUŠEN^hāranan ḥušuwandan appanzi
 n=a an udanzi ug=a uīlna[š ER]ÍN^{MEŠ}-an iyami

'§ When the catch an eagle alive, / they bring it (in). **And** I fashion [a tr]oop [of] clay.'

In (86) the cry of the horn-player is the appropriate action at that point in the ritual, but it is not as closely connected with the events that precede it, spitting by the king and queen, as those events are to each other (and these are marked with geminating *-a*.) Similarly in (87), there is no obviously close connection between bringing in the eagle and fashioning an item from clay. More closely related are the clauses in these two examples, where *-a* coordinates parts of the apodoses:

(88) Laws I §41 (A Vs. II 25'-26'); #36-#37

... takku šaḥḥan=a mimma_ij
 A.ŠĀ^{HI.A} ŠA LÚ ILKI ANA É.GAL-LIM danzi šaḥḥan=a a ḥarak[(zi)] §
 {šaḥḥan.N-*a* ceases }

'... But if he refuses the *šaḥḥan*, / they shall take the field(s) of the *ILKU* man for the palace. **And** the *šaḥḥan* shall cease. §'

(89) Laws I §80 (A Rs. IV 14-15); #42

§ takku UDU-un UR.BAR.RA-ni kuiški peššiezzi išḫaš=šiš UZUĪ dāi
 apāš=a KUŠ UDU dāi §
 {that.N-a skin sheep takes }

‘§ If someone throws a sheep to a wolf, its owner shall take the fat,
 but that one shall take the sheepskin. §’³⁸

In (88), subject switch, as well as different action (change of state), may have licensed the use of *-a*. Similarly in (89), a different subject’s taking a different part of the sheep would call for *-a*. These examples stand in opposition to the numerous instances of *parna=šše=a šuwaizzi*. Although the formula is always at least the second clause of an apodosis, the subject changes only once out of 25 occurrences (from generic 3.pl. assessing the amount of damages to generic 3.sg. in §94), and the household is understood as the resource from which the reward in the preceding clause will be provided.

A final example shows rather close connection in the ritual processing of the king and queen:

(90) StBoT 8 Vs. I 3’-6’; #54

§[III-i]š LUGAL-un SAL.LUGAL-ann=a ḫuyanzi
 III-kiš=a=šmaš šī[n]an / [pa]rā ēpzi
 {thrice -a them.DL figurine.A forth he grasps }
 GUD-n=a=šmaš III-iš parā ēpzi LUGAL-uš
 [III-]iš GUD-un I šīnann=a allappahḫi SAL.LUGAL-ašš=a=an III-iš / [al]lappahḫi ...

‘§ [Thri]ce they run (to?) the king and queen. And thrice to them he [e]xtends a figurine, and an ox he extends to them thrice. The king spits (on) the ox and one figurine thrice, and the queen spits on them (lit. it) thrice. ...’

Here *-a* is appropriate because the actions *ḫuia-* ‘run’ and *parā ep-* ‘hold forth’ (plus object) are different, and because there is an change in subject from 3.pl. to 3.sg.

Although the two clauses are closely connected in the ritual context, they are not as similar

to each other as the second is to the third, where objects are extended, nor as like as the two clauses that follow them wherein the king and queen spit on the cow and the figurine.

These last few examples and examples (58)-(60) above show similar degrees of closeness, yet in the former, *-a* is used, while in the latter, *-a/-ya* is used. The two enclitics thus appear to occur in the same environment. Such convergence in use is unsurprising, or even to be expected, since the boundaries between their use are not clearly defined. As Eve Sweetser observes (p.c.), construal, here of the relations determining the choice of conjunction, can always be different, even for the same contents.

§2.4.2.5 Scope of *-ma* and *-a*

Most scholars have considered *-ma* to be a coordinating conjunction, linking clauses under its scope (cf. §1.2). This function is implicit in the work of earlier scholars, given the frequent equivalents ‘aber’ and ‘but’, and is explicitly stated in more recent work (e.g., Sternemann 1966, Carruba 1969, Luraghi 1990). The possibility has also been raised that *-ma* can be used as an emphatic particle with scope over just a word, the clause-initial word to which it attaches. Houwink ten Cate (1973) understands *-ma* to be a sentence connective, but also sees it functioning as an emphatic particle. Carruba (1985) considers *-ma* to be essentially a (coordinating) conjunction, but mentions a mildly emphatic and adversative function. Garrett (1990) considers *-ma* to be primarily emphatic with word-scope, but acknowledges the possibility of its sentence-scope. CHD (L-N:91-99) understands *-ma* to be a correlative particle, and this view will be addressed below (§5.4).

Since Houwink ten Cate’s identification of *-a* as a particle separate from *-a/-ya*, *-a* has generally been considered to be an emphatic particle with scope over just its host (see Houwink ten Cate 1973, Carruba 1985:82, Garrett 1990:18-19, Luraghi 1990:54-55). Puhvel seems to see a coordinating conjunction in *-a* (1984 1-2:9-10). For those who

recognize emphatic function in the particle(s), *-a(/-ma)* would provide adversative emphasis to topicalized forms and have scope over just these forms.

I follow the traditional view that *-ma* is a coordinating conjunction with scope over its clause, and I think that *-a* shares this status.³⁹ It does seem to me, however, that most occurrences of *-ma* and *-a* are ambiguous between having word-scope or clause-scope, such that those who advocate the former can make a case for it. If one were considering whether *-ma* and *-a* were emphatic clitics with word- or clause-scope, examples such as (91) and (92) could provide evidence for either view.

(91) Laws I §10 (A Vs. I 16'-17'); #1

§[(tak)]u LÚ.ULÙ^{LU}-an kuiški hūnikzi t=an ištarnikzi nu apūn / [(šāk)]'tāizzi'
 pēdi= šši= **ma** LÚ.ULÙ^{LU}-an pāi
 {place.DL- his.DL *-ma* person.A he gives}

'§ If someone injures a person and does him harm, he shall take care of that (person).
 • In his place, **however**, he shall provide a person.'
 • **But** in his place he shall provide a person.'

(92) Zalpa A Rs. 7'-9'; #52-#53

§ LUGAL-š=a *IŠME* š=aš yanniš URUḪaraḫšu=aš ārša Û ERÍNMEŠ URUZalpa
 menaḫḫanda uit š=an LUGAL-uš ḫullit mḪāppiš=a išparzašta
 {Ḫappi.N-*a* escaped }
 mTamnaššun= a ḫušuwantan *IŠBATU* š=an URUḪattuša uwatet §
 {Tamnaššu.Ac-*a* living.Ac they captured}

'§ But the king heard (about this), and he marched. He arrived at Ḫaraḫšu. And the army of Zalpa / came against (him). And the king defeated them.
 • Ḫappi, **however**, escaped; Tamnaššu, **though**, they took alive.
 • **But** Ḫappi escaped; **but** Tamnaššu they took alive.
 And (they) brought him to Ḫattuša. §'

The first translations are intended to convey emphatic word-scope, while the second translations are meant to convey clause-scope.

Without intuitions obtained from native Hittite speakers, it will be difficult, if not impossible, to demonstrate either word- or clause-scope definitively in most examples, but evidence exists which shows that both particles can have scope over their clauses. These clauses contain focal elements to which *-ma* and *-a* do not attach, while they each attach to a word whose referent is active in the consciousness of the audience (given information), or to a word whose referent has only just become semiactive.

(93) Laws I §40 (A Vs. II 18'-22'); #5-#5.5

§^f takku LÚ¹[(GIŠT)UKUL ḫar(akzi)] Û LÚ *ILKI* tittianza nu LÚ *ILKI* tezzi
 kī GIŠTUKUL[(L)-l(i=met k)]ī=ma šaḫḫa<n>=mit A.ŠÀ^{HLA} ŠA LÚ GIŠTUKUL anda
 šittariezzi
 GIŠTUKUL-li=ya ḫar[(zi š)]aḫḫann=a iššai takku GIŠTUKUL-li=ma mimmai
 {if GIŠTUKUL-li -ma he refuses }
 LÚ GIŠTUKUL-š=a! A.ŠÀ^{HLA} ḫarkantaš taranzi n=an=za LÚ^{MEŠ} URU-LIM
 anniškanz[(i)]
 takku LUGAL-š=a NAM.RA^{HLA}-an pāi nu=šše A.ŠÀ^{HLA}-an pianzi t=aš GIŠTUKUL-li
 kīš[(ari)] §

‘§ If a GIŠT[UKUL] man [di]es (or disappears) and an *ILKU* man is designated, and the *ILKU* man says, / “This is my GIŠTUKUL-[l]i (obligation), but this (other) is my *šaḫḫan* (obligation),” and he registers the field(s) of the GIŠTUKUL man, / he shall both hold the GIŠTUKUL-li and perform the *šaḫḫan*. But if he refuses the GIŠTUKUL-li, / they shall declare the field(s) of the GIŠTUKUL man vacant, and the men of the city shall work it for themselves. / But if the king gives a person, they shall give him the land, and it shall become a GIŠTUKUL-li (arrangement). §’³⁵

In (93) a man of *ILKU* (=šaḫḫan?) status may assume the situation of a man of GIŠTUKUL (‘tool, weapon’) status. These positions and their obligations are not entirely clear. Beal links the obligation of *šaḫḫan*, a common tax or service owed the government, to the *ILKU* man, perhaps a common landowner, and connects the GIŠTUKUL man to the obligation of GIŠTUKUL-li, this being an arrangement for holding land, perhaps also with military obligations (1988:274-278).

The protasis with *-ma*, GIŠTUKUL-li=ma mimmai, contrasts with the preceding 6 clauses in which the *ILKU* man accepts the GIŠTUKUL-li arrangement. Since the

Here the ^{GIŠ}TUKUL man may assume the situation of the *ILKU* man. Contrasted with his acceptance of the arrangement, his potential refusal occurs in a protasis with the same structure as that in (93), *takku šahhan = a mimmai*. Again, *mimmai* is the focus of the protasis. Acceptance or refusal of the ^{GIŠ}TUKUL-*li* is not being considered, because it is already associated with the ^{GIŠ}TUKUL man, so *šahhan* is not a focus of contrast. *šahhan* is also active in the consciousness of the audience and thus not informative, as the focus should be. Again, *mimmai* would surely have received focal prosody. Here also, *-a* has attached to a word which is not emphasized, and must have scope over its clause.

An even clearer case for the clause-scope of *-a* can be made with (95):

(95) Laws I §42 (A Vs. II 27'-29'); #38

§ takku LÚ.ULÚ^{LU}-an kuiški kuššanizzi n=aš la₁h₂ha paizzi n=J[(aš aki)]
 takku kuššan piyān šarnikzil [NU.GÁL]
 takku kuššan = a natta piyān I SAG.DU [(pāi)] §
 {if wage.An-*a* not given.An}

‘§ If someone hires a person and he goes on campaign and he dies,
 if the wage (has been) paid, [there is no] compensation,
 but if the wage (has) not (been) paid, he shall give one person (lit. head). §’

Here *-a* has scope over its clause for reasons like those supporting clause-scope for *-ma* above. In the protasis with *-a*, *kuššan* ‘fee’, having been mentioned in the previous subcondition, has just recently become semiactive in the consciousness of the audience. The essential difference between the two protases is the negative in the second; *natta* (*piyan*) ‘(is) not (given)’ is the focus of the clause, and *natta* would surely receive focal prosody. Again, an unemphasized word hosts the adversative conjunction, here *-a*, which must have scope over its clause, and not just the word to which it is attached.

The scope of *-ma* may even extend over a following main or resumptive clause. In (96) the clause with *-ma* in large measure repeats the ideas of the clause before it. The

essential difference between the preceding clause and what follows, then, seems to occur in the main clause upon which the *-ma*-clause depends.

(96) Anitta A Vs. 1-4; #15

^mAnitta DUMU ^mPithāna LUGAL URUKuššara QÍBÍ-MA
 nepišz=aš= <š>ta ^dIM-unni āššuš ēšta
 n= ašta ^dIM-unni= **ma** mān āššuš ēšta
 { CC PV Storm-god.DL-*ma* as dear.N he was }
 URUNēšaš LUGAL-uš URUKuššaraš LUGAL-i × × × ×[] §

‘Anitta, son of Pithana, King of Kuššara, speak:
 He was dear to the Storm-god of Heaven.
But as he was dear to the Storm-god,
 the king of Neša [...] to the king of Kuššara ... §’

Would that we had the full predication in 1.4 of (96)! In (97), in which the clause with *-ma* also in large part repeats the information in the preceding clause, the difference is the contrast between the notions of durativity (*kuitman* ‘while’) and completion (*mān* ‘when’) in the act of recovering rather than any difference between the actions before, during, or after recovery.

(97) Laws I §10 (A Vs. I 16’-19’); #1-#2

§[(tak)]u LÚ.ULÛ^{LU}-an kuiški hūnikzi t=an ištarnikzi nu apūn
 [(šāk)]¹tāizzi¹ pēdi=šši=ma LÚ.ULÛ^{LU}-an pāi nu É-ri=šši
 anniškizzi kuitmān=aš lāzziatta mān= aš lazziatta=**ma**
 { when he recovers-*ma* }
 nu=šše VI GÍN KÙ.BABBAR pā[(i)] LÚA.ZU=ya kuššan apāš=pat pāi §

‘§ If someone injures a person and does him harm, he shall take care of that (person). And in his place he shall provide a person (who) shall work in his household until he (the injured person) recovers. **And** when he recovers, (the injurer) shall pay him 6 shekels of silver, and to the doctor that same one (the injurer) shall pay the fee. §’

A stronger example is (98). Here the protasis and the relative clause with *-ma* repeat much information, and the essential difference in the apodosis is the resumptive clause concerning reward, contrasted with the previous reward clause, not the *-ma*-clause itself.

(98) Laws I §23 (A Vs. I 51'-53'); #3

§[(ta)]kku ÌR-aš huwāi n=aš ANA KUR Luwiya paizzi kuiš=an āppa 'uwat'[(ezzi)]
 nu=šše 6 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR pāi takku ÌR-aš huwāi n=aš ANA KUR kūruri an[da]
 paizzi kuiš= an āppa=**ma** uwatezzi n=an=za apāš=pat dāi §
 {who.N him.A back *-ma* brings }

‘§ If a male slave runs away and he goes to the land of Luwiya, whoever brings him back, (the owner) shall give him 6 silver shekels. If a male slave runs away and he goes in[to] an enemy country, whoever(=*ma*) brings him back, that same one shall take him for himself. §’

In these cases *-ma* seems to be signaling a difference between the preceding context and the content of the entire biclausal structure.

§2.4.3 Summary

The material presented §2.4.1-2 demonstrates that *-ma* and *-a* have the same function, namely to signal in their own clause or sentence a difference or change from the preceding discourse. The contexts in which *-ma* and *-a* occur are 1) clauses with subject switch; 2) clauses expressing contrast or containing particular focus structures, such as the introduction of new referents; 3) clauses which express, or contain an expression of, change in orientation. These contexts often have syntax and vocabulary identical to that in the preceding context. Also, the clause in which *-ma* or *-a* occurs will most often exhibit more than one of these contextual features simultaneously. Although it is not possible to predict where *-ma* or *-a* will occur, identifying these contexts enables us to determine the function of *-ma* and *-a* when they do occur.

Given that their function is to mark difference or change, the meaning of *-ma* and *-a* is adversative. The particles appear to have a range in adversative meaning, from very slight, as in additive contexts, to quite strong, as in contrastive contexts, but I suggest that

-ma and *-a* express not much more than the notion of difference per se, and that the degree of adversativity is largely derived from the context itself. This proposal bears some similarity to Holland's regarding conjunctions derived from **kwi/o-* relatives in Indo-European (1984). On this analysis, a neuter singular relative could be reanalyzed as a conjunction that relativized or topicalized its entire clause and simultaneously indicated the existence of another clause. The interpretation of the relationship of the two clauses, e.g., conditional or causal for a preceding clause, was largely determined by context. The attribution of a conditional or causal meaning to the conjunction itself, which was neutral as regards the relationship of the two clauses, may in fact be more an issue in translation (cf. also Holland 1986:163).

§2.5 More on Adversative Marking in Conditional Clauses⁴⁰

If we accept that *-ma* and *-a* are essentially isofunctional, then some order emerges from the apparent irregularity of adversative marking in conditional clauses in the Laws. The occurrence of *-ma* and *-a* is largely regular.

Nearly every law in the Hittite code is formulated as a condition with protasis and apodosis. Nearly every law is presented as distinct, with little reference between laws.⁴¹ Even if two laws are similar, the second will usually include all the information relevant for that law. Compare Laws §§7-8 in (99):

(99) Laws I §§7-8 (A Vs. I 9'-12')

7 § takku LÚ.ULÙLU-an *ELLAM* kuiški dašuwahhi našma KA×UD-ŠU lāki
karū I MA.NA KÙ.BABBAR peškir kinun=a XX GÍN KÙ.BABBAR pāi pama=šše=a
šuwaizzi §

8 § takku ĪR-nan našma GEME-an kuiški dašuwahhi našma KA×UD-ŠU lāki
X GÍN KÙ.BABBAR pāi pama=šše=ea šuwaizzi §

‘§ If someone blinds a free person or knocks (out) his tooth,
previously they would pay 1 mina of silver, but now he shall pay 20 shekels of silver, and
he shall look? to (his own) house (to provide it) for him. §’
‘§ If someone blinds a male slave or a female slave or knocks (out) his or her tooth,
he shall pay 10 shekels of silver, and he shall look? to (his own) house (to provide it) for
him or her. §’

As this example shows, there is no linguistic marker of continuity between the two cases.⁴²

In laws with more than one condition, however, there are indications of linguistic
continuity. Corresponding identical portions of opposed conditions are often deleted
(gapping), and conditional protases often occur with *-ma* or *-a*.

There are five main types:

I: The law contains two (or more) equivalent and contrasting conditions. *-ma* or *-a*
occurs in the second and following conditions. 5 examples: §§40-41, 47b, [71], and 99.

(100) Laws I §47b (A Vs. II 45'-48'); #10

§ takku LÚ GIŠTUKUL-aš A.ŠÀĤIA-ŠU hūmandan kuiški wāši luzzi [(karp)]iezzi
takku A.ŠÀĤIA-n=a mekkī wāši luzzi natta karpiezzi
takku A.ŠÀĤIA kulēi=ma ārki našma LÚMEŠ URU-LIM pianzi ta luzzi karpiezzi §

‘§ If someone buys all the land of a GIŠTUKUL man, he shall render the *luzzi* service.
But if he buys (only) the large(r part of the) land, he shall not render the *luzzi* service.
But if he subdivides unused? land or the men of the city give (him land), he shall render
the *luzzi* service. §’

II: The law contains one main condition with contrasting subconditions. *-ma* or *-a*
either occurs on the second subcondition (three examples) or does not occur at all (one). 4
examples: §§22, 42, 46, and 53.

(101) Laws I §42 (A Vs. II 27'-29'); #38

§ takku LÚ.ULÙ^{LU}-an kuiški kuššanizzi n=aš la₁h₁ha paizzi n=₁[(aš aki)]
 takku kuššan piyān šamikzil [NU.GÁL]
 takku kuššan=a natta piyān I SAG.DU [(pāi)] §
 takku kuššan=a natta piyān I SAG.DU [(pāi)] §
 {if wage.An-a not given.An}

‘§ If someone hires a person and he goes on campaign and he dies,
 if the wage (has been) paid, [there is no] compensation,
 but if the wage (has) not (been) paid, he shall give one person (lit. head). §’

(102) Laws I §22 (A Vs. I 48’-50’)

§[(ta)]kku ĪR-aš huwāi n=an āppa kuiški uwatezzi
 takku manninkuan ē[(pz)]i nu=šše KUŠE.SIR-uš pāi
 takku kēt ĪD-az II GÍN KÙ.BABBAR pāi
 takku edi ĪD-az nu=šše III GÍN KÙ.BABBAR pāi §

‘§ If a male slave runs (away), and someone brings him back,
 if he captures (him) nearby, (the owner) shall give him (the finder) shoes;
 if (he captures him) on this side of the river, he shall pay 2 silver shekels;
 if on that side of the river, he shall pay 3 silver shekels. §’

III: The law contains one main case, fully determined, and followed by additional specific subcases which may contrast with each other. *-ma* and *-a* do not occur, although *našma* ‘or’ occurs between subcases in one example. 3 examples, most broken to some extent: §§5, [94], [95].

(103) Laws I §[94] (A Rs. IV 40’-43’)

§takku LÚ-LUM EL[LUM?] É-er t[(a)]₁ezzi šakuwaššar=pat pā[(i)] karū d[a(yazilaš I)]
 MA.NA KÙ.BABBAR peškir kinun=a XII GÍN KÙ.[(BABBAR) pāi]
 takku mekki ta[ie(zz) me]kki=še išhianzi
 takku tēpu taie[(zzi)] tēpu=še išhianz[i] ₁parna=₁šše=ea šuwaizzi §

‘§ If a fr[ee] man burglarizes a house, he shall return (it) exactly in full value. Previously for the theft they would pay 1 mina of silver, but now he [shall pay] 12 shekels of silver.
 If he st[ea]ls much, they shall impose much upon him;
 if he steals little, they shall impose little upon him; and he shall look² to (his) house
 (to provide it) for him. §’

(104) Laws I §5 (A Vs. I 3'-6')

§ [t]akku LÚDAM.GAR kuiški kuēnzi I ME MA.NA KÙ.BABBAR pāi parna=šše=ea
 šuwaizzi
 takku INA KUR Luwiya našma INA KUR URUPalā I ME MA.NA KÙ.BABBAR
 pāi āššu=ššett=a šarnikzi
 našma INA KUR URUḪatti nu=zza unattallan=pat amuzzi §

‘§ If someone kills a merchant, he shall pay 100 minas of silver, and he shall look[?] to (his own) house (to provide it) for him (his estate).

If (it is) in the land of Luwiya or in the land of Pala, he shall pay 100 minas of silver,
 and he shall make compensation for his (the merchant's) goods;
 or (if it is) in the land of Ḫatti, he shall deliver the very (body of the) merchant. §’

IV: The law contains one case, with coordination of members of the conditional protasis. *-ma* and *-a* do not occur, although *našma* occurs in one example. 5 examples: §§57, 65-66, 70, 75. The very broken §58 is likely also of this type. Based on duplicates, §75 may have included a subcase, which would reclass it as type III.

(105) Laws I §65 (A Rs. III 44-46)

§ takku MÁŠ.GAL enandan takku DÀRA.MAŠ annanuḫḫan takku UDU.KUR.RA
 ena[(ndan)] kuiški tāiezzi
 māḫḫanda ŠA GUD.APIN.LAL tayazilaš kinza[nn=a[?] uttar[?]] QATAMMA §

‘§ If someone steals a tamed he-goat (or) a trained deer(!) (or) a tamed mountain sheep,
 as (it is) for the theft of a plow ox, so (shall) [also[?]] thei[r case[?]] (be). §’

(106) Laws I §75 (A Rs. IV 1-3)

§ [(takku GUD-un)] ANŠE.KUR.RA, ANŠE.GÌR.NUN.NA ANŠE-in kuiški tūrizzi
 n=aš a[(ki našma=an UR.BAR.))]RA-aš karāpi našma=aš ḫarakzi
 n=an šakuwaššaran=pat pāi [(takku te)]zzi INA QATI DINGIR-LIM ākkiš nu likzi §

‘§ If someone harnesses an ox, a horse, a mule, (or) an ass,
 and it dies, or a wolf devours it, or it disappears,
 he shall replace it at exactly full value. If he says, “It died by the hand of a god,” he shall swear (to it). §’

V: The law contains more than one case. There is no gapping of constituents, and other indications of continuity between the cases are minimal (two examples) or non-existent (two examples). *-ma* and *-a* do not directly link cases. 4 examples: §§23, 77a/b, [92]-[93].

(107) Laws I §23 (A Vs. I 51'-53'); #3

§[(ta)]kku ÌR-aš huwāi n=aš ANA KUR Luwiya paizzi kuiš=an āppa 'uwat'[(ezzi)]
nu=šše 6 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR pāi
takku ÌR-aš huwāi n=aš ANA KUR kūruri an[da] paizzi kuiš=an āppa=ma uwatezzi
n=an=za apāš=pat dāi §

‘§ If a male slave runs away and he goes to the land of Luwiya, whoever brings him back, (the owner) shall give him 6 silver shekels.

If a male slave runs away and he goes in[to] an enemy country, **then** whoever brings him back, that same one shall take him for himself. §’

As discussed above (§2.3.2.1), the *-ma* can be interpreted locally but seems to be helping to signal contrast between the reward clauses of the two cases.

(108) Laws I §77a/b (A Rs. IV 6-9)

§ [(t)]akku GUDÁB arnuandan kuiški walaḥzi ŠA ŠÀ-BI-ŠA peššiezzi II GÍN
KÙ.BABBAR pāi
takku ANŠE.KUR.RA arnuandan kuiški walaḥzi ŠA ŠÀ-BI-ŠA peššiezzi III GÍN
KÙ.BABBAR pāi
takku GUD-aš našma ANŠE.KUR.RA-aš IGI-ŠU kuiški tašuaḥḥi VI GÍN KÙ.BABBAR
pāi parna=šše=a šuwaizzi §

‘§ If someone strikes a pregnant cow (and) causes it to miscarry, he shall pay 2 silver shekels.

If someone strikes a pregnant horse (and) causes it to miscarry, he shall pay 3 silver shekels.

If someone blinds the eye of an ox or of a horse, he shall pay 6 silver shekels, and he shall look[?] to (his own) house (to provide it) for him. §’³⁸

parna=šše=a šuwaizzi probably applies to all three cases in this law.

There are some exceptions to the scheme described above, of course.

(109) Laws I §40 (A Vs. II 18'-22'); #5-#5.5

§^f takku LÚ[(GIŠT)UKUL ḥar(akzi)] Û LÚ *ILKI* tittianza nu LÚ *ILKI* tezzi kī
 GIŠTUKU[(L)-l(i=met k)]i=ma šahḥa-n>=mit A.ŠÀ^{HLA} ŠA LÚ GIŠTUKUL anda
 šittariezzi GIŠTUKUL-li=ya ḥar[(zi š)]ahḥann=a iššai
 takku GIŠTUKUL-li=ma mimmai LÚ GIŠTUKUL-š=a! A.ŠÀ^{HLA} ḥarkantaš taranzi
 n=an=za LÚ^{MEŠ} URU-*LIM* anniškanz[(i)]
 takku LUGAL-š=a NAM.RA^{HLA}-an pāi nu=šše A.ŠÀ^{HLA}-an pianzi t=aš
 GIŠTUKUL-li kīš[(ari)] §

‘§ If a GIŠT[UKUL] man [dies (or disappears) and an *ILKU* man is designated, and the *ILKU* man says, / “This is my GIŠTUKUL-[l]i (obligation), but this (other) is my *šahḥan* (obligation),” and he registers the field(s) of the GIŠTUKUL man, / he shall both hold the GIŠTUKUL-*li* and perform the *šahḥan*.

But if he refuses the GIŠTUKUL-*li*, / they shall declare the field(s) of the GIŠTUKUL man vacant, and the men of the city shall work it for themselves. /

But if the king gives a person, they shall give him the land, and it shall become a GIŠTUKUL-*li* (arrangement). §’^{23,35}

Law §40 has two equivalent conditions (type I). The third condition is a subcase of the second equivalent condition: the king may name a transplantee, but only if the *ILKU* man has refused the land. This subcase is marked with -a, but subcases are not usually coordinated in type III.

Laws of type II show the most variation. Law §46 is a hybrid of type II and type I.

(110) Laws I §46 (A Vs. II 38'-42'); #9

§ takku URU-ri A.ŠÀ^{HLA}-an iwāru kuiški ḥarzi
 takku=šše A.ŠÀ^{HLA}[(^{LA} dapian)za] piyanza luzzi karpīezzi
 takku=šše A.ŠÀ^{HLA}-š=a te[(pauieš pi)yanteš] luzzi natta karpīezzi *IŠTU É ABI-ŠU*=
 ma ka[rpianzi]
 takku iwaruaš išḥāš A.ŠÀ kulēi ārki na[(š)ma] LÚ^{MEŠ} URU-*LIM* A.ŠÀ^{HLA}-an pianzi ta
 luzzi karpīezz[i] §

‘§ If in a city someone holds land as an inheritance gift,
 if al[l] the land is given to him, he shall render the *luzzi* service.

But if the small(er portion of the) fields (is) gi[ven] to him, he shall not render the *luzzi* service, but [they shall] re[nder] it from the house of his father.

If the heir (lit. owner of the gift) subdivides unused? land, o[r] the men of the city give land (to him), he shall render the *luzzi* service. §’

This law begins with one main condition with subconditions, marked on the second subcondition according to the description of type II. A second condition equivalent to the main condition is presented, concerning the dividing off of unused(?) land, but without the *-ma* or *-a* we would expect if it followed the form of type I. Although it is possible, this law does not necessarily contain two distinct cases (type V), for it is reasonable to assume that the *iwaruaš išhaš* ‘heir’ has the same generic referent as *kuiški* ‘someone’ identified in the previous condition and is thus semiactive in audience consciousness. Apparently the expression of the full NP subject of this second condition serves adequately to break with what went before and allow appropriate comparison without the need of *-a* or *-ma*.

Also falling outside the description of type II is the *-ma* that occurs in the second clause of the second apodosis, helping to mark the mild contrast in the party responsible for the *luzzi* obligation.

Law §53 is also a special instance of type II.

(111) Laws I §53 (A Rs. III 7-11)

§ takku LÚ GIŠTUKUL Û LÚĤA.LA-ŠU takšan ašanzi mān=é=za it[(alauēššanzi)...(t)]=az É-ZUNU šarranzi

takku gimraš=šaš X SAG.DU VII SA[(G.DU LÚ GIŠTUKUL dāi)] 'Û III
SAG.DU LÚĤA.LA-ŠU dāi GUD^{HLA} UDU^{HLA} gimraš=šaš Q[(ATAMMA)]
šarranzi

takku NÍG.BA LUGAL TUPPÍ kuiški <harzi> mān=za A.ŠA^{HLA}-n=a k[(aruwilin)]
šarranzi Û NÍG.BA II QATAM LÚ GIŠTUKUL dāu Û I QATAM LÚĤA.L[(A-ŠU
dā)u] §

‘§ If a GIŠTUKUL man and his partner live (lit. are) together, when they have a falling out [...] and divide their household,
if (there are) 10 people (lit. heads) on his fields, the GIŠTUKUL man shall take 7 people, and his partner shall take 3 people; they shall divide the cattle and sheep on his fields in the same manner;
if someone has a royal grant by tablet, **then** when they divide old land, the GIŠTUKUL man shall take two parts of the grant, and his partner [shall] take one part. §’

takku ‘if’ and *mān* ‘when’ are each used to express one part of the main condition. The *takku* clause contains background information for the change in relations described in the *mān* clause, with additional action following in the *ta*-clause. The first subcondition about the number of people follows, with apodosis. Another *takku-mān* pair expresses the second subcondition concerning deeded land. Again the *takku* clause contains background information for the *mān* clause, which describes the essence of the subcondition, dividing land. The *mān* clause contains *-a*, which is consistent with the syntax of *mān* clauses in Old Hittite. So this second subcondition is marked with *-a*; it is just that its structure is more complex than that in either (101) or (110).

The taxonomy presented above provides an account of most occurrences of *-ma* and *-a*, but not all of them: compare the ‘unpredicted’ particles in (109) and (110). And it cannot predict the non-occurrence of adversative marking in law (102) (type II). Length of the preceding text is certainly no stronger a determining factor in the particles’ occurrence here than is the structure of the law. There is only a slight preference for *-ma* or *-a* to occur in the laws following long apodoses with more textual material, 5 out of 8 laws; 3 laws with *-ma* or *-a* have little material in the preceding apodosis. Rather, it seems that *-ma* and *-a* were just chosen most often for laws with a certain structure (8 out of 9 times). The laws in which *-ma* and *-a* occur, laws of types I-II, are those where a case has more than one condition and more than one primary conclusion. Types III-V, where we do not find the particles, contain cases where only one primary conclusion is given. (In type III the subcases are expressed after the primary conclusion has been given.) Evidently the Hittite author(s) of the laws judged that *-ma/-a* were useful in signaling the difference between equivalent conditions with different endpoints. As with all attestations of *-ma* and *-a*, we may be able to explain the occurrence of either in a given clause, but we will probably never be able to predict their occurrence with certainty or to explain their non-occurrence.

§2.6 Response to Starke and Luraghi

The reader will recall from §1.2 that Starke claimed *-ma* had a pragmatically subordinating and explanatory function, especially in ritual texts (1977:31 fn.32, p.74). Starke's claimed function is supposedly clear in clauses without [other] subordinating conjunctions, and in some of these sentences, translating *-ma* with 'while' renders an acceptable meaning (cf., e.g., #22-27) although I reject such an interpretation, as discussed in the section on focus above, §2.3.2. However, there are also examples in which pragmatic subordination and simultaneity obviously play no part. In (112) *-ma* marks a clause which must be considered of approximately equivalent importance to the preceding clause, the performative claiming of land. In (113) *-ma* is attached to an adverb which would only be used after the release; the action of the clause, speaking, is important, and it is subsequent to the action of the preceding clause. In (114) the clause in which *-ma* occurs is explicitly of anterior time and thus functions to provide background information, but simultaneity is ruled out.

(112) Laws I §41 (A Vs. II 23'-24'); #6

§ takku LÚ *ILKI* ḫarakzi Û LÚ ^{GIŠ}TUKUL tittianza LÚ ^{GIŠ}TUKUL tezzi
kī ^{GIŠ}TUKUL-li=met kī=*ma* šaḫḫa<n>=met ...

'§ If an *ILKU* man dies (or disappears) and a ^{GIŠ}TUKUL man is designated, and the ^{GIŠ}TUKUL man says,

"This is my ^{GIŠ}TUKUL-*li* (obligation), **but** this (other) is my *šaḫḫan* (obligation)," ... '

(113) StBoT 8 Rs. III 3-6; #29

§ ta namma ^{MUŠEN}ḫāranan nēpiša tarnahḫi
āppan-anda=*ma*=šše kē mēmahḫi natta=an ūk
tarnahḫun LUGAL-š=an SAL.LUGAL-š=a tarnas ...

'§ Then I release the eagle into heaven
and after(wards) I say these (words) to it: "Not I have
released it, the king and queen have released it. ..." '

(114) StBoT 8 Rs. IV 11-13; #31-#32, #59

§ [m]ān LUGAL-uš SAL.LUGAL-ašš=a taranzi ta DUMU^{MEŠ}-an pama paimi
 [takk]u natta=ma taranzi nu natta paimi karū=ma
 [ŠÀ?] É DUMU^{MEŠ}-an paišgaḥat kinun=a natta kuwāpikki pāun §

‘§ [W]hen the king and queen say (so), I go to the house of the children.
But [i]f they do not say (so), then I do not go. **But** previously,
 I used to go [in?] the house of the children, but now I have not gone at all. §’

Luraghi disagrees with Starke’s views regarding *-ma*’s semantics; she finds *-ma* to be adversative, marking information that is contrary-to-expectation, thus functioning to express textual discontinuity. On her view, *-ma* occurs in clauses that are explanations and parenthetical statements (1990:50-54), marking an introduction of ‘additional’ as opposed to ‘essential’, information (p.108). She describes a few other functions for *-ma*, but these can be seen to be grouped under her concept of textual discontinuity.

I agree with Luraghi that *-ma* is adversative, but would say that the conjunction signals difference or change rather than textual discontinuity. (‘Discontinuity’ is perhaps not the best term to use in this context since even adversative conjunctions function to provide textual cohesion.) I disagree with Luraghi on other points.

First, she regards much more information than I do as being backgrounded. Eight of 20 orientation-establishing examples with *-ma* occur in clauses with *mān*, whose purpose it is to establish the time for the following predication. The remaining 12 examples, however, merely contain some type of setting for the selfsame predication (cf. §2.3.3). It seems that Luraghi confuses this fact with the idea that the entire clause with *-ma* contains backgrounded information. Of the twelve clauses which contain a specifier of orientation, the entire content can be considered backgrounded information in only one, (114) above, so by far the majority of these examples also express foregrounded information. Compare that example with (112)-(113), and compare our differing interpretations of (36) above, at the end of section §2.3.2.2.

Second, I think it is difficult for us to know what to expect in many situations described in a text, such that the information in a *-ma*-clause would counter those expectations. I find no example in the corpus of 32 clauses with *-ma* that is clearly contrary-to-expectation. But one example that Luraghi cites comes closest to expressing such adversativity, although the feature she emphasizes is textual discontinuity. 'In example ([115]c, h, f), with a strictly concatenated series of actions, *-ma-* has the effect of breaking the sequence' (Luraghi 1990:53; glosses mine):

(115) OH Ritual KBo 17.43 Vs. I 10'-13' (Neu 1980:105)

... EGIR-ŠU LÚmeneyaš iētta kētt=a kētt=a G[I-an]
 huttiannāi (c)tarnāi= **ma**= an natta īḫalziššāi LUGAL-i parā I-ŠU
 {releases *-ma* it.Ac not }
 paizzi (f)āppa=**ma**=ašta nēa LÚmenean KUŠšarazzit walaḫzi
 {back *-ma* PV turns }
 (h)₁parā₁=**[m]**a= aš paizzi LÚ.MEŠALAM.ZÚ-uš walaḫzi §
 {forth *-ma* he goes }

'... Behind (him) the archer? walks. On this side and on that side he draws an ar[row], (c)**but** he does not release it. He cries 'i'. He goes forward to the king one time. (f)**And** he turns around. He strikes the archer? with the waterbag?.
 (h)**And** he goes forth. He strikes the clowns. §'

Rather than just 'breaking the sequence' of concatenated actions, *-ma* signals a change in direction in clause (f) and marks a change in direction and resumption of motion in clause (h). In clause (c) *-ma* does not break the sequence of actions at all, but rather signals a contrast of the verb (*natta*) *tarnai* 'releases (not)' with *huttiannai* 'draws'. It is the contrast between the action which usually follows drawing an arrow, namely the release, and the action which in fact follows, the non-release, that allows an interpretation of contrariness-to-expectation here.

Although Luraghi notes the connection between *-ma* and verbs in initial position (1990:52 passim), she does not relate *-ma* with contrast. She does not relate *-ma* to subject switch. She does relate *-ma* to presentational constructions (pp.105-106).

Luraghi is of the opinion that *-ma* conveys no adversativity in the expression *pedi = ši = ma* ‘and in his place’, serving instead to disambiguate between subject- and non-subject-reference for the 3.sg. dat./loc. possessive adjective *-ši* (1990:136 nn. 3, 12). How this function of *-ma* relates to its other uses is not discussed. It seems more profitable, however, to consider semantic roles in the preceding context when determining cases of 3.sg. pronominal reference in which the subject is also 3.sg. (cf. #1; #16 has 1.sg. subject), and to view occurrences of *pedi = ši = ma* as a variant of the presentational construction *LOC = ma NP V*, where the NP is usually new, as discussed in §2.3.2.2.

Luraghi regards the conjunction *-a* as weakly adversative, marking a change to another clause-initial form having the same function. On her view this indicates a ‘shift’; subject shift is the most frequent use of *-a*. According to Luraghi, *-a* does not necessarily indicate a situation contrary to expectation, and is found in only a few contexts where *-ma* would be used (1990:54-55). On her view, *-a* has scope over only its host, whereas *-ma* has scope over its sentence (p.88). Luraghi links *-a* to setting (p.93) and connects *-a* with contrasted constituents (pp.100ff.).

As we saw in §2.4.2, most occurrences of *-a* in the corpus here are associated with subject switch, and many are associated with contrast and changes in setting. These are contexts in which we have also seen *-ma* occur, however. Luraghi’s view that the scope of *-a* extends over only its host is probably influenced by its many cooccurrences with subject switch (and setting change), which in turn are due to *-a*’s phonologically-based distribution. Apart from this view of scope, our findings for *-a* are more similar than our findings for *-ma*. In the main I think her account of *-a* could have served for *-ma*, as well.

Notes to Chapter 2

¹I treat the Ritual for the Royal Couple as a reconstructed text since the copies all date to the OH period, and I do not indicate restorations except when a specific copy is under discussion. References are to the edition of Otten and Souček (1969, with some additional material from Neu 1980). Restorations in the Laws and the Anitta text are indicated because they come from later redactions of the texts.

^{1a}In this table and in tables throughout, a dash ‘-’ indicates zero (0).

²Melchert does not discuss these conditioned exceptions, but they are not the subject of his article.

³Houwink ten Cate (1973:134f. fn.85) presents two putative attestations of Old Hittite *-ma* that follow consonants, one after a relative pronoun, *kuēš=ma* ‘but whichever (pl.)’ at 2 BoTU 11 B II 16 (= CTH 9.4), and one after a personal pronoun, *ammug=ma* ‘but I’ at 2 BoTU 3 I 8 (= CTH 311.1). Kammenhuber (1979:192) lists as Old Hittite *akkiš=ma=aš* ‘but he/she died’ at KBo 3.34 II 12 (= CTH 8.A). However, Oettinger considers CTH 8.A and 9.4 Neo-Hittite copies (1979:579), as does Yoshida (1990:16). Yoshida also considers CTH 311.1 to be a Neo-Hittite copy (p.19); Oettinger does not include CTH 311.

⁴It would be difficult to discern an *-a* following word-final *-i* and *-e*, and probably impossible after *-a*. The former are assumed to be *-ya*, as in the phrase *parna=šše=a šuwaizzi* (for which see note 33).

⁵Please see the Notes on Translation and Glossing in the front matter.

⁶I reviewed the cuneiform autographs for all texts except for the OH ritual fragments (other than the Royal Couple Ritual) found in Neu (1980), for which I consulted the indices in Neu (1983).

⁷I do not include here two other possible occurrences of *-ma* as the status of each is simply too questionable to do so. The first is given by Neu (1983:112) as an alternate reading of

KA in the GUD-*uš-K*[A ‘your cow’ at KBo 25.122 Rs. III 14’ (1980:205). KA offers consistency within the text, but it is unusual for Akkadian possessives to follow Hittite phonetic complementation (so Neu 1983:242 with n. 26). And given the representation of KA as a ligature in the fragment, reading GUD-*K*[A is excluded. In any event, the sign is at a break, and its context remains unknown.

The second very questionable occurrence of *-ma* is in *ma-a-aḥ-ḥa-an-m*[a at KBo 25.87 7’ (Neu 1980:167), but I suggest that the putative MA is rather a DA, giving *maḥḥand*[a] ‘as’. The traces suggest MA, but are also consistent with some DA’s. Such DA’s are found in the Ritual for the Royal Couple (Otten and Souček 1969) and in the Storm Ritual (Neu 1970)—compare the signs represented in Rüster (1972, sign 166) for these texts. Compare also the DA’s at KBo 25.122 Vs. II 4’, Rs. III 3’, 5’, 7’. Reading MA would yield the only occurrence in Old Hittite of *-ma* following a consonant that is not *-š* (or *-z*). Reading MA would also yield a rare cooccurrence of *-ma* with clause-introductory particle, here *ta*. *maḥḥan* in initial or modified initial position is rare in Old Hittite (only one example having been found in the Ḫabiru treaty in a review of several of the larger texts), whereas initial *maḥḥanda* is not uncommon. Along with these rare or unique occurrences are the unusual composition of the clay of the fragment and the surprising appearance of ^dNISABA in an OH text (Neu 1980:165).

⁸The occurrences of *appan-anda* at ABoT 4 öy. II 5 (corrected in KBo 17.1 to Rs. III 4) and at KBo 17.1 Vs. I 33’ seem to show word space, but the first autograph of the latter, KUB 34.119 5’, shows no space. There is no space at KBo 17.3 Rs. III 3, but here the text is on the edge, where a word space could easily be sacrificed. Otten and Souček consider the form one word (1969:110). Neu indicates the ambiguity with a parenthesized hyphen in his transcription *a-ap-pa-an(-)an-da* (1980:6, 9 and similarly p.15), but comes to consider it one word (1983:23). Three of the four attestations adduced by Puhvel (1984ff. 1-2:91-92) are written with a space, so OH scribes evidently considered the form to consist of two words at some level.

⁹The OH texts from which Houwink ten Cate cites examples for *-ma* in environment 2, CTH 311.2.A and CTH 371 (1973:134), have since been reclassified as Old Hittite in NH and MH copies, respectively (Yoshida 1990:11-19; Oettinger 1979:578 for CTH 371).

¹⁰This description employs an opposition of qualities which are more properly conceived of as two points on a cline of continuity.

¹¹The activation status of *GIŠharpa* may have been accessible, but it occurs nowhere else in the text as we have it at present. It is also possible that it is a (rather weak) focus of contrast, opposed perhaps to *šina-* 'figurine' of the preceding clause. Since strong contrast is not obvious, however, I favor interpretation as a new referent.

¹²I understand this example of left-dislocation as establishing a topic, but Givón claims that left-dislocation, while used to retrieve referents at long distance to establish them as topics, is never used to introduce new topics into the discourse (1990:757-758). If this is true, then *GIŠharpa* could have an *accessible* information status if it is associated with the non-linguistic environment (Prince's *situationally evoked*). Since it apparently is a ritual prop, this is entirely possible. If accessible, *GIŠharpa* would be identifiable, and eligible for establishment as topic. But we may not have left-dislocation here. It is also possible that *GIŠharpa* is not to be separated from *I-anta* to the degree that the English translation implies. While the translation seems acceptable, another in which *I-anta* is postposed to *GIŠharpa* to form a unit, as in #22, is also entirely acceptable: 'But one woodpile lies at the king's foot...' Knowledge of Hittite prosody would have helped here.

¹³Examples with topics are ##1-4, 5.5, 7, 10, 13, 15-18, 20.5, 23-25, 29, 31, 32, 34.

¹⁴Examples with topic switch are ##13, 17, 18, 23, 24, 31, and 34. Examples with no topic switch are ##1, 2, 3, 4, 5.5, 7, 10, 15, 16, 20.5, 25, 29, and 32. The 9 examples included in the expanded definition of switch are the 3thetic clauses, ##28, 30, and 33, and the 6 presentational clauses, ##5, 6, 20, 22, 26, and 27.

¹⁵Examples with subjects are the same 20 clauses with topics given in note 13, plus the 6 presentational clauses, ##5, 6, 20, 22, 26, and 27. The 14 examples with subject switch are

##3, 5, 6, 13, 17, 18, 20, 22-24, 26, 27, 31, and 34. Examples with no subject switch are ##1, 2, 4, 5.5, 7, 10, 15, 16, 20.5, 25, 29, and 32. The 3 examples included in the expanded definition of switch are the 3thetic clauses, ##28, 30, and 33.

¹⁶A stronger correlation between subject switch and *-ma* results by including the person of the narrative. *-ma* coincides with subject switch in 75% (15/20) of the clauses in first-person narrative (including two hypothetical quotes), while in only 22% (2/9) of the clauses in third-person narrative do the two coincide.

¹⁷I have treated referents as new when they first appear, but we can be sure that a referent is new only when we have the text preserved from its beginning to the point where the referent is introduced.

^{17a}Neu reads this sign as *-m[u*, thus *henkum[uš* ‘gift (acc.pl.)’ (1974:14, 114-116), but Puhvel reads *-n[i*, thus *henkun[i* ‘gift (dat.sg.)’ (1984ff. 3:291, 4:128). Puhvel apparently objects to Neu’s proposed morphology, but Puhvel’s gloss ‘to me for a gift’ points up the problem of the missing predicate. An instrumental *henkunit* also seems possible, but raises the same question.

¹⁸Examples with new foci are ##7*, 9*, 16, 18*, 20, 20.5*, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28*, 29. Examples with accessible foci are ##1, 3*, 4*, 5, 5.5, 6, 10*, 13*, 17, 27, 29.5, 30*, 31*, 32, 33*, 34. Asterisks indicate which foci served as host for *-ma*. The two examples with indeterminate foci were #2 and #15. In both cases the clause with *-ma* essentially repeats the proposition of the preceding clause. #2: *...kuitman=aš lazziatta mān=aš lazziatta=ma* ... ‘...until he recovers. And when he recovers...’ #15: *nepišz=aš=<š>ta^dIM-unni āššuš ēšta n=ašta^dIM-unni=ma mān āššuš ēšta* ‘He was dear to the Storm-god of heaven. But as he was dear to the Storm-god...’ The essential difference between the clauses seems to be the presence of *mān* ‘when, as’, indicating that the process is complete (#2) or that the state is relevant as regarded from a point or period of time (#15), but focus is difficult to determine here.

¹⁹Examples showing strong contrast are ##3, 4, 5, 5.5, 6, 7, 10, 13, 20, 31. In ##5, 6, and 20 the subjects of these nominal sentences, in each case *ki* 'this', were the foci of contrast, but the foci of the sentences were *šaḥḥa<n>=mit* 'my *šaḥḥan* obligation' for ##5-6, which were also contrasted, and *ḥenkuwaš=šaš* 'of his apportionment'. The example where *-ma* was not hosted by the focus of contrast was #5.5, in which the claiming of the land is contrasted semantically (*mimmai* 'refuses') rather than through negation.

²⁰Examples exhibiting parallel structure are ##2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 13, 15, 31. The two which do not show contrast are #2 and #15.

²¹Examples with demonstrative pronoun subjects are ##5, 6, 20. Examples with *takku* are ##5.5, 7, 10, 13, 31.

²²To these four may be added an example which is too broken to be included among the data used to determine *-ma*'s function, but which is consistent with other examples of contrast:

Laws I §71 (A Rs. III 58-60); #11

§ takku GUD-un ANŠE.K[(UR.RA ANŠE.GÌR.NUN.N)]A ANŠE-in kuiški wemiezzi
[(n=an LUG)]AL-w[(an āška ūnnai ta)]kku utniya=ma wemiezzi
[(n=an LÚ.MEŠŠU.GÌ-aš ḥinkanzi n=an=za)]tūrizzi mā₁n=an₁[(

'§ If someone finds a (stray) ox, horse, mule (or) donkey,
he shall drive it to the king's gate. **But** if he finds (it) in the country,
they shall present it to the elders. (The finder) shall harness it for himself. When it [...]'

²³For more information about the terms in this passage, please see the discussion of Laws §§40-41, examples (93)-(94), in §2.4.2.5.

²⁴Since it would be difficult to render a coordinating conjunction at the beginning of an apodosis in English, *-ma* is not translated here. It could be rendered with *then* or *in that case* here to connote both cohesion and adversativity. *-a* in Law §64 (#41) is translated similarly (see note 39).

²⁵The Anitta and Zalpa texts, as well as the ritual KBo 20.10+ and the instruction KBo 22.1, have not yet been included in this portion of the investigation. The Laws were not included because in this text, new generic referents are introduced in every law, so new subject referents are much more common, not only occurring as noun phrases, but also as the indefinite pronoun *kuiški* ‘someone’. For these five texts, investigation beyond emphatic focus has not been undertaken. One example of emphatic subject placed late in the clause, *apaš = pat* ‘that very one’, occurs in the Laws (cf. #2), but *-ma* does not cooccur with *-pat* in the corpus.

²⁶The examples of orientation with adverbs are ##3, 21, 29, 29.5, and 32. The examples with oblique nouns are ##1, 7, 9, 16, 22, 26, and 27. The examples with *mān* are ##2, 15, 17, 18, 20.5, 28, 30, and 33. It is sometimes difficult to distinguish adjuncts from arguments, especially with regard to clause-initial spatial expressions, although I have attempted to do so. The number of examples would only be higher if arguments were included.

²⁷Examples of change in orientation with foregrounded new information: ##16, 21, 22, 26, 29; with foregrounded accessible information: ##1, 3, 27, 29.5, 32.

²⁸Hoffner notes that if the referent of *kuiški* ‘someone’ was a woman, the *iwaru* ‘gift, inheritance, dowry’ might well refer to a dowry (1997:55 fn. 177).

²⁹Removed

³⁰The 5 examples which introduce new referents outside special syntactic structures are ##1, 9, 16, 29, 34. The 1 prototypical example of contrast is #4, and those of orientation adjustment are ##2, 15, 20.5, 29.5, and 32.

³¹Given Puhvel’s rejection of a formation of *kāša(-)* ‘lo, behold’ from *kāš* ‘this’ + *-a* (1984ff. 4:118-119), however plausible it may seem, 5 forms are not included here: 2 of *kāša* and 1 of *kāšata* from StBoT 8, and 2 instances of *kāšatta* from KBo 22.1. The ambiguous forms *ka-lu-u-lu-pí-iš-mi-ta-aš-ta* (i.e., *kalūlupi* <*t*> = *šmit* = ‘’) ‘with their finger(s) + *-a?* + *-ašta* [enclitic preverb]’ (at StBoT 8 Vs. I 19’) and *ú-ga-an* ‘I + *-a?* +

-an [enclitic preverb]' (at StBoT 8 Vs. II 45 and Rs. III 29) are also excluded, although Rosenkranz considers -a to be present in these forms (1973:321-322).

³²The 25 occurrences of *parna = šše = a šuwaizzi* are located in Laws §§4, 5, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13*, 19b, 20, 25, 57, 58, 59, 60*, 61*, 62*, 63, 67, 69*, 70, 77, 81, 82, 83, and 94. An asterisk indicates a significant break, although occurrence of the formula is certain. Two probable occurrences are in §3 and §96. Two possible occurrences are in §2 and §97.

³³Hoffner translates *parna = šše = a šuwaizzi* as 'and he shall look to his house for it', in which the subject is the injured party (or his heirs), the oblique pronoun -še rather unusually refers to the inanimate compensation, *his* in the translation refers to the offender, and the -a is adversative -a, not -a/-ya (1997:17, 168f., 268 and passim). I propose an interpretation of *parna = šše = a šuwaizzi* that makes a further comment on the liability of the offender: 'and he shall look? to (his own) house (to provide it) for him'. With this translation, -a is (additive) -a/-ya. The subject remains the same as that of the preceding clause, and -še has the injured party, an animate beneficiary, as referent. Similar grammatical relations are seen in the same Law §5 (cf. *āššu = ššet = a šarnikzi* 'and he shall make compensation for his goods') and in Law §76: (If someone seizes an ox, horse, mule, or ass as pawn, and it dies at his place,) *apūn arnuzi kušša<n> = ššet = a pāi* 'he shall deliver (the body of) that (animal), and shall pay its price.' (Laws I A Rs. IV 4-5). In these the referent of the subject remains the offender, and the referents of the possessive pronouns (an oblique relation) are the parties suffering (fatal) injury. Regardless of the acceptability of my suggestion for the formula, however, the obscure semantics of the verb *šuwaizzi* and the unusual order of the enclitic pronoun -šše and -a/-ya (assuming the impossibility of an analysis noun-plus-possessive pronoun for *parna = šše* (via *parna = šša + -ya*)) remain problematic for any analysis.

³⁴Examples of a clause with *karu* followed by a clause with *kinun = a* in the Laws are §§7, 9, 19b, 25, 57 (*karu* very likely in the break), 59 (with broken 'ki-n'[(u-na)]), 63, 67, 69, 81, and 94.

³⁵I regard the lack of LÚ ‘man’ and presence of *-li* in ^{GI}STUKUL-*li* in the last clause as significant, thus translation with the arrangement rather than the person.

^{35a}*-ma* and *-a* also function the same way in independent clauses. This is nicely illustrated in a ritual (transcribed as no.34 in Neu 1980:89-92) where the activity alternates between a single officiant and other participants. The former calls out, those (*apē=ma*) pray to him in like manner, that (one) (*apāš=a*) calls out again, those (*apē=ma*) pray to him in like manner, and so on.

³⁶The 29 examples of *-a* in conjunction with subject switch are #35, 37-39, 41-44, 46-58, 62, and another 7 examples with *kinun=a* from the Laws, in §§9, 19b, 25, 57, 63, 67, and 81. The 9 examples introducing a new subject are ##39, 41, 43, 44, 51, 53, 56, 62 and the Laws §9. The 16 examples with a change in orientation are the 10 clauses with unbroken *kinun=a* from the Laws (cf. note 23; §7=#35), and ##43, 46, 48, 56, 59, and 60. The example of *-a* in a clause with *mān* is #48. The 2 occurrences of *-a* in a conditional protasis are #36 and #38. The 21 examples of *-a* in contrastive clauses are the 10 clauses with unbroken *kinun=a* from the Laws (cf. note 34; §7=#35), and ##36, 38, 39, 42, 45, 46, 49, 50, 51, 53, and 59. The example of *-a* occurring with special syntax is #56.

³⁷In 9 of the 11 clauses with *kinun=a* in the Laws (incl. 1 in §59; see note 23), the subject switches to generic 3.sg. from generic 3.pl. in the preceding *karu*-clause. (In §69 and §94 breaks prevent us from knowing about the verb.) In addition to the change in person, the verb form changes from iterative past to non-iterative present/future. The type of payment remains the same, although the amount is usually halved. Similar but more elaborate changes occur with the two adverb pairs in §9 and §25.

³⁸For another translation of *peššiya-*, see CHD P:322 (8b.-c.). This meaning seems to me better suited to Law §77a/b = (108).

³⁹One law contains *-a* at the beginning of an apodosis, the only unambiguous occurrence in the OH data considered here.

Laws I §64 (A Rs. III 43); #41

§ takku ANŠE.KUR.RA tūriyawaš kuiški tāiezzi uttar=šed=a kī=pat ×?[] §

‘§ If someone steals a draft horse, his case(=a) (shall be) the (lit. this) same [?]. §’

-ma occurred at the beginning of an apodosis in #3, but this was also the beginning of a relative clause in a biclausal relative structure. In English it is difficult to translate a coordinating conjunction in such an environment, and I left the particle untranslated. See note 24. There would be an additional two occurrences of *-a* at the beginning of apodoses if we accept 1) Hoffner’s emendation from UŠ to ŠA in Law §40 (#5–#5.5), and 2) his interpretation of the second clause in the coordinated protasis in Law §99 (#44) as an apodosis (Hoffner 1997:47 with fn. 42, p.97). In all these cases, there is subject switch in the *-a*- or *-ma*-clause. This is perfectly consistent with *-ma*’s use in later stages of Hittite (cf. §3.2.5, §4.2.5, §5.1.3).

⁴⁰Data for this section included material from broken passages of the OH copy of the Laws (KBo 6.2+), supplemented with material from the later duplicates. The occurrences of *-ma* and *-a* in the OH copy are certain, however. Occurrences of Sumerogram-Ca in conditional and temporal protases are considered to be attestations of *-a* since *-a/-ya* does not occur in this environment (§2.4.2.3). The numbers of laws which are substantially broken are enclosed in brackets. Line breaks in the Hittite passages in this section do not necessarily correspond to line breaks on the tablets.

⁴¹The only laws in text A I have found with obvious cross-reference are §§64, 65, and 68, concerning theft of domestic animals, and §84, concerning the killing of a domestic animal. In the apodosis of each of these laws, the matter of compensation is declared to be the same as that of (presumably) the preceding law. §65 overtly refers to the law before the law before it (§63).

⁴²This could be grounds for recategorizing the activation status of 4-5 focal constituents from accessible to new, if activation status were found to be relevant for some aspect of Hittite grammar.

Chapter 3

-ma in Neo-Hittite

§3.0 Introduction

My study of *-ma* continues with an examination of its distribution and function in Neo-Hittite. After initial reports on the data and its sources in §3.0.1, I present information on the particle's phonological distribution in §3.1. Notable here is that the occurrence of *-ma* has extended to unconditioned post-consonantal environments and has become much more frequent.

In §3.2 *-ma*'s syntactic distribution is presented, including its occurrence with forms that defer its position. Evidence is given that in cases involving longer Akkadographic and Sumerographic strings *-ma* nonetheless occurred after the first word of the clause. Interclausal data is also given, showing *-ma*'s not infrequent occurrence in resumptive clauses.

The function of *-ma*, the primary area investigated, is the subject of §3.3. I will show that *-ma* occurs in several contexts, those involving contrast; repeated form; series; counterexpectation; new referents; special emphasis, including variant word order and orthotonic pronouns; orientation, including paragraph-initial environments; and subject switch.

A quick survey of *-a/-ya*'s distribution and function in §3.4 shows many similarities between the two conjunctions, but also some important differences, including the correlation of *-ma* especially with contexts of contrast and orientation. We also see that in many cases *-a/-ya* continues to be used to connect closely related clauses.

§3.0.1 Texts and Data

The texts included for analysis were chosen with an eye to completeness and consistency across linguistic periods, as described in §1.5. Such a goal is recognized as limited from the outset, as there is in Neo-Hittite neither a newly composed set of laws nor

contemporary rituals that are distinguishably unaffected by traditions within the genre. The texts used for Neo-Hittite (NH) historical narrative, thus in continuation of Anitta and Zalpa, are the Annals of Mursili (Götze 1933) and the Apology of Hattusili (Otten 1981), as well as the Treaty of Mursili with Kupanta-^dKAL (Friedrich 1926:95-179) and the Bronze Tablet (Treaty of Tuthaliya with Kurunta; Otten 1988). Continuing the OH Instruction (KBo 22.1) is the Instruction of Tuthaliya to the LÚ.MEŠSAG (von Schuler 1957:22-34). The diplomatic Letter of Puduhepa (Stefanini 1964, Helck 1963) has been included, but the NH correspondence is so fragmentary (cf. Hagenbuchner 1989 1:29, 35, 157) that it is not possible to match the Middle Hittite correspondence in either its completeness or its domestic administrative nature. The sections of these documents analyzed for this study are given in note 1.

The number of occurrences of *-ma* found in the corpus is given in the following table.

(1) Occurrences of <i>-ma</i>		
<u>Text</u>	<u>Secure</u>	<u>Unsure or in Broken Context</u>
Annals of Mursili	131	30
Apology of Hattusili	73	1
Treaty with Kupanta- ^d KAL	69	14
Bronze Tablet	98	1
Instruction to the LÚ.MEŠSAG	24	10
Letter of Puduhepa	<u>16</u>	<u>13</u>
Total	411	69

(See the appendix for a list of the citations of *-ma* in these texts.) The following table shows the frequency of occurrence of *-ma* in the sections considered suitable for inclusion:

(2)

Frequency of *-ma*

<u>Text</u>	<u>Clauses with <i>-ma</i></u>	<u>Number of Clauses</u>	<u>Frequency</u>
Annals of Mursili	132 ^a	814	16.2%
Apology of Hattusili	73	368	19.8%
Treaty with Kupanta- ^d KAL	68 ^{a,b}	332	20.5%
Bronze Tablet	97 ^c	329	29.5%
Instruction to the LÚ.MEŠSAG	24	130	18.5%
Letter of Puduhepa	<u>17^a</u>	<u>104</u>	<u>16.3%</u>
Total	411	2077	19.8%

a) Includes one *-ma* in broken context: AM #3017; SvKK #3069; LPK #3047. b) Counts as 1 each of two clauses with two *-ma*'s (see exx. (15)-(16)). c) Counts as 1 one clause with two *-ma*'s (see ex. (17)).

As the table shows, *-ma*'s occurrence ranges from about 16% to about 30%, depending on the text, with an overall average occurrence of about 20%. After adjustments are made for the 3 clauses that have 2 *-ma*'s, the tally of clauses beginning with *-ma* used in the analysis is 408.

§3.1 Phonological distribution

In Neo-Hittite *-ma* occurs after consonants, vowels, and Sumerographic and Akkadographic forms, examples of which can be seen in (4)-(7). The following table summarizes NH *-ma*'s phonological distribution in the six texts analyzed:

(3)

Phonological Distribution of *-ma*

<u>after C</u>	<u>after V</u>	<u>after non- phonetic writing</u>	<u>Total</u>
214	74	123	411
52.1%	18.0%	29.9%	100.0%

(4) *-ma* after consonant:

(a) ILMS Rs. III 16; #1305

apāš= **ma** apāt memai
 { that.N-*ma* that.A says }

‘and that one says this: ...’

(b) AM I.A Rs. III 44; #1032

ḪUR.SAG Ašḫarpayan= **ma** dannattaḫḫun
 { mountain:Ašḫarpaya.A-*ma* I emptied }

‘and I emptied the mountain(land) of Ašḫarpaya’

(c) AH I 70; #1141

kaniššūwar= **ma**=mu ŠA dIŠTAR=pat GAŠAN-YA ēšta
 { favor -*ma* me.DL of Ištar herself lady my was }

‘and the favor of Ištar herself, my Lady, was on me’

(d) SvKK §10 D II 19 (<A I 27); #1232

tuk= **ma** dUTU-ŠI kuit KUR-TAM ADDIN
 { you.DL-*ma* my sun which land I gave }

‘and the land which I, My Majesty, gave you’

(e) BT Vs. I 97; #1356

uit= **ma** mahḫan ABU-YA memian IŠME
 { he-came -*ma* when father-my matter.A he heard }

‘but when my father came to hear of the matter’

(f) AM II.9.A Rs. III 12; #1104

[iš]pandaz= **ma** iyahḫat
 { night.AB -*ma* I marched }

‘and by night I marched’

(5) *-ma* after vowel:

LPK Vs. 61’; #1282

karū= **ma** kuiēš ḫaššanteš [w]emiyanun
 { already -*ma* which.Nc born.PPL.Nc I met }

‘and the ones already born whom I met’

(6) *-ma* after Sumerogram:

BT Vs. II 8; #1358

MUN=ma daškiddu
 { salt -ma he shall take! }

‘and he shall take the salt’

(7) *-ma* after Akkadogram:

SvKK §2 E I 9; #1207

ABU-YA=ma tamēdani KUR-e ēšta
 { father-my-ma another.DL land.DL was }

‘but my father was in another country’

Hosts formed from Sumerogram or Akkadogram plus Hittite phonetic complementation were counted as Hittite forms since the final phone in such forms is present. However, hosts formed from a combination of Sumerogram or Akkadogram plus Hittite (usually proper) noun were counted with the Sumerograms and Akkadograms since the Hittite stem form ordinarily occurs here and the actual pronunciation of the host phrase is in doubt (cf. Friedrich 1960:22-23 §§3, 5a). An example of such a form is (8).

(8) AH II 61-62; #1166

KUR URUḪakpišša=ma= mu KUR URUIštaḫara=ya ÌR-anni pešta
 { land Ḫakpišša -ma me.DL land Ištaḫara and servitude.DL he gave }

‘but the land of Ḫakpišša and the land of Ištaḫara he gave me in servitude’

It is not certain just how the phrase KUR URUḪakpišša ‘the land of Ḫakpišša’ was pronounced. (For more on these ‘Akkadographic’ or ‘stiff’ forms see §3.2.3.) Also included with the 36 such non-phonetic hosts were five examples of combination writings with apparently inflected forms, as in (9).

(9) AM II.7.A I 40-41; #1079

LÚKÚR KUR 𐎠Kummišmaḥaš= ma [maḥ]ḥan ištamašzi
 {enemy land river:Kummišmaḥa -ma when he hears }

‘but when the enemy of the land of the river Kummišmaḥa hears (about this)’

The final -(a)š of 𐎠Kummišmaḥaš seems to mark the nominative of the entire noun phrase, but could also indicate the genitive. Because the pronunciation of these complex hosts is questionable, such forms have been included with the forms in the non-phonetic group.²

§3.2 Syntax

In Neo-Hittite, as in Old Hittite, -ma typically attaches to the first accented word in the clause, as seen above in (4)-(7), and here in (10) and (11):

(10) AM I.A Rs. III 79; #1040

𐎶Piḥḥuniyaš=ma=mu EGIR-pa kiššan ḥatrāeš
 {Piḥḥuniya.N-ma me.DL back in this way he wrote }

‘and Piḥḥuniya wrote back to me thus: ...’

(11) BT Vs. I 49; #1342

pargauwaz=ma=šši 𐎶HUR.SAG-az URUŠāliyaš ZAG-aš
 {high.AB -ma him.DL mountain.AB Šāliya.N border.N }

‘and on the side of the high mountain, Šāliya shall be the border for him’

Occurrence after the first word in a clause is the predominant syntactic position for -ma, but other positions are also attested, as summarized in (12).³

(12) Syntactic Distribution of *-ma*

i)	after the first word:	346	84.2%
ii)	after the second word, involving one constituent: ex.: [KUR ^{URU} Arzauwa]= <i>ma</i>	40	9.7%
iii)	after the third word, involving one constituent: ex.: [LÚKÚR KUR ^{URU} Durmitta]= <i>ma</i>	4	1.0%
iv)	after the second word, involving two constituents: ex.: [<i>mān</i>] [LÚTEMU]= <i>ma</i>	18	4.4%
v)	after the third word, involving two constituents: ex.: [<i>mān</i>] [NUMUN ^m Tuḫaliya]= <i>ma</i>	<u>3</u>	<u>0.7%</u>
		411	100.0%

Delaying *-ma* to the second or third word of the clause occurs in Neo-Hittite in the same contexts as in Old Hittite. These are a) with clause-initial *mān* ‘if [NH]’; b) with the clause-introductory particle *nu* ‘and’; and c) with Akkadographic or Sumerographic writing (cf. §2.2).

§3.2.1 *-ma* with *mān*

When the conditional subordinating conjunction *mān* ‘if [NH]’ occurs in initial position in a clause with *-ma*, *-ma* attaches to the second word in the clause:

(13) SvKK §19 D IV 6; #1263

mān=kan ERÍN.MEŠ=*ma* ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ warri lammar ŪL a[m]utti
 { if PV troops -*ma* chariotry aid.DL immediately not you move }
 ‘but if you do not move troops (and) chariotry immediately to my aid, ...’

There are also examples where *-ma* attaches to *mān*:

(14) LPK Vs. 65’; #1283

mān=_t*ma*=_{a,t} ANA ŠEŠ-YA UL Z[I]-za
 { if -*ma* it to brother-my not desirable }
 ‘but if it is not desirable to (you,) my brother’

And there are two examples in which *-ma* attaches both to *mān* and to the second word in the clause:

(15) SvKK §10 C 36 ; #1230-#1231

mān = *ma* = *za* *apašila* = *ma* *kuiški* *URU-aš ešari*
 {if *-ma* RFL itself.Nc-*ma* some.Nc city.Nc settles }

‘and if some city settles down (by) itself (i.e., without permission)’

(16) SvKK §16 C 5-6; #1249-#1250

mān = *ma* = *tta* / ^dUTU-ŠI = *ma* *kūn* *AWAT BAL* *ŪL* *ḥatrāmi*
 {if *-ma* you.DL my sun *-ma* this.A matter insurrection not I write }

‘but if I, My Majesty, do not write you (about) this matter of insurrection’

(One other example has two occurrences of *-ma* within one clause, the subordinator in this case being the indeterminate relative pronoun *kuiš*, which itself connotes conditionality in part:

(17) BT Rs. IV 27; #1409-#1410

kuiš = *ma* = *šši* *uwāi* = *ma* *pēdai*
 {who-*ma* him.DL trouble.A-*ma* brings }

‘but whoever brings him trouble’)

In the texts analyzed for this study, there are 10 examples where *-ma* attaches to *mān*, 14 examples where *-ma* attaches to the second word of the clause, and the 2 examples where *-ma* attaches to both. The last two types, along with the example in (17), represent 17 of the 18 examples of syntactic type iv) in (12) above. All 3 examples of syntactic type v), where *-ma* attaches to the third word of the clause, occur in clauses with *mān*.

§3.2.2 *-ma* with *nu*

Two clauses in the data contain both *nu* and *-ma*, seen here in (18)-(19). Example (18) is the last of the 18 examples of type iv) in the table in (12); (19) is broken and is not among the analyzed occurrences of *-ma*.

(18) SvKK §18 D III 48; #1257

nu = *mu* ŠA mÉ.GAL.PAP = *ma* *memian* *ḫūdāk* *IŠPUR*
 { CC me.DL of É.GAL.PAP-*ma* matter.A immediately he wrote }

‘—he wrote me immediately (about) the matter of É.GAL.PAP’

(19) LPK Vs. 14’; #3047

n = *aš* *duwan* = *ma* *parā* ×-it(-)×[
 { CC he/she hither -*ma* forth }

‘he/she? up until now []’

§3.2.3 *-ma* with Akkadograms and Sumerograms

Of the 408 clauses with *-ma*, 123 are written with Akkadogram, Sumerogram, and/or uninflected Hittite form, as described above in §3.1. Of these 123, 77 constitute only one syntactic argument, 69 occurring as host to *-ma* in initial position (as in examples (6) and (7)), 1 occurring in modified initial position (example (18)), and 7 occurring as *-ma*’s host following *mān* (as in example (13)). Thus these 77 examples fall into syntactic distribution categories i) and iv) in the table in (12).

The remaining 46 hosts of *-ma* are written with some combination of Akkadogram, Sumerogram, and/or uninflected Hittite form:

(20) **Multi-Part Non-Phonetic Hosts of *-ma***

<u>Two-Part Hosts</u>	<u># of examples</u>
Sumerogram–Sumerogram	11 (3 with Akkadian preposition)
Sumerogram–Akkadogram	1
Akkadogram–Sumerogram	1
Sumerogram–Hittite	28 (8 with Akkadian preposition)
Hittite–Hittite	<u>1</u> (#1113 = example (c), note 2)
	42
<u>Three-Part Hosts</u>	
Sumerogram–Sumerogram–Hittite	3
Akkadian–Akkadian–Akkadian	<u>1</u> (with Akkadian preposition)
	4

The 4 three-part hosts are the 4 examples of syntactic distribution type iii) in the table in (12). Three of the two-part hosts occur with *mān* and comprise the 3 examples of type v). This leaves 39 two-part hosts, and these are 39 of the 40 examples of type ii). (The last example of type ii) involves a fully inflected Hittite noun derived from a verbal compound:

(21) AH II 28; #1153

LÚ.MEŠpiran ḫūiyatalluš= **ma** ēppūn
 { before runners.A *-ma* I seized }

‘and I seized the leaders’)

So the 46 examples with Akkadographic and Sumerographic combinatory writing, classified in (20), constitute all but one (example (15)) of the occurrences of *-ma* in ‘non-standard’ positions, i.e., second position or later if the combination occurs clause-initially, third position if the combination occurs with *mān*.

Although there is some evidence that these combination writings might have been pronounced as units (cf. §3.1 above and note 2), there is also evidence suggesting that they

were ‘decrypted’ and given good Hittite values when read. A clear example comes from the Bronze Tablet. Tuthaliya, in setting the borders of Kurunta’s land, often employs the syntactic formula ABLATIVE(= *ma* = šši)—NOMINATIVE—PREDICATE.NOMINAL: The ablative expresses the area to be delimited, the nominative instantiates the delimitation, and the predicate nominal labels the delimitation (cf. §3.3.1.2), as in (22):

(22) BT Vs. I 64-66; #1351

... **IŠTU ZAG URUWalma = ma = šši**
 {from border Walma -ma him.DL }
 URUḪuwahḫuwarwaš URUAlluprataš URUKaparuwaš
 { Ḫ. A. K. }
 URUḪaššuwantas URUWalippas URUWalaš ZAG-aš
 { Ḫ. W. W. border.N }

‘and on the side of the border of Walma, / Ḫuwahḫuwarwa, Alluprata, Kaparuwa, Ḫaššuwantas, Walippa, (and) Wala (shall be) the border for him’

In (22) the ablative expression is written with a combination of the Akkadian preposition *IŠTU* ‘from’, the Sumerogram *ZAG* ‘border’, and the uninflected Hittite stem *Walma-*, a placename; *-ma* follows the entire complex. Other examples occur at BT Vs. I 60 and 61. Example (23) offers a syntactic equivalent written in Hittite:

(23) BT Vs. I 53-55; #1346

URUḪauwaliyas = ma = šši **ZAG-za** URUWalwaraš URUḪAR-ḫašuwantaš
 { Ḫauwaliya.AB-ma him.DL border.AB W. ḪAR-ḫ. }
 URUTarāpaš URUŠamantaš URUTūpišaš URUParaiyaššaš / URUNātaš upati ZAG-aš
 { T. Š. T. P. N.G estate?.N border.N }

‘and on the side of the border of Ḫauwaliya, Walwara, ḪAR-ḫašuwanta, Tarāpa, Šamanta, Tūpiša, Paraiyašša / (and) the estate’ of Nāta (shall be) the border for him’

Another such example occurs at BT Vs. I 50-52. In these cases the ablative is written in Hittite or with Hittite phonetic complementation, <-az> or <-za> for /-ats/, and the syntax, an instance of partitive apposition, is Hittite as well. *-ma* occurs after the first member of the

partitive apposition, even though the two members are closely connected semantically and syntactically. The Hittite reading of *IŠTU ZAG URUWalma=ma=šši* in (22) would then almost certainly have been *Walmaz=ma=šši irḥaz*.

These two examples are located in a section of text in which the ablative is represented with Hittite inflection—the last combination writing occurs in Vs. I 35, and such writing begins again in Vs. I 60. If we can assume that Hittite vs. combination writing was a choice made by the scribe, rather than the author, then the preference for Hittite forms in this section offers us fortuitous confirmation of the Hittite reading of Akkadographic and Sumerographic equivalents.

A less precisely parallel pair of examples involving a genitive relation rather than partitive apposition can be seen in (24)-(25).

(24) AM I.A Vs. II 42-43; #1017

URUKÙ.BABBAR-aš=ma=za EN.MEŠ ERÍN.MEŠ ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ=ya
 { Ḫattuša.G -ma RFL lords troops chariotry and }
 kuin NAM.RA.MEŠ uwatet
 { which.A civil-prisoners (he) brought }

‘but the civil prisoners that the lords, troops, and chariotry of Ḫattuša brought (back)’

(25) AH IV 21-23; #1188

KUR.KUR.MEŠ URUḪatti=ma=wa=k[an]
 { lands Ḫattuša -ma QU PV }
 ḫūmanda dIŠTAR ANA ṁḪattušili andan / neḫḫun
 { all.A Ištar to Ḫattušili in I turned }

‘“but all the lands of Ḫatti I, Ištar, have turned to Ḫattušili”’

In (24) *-ma* attaches to the first word of the clause, *URUKÙ.BABBAR-aš* (= *Ḫattušaš*) ‘of Ḫattuša’, a genitive form ending with Hittite phonetic writing, whereas in (25) *-ma* cliticizes to the end of a complex of Sumerian *KUR.KUR.MEŠ* ‘lands’ and Akkadographic *URUḪatti* ‘of Ḫattuša’ (*Ḫatti* most often being transcribed as though it were

Hittite). We may expect the Hittite equivalent to have been *Ḫattušaš=ma=wa=kan umē hūmanda* ‘but all the lands of Ḫattuša’.

It may be noted that even in combination writing, *-ma* tends to be attached to the same word it would be attached to if the complex were written in Hittite, as the combination writing NOMINAL–GENITIVE=*ma* is equivalent to Hittite GENITIVE=*ma* NOMINAL.

§3.2.4 Further Host Syntax

The grammatical categories of the hosts of the 411 *-ma*’s are summarized in (26). The distribution is rather different in some respects than that for OH *-ma* (see §5.1.3). In order to compare the occurrence of the grammatical categories of *-ma*’s hosts against the occurrence of grammatical categories of initial-position constituents in general, the latter distribution from the Apology of Hattusili is included.

(26) Grammatical Categories of *-ma*’s Hosts and of Initial-Position Forms⁴

Noun	136	33.1%		
Noun Phrase	63	15.3%	80 ^e	54.8%
Pronoun	67 ^a	16.3%	20	13.7%
Adjective	17 ^b	4.1%	1	0.7%
Adverb	60 ^c	14.6%	16	11.0%
Negative	7	1.7%	5	3.4%
Preverb	1	0.2%	-	0.0%
Verb	10	2.4%	6	4.1%
Conjunction	<u>50^d</u>	<u>12.2%</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>9.6%</u>
	411	99.9%	142 ^f	97.3%

a) 52 personal, incl. 7 demonstrative pronouns used for 3.sg.; 2 demonstrative; 6 relative; 5 distributive; 2 other. b) 4 attributive, 10 demonstrative, 1 relative, 2 distributive. c) 20 spatial, 27 temporal, 13 other. d) 38 *maḫḫan*/GIM-*an*, 10 *mān*, 2 *kuitman*. e) Nouns + Noun Phrases: 54.8% of clauses as compared to 48.4% for *-ma*’s N+NP hosts. f) The remaining 4 clauses (2.7% of total) had the modal particle *man* in initial position.

The distribution of the grammatical categories of initial-position forms in the Apology of Hattusili is roughly the same as that of *-ma*'s hosts, but there were more noun phrases and fewer of the other categories. Negatives and verbs occurred at a higher rate because the Apology contains a majority of the occurrences of each type (5/7 and 6/10, respectively).

The grammatical relations of the substantival categories are given in (27). An increase in the occurrence of *-ma* with nominatives and accusatives, relative to OH *-ma*, coincides with the NH particle's expanded phonological distribution.

(27) **Grammatical Relations of Substantival Hosts**

	Noun	NP	Pronoun	Adjective	Total
Nominative	60	27	43	7	137
Accusative	29	20	7	4	60
Genitive	8	3	-	-	11
Dative/Locative	21	6	16	5	48
Ablative	19	5	1	1	26
Allative	<u>1</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>1</u>
Total	138	61	67	17	283

§3.2.5 Syntax with respect to Neighboring Clauses

In §2.4.2.5, the scope of OH *-ma* was determined to extend over its clause, as well as over a following main clause in complex sentences. This holds also for NH *-ma*. While an association between *-ma* and the information in its clause is assumed for most clauses (cf. example (29)), the association can in complex sentences be closer between *-ma* and the following main clause—compare example (44), where the relative presentation contains information already active and the resumption contains the new, contrastive information. Of course, the association in complex sentences may be closer between *-ma* and the information in the dependent clause in which it occurs, as in contrasted conditional protases, although *-ma*'s scope still extends over the entire sentence.

-ma links information in its clause(s) with information in clauses that have gone before. Usually this information has occurred in the clauses immediately preceding the clause with *-ma*, but occasionally *-ma* has greater referential scope, as when the content of its clause is contrasted with that of a distantly preceding clause (cf. example (46) with discussion).

Example (28) summarizes the occurrence of NH *-ma* in simple and complex structures (environments after Houwink ten Cate 1973:128; cf. §2.2 above):

(28)	1a	in an independent clause IC- <i>ma</i>	204	50.0%
	1b	in a protasis following another protasis DC DC- <i>ma</i> ...MC	32	7.8%
	2	in an apodosis DC MC- <i>ma</i>	37	9.1%
	3	in a protasis DC- <i>ma</i> MC	128	31.4%
	2/3	in the protasis of a complex apodosis DC (DC- <i>ma</i> MC)	<u>7</u>	<u>1.7%</u>
Total			408	100.0%

As can be seen in (28), *-ma* most frequently occurs in environment 1a, between independent clauses, as in (29).

(29) BT Vs. II 34-37; #1363-1365

apēdani=ma / mēḥuni ABU-YA ŠEŠ MAḤRŪ LÚtūḥukantaḥiti tiyan ḥarta
ammuk=*ma* apēdani mēḥuni LUGAL-iznani nawi taparriyan
{ me.A -*ma* that.DL time.DL kingship.DL not-yet designated }
ḥarta mdLAMMA-aš=*ma*=mu apēdani mēḥuni paḥḥaššanut
{ he had Kurunta.N -*ma* me.A that.DL time.DL he protected }

‘And at that time my father had set my older brother in line for the throne,
but myself he had not yet designated for the kingship at that time,
and Kurunta protected me at that time’

(32) SvKK §16 C II 30, 32-34; #1245-#1246

mān andurza=ma kuiški ... *ITTI* dUTU-Š/ BAL iyazi dUTU-Š/ =ma mān / ZAG-aḥmi
 {my sun -ma if I am successful}
 nu apūn antuḥšan našma apāt / ERÍN.MEŠ ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ ēpmi

‘but if someone inside (Ḫatti) ... rebels against My Majesty, **and** if I, My Majesty, am successful (on my own), I will seize that person or that army (and) chariotry’

There are 6 examples in which both dependent clauses contain overt subordinators. I have included among the clauses in environment 1b 26 examples in which one or both of the dependent clauses has no overt subordinator, as in (33). (See Appendix.) Most of these fall under the scope of a preceding *mān* ‘if’ or conditionally construed *našma* ‘or (if)’.

(33) ILMS Vs. I 33’-35’; #1296

§[na]šma=šmaš EGIR-ziaz ištamašzi kuiški
 [k]uitki /NA É.GAL-LIM=ma=at ŪL memai
 {in palace -ma it not tells }
 nu=šši apadda=ya NIŠ DINGIR-LIM GAM-an GAR-ru §

‘§ Or (if) some one of you secretly hears / something, **but** does not tell it in the palace, then also that will be laid to him under the oath of the god §’

Seven examples occur simultaneously in environments 2 and 3. While in this situation *-ma* occurs between dependent clauses and thus qualifies for categorization in environment 1b, I think it important to distinguish cases where both dependent clauses constitute part of a complex presentation (environment 1b) from cases where the second dependent clause forms part of a complex resumption (environment 2/3). In the latter situation the resumption itself contains both presentation and resumption; the dependent clause begins the larger-scale resumption (environment 2) but also functions as presentation to the smaller-scale resumption (environment 3).

The examples occurring in environment 2/3 are of two types. The first concerns examples where a dependent–main-clause structure is itself nested within a larger dependent–main structure. In (34) *-ma* is found at the beginning of a clause that is the

presentation in a biclausal relative sentence, and the relative sentence itself functions as apodosis to the preceding conditional protases.

(34) BT Rs. III 28-31; #1395-#1396

mān=ma ANA NUMUN mTuthaliya nakkēšzi kuitki
 n=aš ŠA KUR URUḪatti LUGAL-iznani awan arḫa tiyazi
 NUMUN mdLAMMA=ma kuit /NA KUR URUdU-tašša LUGAL-iznani artari
 {descendent Kurunta -ma which in land Tarḫuntašša kingship.DL stands }
 nu ANA LUGAL KUR URUḪatti kururiyahdu

‘And if something becomes (too) difficult for a descendent of Tuthaliya and he steps down from the kingship of the land of Ḫatti, the descendent of Kurunta(=ma) that stands in kingship in the land of Tarḫuntašša, he shall fight for the king of the land of Ḫatti.’

The other examples are #1071, #1359, #1366, and #1392.

The second type involves examples where a dependent–main-clause structure constitutes the second element in a distributive *kui- kui-* ‘some ... the other’ construction, as in (35).

(35) AM II.7.A Vs. II 10-14; #1081-#1082

... EGIR-az=ma URUGašgaz / kūruriḪI.A mekki niniktat
 nu KUR URUḪatti dammešḫair nu kuit KUR-TUM
 ḫaminkir kuit=ma=za ešantat= pat / n=at ḫarkir=pat
 {what-ma RFL occupied also}

‘And behind him enemies from the Gašga city mobilized much and attacked the land of Ḫatti. And the one land they destroyed, and the other that they also occupied, / they also destroyed it.’

Again -ma occurs at the beginning of a relative structure that forms the second part of a larger construction. The other example is #1015.

§3.3 Pragmatics

Following on the results presented in chapter 2, the investigation of *-ma*'s function in Neo-Hittite deals with the pragmatic notions of focus; backgrounding; and, in place of topic per se, subject switch. While *-ma* appears to signal difference between its clause and the preceding discourse, the degree of adversativity understood by the audience varies with the context.⁵

§3.3.1 Focus

Considered as instances of focus are data exhibiting contrast, including counterexpectation; new referents; and special emphasis, as manifested by variant word order and by orthotonic personal pronouns. See §3.3.1.4 for findings on *-ma*'s attachment to focal elements.

§3.3.1.1 Contrast

Contrast was defined above as an opposition of ideas among other possibilities. Here I distinguish two degrees of contrast, strong, like those found in the OH corpus, and weak, for which see §3.3.1.1.2. Although judgments as to the precise degree of contrast may vary from reader to reader, or even from reading to reading, the presence of a contrastive opposition should not be controversial. Also considered as special situations involving contrast are cases of series marking and counterexpectation.

§3.3.1.1.1 Strong Contrast; Repeated Form

In the NH data *-ma* occurred in 114 cases of strong contrast and 84 cases of weaker contrast (see Appendix). Thus contexts exhibiting contrast were found in 48.5% (198/408) of the clauses with *-ma*. Examples follow that show clear contrast between individual ideas. In (36) there is an opposition between capturing-and-delivering a traitor and potentially not performing these actions.

(38) AM II.7.A Vs. I 12-14; #1069

nu=za kāšma aú ^dU NIR.GÁL=mu BELI-YA maḥḥan piran
 ḥūiyanza nu=mu idālaui parā ŪL tamāi
 āššauī= ma=mu parā tarnan ḥarzi
 {good.DL -ma me.A forth left has }

‘Now behold, how the mighty Storm-god, my lord, is supportive
 of me; he does not consign me to evil, / **but** has consigned me to good’

In (39) the referents LUGAL-iznani ‘into kinship’ and *kuedani pidi* ‘into whichever position’ are contrasted. Although their interclausal statuses are different, i.e., conditional protasis vs. resumptive relative clause, the intraclausal structure of their respective clauses is quite similar:

(39) BT Vs. II 37-42; #1365, #1366, #1367, #1368, #1369

... ^{md}LAMMA-aš=ma=mu apēdani mēḥuni paḥḥaššanut
 nu ANA ZI-YA šer kiššan lenkatta ABU-KA=wa=tta māt / LUGAL-iznani ŪL=ya tittanuzi
 kuedani= ma=wa= tta pidi / ABU-KA tittanuzi
 {whichever.DL-ma QU you.A position.DL father-your places }
 ūk=ma=wa tuk=pat paḥḥašši
 nu=wa=za tuel ĪR-iš amḥuk=ma ANA ^{md}LAMMA šer kiššan lenkun
 ūk=ma=wa tuk paḥḥašši

‘... and Kurunta protected me at that time
 and swore thus on my account: ‘Even if your father / does not install you in the kingship,
 to whichever(=ma) position / your father does place you,
 I will protect only you. / I am your servant.’
 And I swore thus to Kurunta: / ‘And I will protect you.’ ’

The passage in (39) offers us additional examples of contrast with -ma. The reports of swearing (‘he swore to me ... and I swore to Kurúnta’) are opposed, as are the contents of both oaths (‘I will protect you ... and I will protect yóu’). In examples like these, repeated, or nearly repeated, vocabulary and syntax constitute a temporary formula which can be exploited to oppose multiple referents. Example (40) contains another such case:

(40) ILMS Vs. II 29'-32'; #1302

§ namma apāt kuit ēššatteni* nu KUR.KUR.ĤI.A
 BA[L d]apianda! I-ēt'ta naiškitten
 nu K[UR.KUR.]ĤI.A LÚKÚR daššanuškitten
 KUR.KUR URUĤatti=ma mališkunuttēn
 {lands Ĥatti -ma you.p weakened }

‘§ Furthermore this which you (all) do: you have united / all the rebelling lands.
 You have strengthened the lands of the enemy, / but you have weakened the lands of Ĥatti’
 *[NI in ēššatteni collated per CHD L-N:361.]

Here KUR.KUR.ĤI.A LÚKÚR ‘enemy lands’ is contrasted with KUR.KUR URUĤatti ‘lands of Ĥatti’, and *daššanu-* ‘strengthen’ is opposed to *mališkunu-* ‘weaken’. The occurrence of repeated forms correlates highly with contrast in the examples with *-ma*. Of the 104 clauses (25.5%) with *-ma* showing repeated form, 89 of these cooccur with contrast (85.6% of clauses with repeated form; 44.9% of clauses with contrast). Of the 15 that remain, 13 cooccur with counterexpectation; the last 2 are members of series. (See Appendix.) While repeated form cannot be considered a pragmatic environment independently associated with *-ma*, it is strongly associated with contrast.

Repeated form also offers examples where one of the relations of contrast is stronger than another. Although the toponyms *Taqqašta* and *Talmaliya* are contrasted here, the central opposition appears to be between *apēz* ‘on that side’ and *kēzza* ‘on this side’:

(41) AH II 32-33 (with B Vs. II 16-17); #1155

... nu=šši apēz KUR URUTaqqaštaš ZAG-aš ēšta
 kēzza= ma= šši URUTalmaliyaš ZAG-aš ēšta
 {this.AB-ma him.DL Talmaliya.N border.N was }

‘on that side the land of Taggašta was the border for him,
 but on this side Talmaliya was the border for him’

In a similar way, in (42) the predicates wherein one son remains 'in' the sea and the other departs from the sea contrast quite plainly, but the main opposition would seem to be between the one son and the other.

(42) AM I.A Vs. II 50-54; #1018, #1019-#1020

§ mahḥan=ma ḥamešḥanza kišat nu mUḥḥa-LÚ-iš kuit GIG-at
 n=[aš=ka]n aruni anda ēšta DUMU.MEŠ-ŠU[[NU]]-ya=šši kattan ešir
 nu=kan mUḥḥa-LÚ-iš aruni anda BA.UG₆ DUMU.MEŠ-ŠU[[NU]]-ma=za arḥa
 šarrandat nu=kan I-aš ŠÀ A.AB.BA=pat ēšta
 I-aš=ma=kan / mT₁apalaz,unawliš arunaz arḥa uit ...
 { 1.N -ma PV Tapalazunawli.N sea.AB away came }

‘§ And when it became spring, since Uḥḥaziti had fallen ill, he had been (residing at a location) in the sea, and his sons were with him. Now Uḥḥaziti died ‘in’ the sea, but his sons / parted: one (stayed) ‘in’ the sea, **but** one, Tapalazunawli, went away from the sea’

Likewise, in (43) the primary contrast is between *zik* ‘you’ and *anzaš* ‘we/us’, rather than disloyal vs. loyal behavior.

(43) SvKK §26 A IV 14-15; #1269

... nu kiššan memir zik=wa
 [ITTI] dUTU-ŠI waštaš anzaš=ma=wa=nnaš ÌR.MEŠ dUTU-ŠI=pat
 { we -ma QU us servants my sun only }

‘... and they spoke thus: ‘You have sinned against His Majesty, **but** we (are) servants of His Majesty alone’

Contrast with *-ma* is by no means required to be expressed with such closely parallel forms as those presented heretofore; compare the first opposition noted above in (39). In (44) Hattusili boasts about attention paid him that eluded his predecessors. Here we see repeated vocabulary, but the syntax is less similar: independent clause vs. relative structure.

(44) AH IV 51-55; #1195-#1196

n=at=mu āššauwaš=pat memiyanaš kišantat
 LÚ.MEŠ *TEME*=ya=mu uiškiuwan tiēr uppeššar^{HI}.A=ma=mu
 uppiškiuwan tiēr uppeššar^{HI}.A=ma=mu kue / uppiškanzi
 { gifts.pAn -ma me.DL which.pAn they send }
 n=at ANA ABBA^{HI}.A Û ABBA ABBA^{HI}.A / ÛL kuedanikki uppir

‘(those already established kings) remained in the same good relations with me:
 they began sending me envoys, and they began / sending me gifts. **But** the gifts that they
 send me, they did not send them to any of my fathers / or forefathers’

In (45) we see an example where the influence of repeated form is negligible. *Harmima*,
 the subject of a nominal sentence, is contrasted with *Upaššana*, the first object of the
 ditransitive verb *iya*- ‘to make’.

(45) BT Vs. I 45-47; #1338, #1339, #1340

... n=aš=kan ANA ^dUTU-ŠI āššana URUZarnušaššaz=ma=šši
 URU^Harmimaš ZAG-aš ēšta ^dUTU-ŠI=ma=šši URUUpaššanān ZAG-an / iyanun
 { my sun -ma him.DL Upaššana.A border.A I made }
 URUUpaššanaš=ma=kan INA KUR ^{ID}Hūlaya āššana §

‘(The TUKUL-obligation is) left to My Majesty. And on the side of Zarnušašša
^Harmima was his border. **But** (I,) My Majesty_(,) have made Upaššana his
 border. But Upaššana (is) left to the land of the ^Hūlaya River. §’

Repeated form, along with *-ma*, can also help to signal contrast at a distance.

(46) SvKK §15 C II 13-14; #1241

§ mān=ma zik ^mKupanta-^dKAL-aš zilatiya ^dUTU-ŠI
 { if -ma you.N Kupanta-Kurunta.N in future my sun }
 DUMU.MEŠ ^dUTU-ŠI AŠŠUM BELUTTİM ÛL paḥḥašti
 { sons my sun regarding lordship not you will protect }

‘§ **But** if you, Kupanta-Kurunta, do not protect My Majesty
 (or) the sons of My Majesty with respect to lordship in future, ...’

The formulaic phrase in (46) about protecting the king and his progeny occurs often in the
 treaties and the instruction, sometimes with minor syntactic variations, but normally with

positive polarity and imperative verb forms. In the text as it is preserved, the positively asserted phrase occurs most recently some four paragraphs before the attestation in (46), where it appears to have occurred twice (§11 D II 35-36, 41-?)—a break in the tablet prevents certainty. Given its frequent occurrence and the intervening gap in the text (23 lines of partial preservation plus an actual gap), it is unlikely that these were the occurrences of the phrase which the attestation in (46) parallels. However, its antecedent must have occurred at least 12 lines (13 clauses) before the attestation in (46), because it is absent from these lines. (That a paragraph (§14 C II 11-12) intervenes is of less significance since it comprises but one clause and continues the discourse topic of the final clauses of the preceding paragraph (§13) (Friedrich 1926:118-122).) This example is useful both for demonstrating that contrast can be expressed over sizeable sections of text, and for showing the devices by which this is accomplished.

§3.3.1.1.2 Weak Contrast

Whereas strong contrast is the striking opposition one typically considers to be contrast, weak contrast involves an opposition that is less robust.

In (47) there is a two-part opposition, between ŠEŠ-YA ^mNIR.GÁL ‘my brother Muwatalli’ and *ammuk* ‘I’ on the one hand, on the other between Muwatalli’s position as king and Hattusili’s position as army commander.

(47) AH I 22-24; #1132, #1133, #1134

§ maḥḥan=ma=za ABU-YA ^mMuršiliš DINGIR-LIM-iš kišat
 ŠEŠ-YA=ma=za=kan ^mNIR.GÁL ANA ^{Giš}GU.ZA ABI-ŠU ešat
 ammuk=ma=za ANA PANI ŠEŠ-YA EN.KARAŠ kišḥaḥat
 { I -ma RFL before brother-my lord.army I became }

‘§ And when my father Muršili died (lit. became a god),
 my brother Muwatalli set himself on the throne of his father,
 and I became the commander of the army before my brother’

The contrastive force in this example is rather mild. The primary reason for this is that the role of the king and the role of the army's commander are not in opposition *a priori*, in fact *ANA PANI ŠEŠ-YA* 'before my brother' asserts the relationship of service of the latter. A secondary reason for the mild contrast is that, although Muwatalli clearly becomes king in the second clause, the word for *king* is absent, and this mitigates the force of the opposition.

Similarly in (48), the king and his progeny did not stand in opposition in the real world, but do so in the linguistic context, such that the force of the opposition is rather weak.

(48) ILMS Vs. I 36'-37'; #1297

§ AŠŠUM EN-UTTI dUTU-ŠI pahḫašten katta= ma NUMUN dUTU-ŠI / pahḫašten
 {down-*ma* progeny my sun you.p protect!}

'§ Protect My Majesty as regards lordship, and subsequently protect the progeny of My Majesty'

The weak contrast in (49) concerns LÚKÚR 'enemy' vs. EN *DINI* 'legal opponent' and LÚ.MEŠ *aršanatalla-* 'enviers'. Although the one is opposed to the two, the force of the opposition is not nearly so great as that between 'good' and 'evil' in (38) above.

(49) AH I 51-57; #1139

... nu=mu DINGIR-LUM GAŠAN-YA ṣkuwayami meḥuni / ŪL kuwapikki šer tiyat
 ANA LÚKÚR=mu / piran katta ŪL kuwapikki tarnāš
 ŪL=ma= mu ANA EN DINI-YA LÚ.MEŠaršanatallaš / kuwapikki piran katta
 {not -ma me.A to lord case-my enviers.DL ever before down}
 tarnāš
 { she left }
 mān=aš INIM LÚKÚR / mān=aš INIM EN DINI mān=aš INIM É.LUGAL kuiški
 nu=mu ḏIŠTAR=pat GAŠAN-YA ḥūmandaza ṣpalaḥšan UGU ḥarta

‘ ... And the goddess, my lady, never left (lit. stepped over) me at a critical time,
 she never abandoned me to an enemy,
 Nor did she ever abandon me to my legal opponent (or) to (my) enviers.
 Whether it (was) a matter of an enemy, whether it (was) a matter of a legal opponent,
 whether it was some matter of the palace,
 Ištar herself, my lady, protected (lit. held her *palaḥša*-garment over) me in every (matter)’

Again, the contrast comes from the linguistic presentation, rather than any internal opposition between or among the members. This is confirmed in the following *mān*-clauses, where each of the three members is listed as a separate option. In spite of repeated form in the (mildly) contrasted clauses, the contrastive force is weak. In fact, the second clause with *-ma* seems quite additive.

§3.3.1.1.3 Series

-ma can be used to signal members in a series that occur subsequent to the first member. Here a series was considered to be three or more clauses constituting approximately equally important components of some overarching event or situation. The series is thus arbitrarily distinguished from structures with two members standing in obvious opposition, as in (41)-(42), but the use of *-ma* in both structures should be related.

(51) AM II.10 Vs. II 5-9, 14-17; #1114-#1119

... nu pāun KUR URUTaggašta / ḥarninkun
 parā= ma KUR URUIštalubba / ḥarninkun
 { further -ma land Ištalubba I destroyed }
 parā=ma KUR URUKappupuwa / ḥarninkun parā=ma KUR URUHutpa / ḥarninkun
 (6 clauses detailing events at Hutpa)
 § parā=ma KUR URUZagapūra ḥarninkun
 parā= ma KUR URUKašipa pāun nu KUR URUGašipa / ḥarninkun
 { further-ma land Kašipa I went }
 parā=ma /NA HUR.SAGGapagapa šarā / [pāun ...]

‘ ... And I went (and) destroyed / the land of Taggašta, **and** furthermore I destroyed the land of Ištalubba, **and** furthermore I destroyed the land of Kappupuwa, **and** furthermore I destroyed the land of / Hutpa (6 clauses)
 § **And** furthermore I destroyed the land of Zagapura, **and** furthermore I went to the land of Kašipa and I destroyed the land of Gašipa, **and** furthermore I [went] up to the mountain of / Gapagapa ... ’

Although the parallelism in form deteriorates somewhat at the end, the series structure is clear in this description of a campaign against the troublemaking Gasga tribes.

The second example of an extended series with contrast and repeated form is (52):

(52) AM II.9.A Vs. II 20-34; #1096-#1100, #1102

- (20) §[*IŠTU?*] URUTimmuḫala kēz URUZimummuwaš irḫāš
 [k]ēz*= ma=kan URUTiyaššiltaš QADU A.ŠÀ A.GÀR-ŠU
 {this.AB -ma PV Tiyaššilta.Nc with field meadow-its }
- (22) [AN]A URUTimmuḫala šipandūanzi anda appanza / (23) ...
 {in Timmuḫala to sacrifice in taken.Nc }
- (24) ... kēz= ma=kan (26) ... apāt BÀD.KARAŠ irḫāš
 {this.AB-ma PV that fortified camp border.N }
 [kē]z= ma=šši URUTašmaḫaz URUZiyantiškaš
 {this.AB-ma him.DL Tašmaḫa.AB Ziyantiška.N }
- (28) irḫāš edizza=ma=šši URUKazzapaz BÀD.KARAŠ
 {border.N that.AB-ma him.DL Kazzapa.AB fortified camp }
 ŠA ABI dUTU-ŠI irḫāš edizza=ma= šši
 {of father my sun border.N that.AB-ma him.DL }
- (30) URUTapapanuwaz (31) ... šarāzziyatar irḫāš / (32) ...
 { Tapapanuwa.AB peak.N border.N }
- (33) ... edizza=ma=šši URUTamettaša / HUR.SAGIúḫiniš irḫāš
 {that.AB-ma him.DL Tamettaša.AB mountain:Iúḫini.N border.N }

‘§ On this side (of) Timmuḫala, Zimummuwa (is) the border,
and on this side Tiyaššilta with its fields (and) meadows
 (is) included in Timmuḫala for sacrifice. / ...
 ... **And** on this side ... that fortified camp (is) the border.
And on th[is] side (of) Tašmaḫa, Ziyantiška
 (is) the border for him, **and** on that side (of) Kazzapa, the fortified camp
 of the father of My Majesty (is) the border for him. **And** on that side (of)
 Tapapanuwa, ... the (mountain) peak (is) the border for him. / ...
 ... **And** on that side (of) Tamettaša, / the mountain Iúḫini (is) the border for him’
 *[l.21 [ke-]e-jez]

This example may be compared with the lengthy border-setting section in the Bronze Tablet
 (Vs. I 26-67).

An example of a series of actions which are not contrasted with each other is (53).

(54) AH II 18-20; #1150

nu KUR URUGašgaHI.A hūmanteš kururiyahhir
 nu KUR URUŠadduppa KUR URUDankuwa=ya arḥa ḥarganuir
 /NA URUPittiyariga=ma kattan dāiš
 {in Pittiyariga -ma down he set }

‘And all the Gašga lands made war;
 they entirely destroyed the land of Šadduppa and the land of Dankuwa,
 and (they) set(tled) down in Pittiyariga’

I identified 14 examples of this type, which cannot be far from a summarizing function. I include here the colophon of the Bronze Tablet (Rs. IV 46-52). Although the disposition of the seven copies of the treaty is presented in what is technically two clauses, the first six are listed together, and *-ma* occurs only in the second clause dealing with the seventh and final copy.

§3.3.1.1.4 Counterexpectation

-ma occurs in clauses with information that is contrary to expectation, that is, information that conflicts in some way with the expectations that the audience has formed regarding it from interpreting the text up to that point. I identified 63 examples of clauses with counterexpectational information among the 408 *-ma*-clauses (15.4%) (see Appendix).

Since identifying cases of counterexpectation depends crucially on understanding the intentions of the author, more so than in cases of contrast, for example, the occurrence of which is normally rather clear, it may be that only the most obvious cases of counterexpectation are perceptible to us and that more subtle cases evade our detection. One context where counterexpectation is fairly clear is that in which someone behaves disrespectfully toward the king, as in (55).

(55) SvKK §4 D I 28-33; #1216

nu tuk ^mKupanta-^dKAL ANA ^mPÍŠ.TUR-wa DUMU-anni [pih^hhun]
 namma KUR URUMirā KUR URUKuwaliya=ya ANA ^mPÍŠ.TUR-wa ^{SAL}Muwa[ttiya]
 tuqq=a ANA ^mKupanta-^dKAL=ya šer linganunun
 namma ^dUTU-Š/ ^mPÍŠ.TUR-wan pah^hšašat n=an ŪL k[ui]tki [idalauw]ah^hhun
^mPÍŠ.TUR-waš=ma=mu= ššan šullit nu=mu KUR URUPitašša LÚ.MEŠ URUḪat[ti=ya]
 {Maš^huiluwa.N-*ma* me.OB PV quarreled}
 IR.MEŠ-YA kattan ḫamamniyat man=mu menah^hhanda ku[ruriaḫta] §

‘(Maš^huiluwa requested my approval of you as his adoptive son,) and [I gave] you, Kupanta-Kurunta, to Maš^huiluwa (as) son. Furthermore, I had the land of Mirā and the land of Kuwaliya swear (allegiance) to Maš^huiluwa, to (his wife) Muwa[tti], and to you, Kupanta-Kurunta. Furthermore, I, My Majesty, protected Maš^huiluwa and [harm]ed him not at all. **But** Maš^huiluwa quarreled with me and incited the land of Pitašša and the men of Ḫatti, my servants, against me, and would have [made] w[ar] against me. § ’

Here Mursili has shown Maš^huiluwa much favor by approving the latter’s choice of heir, securing the position of the two among their neighbors, and supporting Maš^huiluwa in general. As the audience we recognize that Maš^huiluwa should behave with respect and gratitude toward the king, and what we find instead is that he has first challenged Mursili’s authority by quarreling with him, and then has attempted to undermine his authority by conspiring against him. *-ma* occurs in the first clause that reports an act of surprising disrespect. Another excellent example can be found at AM I.A Rs. III 77-86 (#1040), in which Mursili receives an insolent response to his request for the return of his servants. And above in (53) we saw an example in which *-ma* occurs in clauses that contain information that is similarly contrary to expectation, describing inappropriate behavior vis-à-vis the king.

In (56) the information that is contrary to the addressee’s expectation concerns Kurunta’s lack of guilt.

(56) BT Vs. I 6-11; #1315-#1316

§ *ABU-YA* kuwapi *ḡattušiliš ANA ḡurḡiteššupaš*
DUMU ḡmūwatalli menaḡḡanda kururiaḡta
n=an LUGAL-iznanni arḡa tittanut
ANA ḡdLAMMA=ma=kan waštul ŪL kuitki āšta
 {to Kurunta -*ma* PV sin.Nn not any.Nn it remained}
LÚ.MEŠ URUḡatti kuit imma kuit waštir
ḡdLAMMA-aš=ma=kan ŪL kuwapikki anda ēšta
 { Kururnta.N -*ma* PV not in any way in he was }

‘§ When my father *ḡattušili* began hostilities with / *Urḡiteššup*, the son of *Muwatalli*, and removed him from the kingship, / there remained on *Kurunta (=ma)* no sin at all. (In) whatever (way) the men of *ḡatti* sinned, / *Kurunta (=ma)* was not in(volved) at all’

It is only natural to assume that in the struggle between *Hattusili* and *Urḡiteššup* for the kingship, both men should have had supporters, and that in *Urḡiteššup*’s case, this would have included his brother *Kurunta*, as well as other Hittite individuals. These people would have shared *Urḡiteššup*’s ‘guilt’ when he did not prevail. Such co-culpability is referred to in *Mursili*’s treaty with *Kupanta-Kurunta* at SvKK §7 C I 14-17 (and implied at §11 D II 26-31). In (56) *Kurunta*’s lack of guilt, asserted in clauses with -*ma*, can be considered to counter typical expectations of brotherly loyalty.

In (57) we find that *ḡutupiyanza* succeeds in securing the land of *Palā* despite the difficulties detailed in the clauses preceding the report.

(57) AM II.7.A Vs. II 20-27; #1084, #1085, #1086

... nu *ABU-YA* / uni *ḡutupiyanzan DUMU ḡZidā GAL MEŠEDI INA KUR URUPalā*
watarnaḡta KUR URUPalā=ma ŪL kuitki / paḡḡaššanuwan KUR-TUM ēšta
URU BÀD EGIR-pa appannaš AŠRU NU.GÁL kuiški / ēšta dagān ešanta=at KUR-e ēšta
ḡḡutupiyanzaš=ma KUR URUPalā paḡḡaštāt
 {*ḡḡutupiyanza.N-ma* land *Palā* secured }
KARAŠ=ma=šši ŪL kuitki kattan ēšta
 {army -*ma* him.DL not at all down it was }

‘... And my father / ordered this *ḡutupiyanza*, son of *Zidā* the chief *MEŠEDI*, into the land of *Palā*. Now the land of *Palā* / was not at all a secure land. There was no fortified city (or) place of / withdrawal. It was an (entirely lost) land. But *ḡutupiyanza* secured the land of *Palā*, and there was no army at all with him.’

Ḫutupiya's achievement foils the addressee's expectations all the more in that he apparently acted without the aid of an army. Note that *-ma* occurs in both clauses containing information that is contrary to expectation.

When Tuthaliya sets the borders for Kurunta, he typically names cities (townships?) that serve as the limit of Kurunta's land, but these cities invariably remain outside his realm.

(58) BT Vs. I 26-28; #1323

nu=šši *IŠTU* KUR URUPitašša *IŠTU* ZAG URUArimmatta
 URUNahḫantaš URUḪautaššašš=a ZAG-aš
 URUNahḫantaš=ma=kan / URUḪautaššašš=a INA KUR IDḪūlaya āššanteš §
 { Nahḫanta.Nc-*ma* PV Ḫautašša.Nc and in land river:Ḫūlaya remain.PPL.pNc }

'And on the side of the land of Pitašša (and) on the side of the border of Arimmatta, Nahḫanta and Ḫautašša (are) the border for him. **But** Nahḫanta and Ḫautašša (are) left to the land of the river Ḫūlaya §'

In these examples, an expectation might be formed wherein the city named as a border-area will become part of Kurunta's territory, but each time the expectation is countered, in a clause with *-ma*, with the city's assignation to another country. Example (58) is the second occurrence of a border-setting formula that Tuthaliya employs for another 40 lines. With each occurrence the expectation and counterexpectation must diminish in force; if the audience was unfamiliar with this probable formula, they would have caught on after a short while. Even so, I have included all such cases as examples of counterexpectation (13/63 = 20.6%).

A context I have not included as counterexpectation is one very common in the treaties and in the instruction, in which the king prescribes some action, and after so doing, describes what will happen if the action does not take place, usually in a clause with *mān ŪL=ma* ... 'but if ... does not ...', as in (36) (or (37), with opposite polarity). The direct opposition of the inappropriate action to the appropriate one is primarily a relation of contrast rather than of counterexpectation.

§3.3.1.2 New Referents

In addition to contrasted ideas, an idea new to the discourse is fairly certain to be the focus in its clause. If a new referent is not the focus per se, it is certainly salient, thus highly informative and focus-*like*. Of the 408 clauses with *-ma* in the NH data at least 105 (25.7%) contain a referent that is inactive in the audience's consciousness and is thus new when it occurs.⁸ Of these 105, 65 have new subjects (61.9%). Twenty-three of these 65 subjects occur in initial position (35.4%), and 42 (64.6%) occur in at least second position. (See Appendix.) Of the latter, 21 examples occur in either of two similar border-setting formulae employed in four of the six NH documents analyzed.

The first formula, employed by Mursili and Hattusili, has this form, as seen in (59):
ABL.DEM.PRO=*ma*=DAT/LOC.PRO—(ABL—)NOMINATIVE—PREDICATE.NOMINAL.

(59) AM II.9.A Vs. II 27-28; #1098

[kē]z= ma= šši URUTašmaḥaz URUZiyantiškaš / irḥāš
{this.AB-*ma* him.DL Tašmaḥa.AB Ziyantiška.N border.N }

‘And on th[is] side (of) Tašmaḥa, Ziyantiška (is) / the border for him’

The ablative demonstrative pronoun is either *kēz(za)* ‘on this side’ or *edizza* ‘on that side’; the optional ablative complement can be considered a specification of the pronoun standing in partitive apposition to it (cf. Götze 1933:260-261). The dative-locative pronoun is usually *-ši* ‘to him’, i.e., the person governing the land whose borders are being determined. The nominative argument is the place forming the boundary, and the predicate nominal is either *irḥaš* or *ZAG-aš* ‘border’. The copula is normally absent. There are 5 examples of this formula with new subjects in AM, AH, and SvKK. Example (59) shows a clause already given in (52), where other examples of the formula can be seen.⁹

Tuthaliya favors a variation without ablative pronoun, as seen in (60): ABL=*ma*=DAT/LOC.PRO—NOMINATIVE—PREDICATE.NOMINAL. Here the ablative complement may have either ablative inflection or appear with the Akkadian preposition *IŠTU* ‘from’. The

formula appears 16 times with new subject in the Bronze Tablet, as in (60).¹⁰ Other examples can be seen in (11), (22)-(23), and (45).

(60) BT Vs. I 32; #1327

URU \bar{U} šša \bar{z} \bar{ma} šši URUZarataš ZAG-aš
 { Ušša.AB -*ma* him.DL Zarata.N border.N }

‘And on the side of Ušša, Zarata (is) the border for him’

Both variants of this formula provide a strategy for introducing new subjects in a position other than initial position, although the orienting ablative is not necessarily any more active in the audience’s consciousness than is the subject.¹¹ The formula may occur without -*ma* if it is the first (or only) delimitation, and the occurrence of -*ma* may thus be attributed also to series marking. Another construction, which we saw in chapter 2, in which new subjects are introduced late in the clause, DAT/LOC \bar{ma} –SUBJECT(–COPULA), occurs 10-15 times among the clauses with -*ma*. In these cases, -*ma* does not mark the focal constituent per se, but does occur with focal new referents.

New referents also occur in relative clauses, the primary function of which is to (re)introduce a referent not currently active in the consciousness of the audience. Typically a referent is introduced or recalled, depending on its activation status, in a relative clause, and so becomes active (or topical) for the following resumptive clause, as evidenced by the referent’s instantiation there as a personal or demonstrative pronoun, or as zero (Holland 1984:617).

(60a) BT Vs. I 38-42; #1333-#1334

... URUWanzataruwaz=ma=šši / URUKunzinašaz HUR.SAGArlantaš URUAlanāš ZAG-aš
 nu=kan URUAlanāš INA KUR IDHūlaya āššanza wātar= ma=kan kuit
 { water.Nn-*ma* PV which.Nn }
 INA HUR.SAGArlanta šer n= at= kan ANA KUR IDHūlaya
 { in mountain:Arlanta up CC it.Nn PV to land river:Hūlaya }
 Ū ANA KUR URUHatti takšan āššan §
 { and to land Hatti both remain.PPL.Nn }

‘ ... And on the side of Wanzataruwa / (and) Kunzinaša, the mountain Arlanta (and) the city of Alanā (are) the border for him.

And Alanā (is) left in the land of the river Hūlaya. **But the water which** (is) up in the mountain Arlanta, it (is) left to the land of the river Hūlaya and to the land of Hatti both §’

The noun *watar* ‘water’ is first mentioned in the relative clause, where identifying information about it is also presented. It becomes topical for the resumptive clause and is there referred to with the pronoun *-at* ‘it’.

Among the 408 *-ma*-clauses there are 48 non-distributive relative clauses (11.8%). (See Appendix.) Information about 3 of these is compromised by breaks, but of the 45 clear examples, 32 relativized referents are new (71.1%), and 13 have semiactive status (28.9%). Seven of the new referents are indeterminate relative forms, and 12 are referents that are mentioned earlier in their texts but that are specified further in their relative clauses. For example, Tuthaliya mentions his progeny, NUMUN ^m*Tuthaliya*, at BT Vs. II 69, but later at BT Rs. III 21-22 (#1391) he makes this more specific: ...NUMUN ^m*Tuthaliya* = *ma kuit* INA KUR URUHatti LUGAL-*iznani artari* ‘...the progeny of Tuthaliya that stands in kingship in the land of Hatti’. Tuthaliya may have meant the former to be understood in the restricted sense of the latter, but then again he may not have.

Indeterminate relative pronouns and adjectives seem to have some affinity for *-ma*, probably because such forms will always be new. There are 7 in the data. In the Apology, *-ma* occurred with 1 of the 2 indeterminate relative pronouns, and with 12 of the 24 determinate relative forms, rates of 50.0%. In the Bronze Tablet, *-ma* occurs with only 8

of 33 determinate relative forms (24.2%), but occurs with 50% of the clear indeterminate relative pronouns and adjectives (4/8).

The remaining examples with new referent do not appear to form any other coherent category. Occurrence of a new referent nevertheless seems sufficient to trigger the use of *-ma*:

(60b) AM I.A Vs. II 7-10; #1012

§ namma URUPalḫuišša EGIR-pa /NA URUKÙ.BABBAR-ti* úwanun
 nu=za ERÍN.MEŠ ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ nininkun namma apēdani MU-ti /NA KUR
 Arzauwa / iyanniyanun=pat ANA mUḫḫa-LÚ=ma LÚTEMA uiyanun / nu=šši ḫatrānun
 {to Uḫḫaziti -ma messenger I sent }

‘§ Then from Palḫuišša I came back to Ḫattuša,
 and I raised an army and a (force of) chariotry. Furthermore in that year I also marched to
 Arzawa. And to Uḫḫaziti I sent a messenger, / and wrote to him: ... ’

*[Götze emends TI to ŠI to give *Ḫattuši*, arguing that there is no city Ḫatti (1933:44), but
 perhaps only KUR ‘land’ need be restored, as he does for KBo 5.8 Vs. II 6 (p.152).]

Uḫḫaziti is first mentioned in this portion of the text, as is the LÚTEMA ‘messenger’. No
 other environment favoring *-ma* is present—there is no contrast, orientation, subject
 switch, or special emphasis. The slightly marked word order, where the dative object
 occurs before the accusative object, may be explained if we understand that Uḫḫaziti, as
 ruler of Arzawa, is less novel in the context (*accessible*) than is the messenger (*new*).

There is no way to be sure, however, which referent is the focus.

(60c) SvKK §18 C III 22-23, 26-27, D III 47-50; #1256-#1257

§ mānn=a ĤUL-lun memian kuinki ŠA BAL piran / parā ištamašti ... (2 clauses)

memian=ma ANA dUTU-ŠI piran parā ĥūdāk / ŪL ĥatrāši ... (3 clauses)

... našma kinun GIM-an mPÍŠ.TUR-aš

iyat nu=mu ŠA mÉ.GAL.PAP=ma memian ĥūdāk IŠPUR

{CC me.DL of É.GAL.PAP -ma matter.A immediately he wrote }

mÉ.GAL.PAP-aš=wa=za=kan BAL zikkizzi namma=z=aš=kan* EGIR-anda

memiyani šer karuššiyattat nu=mu namma ŪL kuitki ĥatrāš

*[sic; cf. Friedrich 1926:128 with fn.17]

‘§ And if you hear about some dastardly matter of revolt / in advance, ... (2 clauses)

but you do not write to My Majesty right away / beforehand, ... (3 clauses)

... or now as Mašĥuiluwa

did: Now he wrote me about the matter of É.GAL.PAP(=ma) right away:

“É.GAL.PAP-a is inciting revolt,” then he was silent

about the matter afterwards and wrote me nothing more’

As in the preceding example, here *-ma* attaches to a referent, mÉ.GAL.PAP, that has not been mentioned in the text before. Again, other contexts favoring the occurrence of *-ma* are absent. Notifying the king immediately about matters of revolt is the discourse topic, and the new referent is the most salient thing about the clause. (Of course, the cooccurrence with the clause connector *nu* ‘and’ is rare and seems to diminish greatly the connective force of *-ma*.) These are the only two examples in which presence of a new referent is the only factor favoring the occurrence of *-ma*. While new referents will most often occur with other such factors, e.g., contrast, subject switch, orientation, and the like, these two examples show that the mere occurrence of a new referent licenses the use of *-ma*.

§3.3.1.3 Emphasis

§3.3.1.3.1 Variant Word Order

An especially emphasized idea is likely to be the focus of its clause, or at least to possess some degree of focality. Such special focus can be signaled with syntax that diverges from the norm (as sketched in §1.4), e.g., clause-initial verbs or direct objects that precede their subjects. It is not clear that the occurrence of *-ma* correlates particularly with the occurrence of special focus, although examples where the two cooccur are to be found.

Among the 408 clauses with *-ma* there are 9 with verbs in initial position; two of these are phraseological verbs and will not be considered here.¹² The remaining 7 clauses are all rather short. Five can be shown to be emphatic in some way, but 2 are relative clauses with determinate relative pronouns (Held 1957): *āšta=ma=kan kuit* ‘and that which was left’ (LPK Vs. 11’, #1275) and *memai=ma=at kuedani* ‘and the one to whom he says it’ (ILMS Rs. III 11; #1304). In these cases, given the rhetorical choice of the author, the verbs must occur clause-initially, and the relative pronouns must follow them.

The 5 remaining clauses are either counterexpectational (#1243, #1400, and #1182—including the following clause) or contrastive (#1264 = example (37), #1387). Three of these (#1243, #1264, #1400) occur with post-verbal negatives, regarded by Friedrich as placement for emphasis, especially in short sentences (1960:146 §282b; cf. Holland 1980:100-101 and Garrett 1990:77ff.); compare (61).

(61) BT Rs. III 39-42; #1399-#1400

mān=ma ANA LUGAL KUR URUḪatti annawliš kuiški arāi
 našma ^dUTU-ŠI kēzza IŠTU KUR URUŠAPLITI laḫḫiyaizzi
 nu=šši II ME KARAŠ nininkandu
 ašandulanzi= ma=at lē §
 {they shall occupy -ma it.A not! }

‘And if some (king of) equal rank rises against the king of the land of Ḫatti,
 or My Majesty makes war this side of the Lower Land,
 they shall raise a 200(-man) army from him,
but (the army) shall not serve as an occupation force §’

It might be reasonable to expect that an army raised for combat would be used to occupy territory they conquer, but the clause with initial verb and postverbal negative emphatically counters that expectation. In the 5 examples with initial verb, the relation of the clause to its preceding context is one of contrast or counterexpectation, and the nonstandard syntax does appear to add emphasis to this relation. If counterexpectation is understood to be a type of contrast, then these 5 examples are consistent with Holland’s categorization of

verb-initial data, fitting under the category of contrasted verb cooccurring with *-ma* (Holland 1980:41).

Beside examples with initial-position verbs, I have noted 13 clauses with some other deviation from the usual word order: subject NP preceded by accusative object NP (#1049, #1187, #1188 = example (25), #1381-#1382 = example (65), #1412) or by dative/locative NP (#1078 = example (71), #1399 = example (61)); a clause with the order S-Abl-DO-V (#1120); a clause-initial negative separated from indefinite adverb (#1137, #1139 = example (49)); a clause-initial predicate noun (#1197); and a postverbal adverb (#1073 = example (62)). The last 3 types (consisting of 4 examples) can be distinguished from those preceding them in that they involve focal syntactic positions rather than focus-marking word order. All of these clauses exhibit at least one of the contexts in which *-ma* occurs (e.g., contrast, series-marking, counterexpectation, repeated form), and 9 have at least two such contexts, so it is difficult to establish a clear connection between variant word order and occurrence of *-ma*. Additionally, some of the variant word orders apparently have less to do with special focus than with typical ways of presenting information: in 6 (or probably 7) of the 8 examples with accusative or dative/locative constituent placed before the subject, that constituent is more topical than the subject. Nevertheless, the expression of special focus is evident in other cases:

(62) AM П.7.А Vs. I 21-23; #1072-#1073

... mahhan=ma ŠA KUR URUTaggašta ERÍN.MEŠ NARĀRĒ
arḥa parāššešsir ammuK=ma IŠTU MUŠEN tamattat namma
{ to me -ma by bird was allowed further }
nu INA KUR URUTaggašta pāun ...

‘ ... And when the auxiliary troops of the land of Taggašta
had dispersed?, for me(=ma) it was allowed by the bird(-oracle) (to march) **further**,
and I marched to the land of Taggašta ... ’

Here *namma* 'further' is placed postverbally and should express special emphasis. Aside from the verb-initial clauses, however, I have not collected these examples systematically,

so it is not possible at present to know the extent of the cooccurrence of *-ma* with special focus or to form opinions about their correlation. The picture is made even murkier by the presence of other contexts favoring the use of *-ma*.

§3.3.1.3.2 Orthotonic Personal Pronouns

I have also assumed that orthotonic personal pronouns, by their very presence in a clause, express some degree of special emphasis since under normal circumstances an author could choose to use enclitic pronouns (or to rely on subject-verb agreement where subject pronouns are absent). Often these pronouns occur with *-ma* (Houwink ten Cate 1973). I have identified 52 such examples: 22–1.sg., 20–2.sg., 7–3.sg., and 1 of each person in the plural.¹³ (See Appendix.) Most of these coincide with subject switch (45/52 = 86.5%, including 31/34 nominative pronouns). Contrastive contexts are well represented among these examples (21/52 = 40.4%), and other contexts favoring *-ma* also occur in small numbers.

The emphasis that I believe orthotonic pronoun with *-ma* expresses can be seen in (63). There is no change in subject here, and any contrast that is present, say, between war spoils and Mursili as discourse subtopic, is exceedingly mild.

(63) AM II.7.A Rs. III 37-41; #1093-#1094

§ mahḥan=ma EGIR-pa uwanun nu šāru kuit NAM.RA
 GUD UDU AKŠUD LÚ.MEŠŠU.DIB=ya kuin ēppir
 n=an INA URUAltanna arḥa dalaḥḥun
 ammuk=ma INA HUR.SAGKaššū ANA mPittipara
 { I -ma in mountain:Kaššū DL Pittipara }
 Ū ANA NAM.RA EGIR-anda pāun ...
 { and DL people after I went }

‘§ And when I came back, the booty, civil prisoners,
 cattle, (and) sheep that I had taken, and the military prisoners that they had seized,
 I left them in Altanna.

And I marched to the mountain Kaššū after Pittipara / and (his) people ...’

A similar example is #1050. In these cases without subject switch, strong contrast, or other environments that favor *-ma*, I consider the collocation to express emphasis.

§3.3.1.4 *-ma*'s Attachment to Focal Elements

While *-ma* often attaches to the focal element in a clause, it is not required to do so. The degree to which it attaches to the focal element varies by context. *-ma* will almost always attach to a focus of contrast (or one of them, for there are frequently more than one), as it does in 32 of 33 examples of contrast in the Apology of Hattusili (and in 9 of 10 examples in Old Hittite—cf. §2.3.2.1). *-ma* attaches less consistently to focal new referents: only 48 of 107 new referents (44.9%) host *-ma* (23 subjects and 25 non-subjects), while 59 of 107 new referents occur later in the clause (55.1%; 42 subjects and 17 non-subjects). In series, *-ma* will again more often attach to a focus of contrast, since series members will often show similar form but be contrastive (but see example (51)). In cases of counterexpectation, it is unlikely that *-ma* will attach to a focal element, because the entire proposition, or at least the predicate, is often focal.

§3.3.2 Orientation

In addition to being used with various types of focus, NH *-ma* also marks adjustments to backgrounded information. The particle frequently occurs in clauses which contain a linguistic expression that changes the orientation for that clause and potentially for clauses that follow. I found that 153 of 408 clauses with *-ma*, or 37.5%, contain such expressions. In more than half of the cases the adjusting expression is an adjunct of a clause with other propositional content and occurs clause-initially (94/153, 61.4%), whereas in 65 cases the entire clause is devoted to adjusting the setting (65/153, 42.5%). The two types coincide in 6 clauses. (See Appendix.)

There are examples which adjust the orientation with respect to time and location, as well as some that are ambiguous between these. In (64)-(65) we see changes being made to the temporal setting.

(64) AM I.A Vs. I 4-6; #1001-#1002

... nu=za *ABU-YA* kuwapi *DINGIR-LIM-iš DÙ-at*
^mArnuandaš=ma=za=kan *ŠEŠ-YA ANA* ^{Giš}*GU.ZA ABI-ŠU* ešat
EGIR-an=ma=aš / irmaliyattat= pat ...
 {after -ma he he fell ill also}

‘... And when my father died (lit. became a god),
 Arnuanda, my brother, sat upon the throne of his father. **And** thereafter he / also fell ill’

In (64) *EGIR-an (appan)* ‘afterwards’ changes the time of events from a point in the past to point nearer, though still antecedent to, the time of composition. The adverb *kinun* ‘now’ in (65) adjusts the setting from the reign of Tuthaliya’s father Hattusili to the time of the composition of the Bronze Tablet.

(65) BT Vs. II 86-89; #1381-#1382

... nu *ṬUPPU RIKILT*i kuwapi iēr
 apūn=ma=za *SAL-an* ^{md}*LAMMA-aš ANA PANI ABI-YA* datta=pat nawi
kinun=ma=za apūn SAL-an ^{md}*LAMMA-aš mān dāi*
 {now -ma RFL that.Ac woman.Ac Kurunta.N whether he takes }
 mān=z=an *ŪL dāi* nu apāš memiyaš *ŪL* dattari

‘when they made the treaty tablet,
 Kurunta had not yet taken this woman (as wife) before my father,
but now, whether Kurunta takes this woman
 or he does not take her, this matter will not be considered’

Of the 94 examples with an initial expression that adjusts the setting, 35 are temporal changes. Twenty-seven of these involve adverbs, and 8 involve oblique noun phrases.

In (66)-(67) the spatial orientation is modified. Of the 44 such examples, 24 are expressed with productively-formed oblique noun phrases, as in (66), and 20 are expressed with adverbial forms, as in (67).

(66) AM II.9.A Rs. III 41-44; #1110-#1111

§[p]arā=ma /INA KUR URUḪurna pāun nu KUR URUḪurna URUḪumann=a / ḫaminkun
 /INA URUḪurna=ma=ššan kuit É dU URUḪurna / EGIR-an ēšta
 {in Ḫurna -ma PV which.N house Storm-god Ḫurna behind it was}
 n=at ḫuldalānun / n=at ŪL šaruwāir ...

‘§ And furthermore I marched to the land of Ḫurna, and I destroyed the land of Ḫurna and the city of Ḫurna. And in the city of Ḫurna, the temple of the Storm-god of Ḫurna which remained (lit. was behind), I spared it, / and they did not plunder it ...’

In the second clause with *-ma* the initial dative/locative ‘phrase’ *INA URUḪurna* ‘in the city of Ḫurna’ adjusts the orientation for events from the land of Ḫurna to the city of the same name. Here the city is changed from foregrounded information, one of the geographic entities suffering destruction, to backgrounded information, the area in which the temple is located.

(67) AM I.A Rs. IV 27-30; #1041

... nu=za URUYahreššan / [URU-an tar]aḫḫun [na]mma=an arḫa warnunun
 parā=ma / [INA KU]R Piggainarešša pāun
 {forth-ma in land Piggainarešša I went }
 nu ŠA KUR Piggainarešša / [o URUG]aškan GUL-un

‘and I [con]quered / [the city of] Yahrešša, furthermore I burned it down, and I went forth [into the land] of Piggainarešša and attacked the Gašga [city] / of the land of Piggainarešša’

In (67) *parā* ‘forth’ indicates direction further along the path of a military campaign.

The 15 remaining orientation-modifying adverbial expressions are less clearly spatiotemporal, but rather are ambiguous between spatial and temporal modification (#1105, #1280), or have become metaphorical to the point where they adjust the setting in other ways, as by providing orientation within the text.

(68) AM II.9.A Rs. III 31-34; #1107, #1108, #1109

§ namma parā /NA URUTaḥappišūna pāūn
 n=an arḥa warnunun /ŠTU NAM.RA=ma=an GUD UDU / ēppun
 parā=ma URUKāraššuwan warnunun / ŠTU NAM.RA=ma=an GUD UDU ēppun
 { forth-*ma* Karaššuwa.A I burned }

‘§ Then I marched forth into the city of Taḥappišūna
 and burned it down, but seized it with (its) people, cattle, (and) sheep.
 And furthermore I burned Kāraššuwa / and seized it with (its) people, cattle, (and) sheep’

In this example, *parā* ‘furthermore’ indicates progress along a trail of the events of the text, rather than progress along an actual path of destruction, as in (67), which could, incidentally, be ambiguous between the physical and metaphorical readings.

(69) SvKK §10 D II 19-20 (with A I 27-29); #1232-#1233

tuk=ma dUTU-Š/ kuit KUR-TAM ADDIN nu=za apāt KUR-TAM paḥši
 namma=ma=z [Š]A KUR URUḪatti ZAG-an lē ilaliyaši
 { further-*ma* RFL of land Ḫatti border.A not! you desire }

‘and the land that I, My Majesty, gave you, protect that land,
 and furthermore, do not covet (any) border (i.e., territory) of the land of Ḫatti’

In (69) the adverb *namma* ‘furthermore, moreover’ adjusts the orientation for its clause by indicating that it follows on and relates to the clauses preceding it.

Sixty-five of the 153 orientation-changing examples involve entire clauses, all but one of which contain a subordinating conjunction (#1068).¹⁴ Most frequent are clauses with temporal *mahḥan*/GIM-*an* ‘when’, of which there are 44, followed by clauses with *kuit* ‘because; the fact that; when’ (16), *kuitman* ‘while’ (3), and *kuwapi* ‘when’ (1). (See Appendix.) In (70) the clause with *mahḥan=ma* advances the time of the events from when Mursili sets out for Taptina to when he arrives at Tarkuma.

(70) AM II.5.B Rs. III 43-44; #1056-#1057

§ lukkatti=ma /NA URUTaptina parā iyahḫat
maḫḫan=ma / NA URUTarkuma āraḫḫun nu URUTarkuman arḫa warnunun
{when -ma in Tarkuma I arrived}

‘§ And the next day I went forth to(ward) the city of Taptina. And when I arrived in the city of Tarkuma, I burned down the city of Tarkuma.’

The clause with *-ma* and *kuit* in (71) presents a situation which I interpret as motivation for Mursili’s remaining in Takkuwaḫina and Taḫantattipa.

(71) AM II.7.A Vs. I 35-38; #1077-#1078

... nu dUTU-ŠI=ma pāun=pat nu KUR URUTakkuwaḫina
URUKUR URUTaḫantattipa arḫa warnunun
kēdaš= ma ANA KUR.KUR.ḪIA LUGAL URUḪatti kuit ŪL kuiški
{those.DL-ma to lands king Ḫatti since not anyone.Nc }
pānza ēšta nu=ššan šer šakuwantariyanun
{gone.PPL.Nc was}

‘and I, My Majesty, also marched. I burned up the land of Takkuwaḫina and the land of Taḫantattipa. / But since no king of Ḫatti had gone to these lands, I stayed on’

In the Bronze Tablet Tuthaliya wants to justify Kurunta’s position as king of Tarḫuntašša and does so in part by describing the good relations between the two that began long before Tuthaliya ascended to the throne of Hatti. The clause with *-ma* and *kuitman* in (72) orients the audience’s consciousness to that time period.

(72) BT Vs. II 31-32; #1361-#1362

§ ūk=ma mTuthaliyaš LUGAL.GAL kuitman LUGAL-izziaḫḫat=pat nawi
{ I -ma Tuthaliya.N king great while I became king even not yet }
ūk=ma mdLAMMA-ann=a DINGIR-LUM annišan=pat āššuwanni anda amut

‘And before I, Tuthaliya, Great King, even became king, the god led (me) and Kurunta even then into friendship’

In describing Kupanta-Kurunta's adoption as heir, Mursili gives background leading up to the event by setting the time of the discourse to when Mašḫuiluwa brought up the subject, as we see in the clause with *-ma* and *kuwapi* in (73):

(73) SvKK §4 D I 21-22; #1213

§ annišan=*ma* kuwapi ^mMašḫuiluwan ANA KUR ^{URU}Mirā AŠŠUM BELUT<TIM>
 { first *-ma* when Mašḫuiluwa.A in land Mira concerning lordship }
 tittanunun nu=*mu* ^mPÍŠ.TUR-waš kiššan IQBI DUMU.NITA=*wa* NU.[GÁL o]
 { I installed }

‘§ And when I had first placed Mašḫuiluwa in lordship in the land of Mirā, Mašḫuiluwa spoke thus to me: “(I have) no heir.” ’

As in (73), five other orientation-adjusting clauses contain orientation-adjusting initial adverbs.

To these cases of modification of orientation can be added examples with conditional protases because they specify one or more new conditions for the ensuing discourse. There are 32 conditional protases with *mān* ‘if’ in the clauses with *-ma* and 9 clauses without subordinators under the scope of a preceding *mān*. Four of these 41 clauses have initial adverbs and were included in the totals above. There are also 12 *-ma*-clauses without subordinators under the scope of a preceding conditional *našma* ‘or (if)’, and 1 of these contains an initial setting expression included in the totals above. (See Appendix.)

In a way the relative clause can be thought of as orienting because it affects the basic organization of the text by adding a new referent or reactivating a dormant one. A relative clause is more typically orienting in the sense used in this study in that the information presented about the new or recalled referent describes the conditions which relate it to the discourse. Since this information need not bear directly on the current part of the text, it functions as background; the resumptive clause will ordinarily continue the main thrust of the discourse. In clauses with *kuit* ‘in that, seeing that, since, as’, this feature of

relative clauses extends to entire propositions. In a *kuit* clause the entire proposition is topicalized (Holland 1984, 1995), but the information then functions as background for the following resumptive clause.

§3.3.2.1 Paragraph-Initial *-ma*

Neo-Hittite *-ma* frequently occurs at the beginning of paragraphs, as can be seen in (74):

(74)

Clause-Connectors at the Beginning of Paragraphs								
<u>Text</u>	<u>-ma</u>	<u>-ya</u>	<u>nu</u>	<u>other</u>	<u>none</u>	<u>broken</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>% with -ma</u>
AM	33	-	16	9	1	14	73	45.2%
AH	8	1	2	-	2	-	13	61.5%
SvKK	9	1	1	5	1	1	18	50.0%
LPK	3	-	1	-	3	-	7	42.9%
ILMS	-	3*	-	10*	1	4	17*	0.0% ¹⁵
BT	<u>15</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>55.6%</u>
Total	68	14	21	24	10	19	155*	43.9%

*1 clause beginning with *namma* = *ya* counted as 1 instead of 2 in text Total.

Since *-ma* occurs in only about 20% of clauses in general in the data, the ~44% rate of occurrence at the beginning of paragraphs shows a definite tendency for *-ma* to be favored in this environment.

There are 68 paragraph-initial examples with *-ma*, 16.7% of the clauses with *-ma*. (See Appendix.) Of the 68 examples, 55 establish the orientation (80.9%), and 53 exhibit subject switch (77.9%); 36 (52.9%) do both. In the 408 clauses with *-ma*, orientation occurs roughly half as often as subject switch (37.5% as against 69.1% of examples), so a correlation between orientation and its occurrence paragraph-initially would seem more relevant than a correlation between subject switch and its occurrence paragraph-initially. Moreover, it is natural for a statement of orientation to occur at the beginning of an episode

(Chafe 1994:138-139), assuming that Hittite paragraphs are more or less coherent episodes. Subject switch is nonetheless relevant because it occurs in so many of the paragraph-initial examples and because it is the strongest motivation for occurrence of *-ma* in the cases that do not adjust the setting.

(75) AM II.10 Rs. III 23-27; #1122

nu /NA URUMaraššantiya gimmandar[iy]a[nu]n
 § ^mAparruš=ma LÚ URUKalašma URUḪattuši / MAḪAR dUTU-ŠI úet
 { Aparru.N -ma man Kalašma Ḫattuša.DL before my sun he came }
 n=an parā ḫittianun
 n=an EN-LAM iyanun nu=šši KUR URUKalašma / maniyahḫūwanzi peḫhun

‘(and My Majesty returned to Ḫattuša (from this campaign)),
 and I wintered in Maraššantiya.
 § And Aparru, the man of Kalašma, came
 before My Majesty at Ḫattuša. And I (treated) him (preferentially):
 I made him a lord, and I gave him the land of Kalašma / to administer’

Here we see a clear example of a new episode beginning without statement of orientation, but with subject switch. The previous paragraph dealt with a campaign of Mursili, and the next covers his new dealings with Aparru. While such examples show that subject switch cannot be disregarded here, they make up only 13 of the 68 paragraph-initial examples, and 4 of these are conditional protases that can be construed as orientation-establishing.

Of the 55 orientation-establishing expressions with *-ma* in paragraph-initial position, 42 establish the temporal setting (30 with subordinating conjunctions, 12 with adverbial expressions); 6 establish the spatial setting (5 ablative nouns and 1 adverb); 2 establish the textual setting (1 dative/locative phrase and 1 adverb); and 5 establish causal conditions (all with *kuit* ‘since, given that’). A thoroughly typical example of paragraph-initial orientation with *mahḫan* ‘when’, of which there are 27, can be seen in (76).

(76) AM I.A Vs. I 35-37; #1010-#1011

URUḪalilan=ma URUDuddušgann=a arḫa warnunun
 § mahḫan=ma KUR URUGašga ŠA URUḪalila Û ŠA URUDuddušga ḫarninkuuar
 { when -ma land Gašga of Ḫalili and of Duddušga destruction.A }
 ištamašta nu KUR URUGašga ḫūman anda warreššešta
 { it heard }

‘and I burned down Ḫalila and Duddušga.

§ **And when** the Gašga-land heard about the destruction of Ḫalila and Duddušga, the whole Gašga-land (came to their aid)’

Here the paragraph-initial clause with *mahḫan=ma* changes the temporal setting from the preceding activities, Mursili’s burning of Ḫalila and Duddušga, to the later time when the Gašgas learn of their destruction. It also begins a new episode, as the ensuing narrative describes the reaction of the Gašga folk to the attack.

Using an expanded definition of orientation, i.e., including conditional protases as described in the preceding section, increases the number of setting-changing examples by 4 to 59 (86.8%) and further strengthens the correlation of orientation and paragraph-initial position.

§3.3.3 Subject Switch

Neo-Hittite *-ma* frequently occurs in clauses whose subject changes. Of the 408 clauses with *-ma*, 279 (68.4%) contain subject switch. By far the majority of these occur in contexts with other of the pragmatic categories discussed above, and only 11 (2.7% of 408) seem to have subject switch as the sole factor licensing the use of *-ma*. (See Appendix.)

In (77) we see an example where subject switch is the sole category present:

(77) BT Vs. I 14-18; #1317, #1318, #1319

§ mahḥan=ma ABU-YA mÚrḥiteššupan LUGAL-iznani arḥa tittanut
 mdLAMMA-an=ma ABU-YA dāš n=an INA KUR URUdU-tašša LUGAL-iznani tittanut
 nu=šši ABU-YA kuit išhiūl iyat ZAG.MEŠ-iš=ši mahḥan daiš
 nu=šši ABU-YA ṬUPPAḪI.A RIKILTİ iyat n=at mdLAMMA-aš ḥarzi
 ZAG.MEŠ=ma=šši kiššan tiyanteš IŠTU KUR URUPitašša=tta
 {borders -ma him.DL in this way set.PPL.pN}

‘§ And when my father removed Urḥiteššup from the kingship,
 my father took Kurunta(=ma) and installed him in the kingship in Tarḥuntašša.
 And the treaty which my father made for him, how he set the borders for him,
 now my father made treaty tablets for him, and Kurunta has (them).
 And the borders (are) set for him in this way: On the side of Pitašša ... for you ... ’

In this example the previously mentioned ZAG.MEŠ ‘borders’ becomes subject in a clause, marked with *-ma*, that shows no contrast, repeated form, counterexpectation, new referents, special emphasis, series marking, or setting—the adverb *kiššan* ‘thus, in this way’ is textually deictic, but conveys foregrounded orientation. *kiššan*’s pointing forward is part of the predicate rather than a setting for the action of the predicate. A similar example is to be found in #1371.

In comparison with the unsurprising progression in change of subject in (77), (78) shows an abrupt and strong subject switch.

(78) AHI 66-72; #1141

... nu=mu ^dIŠTAR GAŠAN-YA
 GIM-an kaniššan ħarta nu=za=kan IGI.ĦI.A-wa kuwattan
 ANA KUR LÚKÚR andan nāiškinun nu=mu=kan IGI.ĦI.A-wa LÚKÚR
 EGIR-pa ŪL kuiški nāiš nu=za KUR.KUR.MEŠ LÚKÚR tarahḫiškinun
 kaniššūwar=ma=mu ŠA ^dIŠTAR=pat GAŠAN-YA ēšta
 {favor.N -ma me.DL of Ištar herself lady- my it was }
 nu=kan ŠÀ KUR.KUR.MEŠ URUḪatti LÚKÚR kuiš kuiš anda ēšta
 n=an=kan IŠTU KUR.KUR URUḪatti arḫa=pat uiyanun

‘ ... And as Ištar, my lady, / had favored me, wherever I would turn my eyes
 on an enemy land, no enemy at all / could return my gaze (lit. turned his eyes back on me)
 and I conquered the lands of the enemy.
 And the favor of Ištar herself, my lady, was on me.
 And whichever enemy was inside the lands of Ḫatti,
 I also sent him away from the lands of Ḫatti’

Despite the abrupt switch from dominance over the enemy to the ideas of Ištar and her favor, the latter have only very recently become semiactive by the time the *-ma*-clause occurs, having been mentioned only four clauses before, so no new ideas are introduced here. In fact, Hattusili considers Ištar’s favor as the factor generally underlying his successes, and he includes such acknowledgments throughout the Apology. Also absent from the *-ma*-clause are expressions of orientation, counterexpectation, and series marking. But other pragmatic categories are present. The clause repeats in different form the previous clause concerning Ištar and her favor. *Ištar* is made emphatic through cliticization of the particle *-pat*. Further, in addition to using the clause as humble refrain and interim conclusion, Hattusili may have intended it to function as a transition between details of offensive and defensive warfare, in which case contrast is present. Apparently presence of subject switch alone is a sufficient condition for the occurrence of *-ma*, but such a situation is rather rare as subject switch tends to occur with other pragmatic categories.

A correlation appears to exist between subject switch and Houwink ten Cate’s syntactic environment 2, the beginning of a main clause following a preceding dependent clause (observed by Houwink ten Cate 1973:134). There were 44 clauses with *-ma* in

environment 2 (including 7 simultaneously in environment 3, cf. §3.2.5), and 37 (84.1%) of these had a change in subject from the preceding clause, as in (79).

(79) AH II 39-41; #1160-#1161 ¹⁶

... LÚ-LUM=ma kuiš piran ḫūiyanza
 ēšta nu anda pennu[] n=an=kan GIM-an kuenun
 LÚKÚR=ma= za piddāiš ...
 {enemy -ma RFL he fled }

‘... and the man who was / the leader and (dr[ove] them on), when I slew him,
 the enemy(=ma) fled ...’

Here there is a change in subject from the dependent adverbial clause to the main clause.

The clause-coordinative force of *-ma* seems to be greatly reduced, its occurrence apparently conditioned rather by the subject switch. Other clear examples can be seen above in (31), (47), and in #1374.

The 7 examples without subject switch remaining from the 44 clauses in syntactic environment 2 all show some degree of contrast, and 5 cooccur with a third category of *-ma* use: two-member and series marking or counterexpectation.

§3.4 A Brief Look at Neo-Hittite Clause-Connective *-a/-ya*

A complete description of *-ma* would be situated among a study of all the Hittite clause connectors. In this section I briefly describe the characteristics of Neo-Hittite clause-connective *-a/-ya* ‘and’, but I exclude its uses as subclausal conjunction ‘and’ and as emphatic particle ‘even, also’ (unless these should occur in Wackernagel’s Law position and thus exhibit at least formal identity with the clause connector). This particle deserves its own study, but here I have examined it primarily with regard to the categories that I have found to be associated with *-ma* with the intention of shedding light on that particle’s function.

In the areas of frequency, phonology, and syntax, the distribution of NH *-a/-ya* is rather like that of NH *-ma*. Its functional distribution, too, shows many similarities to *-ma*'s, but with some important differences.

§3.4.1 Frequency, Phonological Distribution, and Syntactic Distribution

The number of occurrences of *-a/-ya* found in the corpus is given in the following table.

(80) Occurrences of <i>-a/-ya</i>		
<u>Text</u>	<u>Secure</u>	<u>Unsure or in Broken Context</u>
Annals of Mursili	24	3
Apology of Hattusili	23	3
Treaty with Kupanta- ^d KAL	15	3
Bronze Tablet	33	2
Instruction to the LÚ.MEŠSAG	8	6
Letter of Puduhepa	<u>3</u>	<u>12</u> ¹⁷
Total	106	29

With 106 attestations, *-a/-ya* occurs about one-fourth as many times as *-ma*, with 411 attestations. The following table shows the frequency of occurrence of *-a/-ya* in the sections considered suitable for inclusion:

(81)

Frequency of *-a/-ya*

<u>Text</u>	<u>Clauses with <i>-a/-ya</i></u>	<u>Number of Clauses</u>	<u>Frequency</u>
Annals of Mursili	26 ^a	814	3.2%
Apology of Hattusili	23	368	6.3%
Treaty with Kupanta- ^d KAL	16 ^b	332	4.8%
Bronze Tablet	33	329	10.0%
Instruction to the LÚ.MEŠSAG	10 ^c	130	7.7%
Letter of Puduhepa	<u>3</u>	<u>104</u>	<u>2.9%</u>
Total	111	2077	5.3%

a) Includes 2 *-a/-ya*'s, each of which is the second member of a correlative pair (#5031, #5032). b) Includes 1 *-a/-ya* in broken context (#5010). c) Includes 2 *-a/-ya*'s in broken context (#5023, #5024).

As the table shows, *-a/-ya*'s occurrence ranges from about 3% to about 10%, depending on the text, with an overall average frequency of about 5%, compared with about 20% for *-ma* (cf. (2)). After adjustments are made for the 5 secure attestations in correlative constructions and in broken sections of the accepted portions of the texts, the tally of clauses beginning with *-a/-ya* used in the analysis is 106 (408 for *-ma*). (See Appendix.)

The following table summarizes NH *-a/-ya*'s phonological distribution in the six texts analyzed:

(82)

Phonological Distribution of *-a/-ya*

<u>after C</u>	<u>after V</u>	<u>after non- phonetic writing</u>	<u>Total</u>
41 ¹⁸	14	51	106
38.7%	13.2%	48.1%	100.0%
(52.1%	18.0%	29.9%	distribution of <i>-ma</i> from (3))

As compared to *-ma*, *-a/-ya* occurs less frequently after consonants and vowels and more frequently after non-phonetic writings.

As with *-ma*, the predominant syntactic position for *-a/-ya* is after the first word in a clause, but other positions are also attested, as summarized in (83). (Cf. note 3.)

(83) **Syntactic Distribution of *-a/-ya***

	#	%	<i>-ma</i>
i) after the first word:	84	79.2%	84.2%
ii) after the second word, involving one constituent: ex.: [ĪR.MEŠ DINGIR-LIM] = <i>ya</i>	15	14.2%	9.7%
iii) after the third word, involving one constituent: ex.: [ANA LUGAL KUR URUdU- <i>tašša</i>] = <i>ya</i>	5	4.7%	1.0%
iv) after the second word, involving two constituents: ex.: [<i>nu</i>] [ABU-YA] = <i>ya</i>	2	1.9%	4.4%
v) after the third word, involving two constituents:	—	0.0%	0.7%
	106	100.0%	

The table shows the intraclausal syntactic distribution of *-a/-ya* and *-ma* to be rather similar. *-a/-ya* delayed to the second or third word of the clause occurs in Neo-Hittite in the same contexts as delayed *-ma*. These are a) with clause-initial *mān* ‘if [NH]’—1 occurrence; b) with the clause-introductory particle *nu* ‘and’—1 occurrence; and c) with Akkadographic or Sumerographic writing—20 occurrences.

The grammatical categories of the hosts of the 106 *-a/-ya*’s are summarized in (84).

(84) **Grammatical Categories of *-a/-ya*'s Hosts**

	#	%	<i>-ma</i>
Noun	37	34.9%	33.6%
Noun Phrase	26	24.5%	14.8%
Pronoun	18 ^a	17.0%	16.3%
Adjective	1 ^b	0.9%	4.1%
Adverb	8 ^c	7.5%	14.6%
Negative	-	0.0%	1.7%
Preverb	2	1.9%	0.2%
Verb	3	2.8%	2.4%
Conjunction	<u>11</u>	<u>10.4%</u>	12.2%
	106	99.9%	

a) Pronouns: 12 personal, 4 demonstrative, 1 relative, 1 distributive. b) Adjective: 1 attributive. c) Adverbs: 2 spatial, 1 temporal, 5 other.

The distribution of *-a/-ya* and *-ma* with respect to their hosts is also rather similar. Two notable differences are 1) the higher percentage of *-a/-ya*'s hosted by noun phrases, which is consistent with the more frequent cooccurrence of *-a/-ya* and non-phonetic writing seen in (82); and 2) the higher percentage of *-ma*'s hosted by adverbs, which is consistent with *-ma*'s greater association with the orientation function (see below).

The grammatical relations of the nominal-type categories is given in (85).

(85) **Grammatical Relations of Nominal Hosts**

	Noun	NP	Pronoun	Adjective	Total	%	<i>-ma</i>
Nominative	16	8	13	-	37	34.9%	33.3%
Accusative	14	12	2	1	29	27.4%	14.6%
Genitive	3	-	-	-	3	2.8%	2.7%
Dative/Locative	3	6	3	-	12	11.3%	10.0%
Ablative	1	-	-	-	1	0.9%	6.3%
Allative	<u>—</u>	<u>—</u>	<u>—</u>	<u>—</u>	<u>—</u>	<u>0.0%</u>	<u>0.2%</u>
Total	37	26	18	1	82	77.4%	67.2%

We see relatively more ablative forms for *-ma*, the result of the long border-setting section of the Bronze Tablet. Proportionately *-a/-ya* occurs about twice as often with accusative forms as does *-ma*, but no explanation for this is evident at present.

As regards interclausal syntax, *-a/-ya* occurs as follows in these environments (after Houwink ten Cate 1973:128; cf. §2.2. above):

(86)	Interclausal Environments for <i>-a/-ya</i>	#	%	<i>-ma</i>
1a	in an independent clause IC- <i>ya</i>	50	47.2%	50.0%
1b	in a protasis following another protasis DC DC- <i>ya</i> ...MC	9	8.5%	7.8%
2	in an apodosis DC MC- <i>ya</i>	7	6.6%	9.1%
3	in a protasis DC- <i>ya</i> MC	39	36.8%	31.4%
2/3	in the protasis of a complex apodosis DC (DC- <i>ya</i> MC)	<u>1</u>	<u>0.9%</u>	1.7%
Total		106	100.0%	

Also here the distribution of *-a/-ya* is quite similar to that of *-ma*.

§3.4.2 Functional Contexts

The figures below show the occurrence of *-a/-ya* in the functional contexts that I have claimed favor the use of *-ma*. *-a/-ya* is attested in all these environments (see the Appendix for the attestations in each context), and in some environments it occurs at a rate equal to that of *-ma*. However, there are some important differences. Most obviously, *-ma* occurs much more frequently, both absolutely and relatively, in contexts of contrast and orientation, and in their respective special subcategories of counterexpectation and paragraph beginnings.

(87)		<i>-a/-ya</i>		<i>-ma</i>	
Contrast: strong	10	9.4%	114	27.9%	
weak	19	17.9%	84	20.6%	
overall	29	27.4%	198	48.5%	
Counterexpectation:	2	1.9%	63	15.4%	
Orientation:	18	17.0%	153	37.5%	
conditional protases	14	13.2%	53*	13.0%	
combined	32	30.2%	201	49.3%	
Paragraph-initial:	14 ¹⁹	13.2%	68	16.7%	
% of Total (155)		9.0%		43.9%	

*Five examples contain other orienting expressions.

Although *-ma* and *-a/-ya* occur with new referents at about the same rate, *-a/-ya* occurs much less frequently with new subjects and with new relativized referents than does *-ma*.

(88)		<i>-a/-ya</i>		<i>-ma</i>	
Clauses with New referents:	≥ 23*	21.7%	≥ 105*	25.7%	
subjects	9/23	39.1%	65/105	61.0%	
relativized referents	8/25	32.0%	32/45	71.1%	

*Not comprehensively collected.

Proportionately *-ma* occurs somewhat more frequently in environments with repeated form and in cases of series marking.

(89)		<i>-a/-ya</i>		<i>-ma</i>	
Repeated form:	21	19.8%	104	25.5%	
Series marking:	11	10.4%	76	18.6%	
final only	≥ 3*	≥ 2.8%	14	3.4%	
bipartite	17	16.0%	≥ 43*	≥ 10.5%	

*Not comprehensively collected.

In cases involving special emphasis, as manifested by variant word order and by orthotonic personal pronouns, *-a/-ya* and *-ma* occur with approximately the same relative frequency. The same holds true for cases of subject switch. Different here, though, is the more frequent occurrence of *-a/-ya* in cases where subject switch is the only of the pragmatic categories present. This can be viewed as consistent with the typical additive function of *-a/-ya* (see below).

(90)	<i>-a/-ya</i>		<i>-ma</i>	
Special focus:	16	15.1%	69	16.9%
variant word order	≥ 2*	≥ 1.9%	≥ 18*	≥ 4.4%
orthotonic pronouns	14	13.2%	52	12.7%
Subject switch:	69	65.1%	279	68.4%
As only factor	10/106	9.4%	11/408	2.7%

*Not comprehensively collected.

Although the two particles may occur with nearly the same frequency in several pragmatic environments, including subject switch, repeated form, and series marking, the much more frequent occurrence of *-ma* in absolute terms is likely to foster an association (in the consciousness of the audience) between *-ma* and a given pragmatic category that is stronger than any association between *-a/-ya* and the category. Even when *-ma* occurs relatively less frequently than *-a/-ya*, as with personal pronouns, the absolute number of occurrences with *-ma* outnumbers those that occur with *-a/-ya* by almost 4 to 1 and encourages a strong connection between the particle and the environment.

Examining *-a/-ya* in the environments with which *-ma* is associated sheds light on which are the *-ma*'s primary functions, e.g., contrast, orientation, particular new referents. In a similar way, examining *-ma* in contexts typically associated with *-a/-ya* can confirm the main functions of *-a/-ya* (at least in part).

(92)	<i>-a/-ya</i>		<i>-ma</i>	
Close connection:	33	31.1%	37	9.1%
showing contrast	20/33	60.6%	33/37	89.2%

For purposes of comparison, I include an example of close connection with *-ma*. This is one of only four examples that do not show contrast or counterexpectation, and these four are most like examples with *-a/-ya*.

(93) AH II 31, 34-37; #1154, #1156, #1157, #1158, #1159

§ úit=ma LÚKÚR URUPišḫuruš anda āraš (2-3 clauses describing the enemy's borders)
 ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ=ma VIII ME ŠIMTUM ēšta
 ERÍN.MEŠ-ti=ma=kan / kappuwauwar ŪL ēšta
 {troops.DL -ma PV counting.N not was}
 ammuk=ma ŠEŠ-YA mNIR.GÁL-iš
 uiyat nu=mu I ME XX ŠIMTUM ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ pešta
 ERÍN.MEŠ-az=ma=mu I LÚ=ya kattan ŪL ēšta ...

‘§ And the enemy of Pišḫuru came (and) made an incursion, (2-3 clauses about borders) and there were 800 teams of horses **and** there was no counting the troops (dat./loc.). And my brother Muwatalli / sent me. He gave me 120 teams of horses, but of troops there was not a single man with me ...’

Since ERÍN.MEŠ ‘troops’ and ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ ‘chariotry, horses’ are so often mentioned together in texts, it is natural to report on their numbers when describing military attacks. A contrastive reading for these clauses is possible, but seems less contrastive when they are compared to the clauses describing Hattusili’s much less favorable situation. Other examples of *-ma* in clauses with close connection have been presented above.²⁰

A difference between the particles’ distribution, as can be seen in the table, is that the examples of close connection with *-ma* occur in contrastive environments much more frequently than do the examples with *-a/-ya*. Moreover, the examples with *-ma* mostly fall into a few classes: a) formulaic clauses concerning the guilt of the father applying automatically to the son; b) formulaic clauses concerning the progeny of one referent

protecting the progeny of another; c) distributive ‘some ... the other’ clauses; and d) *mahḥan-QATAMMA* ‘as *x* ... so *y*’ correlative pairs.

There are 4 examples with *-a/-ya* of types c) and d) and 6 with a near formula,²¹ but the remaining cases, about a fifth of all the examples with *-a/-ya*, are not so easily classifiable. Exhibiting no formulae and not particularly associated with any of the *-ma*-oriented pragmatic contexts examined, these 23 examples point to a more productive, more general clause-connective function for *-a/-ya*. Twenty of the 33 examples of close connection with *-a/-ya* have subject switch, a nearly average rate of occurrence of 60.6%. The incidence here of contrast, repeated form and two-part clause marking is higher than the average for *-a/-ya* (60.6%, 39.4%, and 39.4%, respectively), but this may be expected in cases of close connection. Occurrence of other *-ma*-oriented categories is minimal here.

The 9.4% of *-a/-ya*-clauses where subject switch is the only *-ma*-oriented pragmatic factor present can also be viewed as consistent with a general, additive function for *-a/-ya*. On this view, the subject may change, but it is evidently not new or contrastive, the action performed is not contrastive, and so on with the other pragmatic contexts.

Also supporting the idea that *-a/-ya* has a more general, additive function are 3 examples with *-a/-ya* (2.8%) that do not exhibit any of the *-ma*-oriented categories examined above. These clauses report actions that are natural, expected continuations of the actions preceding them, as in (94).

as after Akkadograms and Sumerograms. *-ma* occurs most often after the first word in its clause, but can appear later in certain cases. Although its position is often delayed when it is attached to Akkadograms and Sumerograms, this delay is likely to be only graphic in most cases. *-ma* occurs in both independent and dependent clauses, but tends to occur in *Vordersätze*.

We also extensively reviewed pragmatic contexts in which NH *-ma* occurs. The first pragmatic notion examined was focus. *-ma* was seen to occur frequently in clauses of contrast, and these often involve repeated form. Sometimes these factors are combined in series, and *-ma* can mark them. *-ma* also occurs in cases of counterexpectation, where the contrast exists between the text and the audience's expectations. *-ma* is frequently found in clauses with new referents, especially new subjects and new relativized nouns. *-ma* can be linked to special cases of focus, where emphasis is conveyed with variant word order or orthotonic personal pronouns.

-ma was seen to occur also in clauses that change the setting of the text, and very frequently in a special subset of orienting clauses, at the beginning of paragraphs. *-ma* also occurs with subject switch about two-thirds of the time. Although this may be the average frequency for subject switch in texts in general, a few cases where no other pragmatic factor is present show that a connection between *-ma* and subject switch should not be discounted.

Examining the other NH enclitic conjunction *-a/-ya* revealed that it, too, occurs in the environments in which *-ma* occurs, but usually less frequently. *-a/-ya* was seen to occur more frequently than *-ma* in clauses closely related to the preceding clause. These differences can be seen as confirming a link between *-ma* and the pragmatic environments examined; the strongest links appear to be between *-ma* and contrast and between *-ma* and orientation.

Although the pragmatic contexts were most often examined individually, their occurrence with *-ma* is by no means as atomistic as the method implies. Only 28 of the 408

clauses with *-ma* (6.9%) exhibited just one of the contexts examined: 8 with contrast, 6 with orientation change, 2 with new referents, 1 with a member of a series, and 11 with subject switch (see Appendix). Thus 93.1% of the clauses with *-ma* show at least two of the contexts. A good example is (95).

(95) BT Vs. II 72-73; #1378

ūk mahḥan ᵐTuthaliyaš LUGAL.GAL ᵐᵈLAMMA-an paḥḥašḥi
 katta=ma DUMU-YA DUMU.DUMU¹-YA NUMUN ᵐᵈLAMMA QATAMMA
 {down-*ma* son- my grandson- my progeny Kurunta in that way }
 paḥḥašḥu
 {he shall protect! }

‘As I, Tuthaliya, Great King, protect Kurunta,
 in future(=ma) shall my son (and) my grandson protect the progeny of Kurunta in like
 manner’

In this passage with *-ma* we see several pragmatic conditions present at one time. A couple of these derive from the characteristics of the *mahḥan-QATAMMA* ‘as x ... so y’ construction: 1) There is contrast between Tuthaliya and his descendents and between Kurunta and his progeny. 2) The second clause is the second of a pair, a pragmatic context for which I have not demonstrated a link for *-ma*, but which must be related to series marking, if indeed it is not its source. The other contexts are the introduction of a subject, the subject switch that necessarily accompanies it, and orientation establishment in the adverb *katta* ‘in future’. We also see some repeated form in ᵐᵈLAMMA *paḥḥ*- ‘protect Kurunta’, although the form is closer in other passages. Sections of text in which borders are determined also provide examples with several contexts obtaining simultaneously. Compare (52), or column I of the Bronze Tablet, where in any given example one can find contrast, orientation establishment, new referents, subject switch, series-marking, as well as the special emphasis expressed by the formula(e).

Notes to Chapter 3

¹Sections of NH texts accepted for use in this study were the following:

Annals of Mursili (667 lines), here abbreviated 'AM' with taxonomy as under CTH 61:

Ten-Year Annals: CTH 61.I.A I 3-32, II 1-78, III 17-95, IV 26-48;

Detailed Annals: CTH 61.II.5.B (+ KBo 19.46) I 39-44, II 45-75, III 14-64, 68-70, IV 5-60;

CTH 61.II.7.A I 1-42, II 1-40, III 14-43, IV 5-22, and CTH 61.II.7.C (+ KBo 16.14) II 15'-34'. (Bo 69/404, listed under II.7.C in oCTH, is unavailable as far as I know);

CTH 61.II.9.A II 16-45, III 11-13, 18-48;

CTH 61.II.10 I 1-9, II 1-17, III 18-63 (after combined edition at KBo 16.17), IV 6-28.

Apology of Hattusili (CTH 81) (322 lines), abbreviated 'AH': All but I 1-4 and III 31-37' (after Otten 1981).

Treaty with Kupanta-^dKAL (CTH 68) (245 lines), abbreviated 'SvKK': §2-§11 D 41, §13 C 4-§21, §26 A 9-§27 A 21, 26-37 (after Friedrich 1926:106-150; out of regard for this enduring edition, I retain for this text the reading KAL over the updated LAMMA (Rüster and Neu 1989:187 no. 196)). SvKK/oCTH.68 A = CTH 68.C (include KBo 19.64a per Otten, KBo 19:VI), SvKK/oCTH B = CTH A (include KBo 19.65, KBo 22.38 per oCTH), SvKK/oCTH C = CTH B, SvKK/oCTH D = CTH E (include KBo 19.66 per oCTH), SvKK/oCTH E = CTH D, SvKK/oCTH F = CTH G, SvKK/oCTH G = CTH H, SvKK/oCTH H = CTH F (include HFAC 1=NBC 11801 per oCTH); SvKK J = CTH/oCTH I).

Bronze Tablet (347 lines), abbreviated 'BT': All but Vs. I 1-5 (after Otten 1988).

Instruction to the LÚ.MEŠSAG (CTH 255.1) (123 lines), abbreviated 'ILMS': I 4-40, II 12-36, III 3-23, IV 3-42 (after von Schuler 1957:22-34 Text I.2).

Letter of Puduhepa (CTH 176) (45 lines), abbreviated 'LPK': Vs. 11-21, 47-65, Rs. 1-15.

Melchert (1984b:81-82) observes some orthographic changes within Neo-Hittite that could help in dating manuscripts. I have given attention to the manuscripts he designates as later NH copies, but could not perceive any difference in the use of *-ma* in earlier versus later copies. For this study, those manuscripts were CTH 68.B (KBo 5.13), 68.C (KBo 4.3+, 19.64a?), and 68.H (KUB 6.48).

²The other four examples of complex hosts of *-ma* with inflected Hittite nouns are these:

(a) AM II.7.A Vs. I 4-5; #1068

ERÍN.MEŠ URUTaggaštaš=ma parā ešanza KUR URUŠadduppa
 {troops Taggašta.Nc -ma forward set.PPL.Nc land Šadduppa }
 [KUR U]RU Karaḥna KUR URUMarišta=ya ešan ḥarta
 { land Karaḥna land Marišta and set had }

‘but the troops of Taggašta, positioned forward, had occupied the land of Šadduppa,
 [the land of] Karaḥna, and the land of Marišta’

(b) AM II.7.C Vs. II 23’; #1088

LÚKUR URUGašgaš=ma=šši= kan makkiššanza e[-eš-ta]
 { enemy Gašga.Nc -ma him.DL PV become-much.PPL.Nc was }

‘but the Gašga enemy h[ad] become too numerous for him’

(c) AM II.10 Vs. I 4; #1113

[N]Aḫekur Pittalaḥšaš=ma=za= kan IŠTU ERÍN.MEŠ NAM.RA / [IŠ]BAT
 {stone:sanctuary.A Pittalaḥša.G-ma RFL PV with troops civilians seized }

‘but (the enemy) [to]ok the Pittalaḥša sanctuary along with troops and civilians’

(d) BT Rs. III 36; #1397

IŠTU É tuppāš=ma=šši KARAŠ lē šanḫanzi
 {from house containers.G -ma him.DL army not! they seek }

‘but from the administration they shall not demand an army for him’

Götze accepts as nominatives the inflected Hittite placenames in (a) and in (b) (though in analogous passages, e.g., at KBo 5.8 Vs. II 17, since the assembled text KBo 16.8 + 14

was unavailable to him; Götze 1933:326-327). If ^{URU}*Taggašaš* in (a) and ^{URU}*Gašgaš* in (b) are nominatives, their inflection *-aš* would function to mark the case for the whole phrase, this in contrast to the Sumerian syntax in Hittite texts which has the form NOUN–GENITIVE(–GENITIVE) (Friedrich 1960:171 §337b). The phrasal host of *-ma* in example (9) could also belong to this category. If this is correct, then it raises the question of just how the Hittites were actually pronouncing such combinations. Examples like (e) make it clear that inflection for the entire phrase cannot be rejected outright.

(e) AM II.5.B Vs. II 56-57; #1049

apūn= ma=wa= tta LÚKÚR ^{URU}Ḫayašan / dU BELI-YA karū paiš
 {that.Ac *-ma* QU you.DL enemy Ḫayaša.Ac Storm-god lord my already gave}

‘ “the Storm-god, my lord, gave you that Ḫayaša enemy already” ’

Although ^{URU}*Ḫayaša* would by known principles function as a genitive, here it clearly carries accusative inflection for the entire direct-object noun phrase.

The forms in (a) and (b) could also be analyzed as genitives, however. Götze implicitly takes the inflected Hittite placenames in (c) and example (9) as genitives (pp.181, 151, respectively). Weitenberg has observed that (^{NA})*ḫekur* (‘sanctuary’) behaves like a Sumerogram (1984:154, noted in Puhvel 1980ff. 3:289), and its occurrence in (c) is consistent with this idea. The noun *tuppaš* ‘containers’ in (d) is a genitive; *tuppa-* would have the ablative ending *-az* if it were carrying the inflection for the entire noun phrase (Tischler 1977ff. III:441-444). Of course, the questionable case forms are not necessarily either all genitive or all nominative.

In any event, since we are not sure how these complex phrases were pronounced, I have included the 5 inflected hosts of *-ma* with the uninflected, non-phonetic writings whose form they otherwise share.

³The following were not considered constituents in determining syntactic positions:

Akkadian prepositions; the Sumerian predeterminers ^{URU} ‘city’, ^{ḪUR}.SAG ‘mountain’,

ÍD 'river', LÚ(.MEŠ) 'man(/men), [profession]', ^m '[male personal name]', and ^d '[divine name]', etc. KUR 'country, land' was regarded as a constituent, following Friedrich (1960:23 §6a-b) and Güterbock (1945). Square brackets in examples (12) and (83) indicate syntactic constituency, not tablet breaks.

⁴Included as Noun Phrases for *-ma*'s hosts are combinations of Akkadian, Sumerian, and uninflected Hittite forms, as well as nouns with enclitic Akkadian possessive pronouns. These types make 61 of the 63 examples; the two remaining are #1113 = note 2, example (c) and #1153 = example (21).

The clauses from the Apology of Hattusili are those that occur without the clause-connector *nu*, thus with forms in initial position, and they number 146. Nine broken clauses were excluded.

⁵*-ma* might have been construable in different contexts as 'but then' or 'and then' and the like, or as more rhetorically colorful equivalents like 'while' (e.g., in example (47)), but I do not know of any principled way to determine this, i.e., attributing such English-based construals to *-ma* while remaining true to the data. Indicating the degree of perceived adversativity by giving translations with 'and' or 'but' (and if strongly adversative, 'however' and the like) is about as far as it is safe to go.

⁶The second members marked with *-ma* in bipartite structures were not collected comprehensively, so the total may be more than 43.

⁷It does not matter for the purposes of understanding the force of counterexpectation whether the referent of *apāš* 'that one' be the messenger, the person who sent him, or the extraditee.

⁸New non-initial non-subjects were not collected systematically, so the number of clauses with new referents is actually higher than 105. Two of these clauses (#1012, #1046) have two referents each, so the number of new referents in the 105 clauses is 107. Cf.

Appendix.

⁹These 5 examples of the border-setting formula with new subject are #1098-#1099, #1102 (all given in example (52)), #1155 (= example (41)), and #1227.

¹⁰The 16 examples of the border-setting formula in the Bronze Tablet are ##1322, 1324, 1326, 1327, 1329, 1331, 1333, 1335, 1338, 1341, 1342, 1344, 1346, 1347, 1350, 1351.

¹¹Of course it is possible in these border-setting formulae that *irḥaš/ZAG-aš* 'border' is the subject and that the placename is the predicate nominal. Such an analysis would be consistent with Delbrück's 'rule' for nominal sentences in Sanskrit, in which the predicate nominal more frequently occurs at the beginning of the clause because it is new and thus emphasized (Delbrück 1888:17). Although the placename in the Hittite examples does not occur clause-initially, it is certainly new and stressed. At present both views of the Hittite data are plausible. The difficulties associated with deciding which nouns are subjects and which are predicate nominals in Sanskrit led Gren-Eklund (1978) to reject the verbal model for nominal sentences.

¹²The two clauses with phraseological verbs are #1154 (in example (93)), occurring paragraph-initially (cf. §3.3.2.1), and #1356 (= example (4e)), occurring in a clause of orientation with *maḥḥan* 'when' (cf. §3.3.2).

¹³The demonstrative pronominal stem *apā-* was considered 'personal' for the third person (Friedrich 1960:62 §98).

¹⁴#1068 can be seen in note 2, example (a), where relevant information is backgrounded by means of a pluperfect construction.

¹⁵Although no preserved paragraph beginnings in ILMS show *-ma*, 6 paragraphs begin with *našma* 'or (if)', and 4 begin with *namma* 'furthermore'. The former contains *-ma* historically, and the latter may do (Tischler 1977ff. II:266-268, 279-282). Both forms tend to occur *after* something else.

¹⁶This paragraph of AH (§7 in Otten's 1981 ed.) contains many subject switches occurring with *-ma*. In the 20 clauses from l.33 to l.47, there are 14 changes in subject, and 10 of

these are marked with *-ma*. Example (93) contains more text from this paragraph that precedes the passage in (79).

¹⁷As Ruggero Stefanini observes, *-a/-ya* is ‘especially present’ in the Letter of Puduhepa (1964:52-54). Unfortunately, many attestations were excluded from this study because they are not clause-connecting, or because they occur in broken contexts or are unclear.

¹⁸One of these 41 attestations does not occur with geminate consonant. At AH IV 17 (#4040) we find *kišat=ya=za* ‘and (so) it happened’, instead of **kišatt=a=za*. Another non-geminate attestation in apparently non-clause-connective context occurs at LPK Vs. 54’ (#5017): *n=at mān iyat=ya* ‘and even if you did it’, instead of **iyatt=a*.

¹⁹Nine of the 14 paragraph-initial *-ya*’s are found in the Bronze Tablet, so the particle’s occurrence in this environment is otherwise rare (cf. §3.3.2.1). It may be noted that both *-ma* and *-ya* have much higher-than-average rates of occurrence in the Bronze Tablet:

29.5% of clauses for *-ma* (average 19.8%), and 10.0% of clauses for *-ya* (average 5.3%).

²⁰Examples of close connection with *-ma* were presented in (35) = #1082, (37) = #1264, (38) = #1069, (39) = #1368-#1369, (48) = #1297, (49) = #1139, (53) = #1314, and (93) = #1157, as well as below in (95) = #1378.

²¹The 6 examples with *-ya* are found in the Bronze Tablet. All occur in the second of a pair of clauses. In the first clause Tuthaliya asserts that his father Hattusili did something for the benefit of Kurunta, and in the second Tuthaliya says that he also performed the same action benefiting Kurunta. The examples are ##4085, 4088, 4090, 4102, 4106, 4107.

²²I am aware that some of these conditions may have obtained when Mursili actually heard the report that he quotes, but it seems unlikely that he is necessarily quoting the report verbatim, given the presentation of the information in the previous paragraph, or that he is considering the status of referents and relations in his consciousness at the time of the report, or moreover that such statuses, for instance the newness of the referents, would trigger the occurrence of *-a/-ya* as opposed to any other conjunction.

Chapter 4

-ma in Middle Hittite

§4.0 Introduction

My study of *-ma*'s function continues with the examination of its occurrence in the Middle Hittite Maṣat letters.

In §4.0.1 I reiterate the reasons for using the letters, and present the basic statistics on *-ma*'s occurrence. I find that it is more likely to occur in texts that are relatively longer than shorter.

§§4.1–4.2 contain the data on the phonological and syntactic distribution of *-ma*. Regarding the former, the particle has already been extended to post-consonantal environments. As to the latter, a smaller number of attestations exhibits less variety.

The pragmatic notions focus, orientation, and topic and their occurrence with *-ma* are examined in §4.3. Middle Hittite (MH) *-ma* can be most strongly associated with contrast and subject switch. In addition to expected uses, *-ma* in contrastive and emphatic contexts is found to occur with three Hittite formulae. *-ma* is also seen to link and signal conflict between clauses in the same and different conceptual domains (Sweetser 1990).

In §4.4 I review the evidence for the continued productivity of *-a*, discussed in §2.4. While most occurrences support the idea that *-a* is fossilized by Middle Hittite, limited evidence suggests that it is instead merely moribund.

I briefly examine the distribution and function of *-a/-ya* in §4.5. The number of attestations of MH (clause-connective) *-a/-ya* is rather small, and this is evident in its less robust occurrence in almost all distributional and functional categories, particularly the pragmatic contexts associated with *-ma*. It continues to be strongly associated with contexts of close connection between clauses, however.

§4.0.1 Texts and Data

In this study the primary goals for including texts for analysis were 1) secure dating of the composition and manuscript of a text, and 2) consistency across textual genres. The corpus commonly accepted as Middle Hittite might allow consistency of genre to be achieved for the most part, but the dating of non-historical texts to the period is not entirely certain (Melchert 1984b:80, Yoshida 1990:9 fn.7). As historical texts, the treaties with the Gasga (CTH 137-139) seem to be securely Middle Hittite but are either too fragmentary or have too many questionable attestations to have been included in the corpus. I therefore have chosen to use only the letters from Maṣat.¹

Middle Hittite is not crucial for determining which changes occurred between Old Hittite and Neo-Hittite, as Melchert notes (with reference to his study, 1984b:80-81), although it could provide evidence for tracking such changes. Upon quick review, the use of *-ma* in some MH texts seems to agree with that in OH texts, while other texts indicate transition or affinity with NH texts.²

Nevertheless, the letters constitute a well preserved corpus securely datable to a time shortly before Suppiluliuma I (Alp 1991a:109-112), in whose reign the Neo-Hittite linguistic period is commonly considered to have begun. Their primary value for the present study, however, is that they probably contain colloquial Hittite, or as close to it as we shall ever get.³ This assumption is supported by the fact that the letters deal primarily with domestic administrative matters, which should imply a style that is, minimally, less formal than that of diplomatic correspondence.

The letters present two complications with regard to consistency. First, there is no well-preserved correspondence of a similar stylistic level in the OH and NH texts; and second, the letters themselves are less involved texts than, say, NH historical texts, simply because they are not as long. In this respect, they resemble the language of the Laws, with shorter chunks of texts (paragraphs) and less rhetorical development.

See the appendix for the letters included for analysis.

The number of occurrences of *-ma* found in the Maşat letters is given in the following table.

(1) Occurrences of <i>-ma</i>		
<u>Text</u>	<u>Secure</u>	<u>Unsure or in Broken Context</u>
Maşat Letters	70	30 ⁴

(See the appendix for a list of the citations of *-ma* in these texts.) The following table shows the frequency of occurrence of *-ma* in the letters considered suitable for inclusion:

(2) Frequency of <i>-ma</i> ; Clause Counts					
<u>Text</u>	<u>Clauses with <i>-ma</i></u>	<u>No. of Clauses</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>No. of Letters</u>	<u>Clauses per Letter</u>
Maşat Letters	71 ^a	665	10.7%	72	9.2
Letters with <i>-ma</i>	67	394	17.0%	29	13.6
Letters without <i>-ma</i>	0	145	0.0%	23	6.3
<i>Zweitbriefe</i>	4	126	0.2%	20	6.3

a) Includes one *-ma* in broken context: #7012.

Fifty-two letters and 20 *Zweitbriefe* were found to be acceptable under the criteria laid out in §1.5. While 71 clauses contain *-ma*, 1 of these (#7012) must be excluded from analysis due to damage, so the tally of clauses beginning with *-ma* and included in the analysis is 70. In individual letters *-ma*'s occurrence ranges from 0.0% (or 5.3% (HKM 58) for letters with *-ma*) to 29.4% (HKM 68).

While the frequency of *-ma* in the letters is 10.7% overall, it is 17.0% in the letters with *-ma* as considered separately from the letters without *-ma* and the *Zweitbriefe*. The profiles of the last two are rather similar, the rarity of *-ma* apparently having to do with the length of the letter.

In fact, occurrence of *-ma* correlates well with length of letter, even among letters by one author. Assuming just one Hittite king authored all letters from ^dUTU-ŠI ‘My Majesty’ in the corpus, then he is the only author to have written more than two letters (excluding *Zweitbriefe*). The king dictated 29 of the 52 letters, and 18 of these 29 contain *-ma*. The average length of a letter among the 18 is 10.4 clauses, while the average length among the king’s 11 letters without *-ma* is 4.5 clauses. Clearly, *-ma* is more likely to occur in longer texts.

§4.1 Phonological Distribution

In Middle Hittite, *-ma* occurs after consonants, vowels, and Sumerographic and Akkadographic forms. There is thus no phonological restriction on the enclitic’s occurrence. The following table summarizes MH *-ma*’s phonological distribution in the letters analyzed:

(3)

Phonological Distribution of <i>-ma</i>			
<u>after C</u>	<u>after V</u>	<u>after non- phonetic writing</u>	<u>Total</u>
25	10	35 ^a	70
35.7%	14.3%	50.0%	100.0%

a) Includes 6 examples with Akkadogram or Sumerogram plus Hittite stem form.

§4.2 Syntactic Distribution

As in Old Hittite and Neo-Hittite, Middle Hittite *-ma* usually occurs after the first word in its clause, but may occur in other positions, as summarized in (4).

(4) **Syntactic Distribution of *-ma***

i)	after the first word:	54	77.1%
ii)	after the second word, involving one constituent: ex.: [LÚ.MEŠ URUQašqa]=ma	6	8.6%
iii)	after the third word, involving one constituent: ex.: [LÚKÚR KUR URUDurmitta]=ma	-	0.0%
iv)	after the second word, involving two constituents: ex.: [mān] [ŪL]=ma	9	12.9%
v)	after the third word, involving two constituents: ex.: [nu] [Gišmurtatuel]=ma	1	1.4%
		70	100.0%

Delaying *-ma* to the second or third word of the clause occurs in Middle Hittite in the same contexts as in the other periods. These are a) with clause-initial *mān* ‘if [MH-NH]’; b) with the clause-introductory particle *nu* ‘and’; and c) with Akkadographic or Sumerographic writing (cf. §2.2, §3.2).

§4.2.1 *-ma* with *mān*

The conditional conjunction *mān* ‘if’ cooccurs with *-ma* 7 times in the letters, accounting for 7 of the 9 examples of syntactic distribution type iv) in (4). Six of these involve the phrase *mān ŪL=ma* ‘but if not’, as in (5).

(5) HKM 52 öy. 17-18; #6051

mān ŪL=ma n=at uwami / INA É.GAL-LIM memahḫi
{ if not -ma cc-it I will go in palace I will tell }

‘But if not, I’ll go tell it in the palace’

(See §4.3.1.1 for more discussion of this phrase.) The seventh example contains *mān=aš nāwi=ma* ‘but if he (has) not yet’ (#6060).

§4.2.2 *-ma* with *nu*

-ma occurs 3 times with *n(u)* ‘and’. Two of these involve *n=ašta ...=ma*, as in (6), where *-ma* is delayed to the third word of the clause.

(6) HKM 72 öy. 9-10; #6068

§ *n=ašta* ^{GIŠ}*murta* tuel= *ma* / *karaššandu*
 { CC-PV wood:*murta*.A you.G *-ma* they cut! }

‘§ (Or) let them cut your(=ma) *murta*-wood’

Here the presence of *n(u)* and the unusual placement of *-ma* seem to make *-ma* an emphatic particle (see example (16b)). The other example with *n=ašta* is (7):

(7) HKM 47 ay. 50; #6047

... *n=ašta* *ḫūtāš=ma=kan* *piran* SIG₅-az *zilawan* SIG₅-az
 { CC-PV *ḫuta*.N-*ma* PV before SIG₅-az *zilawan* SIG₅-az }

‘... then a *ḫuta* (-bird) (was) in front SIG₅-az *zilawan* SIG₅-az’

Interesting here is the addition of *-kan* after *-ma*. Desirous of including *-kan*, but finding its usual syntactic slot filled by *-ašta*, the author placed it in what seems to be the backup position for sentence enclitics. Both *-ma* and *-kan* are written above the line, indicating that they were added after initial composition of the text. Both examples with *n=ašta* show more syntactic flexibility than we are accustomed to, and this may be attributed to the presumably unrevised and colloquial nature of correspondence.⁵ The third example with *nu* is *nu=wa* ^{URU}*Kapapahšuwān=ma walḫūwani* “‘we will strike *Kapapahšuwā*” (#6020). This example and (7) are the two remaining instances of syntactic distribution type iv) in (4), while (6) is the sole example of type v).⁶

§4.2.3 *-ma* with Akkadograms and Sumerograms

-ma occurs with Akkadograms and Sumerograms in compounds that constitute all 6 examples of syntactic distribution category ii) in (4). Similar examples were discussed in

§3.2.3. *-ma* also occurs with 29 Akkadograms and Sumerograms that function as single words and do not cause delay of *-ma*. Three of the former type and 3 of the latter involved undeclined Hittite stem-forms.

§4.2.4 Further Host Syntax

The grammatical categories of the hosts of the 70 *-ma*'s are summarized in (8).

(8) Grammatical Categories of *-ma*'s Hosts

Noun	26	37.1%
Noun Phrase	8	11.4%
Pronoun	7 ^a	10.0%
Adjective	2 ^b	2.9%
Adverb	14 ^c	20.0%
Negative	8	11.4%
Preverb	-	0.0%
Verb	1	1.4%
Conjunction	<u>4</u> ^d	<u>5.7%</u>
	70	99.9%

a) 2 personal (genitive) and 1 demonstrative used for 3.sg. personal; 4 demonstrative. b) 1 demonstrative, 1 number. c) 3 spatial, 2 temporal, 9 other. d) 1 *mahhan*, 3 *kuitman*.

The grammatical relations of the substantival categories is given in (9).

(9) Grammatical Relations of Substantival Hosts

	Noun	NP	Pronoun	Adjective	Total
Nominative	9 ^a	3 ^a	4	1	17
Accusative	5	-	-	1	6
Genitive	9	4	2	-	15
Dative/Locative	3	1	1	-	5
Ablative	-	-	-	-	-
Allative	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>
Total	26	8	7	2	43

a) incl. 1 possibly vocative form (N-#6052 in HKM 52; NP-#6057 in HKM 56).

§4.2.5 Syntax with respect to Neighboring Clauses

Example (10) summarizes the occurrence of MH *-ma* in simple and complex structures (environments after Houwink ten Cate 1973:128; cf. §2.2):

(10) Interclausal Syntax of <i>-ma</i>			
1a	in an independent clause IC- <i>ma</i>	26	37.1%
1b	in a protasis following another protasis DC DC- <i>ma</i> ...MC	1	1.4%
2	in an apodosis DC MC- <i>ma</i>	9	12.9%
3	in a protasis DC- <i>ma</i> MC	34	48.6%
2/3	in the protasis of a complex apodosis DC (DC- <i>ma</i> MC)	—	<u>0.0%</u>
Total		70	100.0%

In the Mašat letters analyzed, the number of examples involving complex protases (environments 1b and 2/3) was noticeably small, there being only 1, or 1.4% of the total, as compared to 9.5% of the total in Neo-Hittite. This is attributable to the shorter length of texts and portions of texts (i.e., ‘paragraphs’) in the letters as compared to NH historical documents. The brief nature of the letters does not favor complex structures, here, complicated sets of conditions.

The scope of *-ma* is the same as discussed in §3.2.5. It includes its own clause and a following clause if the structure is dependent(= *ma*)–main (environment 3). Its referential scope is typically the immediately preceding clause(s), but can extend further back, e.g., in contrastive contexts. See §4.3.1.1 for discussion of the formula for introducing discourse-topics, in which the connection between the dependent and main clauses is looser than usual.

§4.3 Pragmatics

As was done for the previous periods of Hittite, I will examine the correlation of *-ma* with the pragmatic notions of focus, background, and subject (representing topic) also in Middle Hittite.

§4.3.1 Focus

Considered as fairly secure instantiations of focus worth investigating are contrast, including counterexpectation and series-marking; new referents; and special emphasis.

§4.3.1.1 Contrast

Middle Hittite *-ma* occurs in contrastive contexts, that is, contexts where one idea is opposed to another. A clear example is the two-clause specification in (11). *I-iš* ‘one’ is opposed to the second *I-iš* ‘one, the other’, and, forming the primary focus of contrast, the first crossing point, *Išteruwa*, is opposed to the second, *Zišpa*. *-ma*, of course, occurs in the second, contrasted clause.

(11) HKM 46 öy. 3-7; #6039

§ *kāša=kan* ^{LÚ}*KÚR* *pangarit* / ^{II}*AŠRA* *zāiš*
nu=kan *I-iš* / *lattiš* ^{I'NA} ^{URU}*Išteruwa* / *zāiš*
I-iš=ma=kan *lattiš* / ^{INA} ^{URU}*Zišpa* *zaiš*
 { 1.N *-ma* PV tribal group.N at *Zišpa* crossed }

‘§ Lo, the enemy crossed / in force at two locations.
 One / tribal group crossed / at *Išteruwa*,
 And one tribal group / crossed at *Zišpa*’

Forty-one clauses with *-ma* were contrastive (58.6% of 70), 23 (32.9%) exhibiting strong contrast, and 18 (25.7%) exhibiting weak contrast, as in §3.3.1.1.1 and §3.3.1.1.2, respectively.⁷

Sixteen of the 18 examples of weak contrast with *-ma* involve a formula used to set the discourse topic for the next portion of the discourse, as in (12).⁸

(12) HKM 2 öy. 4-ay. 13; #6001 (dUTU-ŠI to Kaššu)

§ ŠA ANŠE.KUR.RA.ĤI.A=mu / kuit uttar ĥatrāeš
 n=ašta kāšma / ANŠE.KUR.RA.ĤI.A karū / 1pa,rā neĥhun
 n=an=za=kan menaĥĥanda aú
 § ŠA ŠEŠ mĤimu-DINGIR-LIM=ma / kuit uttar ĥatrā[e]š
 { of brother Ĥimuili -ma REL.An matter.An you wrote }
 n=an=kan kāša / parā neĥĥi §

‘§ The matter of the chariotry / that you wrote to me:

Lo, / I have already / sent (the) chariotry forth.

Look out for them.

§ And the matter of the brother of Ĥimuili / that you wrote:

Lo, I will / send him forth §’

Here the discourse topic about Ĥimuili’s brother is opposed to the discourse topic about chariotry, but the opposition is not very strong—as far as we can tell, there is no reason to assume that the two were so closely related in some situation that separate reference to each would connote strong contrast. Each topic was apparently written about separately in one or more previous communications from Kaššu to the king.

Repeated form tends to highlight oppositions, and 21 of the 70 clauses with *-ma* show some degree of repeated form (30.0%). Twenty of the 21 occur in contrastive contexts.⁹ Among the examples with weak contrast, repeated form is limited to the formula that changes the discourse topic. The examples with strong contrast exhibit more variety in repeated form.

The formula that changes the discourse topic has one of two forms, either that given above in (12), ŠA NP(=ma)(=mu) kuit uttar ĥatrāeš ‘(and) the matter of NP that you wrote (me):...’ (10 out of the 16 occurrences with *-ma*), or a variant with deictic adverb (6 out of the 16 occurrences with *-ma*): kiššan(=ma)=mu kuit ĥatrāeš ‘(and) that which you wrote me in the following way:...’ (cf. Hagenbuchner (1989:87-89)). The author may optionally then quote from the communication he had from the addressee (not done in (12)). The formula occurs most frequently at the beginning of paragraphs (15 out of the 16 occurrences with *-ma*) and typically changes the discourse topic to something not yet

discussed in the current letter. It often establishes the first discourse topic of a letter (but not with *-ma*). While the formula consists of a relative protasis, the relative noun or pronoun is grammatically resumed in only 5 of 14 occurrences with *-ma* (3 of the first variant, 2 of the second; 2 of 16 examples broken). When resumptions do occur, they may refer to the genitive noun phrase or to an idea from the quote. Relative clauses in Hittite typically exhibit tight anaphoric connections, and this looser grammatical connection 1) supports the idea of a specialized function for this formula, i.e., to set the discourse topic for the following discourse, and 2) provides conditions of ambiguity favorable for the passage of *kuit* from a relative form to a conjunction, as discussed in Holland (ms.).

Another formula associated with contrast is *mān ŪL=ma* ‘but if not’ (cf. CHD L-N:94, 156, 417). The function of this phrase is to set up conditions opposite from those of a preceding proposition (or propositions). The phrase is therefore strongly contrastive. Compare (13).

(13) HKM 16 öy. 5-ay. 15; #6017 (dUTU-ŠI to Kaššu and Zilapi[ya])

§ maḥḥan=šamaš / kāš tuppianza / anda wemizzi
 nu MAḤAR dUTU-ŠI / liliwaḥḥūanzi / ūnništen
 § mān ŪL=ma
 { if not -ma }
 nu=šmaš=šan / úwanzi / apiya pidi / tašuwahḥanzi

‘§ When / this tablet / reaches you,
 come / quickly / before My Majesty.
 § But if (you do) not,
 they will come / blind / you / there’

The addressees are expected to heed the king’s command. The clause, *mān ŪL=ma*, creates a hypothetical situation in which they fail to do so, and under those circumstances it will go badly for them. Although negative conditional protases with *-ma* are found in the OH and NH corpora, they include explicit predicates. In the Mašat letters, however, *mān ŪL=ma* clauses show that the predicate of a preceding proposition can be gapped in a

negative conditional protasis,¹⁰ and the use of the phrase provides evidence for the colloquial nature of the letters.

§4.3.1.1.1 Series

A use of *-ma* that is strongly associated with contrast marks the opposition of ideas constituting one overarching situation, either of three or more ideas, as in series marking, or, as with its less complicated source, opposition of two ideas (cf. §3.3.1.1.3). In Middle Hittite, 15 examples with *-ma* (21.4% of 70) are marked as series members in 6 different series. The more common, but perhaps less striking, pair-marking is seen in 13 examples (18.6%). All but one example each of pair (#6030) and series (#6003) marking occur in contrastive clauses. Most examples of both types are instances of the construction that changes discourse topics discussed in §4.3.1.1: 9 of 15 series members, 8 of 13 two-part members.¹¹

An interesting example of multiple-member marking can be seen in (14), where a two-member opposition makes up part of a larger series:

(14) HKM 6 öy. 3-14; #6002, #6003, #6004 (dUTU-Š/ to Kaššu)

§ kiššan=mu kuit ḫatrāeš / kāša=wa LÚKÚR úit
 nu=wa=za=kan URUḪaparan iniššan / tamašta
 URUKašipuran=ma=wa=kan / kēz ta'mašta
 { Kašipura.A -ma QU PV this.AB oppressed }
 apāš=ma=wa=kan / ištarna arḫa úit
 { that.N-ma QU PV between away came }
 namma=ma=wa<r>=aš kuwapi pait / nu=wa:r=aš ŪL IDI
 § nu apāš LÚKÚR / alwanzaḫḫanza imma / ēsta n=an ŪL / šakta[[š]]? §

‘§ That which you wrote me in the following way: / “Lo, the enemy came.
 He oppressed Ḫapara / as (previously) stated,
 and he oppressed Kašipura / from this side,
 and that one / went away,
 but when he went on, / I did not recognize him (lit. know them).”
 § Was that enemy / indeed bewitched, / that you did not / know him? §’

The enemy actions, oppressing first Hapara and then Kašipura, and then departing from the area, form a series, the second and third members of which are signaled with *-ma*. The two clauses reporting the attacks on the cities also form a two-member opposition within the series. These clauses contain repeated vocabulary and show stronger opposition to each other than either does to the last clause about enemy movements.

§4.3.1.1.2 Counterexpectation

The last two clauses of the first paragraph in (14), *namma=ma...ŪL IDI*, form a sentence expressing counterexpectation. Kaššu reported to the king that the enemy had been coming, presumably toward him, such that he would have been able to challenge them, but that as the enemy moved on, he did not recognize them, and they apparently evaded his notice. Example (15) concerns another situation in which events occur that go against expectations.

(15) HKM 56 öy. 7-10; #6057 (Himmuili to Huilli)

§ ammel [k]uit ^{LÚ}TEMU / apez úit

ŠEŠ. DÜG.GA- YA=ma=mu / aššul kuwat ŪL / ḥatrāēš §
 {brother dear my -ma me greeting.A why not you wrote }

‘§ When my messenger / came (back) from there,
 why(=ma), my dear brother, / did you not write me / greetings? §’

We can infer from this passage that Himmuili expected salutations from Huilli, and when these were not forthcoming, he was compelled to question Huilli about it. Of the 70 clauses with *-ma*, 14 (20.0%) express counterexpectation.¹²

Five of the 6 examples of clausal *mān ŪL=ma* ‘but if not’ are counterexpectational, as in (13). All 5 follow an author’s commands which he expects the addressee to obey. The negative conditional protasis poses a scenario in which the latter does not carry out the order, and the apodosis describes the punishment he would then suffer—these sentences function as threats. The sixth instance of *mān ŪL=ma* (#6070) is not contrary to

expectation and presents an alternative to a given scenario with more than one possibility. Therefore the counterexpectationality associated with the phrase *mān ŪL=ma* is due to the context in which it occurs rather than any quality of the phrase itself.

Example (15a) shows another case of counterexpectation wherein *-ma* links clauses in the epistolary domain:¹³

(15a) HKM 8 a.k. 12-ay. 19; #6006 (dUTU-ŠI to Kaššu)

§ n=ašta LÚKÚR QATAMMA / kuit KUR-e anda / lammar lammar iattari
 mān=an hāndāši / kuwapiki mān=an / walaḥši
 § ANA PANI LÚKÚR=ma=z / m[e]kki paḥḥašnuanza ēš §
 { before enemy *-ma* RFL very cautious you be! }

‘§ Since the enemy / is marching through the land / hour by hour in that way,
 either you will handle him somehow, or you will strike him.
 § But be very careful / of the enemy! §’

-ma links the imperative with the preceding clauses, which themselves are functionally, if not formally, imperative. The counterexpectation (Sweetser’s *conversational conflict*) arises because the first two clauses direct the addressee to engage the enemy, but the last clause, with *-ma*, implies the danger inherent in such activity. *-ma* occurs with other questions and imperatives (see (15) above and (16a) and (16b) below, as well as note 16), but in these it seems to link and indicate adversativity between the epistolary domain and the epistemic domain, the domain of reasoning that accommodates most, if not all, cases of counterexpectation I have identified heretofore.

Although *-ma* occurs with imperatives and questions elsewhere in the corpus, in the NH treaties and instruction, for example, the cases of domain-linking here are more salient, probably because of the near-immediacy of the epistolary context: these questions and commands were directed at someone in particular, in a specific situation. The addressee would have responded immediately if it were face-to-face conversation, and this is rather different from the dictating of general commands and prohibitions that characterizes treaties

and instructions. The addressees of those documents would not have been expected to respond to the king setting down terms of behavior.

§4.3.1.2 New Referents

Referents considered to be inactive in the consciousness of the addressee were examined as obvious instantiations of focus. There are no fewer than 35 new referents in 33 clauses with *-ma* (47.1% of 70). Twenty-two referents served as *-ma*'s host clause-initially. Eight of these were genitive NPs occurring in the discourse-topic-changing construction. Five consciousness-inactive hosts were new subjects; another 7 new subjects occurred later in the clause. An additional 6 new referents also occurred after initial position.¹⁴

An example of *-ma*'s cooccurrence with a new referent can be seen in (16), in which the author is describing the observation of birds in various positions and directions:

(16) HKM 47 öy. 32-a.k. 36; #6043-#6044 (Šarla-^dLAMMA to ^dUTU-Š/)

§[na]m[?]ma ħūranniš tar-u tapaššiš GUN / [zi]lawan SIG₅-az nu āršintaraš
[z]ilawan kuš úit kuitman=ma=an ušgauen
[š]a[?]šān=ma tar-u-an aúmen / n=aš pariyawan pait ...
{ šaša.A -ma tarwiyalīyan we saw }

‘§[Th]en a ħuranni(-bird) (was) tarwiyalī tapaššiš GUN zilawan SIG₅-az. And an āršintara(-bird) came zilawan kuštayati. And while we were watching it, we saw a [š]aša(-bird)(=ma) tarwiyalīyan, / and it went pariyawan ...’

In this passage the direct object *šaša*, a type of bird, is mentioned for the first time. *-ma* really seems to be marking this referent's introduction, for it is the only category associated with the particle that is present: the *šaša* does not seem to contrast with the most recently observed bird, the *āršintara*. Also, the subject of the clause is the same as that of the preceding clause (1.pl.), whereas resumptive clauses with *-ma* most often have subject switch (7/8 in Middle Hittite, 37/44 in Neo-Hittite).¹⁵

§4.3.1.3 Emphasis (Special Focus)

MH *-ma* occurs in contexts of special focus, that is, where the proposition or an element therein is emphasized, as described in §3.3.1.3. Twelve clauses with *-ma* (17.1%) are detectably emphatic. Four of these are forceful questions, 3 are imperatives, and 3 contain orthotonic personal pronouns ; 3 are generally emphatic.¹⁶ Two of these emphasized clauses can be seen in (16a).

(16a) HKM 68 öy. 4-7; #6062-#6063 (UGULA NIMGIR.ERÍN.MEŠ to Pallanna and Zartummanni)

§ ammuk ŪL kuitki kuit / dammišḫan ḫarmi
 ŪL=*ma*=kan / dān kuedaniki kuitki ḫarmi
 { not *-ma* PV taken someone.DL something.A I have }
 QATAMMA=*ma*= mu kuwat dammišḫiṣkanzi §
 { in that way *-ma* me why they are attacking }

‘§ (Seeing) that I have not / harmed anything,
 nor have / I taken anything from anyone,
 why(=*ma*) are they attacking me in that way? §’

The two clauses with ŪL (= *natta*) ‘not’ exemplify a Hittite rhetorical practice that is seen twice in the Apology of Hattusili (see chapter 3, example (49), and #1137), wherein the second of two negated assertions contains a fronted negative with *-ma*.¹⁷ The effect of this strategy is to aid in emphasizing the content of the second clause, as seen above. Similarly in the last clause, the adverb QATAMMA (= *apeniššan*) ‘in that way’, which with more constituents would occur later in the clause, occurs clause-initially and highlights the emphatic nature of the question.

Three other examples exhibit variant syntax. One (#6023) features a new subject placed late in its clause, after the locative and the direct object. The other 2 exhibit non-standard clitic placement—see examples (7) and (16b). In addition to these, two broken examples have clause-initial verbs (#7002, #7007).

There are 3 examples in which *-ma* attaches to an orthotonic personal pronoun, but only 2 of these are in clause-initial position.¹⁸ Interestingly, there are 12 examples of orthotonic personal pronoun with *-a*; see note 22. See §4.4 below for discussion of *-a*.

In example (16b), which repeats example (6) with more context, *-ma* attaches to a genitive personal pronoun that atypically follows its head noun.

(16b) HKM 72 öy. 7-10; #6068 (Chief Scribe to Gaššu, quoting Tarḫu[np]iḫanu in part)

GIŠ.ḪI.A=ma=wa NU.GÁL nu=ššan k[āša?] / ANA GIŠ ḫuški

§ n=ašta GIŠmurta tuel= ma / karaššandu

{CC-PV wood:murta.A you.G -ma they cut! }

‘(T. reported to me: “The stone part of the bridge is finished being built,) but there is no wood.” L[ook?], wait for the wood.

§ (Or) let them cut (some of?) yóur(=ma) murta-wood (and take it to finish the bridge)’

The occurrence of *-ma* with *nu* and the placement of *-ma* on the third word of the clause greatly diminish the connective force of the particle and seem to make it almost purely emphatic, probably with connotations of adversativity, of course. Compare §5.5.

§4.3.2 Orientation

In Middle Hittite, as in the other stages of Hittite, *-ma* occurs in contexts that adjust the setting in which the events of the discourse take place. Fourteen such clauses with *-ma* are found in the data (20.0% of 70). The majority, 10 clauses, make temporal adjustments to the discourse while spatial adjustments occur in only 2 clauses, the last 2 clauses being ambiguous between these or otherwise modifying. Six examples occur in dependent adverbial clauses, and 1 occurs in a circumstantial clause under the scope of *kuit*. Eight examples involve clausal complements: 6 initial adverbs, and 2 initial oblique nouns.¹⁹ The clause-initial adverb *appezziyaz* ‘afterwards’ in example (17) adjusts the setting of the action to the third stage of coldly efficient civilian relocation.

(17) HKM 10 öy. 9-12; #6009 (dUTU-ŠI to Gaššu, quoting the latter's quote)

nu=war=an=za imma III ME É-TUM arumi
 namma=wa=kan LÚ.MEŠSIG, MAḪAR dUTU-ŠI / parā nehḫi
 appezziyaz=ma=wa / URU-an arumeni
 { afterwards -ma QU city.A we will move }

‘ “Indeed I will move 300 (of) it(s) house(hold)s.
 Then I will send the prominent? men before His Majesty,
 and afterwards we will move the (population of the entire) city.” ’

The number of examples with *-ma* that establish the orientation may be augmented by including conditional protases (7: #6060 and those in note 10) and relative clauses (4: ##6030, 6045, 6052, 6064), as described in §3.3.2. If these are included, then 25 clauses with *-ma* adjust the setting (35.7% of 70). The data containing the formula for changing discourse topics, discussed in §4.3.1.1, could also be included here. The background information would then be that the addressee had written to the author about the subject in a previous letter. These 17 would bring the total of orientation-establishing examples to 42 (60% of 70). It may be noted here that 13 clauses in the data analyzed begin with *kinun*(=?)a ‘(but) now’; see note 22.

§4.3.2.1 Paragraph-Initial *-ma*

The incidence of clause connectors that occur at the beginning of paragraphs is summarized in (18):

(18)	Clause Connectors at the Beginning of Paragraphs					
	<u>-ma</u>	<u>-ya</u>	<u>nu</u>	<u>other/none</u>	<u>broken</u>	<u>Total</u>
Maṣat Letters	27*	6	44*	103	16	195*

*1 clause beginning with *n=ašta...=ma* (#6068) counted as 1 instead of 2 in Total

The 27 paragraph-initial *-ma*'s constitute 38.6% of the 70 clauses with *-ma*, but only 13.8% of the total of paragraph-initial clause connectors. The latter frequency is only

slightly higher than *-ma*'s 10.7% occurrence in the letters in general. The prevalent strategy is to have no clause connector at the beginning of paragraphs (103/195 = 52.8%).

Many paragraphs begin with the formula that changes or sets the discourse topic (43/195 = 22.1%). In 15 paragraphs the formula cooccurs with *-ma*; in 2, with *nu*; in 1, with *-ya*; and in 25, usually the first occurrence in a letter, no clause connector occurs. Another 20 paragraphs begin with relative clauses (4 occur with *-ma*), which typically make a referent topical for the ensuing discourse.

Of the paragraph-initial clauses with *-ma*, 16 involve the formula (including the one relative structure that is very similar to the formula, #6066), but the 11 that remain do not seem to form any coherent and salient group. We see relative clauses, conditional protases, a clause-initial setting change, examples with subject switch, and others that may be separated from the preceding paragraph simply for emphasis.²⁰ While the motivation for using some connectors is clear (e.g., *-ma* with non-text-initial occurrences of the formula), it would be interesting to try to determine the conditions for using or not using *-ma* or one of the other of the connectors at the beginnings of paragraphs in other contexts.

§4.3.3 Subject Switch

In this study *-ma* is considered to mark changes in topic only insofar as it marks changes in subject. In the Middle Hittite of the Maşat letters, *-ma* occurs 41 times with subject switch (58.6% of 70).²¹ Although all examples also contain other conditions that favor the occurrence of *-ma*, the fairly high frequency and examples like (19) support the association of *-ma* with subject switch.

(19) HKM 19 öy. 9-15; #6024-#6025 (dUTU-Š/ to Kaššu, quoting Kaššu)

§ nu=wa=šmaš=kan ŠA URUGašipūra / ḫalkiḫI.A-aš zigganzi
 ERÍN.MEŠ.ḫI.A= ma=wa= kan ANŠE.KUR.RA.ḫI.A / anda NU.GÁL
 {troops -ma QU PV chariotry in be not }
 dUTU-Š/ma=wa / mKal'lun LÚBEL ANŠE.KUR.RA / watamaḫta
 { my sun -ma QU Kallu.A lord chariotry commanded }
 ANŠE.KUR.RA.ḫI.A=kan / parā nai ...

‘§ “They are harvesting / the grain of Gašipura for you (pl.).

But troops (and) chariotry (are) not present.

And His Majesty / commanded Kallu, / lord of the chariotry (thus):

‘Send / chariotry (to them) ...’ ” ’

Although the first clause with *-ma* seems counterexpectational, and even though the second clause with *-ma* contains a new direct object, both *-ma*’s correlate also with a change in the subject of their respective clauses, and the association between *-ma* and subject switch remains strong. This association is aided by the fact that *-ma* cliticizes to each subject, and by the fact that the first subject in the first clause, ERÍN.MEŠ.ḫI.A ‘troops’, is a new referent.

§4.4 *-a* in the Maṣat Letters

The enclitic conjunction *-a* that was used productively in Old Hittite remains only marginally in the Middle Hittite of the Maṣat letters, and there are tantalizing indications that it is still somewhat productive.

Most attestations occur attached to orthotonic personal pronouns, as in *ziga* ‘but you’, or to the temporal adverb *kinun* ‘now’, *kinuna* ‘but now’. There are 13 examples of the latter, all of which can be considered to change the temporal orientation of their clauses. Five occur paragraph-initially, and 10 have subject switch. We find 12 examples of pronoun plus *-a*: 5 nominative 1.sg. *ammuga*, 5 nominative 2.sg. *ziga*, 1 accusative/dative-locative 2.sg. *tuga*, and 1 nominative 3.sg. *apāša*. By their very presence, these 12 can be considered emphatic to some degree. Among these we see 2

strongly contrastive examples, 1 contrastive or counterexpectational example, 5 paragraph-initial examples, and 8 examples with subject switch. All the pronouns and adverbs occur in clause-initial position, with the exception of one pronoun that occurs in modified initial position. Given the quite limited distribution of *-a* here, it is not unreasonable to assume that the pronouns and the adverb have come to be regarded as alternates for forms without *-a* and that these alternates are used in specific contexts, e.g., clause-initially, in cases of emphasis, or of contrast.²²

Such forms are productive in Old Hittite but have become fossilized by the time of Neo-Hittite. The MH examples certainly seem to be residual forms, but their status is not entirely sure, because two forms in the Mašat letters may indicate that *-a* is marginally productive. Unfortunately, both forms are in either unclear or broken context. The first example can be seen in (20).

(20) HKM 38 öy. 3-7; (^dUTU-ŠI? to ?)

§ man=za x[] EGIR-an / karū paḥḥašnut*
 antuḥšaš(=?)a= kan uttar / kiššarī anda / karū daiš §
 { person -a? PV matter.A hand.DL in already set }

‘§ (?) would have protected [?] earlier,
 but? the person (had) already set the matter in the hand (i.e., took care of it) §’
 *p[a]-aḥ-°

This is the first paragraph of the letter after the greeting, and the discourse topic is evidently already known to the author and the addressee. It is difficult to know whether the subject of the clauses is the addressee or some third party, for *antuḥšaš* ‘person, man’ could here be a genitive dependent on *uttar* ‘matter’ rather than the nominative suggested. We also do not know what was in the break. It was probably the direct object, and the traces are consistent with the sign TU, allowing *tuk* ‘you [acc./dat.-loc.]’, as well as ERÍN, allowing ERÍN.MEŠ ‘troops’, as Alp suggests (1991a:188). Alp translates ‘Hättest du die Fu[sstruppen] hinterher schon ges[ch]ützt, (hätte die Gottheit dir) die Sache der Menschen

schon in die Hand gelegt' (1991a:189), thus rendering the clauses as a counterfactual conditional sentence. In such sentences, however, the modal particle *man* is usually present in both clauses (CHD L-N:139-143).

Without knowing better the situation underlying the letter, it is hard to know just how to interpret the *-a*. It could be *-a* occurring in a contrastive or counterexpectational clause. It could also be *-a/-ya* written without gemination, either with emphatic word-scope or with clause-scope. There are two examples in the Maṣat letters where the second of two conjuncts is written so.²³ But these joined forms are both constituent phrases within the clause, not clauses themselves.

The second potential *-a* occurs in the fragment HKM 92 at ay. 6':]*kiyaš(=?)a=šši*. The beginning of the line is broken, but this is the first line of a paragraph, and this is very probably also the first word of the paragraph, therefore of a clause. There is no other context to help decide this case. The *-a* here could be real, as it could in *antuḫšaš(=?)a=kan*. (It may be recalled that *-a* occurred most frequently after <š> in the MH texts not included in this study (see note 2).) MH *-a* may be moribund, but not yet dead.

The form *ḫinganaz(=?)a=ma=kan* 'and from the plague' (at HKM 50 öy. 4) brings to mind the rare occurrences of *=a=ma* seen in Old Hittite (§2.2). The ablative ending written <-aza> would not arouse any suspicion if it occurred word-finally, but its occurrence before clitics is unusual. The fortuitous presence of *kit(-)pantalaza=pat* 'from this very time on' (HKM 96 ay. 11') helps determine how to interpret the questionable attestation. The emphatic particle *-pat* would not occur after *-a*, whether this be a particle with scope over word (Houwink ten Cate 1973) or over clause, because *-pat* attaches directly to the form on which it operates (Hoffner 1973a:104²⁴). In *kit(-)pantalaza=pat*, then, we have the ablative ending /-ats/ written <-aza>, with faux final vowel. This erases any suspicion that the final <-a> in *ḫinganaza* might be the enclitic *-a*.

In closing, I note that I have not observed *-a* attaching to <-z> and that the common Hittite scribal practice of writing the ablative ending <-*aza*> would obscure any such attestation.

§4.5 A Brief Look at Clause-Connective *-a/-ya* in the Maṣat Letters

In this section I briefly examine the function of MH *-a/-ya*. The conjunction deserves a full treatment in its own right, and I do not claim to have fully studied its uses. As in §3.4, here I examine *-a/-ya* primarily with regard to the categories of use associated with *-ma* and present only a very brief characterization of *-a/-ya*. The conjunction occurs in almost all the environments examined, but the small number of attestations limits the range of its occurrence in both type and robustness.

§4.5.1 Frequency, Phonological Distribution, and Syntactic Distribution

The number of occurrences of *-a/-ya* found in the Maṣat letters is given in the following table.

(21)	Occurrences of <i>-a/-ya</i>	
	<u>Secure</u>	<u>Unsure or in Broken Context</u>
Maṣat Letters	23	13

With 23 attestations, *-a/-ya* occurs about one-third as many times as *-ma*, with 70 attestations. The following table shows the frequency of occurrence of *-a/-ya* in the sections of the Maṣat letters considered suitable for inclusion:

(22)	Frequency of <i>-a/-ya</i>		
	<u>Clauses with <i>-a/-ya</i></u>	<u>Number of Clauses</u>	<u>Frequency</u>
Maṣat Letters	25	665	3.8%

The frequency of *-a/-ya* at 3.8% is correspondingly about one-third that of *-ma*, at 10.7%. The 25 clauses with *-a/-ya* contain two attestations in broken context (#9007 and #9008). Subtracting these 2 clauses from the 25 yields a total of 23 clauses accepted for analysis. (See Appendix.)

The following table summarizes *-a/-ya*'s phonological distribution in the Maṣaṭ letters analyzed:

(23)

Phonological Distribution of <i>-a/-ya</i>			
<u>after C</u>	<u>after V</u>	<u>after non- phonetic writing</u>	<u>Total</u>
8	2	13*	23
34.8%	8.7%	56.5%	100.0%
(35.7%	14.3%	50.0%	distribution of <i>-ma</i> from (3))

*Includes 2 examples of Sumerogram plus Hittite stem form.

As compared to *-ma*, *-a/-ya* occurs less frequently after vowels and more frequently after non-phonetic writings.

As with *-ma*, the predominant syntactic position for *-a/-ya* is after the first word in a clause, but *-a/-ya* exhibits much less variety in its occurrence than we have seen before. Its syntactic distribution is summarized in (24).

(24)

Syntactic Distribution of -a/-ya

	#	%	-ma
i) after the first word:	20	87.0%	77.1%
ii) after the second word, involving one constituent: ex.: [ĪR ṁŠaparta]=ya	3	13.0%	8.6%
iii) after the third word, involving one constituent: ex.: [ANA LUGAL KUR URUdU-tašša]=ya	0	0.0%	0.0%
iv) after the second word, involving two constituents: ex.: [nu] [ABU-YA]=ya	0	0.0%	12.9%
v) after the third word, involving two constituents:	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0%</u>	1.4%
	23	100.0%	

Occurrence with Sumerographic and Hittite stem-form writing accounts for the 3 examples in which -ma appears later than usual in the clause.

Please see note 25 for statistics on the syntax of -ma's host.

As regards interclausal syntax, -a/-ya occurs as follows (after Houwink ten Cate 1973:128; cf. §2.2 above):

(25)	Interclausal Environments for -a/-ya	#	%	-ma
1a	in an independent clause IC-ya	12	52.2%	37.1%
1b	in a protasis following another protasis DC DC-ya...MC	1	4.3%	1.4%
2	in an apodosis DC MC-ya	1	4.3%	12.9%
3	in a protasis DC-ya MC	9	39.1%	48.6%
2/3	in the protasis of a complex apodosis DC (DC-ya MC)	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0%</u>	0.0%
	Total	23	99.9%	

The distribution of -a/-ya is similar to what we have seen to that for other periods of Hittite.

§4.5.2 Functional Contexts

The contexts which favor the occurrence of *-ma* were used to evaluate the occurrence of *-a/-ya*, and the results can be seen in (26). The attestations underlying the tallies are given in note 26.

(26)	<i>-a/-ya</i>		<i>-ma</i>	
Contrast: strong	2	8.7%	23	32.9%
weak	2	8.7%	18	25.7%
overall	4	17.4%	41	58.6%
Repeated form:	4	17.4%	21	30.0%
Series marking:	0	0.0%	15	21.4%
bipartite	1	4.3%	13	18.6%
Counterexpectation:	0	0.0%	14	20.0%
Clauses with New referents:	16	69.6%	33	47.1%
subjects	6/16	37.5%	12/33	36.4%
Special focus:	3	13.0%	12	17.1%
variant word order	0	0.0%	6	8.6%
orthotonic pronouns	3	13.0%	3	4.3%
Orientation:	3	13.0%	14	20.0%
conditional protases	0	0.0%	7	10.0%
combined	3	13.0%	21	30.0%
Paragraph-initial:	6	26.1%	27	38.6%
% of Total (195)		3.1%		13.8%
Subject switch:	16	69.6%	41	58.6%

In most categories the rate of occurrence of *-ma* (relative to the number of *-ma*-clauses) is higher than the rate of occurrence of *-a/-ya* (relative to the number of *-a/-ya*-clauses), and we can therefore conclude that most categories are more closely associated with *-ma* than

with *-a/-ya*. *-ma* is relatively less frequent than *-a/-ya* in the categories of subject switch and new referents, but when regarded absolutely, *-ma* still occurs in these contexts at least twice as often as does *-a/-ya*. *-ma* attaches to orthotonic personal pronouns rather infrequently (3x); such forms are outnumbered by those with pronoun plus *-a*, 12 of which occur in the data.

-a/-ya is more strongly associated with additive contexts, e.g., those of close connection, in which the same subject or the same action is maintained over two clauses or sentences. *-ma* occurs at a lower rate in such contexts, but the frequency of contrast in its attestations is much higher than it is for examples with *-a/-ya*.

(27)		<i>-a/-ya</i>		<i>-ma</i>
Close connection:	12	52.2%	20	28.6%
showing contrast	2/12	16.7%	16/20	80.0% ²⁷

A typical example of close connection with *-a/-ya* can be seen in (28), in which *-a/-ya* links the two clauses that deal with Gaššu's repulsion of the attack by the enemy.

(28) HKM 10 ay. 33-41; #6013-#6014, #8004 (dUTU-Š/ to Gaššu)

§ kiššan=ma=mu kuit ḫatrāēš
 maḫḫan=wa=kan! ammuk / INA KUR URU Iṣḫupitta ārḫun
 EGIR-an=ma=wa LÚKÚR URUZikkattan / walaḫta
 nu=wa XL GUD.ḪI.A I ME UDU.ḪI.A / penneš
 nu=war=an=kan arḫa / peššiyanun
 ŠA LÚKÚR=ya=wa=kan / appantet kunantit / XVI[]L,Ú.MEŠ peššiyanun
 { of enemy and QU PV captured.I killed.I 16 men I threw }
 n=at AŠME §

‘§ And that which you wrote to me in this way:

“When I / arrived in the land of Iṣḫupitta,

later(=ma) (or behind me) the enemy struck / Zikkatta,
 and he drove (away) 40 (heads of) cattle (and) 100 / sheep.

And I repelled / him

and (dispensed with) 16 / of the enemy, / (together) with (those) captured and killed.”
 I have heard it §’

The two clauses connected by *-al/-ya* concern closely related issues, but are not contrastive. For two non-contrastive examples of close connection with *-ma*, see (17) and the second clause with *-ma* in (14). Contrastive examples include the first and third clauses with *-ma* in (14).

§4.6 Conclusion

The Maşat letters make for a very interesting object of study simply by virtue of their subject matter and the style in which they are written. They offer us an opportunity to see how the Hittites administered their empire and how they communicated with one another.

The functions of *-ma* in the letters seem not to differ greatly from its functions in other periods and in other genres. We find it used to mark contrast and counterexpectation, the opposition of members in pairs and series, the introduction of new referents, special emphasis, orientation, and change of subject. In the letters *-ma* most frequently occurs in contexts with contrast, subject switch, and new referents, although somewhat less often in contexts involving change in orientation.

Thus whatever the degree of colloquiality in the letters, it does not appear to affect appreciably the function of *-ma*, but the particle *is* often used in utterances that are emphatic and therefore clearly colloquial, as in imperatives, forceful questions, and strong denials, as well as in the contrastive phrase *mān ŪL=ma*. In fact, *-ma*'s occurrence with imperatives and questions brought to light another use of the particle: to link and indicate difference between clauses within the epistolary domain, as well as to connect and signal adversativity between clauses in the epistemic and epistolary domains. A higher incidence of clauses with both *nu* and *-ma* may also be due to the more colloquial nature of the letters.

Some effects can be attributed to genre. In the Maşat letters *-ma* has a lower frequency, as compared to Neo-Hittite. Its occurrence seems to correlate with length of letter, occurring more frequently in longer letters. But the letters are not as long in general

as other text types. Another obvious effect of epistolary style is the frequent use of *-ma* in the formula that changes the discourse topic.

The syntactic distribution of *-ma* in the Maṣat letters is like that of the Neo-Hittite texts, even if, with fewer examples, it is less diverse. The phonological distribution of *-ma* is also like that of Neo-Hittite, especially in that the restriction observed in Old Hittite, namely occurrence almost exclusively after vowels, no longer holds.

OH *-ma*'s partner in suppletion, *-a*, lives on in the Middle Hittite of the Maṣat letters in clause-initial forms: personal pronouns and the adverb *kinuna*. It may also persist as a productive particle, though quite marginally.

The small number of occurrences of the clause conjunction *-a/-ya* in the letters may compromise our understanding of it. It occurs in the contexts associated with *-ma*, but, with the exception of contexts involving subject switch and new referents, it does not occur with the frequency that *-ma* does. Instead, it occurs more often in contexts involving (usually non-contrastive) close connection between clauses.

Notes to Chapter 4

¹The letter to augurs, KUB 31.101, is most probably Middle Hittite (Meacham ms.), but I exclude it due to its uncertain date and to the fact that, as regards *-ma*, it offers nothing not found in the Mašat letters. See note 10.

²Upon quick review the other MH texts provisionally eligible for inclusion provide evidence sufficient to inspire a closer look at the transition in use of *-mal/-a* to *-ma*. The Gašga treaties (CTH 137, 139.A) the Prayer of Arnuwanda and Ašmunikal on the subject of Nerik (CTH 375), and particularly the Ritual naming Tuthaliya and Nikalmati (CTH 443) maintain the phonological distribution of OH *-mal/-a*, with about 1 exception per text. The Prayer of Kantuzzili (CTH 373), typically considered to be ‘archaizing’ (Old Hittite in Middle Hittite copy (Yoshida 1990:11)), actually has *-ma* occurring after more consonants than do the texts above. The Instruction for the Royal Bodyguard (CTH 262) is much more like a Neo-Hittite text, *-ma* having free phonological distribution. In this text there appears to be only 1 example of *-a*, occurring after <š>. In fact, *-a* in all the texts occurs primarily after <š>, and, excepting instances of *kinuna*, only occasionally after <n>, and even less frequently after other consonants.

³Chafe (1994:271-272, 277) describes the (personal) letter as the form of writing least divergent from conversation because a letter has a specified addressee and because the author expects a response (also likely in the form of a letter). The latter characteristic seems to be crucial.

⁴Of these 30, 21 are found in letters not included in the analysis, thus only 9 unsure or uninterpretable *-ma*’s occur in the letters included in the analysis (12.9%).

⁵This is not the only example of atypically placed *-kan*. See the Apology of Hattusili col. I 7, where *-kan* is placed well within the clause (Otten 1981:4).

⁶In broken context we find also the attestation *našma = wa zigga = ma* “‘or (even) you” (#7018), intriguing because of the syntax of delay and because *našma* ‘or’ contains *-ma* historically and functions to mark the second (or later) of two alternatives.

⁷There are 41 clauses with *-ma* in contrastive contexts. The 23 with strong contrast are ##6002, 6004, 6015, 6016, 6017, 6018, 6023, 6027, 6034, 6039, 6040, 6048, 6051, 6053, 6054, 6055, 6056, 6058, 6060, 6062, 6067, 6068, 6070. The 18 with weak contrast are ##6001, 6005, 6007, 6010, 6011, 6012, 6013, 6019, 6021, 6026, 6029, 6031, 6032, 6033, 6035, 6036, 6037, 6066.

⁸The 16 examples of the discourse-topic-changing formula are ##6001, 6005, 6007, 6010, 6011, 6012, 6013, 6019, 6021, 6026, 6029, 6031, 6032, 6033, 6035, 6036. #6066 is very similar to the formula and is also considered to change the discourse topic.

⁹The 21 clauses with *-ma* with repeated form are ##6001, 6002, 6005, 6010, 6012, 6013, 6019, 6026, 6027, 6029, 6031, 6032, 6033, 6035, 6036, 6039, 6047 (in non-contrastive context), 6054, 6055, 6056, 6060.

¹⁰This is frequently the case for letters (CHD L-N:156). In fact, the only *-ma* in KUB 31.101 occurs in *mān ŪL=ma* (l. 24'). The 6 examples in the Maṣat letters are ##6015, 6016, 6017, 6034, 6051, 6070; #7029 is a broken attestation of the phrase.

¹¹The 15 examples of series marking with *-ma* are ##6002*, 6003*, 6010, 6011, 6012, 6013, 6019, 6032, 6033, 6035, 6036, 6053*, 6054*, 6055*, 6056*. (An asterisk indicates that the example is not an instance of the construction that changes discourse topics.) Two of these mark only the last member of series with three members (#6019, #6056). The 13 examples of two-member marking with *-ma* are ##6001, 6002*, 6005, 6007, 6021, 6026, 6027*, 6029, 6030, 6031, 6037*, 6039*, 6062*. (Asterisks are similarly meaningful.)

¹²The 14 examples of *-ma* with counterexpectation are ##6004, 6006, 6015, 6016, 6017, 6024, 6034, 6051, 6057, 6059, 6063, 6065, 6067, 6069.

¹³I use *epistolary* here as an equivalent to Sweetser's *conversational* domain (1990:11). The language of the letters is the closest we will ever see to spontaneous Hittite speech, and this label is merely intended to be an adaptation of her model to fit the situation at hand.

¹⁴There are 35 examples of new referents in 33 clauses with *-ma*. The 22 examples of *-ma* with new host are ##6001, 6002, 6007, 6010, 6018*, 6020, 6021, 6023, 6024*, 6029, 6031, 6032, 6033, 6035, 6042, 6044, 6047*, 6056, 6061*, 6064, 6066, 6067*.

(Asterisks indicate that the host is a new subject.) The 7 examples with non-clause-initial new subject are ##6009, 6014, 6023 (also with new host), 6030, 6038, 6063, 6068. The 6 examples with other non-clause-initial new referent are ##6010 (also with new host), 6025, 6052, 6053, 6054, 6055.

¹⁵A reading of counterexpectation is also possible for this passage, depending on how surprising it was to view the *šaša*. The inability to determine this illustrates the limitation of functional analysis of texts in dead languages. An example similar to (16) occurs 15 lines later in the same text: *kuitman = ma I-in / [uš]gauen n = ašta hūtaš = ma = kan piran SIG₅-az zilawan SIG₅-az* ‘and while we we[re watch]ing the one, a *huta*(-bird) = *ma* was in front SIG₅-az zilawan SIG₅-az)’ (#6046-#6047). This example is more clearly emphatic, with both *nu* and *-ma*, than example (16); *hūtaš* is a new referent here. There is also subject switch.

In example (16) *tar-u* is an abbreviation for the augury term *tarwiyalli-*, which Tischler seems to understand as an oracular status for a bird (1977ff. III:248-250). Scholars have represented the abbreviation differently, see Tischler (p.249) and compare CHD, where one can find *taru.-an* (P:151, 154).

¹⁶The 4 questions with *-ma* are ##6050, 6057 = example (15), 6063 = example (16a), 6065. The 3 imperatives with *-ma* are ##6006, 6022, 6068 = example (6)/(16b). The 3 clauses with orthotonic personal pronoun and *-ma* are ##6003 = example (14), 6038, 6068 = example (6)/(16b). The 3 generally emphatic clauses with *-ma* and variant word order are ##6023, 6047 = example (7) and 6062 = example (16a).

¹⁷The article on *natta* in CHD (L-N:409-419) observes that clause-initial occurrences may express emphasis (p.418), but the examples I cite are of a special, though productive, type that combines emphatic, truly fronted negatives with the pair-marking of *-ma*. These three

examples also contain indefinite expressions in both clauses, and, in the second clause, fronting separates the negative from the indefinite. CHD cites one other example of the type under uses *e*. (p.416) and *j 4'* (p.418) (in which each pair involves two clauses). The clause-initial negatives in other emphatic pairs with *-ma*, given under uses *c 1'* (p.412), *c 3'* (p.413, repeated under *c 6' a'* (p.415)), and *i* (p.417), would also occur clause-initially under non-emphatic circumstances, due to the gapping of constituents.

¹⁸The example with non-clause-initial orthotonic pronoun plus *-ma* is #6068 = example (6)/(16b). The referent of a fourth pronoun, *apedani* 'from that one' (#6065), is probably not human.

¹⁹One example (#6004) is a dependent adverbial clause with clause-initial adverb, thus an apparent total of 15. The 14 examples of setting modification with *-ma* are as follows; the examples that are not temporal modifications are so noted. ##6004 (other; ambiguous), 6009, 6014, 6023 (spatial), 6027 (spatial), 6028, 6038, 6041, 6042, 6043, 6046, 6049, 6058, 6062 (other).

²⁰The 27 examples of *-ma* that occur paragraph-initially are ##6001*, 6005*, 6006, 6007*, 6008, 6010*, 6011*, 6012*, 6013*, 6015, 6017, 6019*, 6021*, 6026*, 6029*, 6030, 6032*, 6033*, 6035*, 6036*, 6042, 6052, 6060, 6064, 6066*, 6068, 6069. An asterisk indicates cooccurrence with the discourse-topic-changing formula, including the similar form found in #6066.

²¹The 41 examples of subject switch with *-ma* are ##6007, 6009, 6011, 6014, 6018, 6019, 6020, 6022, 6023, 6024, 6025, 6026, 6028, 6029, 6030, 6032, 6033, 6038, 6039, 6041, 6042, 6043, 6045, 6046, 6047, 6048, 6050, 6052, 6053, 6054, 6055, 6057, 6059, 6060, 6061, 6063, 6064, 6066, 6067, 6068, 6069.

²²The 12 examples of personal pronoun plus *-a* are located at HKM 10 öy. 26, a.k. 30; HKM 35 öy. 1; HKM 46 ay. 18; HKM 52 öy. 10; HKM 55 ay. 36; HKM 58 ay. 30; HKM 63 ay. 25; HKM 66 ay. 29, 34; HKM 71 öy. 11; HKM 73 ay. 28 (occurs in modified initial position). The 13 examples of *kinuna* are located at HKM 5 öy. 7; HKM

18 ay. 26; HKM 19 a.k. 17; HKM 30 ay. 16, 18; HKM 52 öy. 15, ay. 36; HKM 54 ay. 25; HKM 56 öy. 13; HKM 57 a.k. 18; HKM 66 ay. 36, 39; HKM 68 öy. 8.

²³The two examples where *-a/-ya* is written without gemination are the following. HKM 30 ü.k. 23-25: [k?]ašš=a GEME kuit / [kui]t dān dayan=a / x? harzi ‘and whatever this female slave has taken **and** stolen (...)’. HKM 57 öy. 13-17: n=an=ši=kan / ^mḪimuiliš / ^mTarḫūmūwaš=a / II LÚ.MEŠ URUḪaššarpanda / arḫa daiēr ‘And Ḫimuili **and** Tarḫumuwa, two men of Ḫaššarpanda, separated him from her (or her from him)’.

²⁴Among Hoffner’s attestations is a very interesting exception, ‘*a-ap-pa-ia-pát* “afterwards too(?)”’, with *-a/-ya*, at IBoT I 36 iii 25 (1973a:106), but this *-a/-ya* appears to have word-scope (cf. Güterbock and van den Hout 1991:25).

²⁵The grammatical categories of the hosts of the 23 *-a/-ya*’s are summarized in (a).

(a) **Grammatical Categories of *-a/-ya*’s Hosts**

	#	%	<i>-ma</i>
Noun	13	56.5%	37.1%
Noun Phrase	4	17.4%	11.4%
Pronoun	3i	13.0%	10.0%
Adjective	-	0.0%	2.9%
Adverb	3ii	13.0%	10.0%
Negative	-	0.0%	11.4%
Preverb	-	0.0%	0.0%
Verb	-	0.0%	1.4%
Conjunction	-	<u>0.0%</u>	5.7%
	23	99.9%	

i) Pronouns: 3 personal. ii) Adverbs: 1 spatial, 2 other.

The distribution of *-a/-ya* and *-ma* with respect to their hosts differs in that that of *a/-ya* is more restricted. A notable difference is the higher percentage of *-a/-ya*’s hosted by noun phrases, which is consistent with the more frequent cooccurrence of *-a/-ya* and non-

phonetic writing seen in (23). Other differences may be attributed to the smaller number of occurrences of *-a/-ya*. Here a smaller count correlates with less variation.

The grammatical relations of the substantival categories is given in (b).

(b) Grammatical Relations of Substantival Hosts							
	Noun	NP	Pronoun	Adjective	Total	%	<i>-ma</i>
Nominative	4	2	1	-	7	30.4%	24.3%
Accusative	7	1	1	-	9	39.1%	8.6%
Genitive	2	1	-	-	3	13.0%	21.4%
Dative/Locative	-	-	1	-	1	4.3%	7.1%
Ablative	-	-	-	-	-	0.0%	0.0%
Allative	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>0.0%</u>	<u>0.0%</u>
Total	13	4	3	0	20	~87.0%	61.4%

-a/-ya occurs much more frequently with accusative forms than does *-ma*, but no explanation for this is evident at present.

²⁶Concerning *-a/-ya*:

The 2 examples with strong contrast are #8016 and #8023. The 2 examples with weak contrast are #8001 and #8011.

The 4 examples with repeated form are ##8001, 8002, 8011, 8017.

The 1 example of bipartite marking is #8005.

The 16 examples with new referents are ##8001*, 8005, 8006*, 8007, 8008*, 8011, 8012, 8013, 8014, 8015, 8016*, 8018*, 8019, 8020, 8022, 8023*. Asterisks indicate new subject.

The 3 examples with orthotonic personal pronouns are #8001, #8009, #8010.

The 3 examples with orientation change are #8002, #8022, #8023.

The 6 examples occurring paragraph-initially are ##8002, 8011, 8012, 8017, 8020, 8021.

The 16 examples with subject switch are ##8001, 8002, 8006, 8008, 8009, 8010, 8012, 8015, 8016, 8017, 8018, 8019, 8020, 8021, 8022, 8023.

²⁷The 12 examples of close connection with *-a/-ya* are ##8001*, 8003, 8004, 8005, 8006, 8007, 8010, 8013, 8014, 8015, 8018, 8023*. Asterisks here and following indicate contrastive examples. The 20 examples of close connection with *-ma* are ##6002*, 6003, 6004*, 6009, 6015*, 6016*, 6017*, 6034*, 6037*, 6039*, 6040*, 6044, 6049, 6051*, 6054*, 6055*, 6056*, 6060*, 6062*, 6070*.

Chapter 5

Diachronic Interpretation

§5.0 Introduction

Given the findings of the synchronic studies of *-ma* in Old Hittite, Middle Hittite, and Neo-Hittite in the preceding chapters, it is possible to determine what changes occurred in the use of *-ma* and what may have motivated those changes identified.

In §5.1.1 I present evidence for a great increase in *-ma*'s frequency from Old Hittite to Neo-Hittite that indicates increased grammaticalization of the enclitic. In §5.1.2 I observe that by the Middle Hittite period *-ma* had moved into the phonological domain of its OH allomorph, *-a*, and I suggest a path for this change. In §5.1.3 I present changes in *-ma*'s syntactic distribution. In terms of intraclausal syntax, *-ma*'s placement became more regular over time, whereas the particle's occurrence increased in non-sentence-initial interclausal environments.

Section §5.2 concerns changes in the pragmatic distribution of *-ma*. The connector occurred much more frequently in nearly all categories, but particularly in contexts with series, with orthotonic personal pronouns, with counterexpectation, and in paragraph-initial environments. Smaller but nevertheless robust increases were seen in nearly all the remaining categories. It is possible to suggest paths of development for several of these changes.

In §5.3 I present a partial confirmation of my method by measuring whether in one text *-ma* occurs in a significant portion of the categories examined. There are clear correlations between occurrence of *-ma* and its use with the categories of contrast, counterexpectation, orthotonic personal pronoun, and paragraph-beginnings, and a somewhat lower correlation with establishment of orientation.

Section §5.4 contains my response to the treatment of *-ma* found in CHD. I disagree with their analysis that *-ma* is a marker of correlation. Although our approaches

differ, they are largely complementary, and the CHD article offers a practical summary of both common and rare uses of *-ma*.

In Section §5.5 I present *-ma*'s that have unusual placement. These examples are very interesting, but because they are so uncommon, it is difficult to assess their significance.

In Section §5.6 I demonstrate that *-ma* has functions that are at least partially similar to those of Hieroglyphic Luwian *-pa* and Thessalian *má* and show that the particle exhibits similarities in function to Greek *dé*, as analyzed by Bakker (1993). While the Thessalian form tantalizes as a possible cognate, etymologies for the enclitic, and for Hittite forms potentially containing the enclitic, remain speculative.

In Section §5.7 I summarize the findings of the present chapter.

§5.1 Changes in Frequency and in Phonological and Syntactic Distribution

§5.1.1 Overall Frequency

The incidence of *-ma* increases greatly over the period of attested Hittite. See (1).

(1) Overall Frequency of Enclitic Conjunctions¹

	OH		MH		NH	
	# of <u>exx.</u>	% of <u>total</u>	# of <u>exx.</u>	% of <u>total</u>	# of <u>exx.</u>	% of <u>total</u>
<i>-ma</i>	32	4.2%	71	10.7%	411	19.8%
<i>-a</i>	36	4.7%	(26)	(3.9%)	(14)	(0.7%)
<i>-ma/-a</i>	68	8.8%				
<i>-a/-ya</i>	57 ²	7.4%	25	3.8%	111	5.3%
# of clauses	771		665		2077	

The number of NH clauses included in the corpus is greater than the number of OH and MH clauses included by about a factor of 3 (2.7 and 3.1, respectively). Taking this difference into account, we see that *-ma* occurs 4.7 times more often in the NH sample than

in the OH sample (19.8% vs. 4.2%). NH *-ma* occurs 2.25 times more frequently than do the OH suppletive allomorphs *-ma/-a* taken together (19.8% vs. 8.8%). The frequency of MH *-ma* in the Maṣat letters, occurring in 10.7% of clauses included, may be taken as indicating a transitional stage in the particle's increase, but recall that *-ma* occurred more frequently in longer letters—17.0% (cf. §4.0.1), a rate that is only slightly lower than that in Neo-Hittite. The increased frequency of *-ma* is consistent with an interpretation of increasing grammaticalization of this particle.

The incidence of *-a* decreased drastically from Old to Neo-Hittite, from 4.7% to 0.7% of clauses included. Although the frequency of *-a* in Middle Hittite is only slightly lower than that in Old Hittite, all but one (potentially productive) example of the 26 MH examples occur in forms of orthotonic personal pronouns or in *kinuna* 'now', whereas only 5 OH *-a*'s are attached to pronominal forms, and 11 to *kinuna* (out of 36 attestations of *-a*). MH *-a* may still be marginally productive, but by Neo-Hittite, the particle is preserved only in the (by then unproductive) pronominal forms and in *kinuna*.

The frequency of *-a/-ya* decreased by about one-quarter (28.4%) from Old to Neo-Hittite (from 7.4% to 5.3%, respectively). While in Old Hittite *-ma/-a* and *-a/-ya* occurred in approximately the same proportion of clauses (8.8% and 7.4%, respectively), by Neo-Hittite the use of *-ma* has increased greatly, while the use of *-a/-ya* as clause conjunction has declined somewhat.

§5.1.2 Phonological Distribution

In chapter 2, we saw that the distribution of OH *-ma* was almost entirely restricted to postvocalic environments and was just beginning to include postconsonantal environments. By the Middle Hittite period the phonological restriction on *-ma*'s occurrence had ceased; *-ma* had come to occur freely after consonants. See (2).

(2) **Phonological (and Graphic) Distribution of *-ma***

Distribution	OH			MH			NH		
	# of <i>-ma</i>	% of <i>-ma</i>	% total clauses	# of <i>-ma</i>	% of <i>-ma</i>	% total clauses	# of <i>-ma</i>	% of <i>-ma</i>	% total clauses
<i>-V=ma</i>	31	96.9	4.0	10	14.3	1.5	74	18.0	3.6
<i>LOG=ma</i>	1	3.1	0.1	35	50.0	5.3	123	29.9	5.9
<i>-C=ma</i>	0	0.0	0.0	25	35.7	3.8	214	52.1	10.3

By Middle Hittite, *-ma* occurred more frequently after Sumerograms and Akkadograms. I attribute this (at least minimally) to both an increase in the occurrence of *-ma* and to an increase in writing with such forms over time.³ (The above numbers for such writing in Middle Hittite are somewhat skewed by the large proportion that are formulae that change the discourse topic: $10 / 35 = 28.6\%$; cf. §4.3.1.1.) While from Old to Neo-Hittite the proportion of *-ma*'s occurring postvocally decreased significantly (96.9% vs. 18.0%, respectively), the frequency of postvocalic *-ma* over the total number of clauses remained approximately the same (4.0% vs. 3.6%, respectively).

For whatever reason, *-ma* and *-a* functioned suppletively in Old Hittite, *-ma* occurring only after vowels and *-a* only after consonants. By Middle Hittite, *-ma* occurred without restriction and had nearly subdued its partner *-a*, and the question naturally arises as to how this happened. The Zukraši text, which was so valuable in determining chronology for Hittite texts (Otten 1953), is also valuable in determining (at least part of) the answer to this question. The text contains the form ^{URU}*Hattuaz=ma=aš* 'and he ... from Hattu' (chapter 2, example (11)), thus with *-ma* after an ablative in *-az*. Hittite *-az* descends from the Common Anatolian ablative **(ó)ti* by regular sound change (Melchert 1994a:131, 1994b:182-183): CA **(ó)ti* > **(a)ti* > (Pre)Hitt. **(a)zzi* [-atsi] > Hitt. *-az* [-ats] or *-z(a)* [-ts], the last written with the sign ZA but with phonetically unreal final vowel. I assume that *-ma* was being attached to clause-initial ablatives by the time affrication of **t* had occurred, but before loss of the final **i*, giving forms ending in **-azzi=ma*. While the final vowel was being lost, we could expect to have encountered

forms ranging from **-azzi=ma* to *-az=ma* (and points in between). Since there was no phonological encouragement of the sequence *-i-m-*, which existed for *-i-ya-* and was preserved in forms like *kez...kezzi=ya* 'on this side...and on that side', the result of the sequence by regular sound change would have been *-az=ma*. Once *-ma* began to occur after one consonant, one that ended in an [s] (or [s]-like) sound, the stage was set for it to spread to other post-consonantal environments, starting with final <š> (= [s]). A situation conducive to such spread may be seen in the enclitic pronoun *-šmaš* 'you [pl.acc.&dat./loc.]; them [dat./loc.]', where the phonetic sequence [-sma-] and its strong associations with enclisis had long since been established in speakers' minds. It may be noted, however, that MH *-a* occurs most frequently after <š> (see chapter 4, note 2, and §4.4).

During the transitional period when final **i* was being lost after **z*, one might expect language learners to have appended the conjunction *-a* to clause-initial ablatives in contexts of contrast, orientation, etc., giving **-az=a*.⁴ Such ablatives may still be lurking unidentified in OH texts, where it may be difficult to distinguish a clause-initial ablative with *-a* from an ablative written with unreal final <a> (so Neu 1974:62 n.85). However, factors functioning as disincentives to using *-a* with ablatives (but favoring the use of *-ma*) are 1) the probable association of *-a* with non-geminate, voiced consonants and of *-a/-ya* with geminate, voiceless consonants, while the <z> in *-az* is voiceless; 2) the robustness of phonetic material found with *-az=ma* as compared to **-az=a*; and 3) the probable association of *-ma* (over *-a*) with the ablative in speakers' minds (e.g., in clause-initial expressions of orientation). Together these factors would have guaranteed *-ma*'s association with the ablative.

§5.1.3 Syntactic Distribution

Changes in *-ma*'s syntactic distribution are suggestive of other changes as yet undemonstrated: 1) that the syntax of the Hittite clause became more rigid over time, and

2) that writing with Sumerograms and Akkadograms increased over the period of attestation. The changes also support the view that *-ma* fully assumed the function of *-a*.

In Old Hittite, *-ma/-a* occurred almost entirely in categories i) and iv) (65/68 examples), although *-ma* at this stage could attach to constituents consisting of more than one word (3/68).

(3)	Clausal syntactic distribution				
	Old Hittite		Middle Hittite		Neo-Hittite
	<i>-ma</i>	<i>-a</i>	<i>-ma/-a</i>	<i>-ma</i>	<i>-ma</i>
i) x- <i>ma</i>	50.0%	91.7%	72.1%	77.1%	84.2%
ii) [x y]- <i>ma</i>	6.3 = 2	-	2.9	8.6	9.7
iii) [x y z]- <i>ma</i>	-	-	-	1.0	
iv) [x][y]- <i>ma</i>	40.6 = 13	8.3 = 3	23.5 = 16	12.9	4.4
v) [x][y z]- <i>ma</i>	3.1 = 1	-	1.5	1.4 = 1	0.7 = 3

In Neo-Hittite, *-ma* occurred in all 5 categories, with even greater priority given to category i), placement after the first word in the clause. The Middle Hittite situation is clearly one of transition between these stages.

The distribution of *-ma* shifts away from occurrence after the second constituent (categories iv)-v)) toward occurrence after the first constituent (categories i)-iii): 75.0% in OH categories i)-iii) as compared to 94.9% in NH i)-iii); 25.0% in OH categories iv)-v) as compared to 5.1% in NH iv)-v). The old rule whereby *-ma* was delayed beyond an initial conjunction or relative pronoun to the second constituent of a clause was clearly on its way out.

As the numbers indicate, such changes are not abrupt. In the OH data *-ma* was delayed to the second word of the clause with the conjunctions *mān* 'when', *takku* 'if', and *nu* 'and', and with the indeterminate relative pronoun *kuiš*. In the MH letters, the restriction had loosened. *-ma* continued to be delayed to the word following *mān* 'if' and *nu*, but it was attached to *kuitman* 'until' and to *maḥḥan* 'when, as'. (There was no relative occurring with *-ma* in the MH letters.) By Neo-Hittite, the restriction had

weakened even more. *-ma* continued to be attached to the conjunctions *mahḥan* and *kuitman*, but was also attached to indeterminate relative pronouns (6/6). *-ma* continued to be delayed to the word after *nu* (1/1) and after a slight majority of the examples with *mān* (17/29 = 58.6%), but 12 examples of *-ma* are attached to *mān*. Among these, 2 examples with *mān* and 1 with *kuiš* have *-ma* both attached to the clause-initial conjunction or relative and delayed to the second word (§3.2.1). These attestations, where the authors observed both traditional and regularizing rules of placement, nicely demonstrate transition between the old and new ways. The shift toward regular placement of *-ma* accounts for the decrease in the percentage of examples of category iv) and the corresponding increase in examples of categories i)-iii). It also shows that Hittite speakers were tending toward increasingly rigid clausal syntax, here concerning clitic placement.

The second change in the distribution of *-ma* within the clause is its increased occurrence in categories ii) and iii), i.e., after constituents consisting of more than one word. Such hosts involve about 3% of *-ma/-a*-clauses in Old Hittite, but about 11% of *-ma*-clauses in Neo-Hittite (0.3% and 1.9% of all clauses, respectively). One of the 2 OH examples of category ii) contains Sumerographic and Akkadographic writing, while 43 of 44 NH examples of categories ii) and iii) contain such writing. I gave evidence in §3.2.3 for Hittite readings of Sumerographic and Akkadographic noun phrases, which likely occurred with these examples (although I am not convinced that all such forms were always given Hittite readings). The increase in examples of categories ii) and iii) is therefore probably only a graphic matter. This increase, taken together with the increase in *-ma*'s occurrence after Sumerograms and Akkadograms (see §5.1.2), supports the view that Sumerographic and Akkadographic writing increased in frequency over the period of attested Hittite.

Examples of category v) are quite rare, though consistently represented. The OH and MH corpora each contain only 1 example, and only 3 are found in the NH corpus (0.13%, 0.15%, and 0.14%, respectively, of all clauses).

The changes in distribution of *-ma* with regard to its host's grammatical category also suggest increasing uniformity of clausal syntax (cf. Holland 1980). In Neo-Hittite, *-ma* occurred more frequently after noun phrases and conjunctions than it did in Old Hittite. From the earlier to the later period it occurred much less frequently after verbs.

(4)	Host grammatical categories				
		Old Hittite		Middle Hittite	Neo-Hittite
	<i>-ma</i>	<i>-a</i>	<i>-ma/-a</i>	<i>-ma</i>	<i>-ma</i>
NP	40.6%	36.1%	38.2%	48.6%	48.4%
Pro	9.4	16.7	13.2	10.0	16.3
Adj	-	2.8	1.5	2.9	4.1
Adv	15.6	44.4	30.9	20.0	14.6
Neg	6.3	-	2.9	11.4	1.7
PreV	3.1	-	1.5	-	0.2
V	25.0	-	11.8	1.4	2.4
Conj	-	-	-	5.7	12.2

The differences concerning verbs and conjunctions are particularly striking. If the distribution seen among *-ma*'s hosts holds for all of Hittite,⁵ then from Old to Neo-Hittite we see an increase in the proportion of clause-initial conjunctions and NPs and pronouns (most of which are nominative), while the frequency of clause-initial verbs decreases dramatically. We also see a decrease through Middle and Neo-Hittite in clause-initial adverbs, which often served as hosts to OH *-ma/-a*. Such changes in distribution would be consistent with increasingly rigid structure of the Hittite clause over time. However, rather than saying anything about the development of *-ma* per se, these changes in its distribution imply more about shifts in the greater structure of Hittite.

One may also observe that OH *-ma* attaches to a wider variety of grammatical categories than does OH *-a*, due at least in part to the distributional differences associated with suppletion (cf. §2.4.2.3). This wider distribution places *-ma* in a position favorable for displacing its suppletive partner.

In terms of the grammatical case of substantival hosts of *-ma*, the most notable change from Old to Neo-Hittite is the increase in occurrence of *-ma* after nominative and accusative forms (and the decrease in the proportion of dative/locative hosts).

(5)

	Grammatical case of substantival hosts				
	Old Hittite			Middle Hittite	Neo-Hittite
	<i>-ma</i>	<i>-a</i>	<i>-ma/-a</i>	<i>-ma</i>	<i>-ma</i>
Nom	12.5%	41.7%	29.4%	24.3%(22.9)	33.3%(29.0)
Acc	6.3	13.9	10.3	8.6	14.6 (10.5)
Gen	3.1	-	1.5	21.4 (15.7)	2.7 (2.2)
D/L	18.8	-	8.8	7.1 (5.7)	11.7 (10.7)
Abl	3.1 (0.0)	-	1.5	-	6.3 (5.1)
All	6.3	-	2.9	-	0.2

Tallies with Sumero-/Akkadographic phrases removed stand in parentheses.

This increase is consistent with *-ma*'s move into the phonological (and, thereby, functional) territory of its OH (suppletive) allomorph, *-a*.

Concerning interclausal syntax from Old to Neo-Hittite, we see a significant increase in *-ma*'s distribution in two of the syntactic environments identified by Houwink ten Cate (1973). These are environments 1b and 2, and, along with environment 3, their frequency apparently expanded at the expense of that of environment 1a, which nevertheless remained in Neo-Hittite the predominant type.

(6)

	Old Hittite			Middle Hittite	Neo-Hittite
	<i>-ma</i>	<i>-a</i>	<i>-ma/-a</i>	MH- <i>ma</i>	NH- <i>ma</i>
1a-IC- <i>ma</i>	56.3%	80.6%	69.1%	37.1%	50.0%
1b-DC DC- <i>ma</i> ...MC	-	2.8	1.5	1.4	7.8
2-DC MC- <i>ma</i>	-	2.8	1.5	12.9	9.1
3-DC- <i>ma</i> MC	40.6	13.9	26.5	48.6	31.4
2/3-DC(DC- <i>ma</i> MC)	3.1	-	1.5	-	1.7

The increase of *-ma* in environment 1b has as much to do with differences between Old and Neo-Hittite structure as with changes of *-ma* (which was becoming increasingly grammaticalized). Here the difference is between Old and Neo-Hittite texts. The NH texts analyzed (particularly the treaties and the instruction) contain a higher number of protases consisting of more than one clause than do the texts from the earlier periods. *-ma* was appropriate for marking pair- or series-membership, subject switch, and counterexpectation, among other relations that obtain between the clauses constituting such complex protases.

We also see an increase in the frequency of *-ma* occurring at the beginning of apodoses (environment 2). These apodoses most often contain subject switch, as observed by Houwink ten Cate (1973): 32/37 (86.5%; 37/44 = 84.1% including examples in environment 2/3). This compares with a general frequency of 68.4% for subject switch in the *-ma*-clauses of the NH sample. It seems that, even by Middle Hittite, *-ma* was being increasingly employed to link main clauses to their preceding dependent clauses when the subjects of the clauses were different. If the purpose for using *-ma* is correctly identified here, this increase in *-ma*'s occurrence would be consistent with an interpretation of increasing grammaticalization of the particle.

The NH figures for *-ma*'s occurrence in interclausal syntactic environments and for the grammatical case of *-ma*'s substantival hosts are more similar to the figures for OH *-ma/-a* in these categories than those for OH *-ma* alone. These statistics support the view that NH *-ma* continues the function of OH *-ma/-a* (while MH *-ma*'s statistics are skewed by its occurrence in epistolary formulae).

§5.2 Changes in Pragmatic Distribution

Changes in *-ma*'s pragmatic distribution also indicate that over time use of the particle proliferated. All uses found in Old Hittite are found in Neo-Hittite, including a few

that are rare or only incipient in the earlier period, and all of these uses from the corpus investigated here have greatly increased in frequency by Neo-Hittite.⁶

The increases in frequency for some categories are quite large: NH *-ma* marks individual series members 37 times as often as OH *-ma/-a*; it occurs paragraph-initially about 7 times as often, and it attaches to orthotonic personal pronouns about 4 times as much. The number of attestations of *-ma* with counterexpectation also increased greatly. For other categories, increases are substantial: NH *-ma* occurs in conditional protases nearly 3 times as often as OH *-ma/-a*, and it occurs about 2 times as often in contexts with contrast, special emphasis, new subject, or subject switch. For the categories of orientation, repeated form, and new referents (for which data has not been completely collected), NH *-ma* occurs at a frequency that is about 1.5 times that of OH *-ma/-a*. The only categories decreasing in frequency are two for which NH data are incompletely collected: variant syntax and pair-marking.

It is possible to suggest concomitant causes for the increase in the use of *-ma*, apart from general increase in frequency, depending on the category. Some categories are not well established in Old Hittite, but become so by Middle Hittite or Neo-Hittite, and these categories see the biggest increases in their use. The category with the greatest increase, series-marking, appears to be incipient in Old Hittite, where only 1 example (#60) of *-a* marks the last member of a series of 3 (see the appendix for examples). There are intimations of series-marking in the section of the Royal Couple ritual with fronted verbs (#23-#26 + #55-#56), where out of 14 clauses describing a sequence of events and states, 6 clauses are marked with *-ma/-a*. One of these (#25) marks the second member of a pair, a use that appears to be well established in Old Hittite. Such conditions would be conducive to development of series-marking. In similar environments the (oppositional) relation holding between members in a pair of clauses marked with *-ma(/-a)* would next be extended to a third member, eventually establishing such use as a construction for signaling multiple parts of a greater whole. The way would then be clear for extending such marking

to structures with even more members. Series-marking with *-ma* is found in 1 series in Old Hittite, in 6 series in Middle Hittite with *-ma*, and in 17 series in Neo-Hittite. With the adjustment for the greater number of clauses (a factor of 2.7), the use of *-ma* in such structures in Neo-Hittite is 6.3 times as high as in Old Hittite.

Another category that is present in limited numbers in Old Hittite is paragraph-initial *-ma/-a*. The particles occur at the beginning of 3.3% of paragraphs. By Neo-Hittite, *-ma* occurs at the beginning of 43.9% of paragraphs, 13.3 times as frequently. In Old Hittite, paragraph-initial *-ma/-a* attaches to expressions of orientation (*anda=ma* 'and in addition', *šer=šemet=a* 'and over them', *mān lukkatta=ma* 'and when it dawns') and to 1 switched subject (*ki=ma* 'but this'). Evidently these examples began a new episode (or part of an episode) that was linked closely enough to the preceding context to warrant the use of *-ma*. Thus *-ma* could already be used in Old Hittite to connect material across paragraph boundaries. Almost all of the MH paragraph-initial *-ma*'s (25/27) and all of the NH examples continue to occur with the categories of orientation, subject switch, or both.

Since *-ma* proliferated in general from Old Hittite to Neo-Hittite, it is only to be expected that paragraph-initial *-ma*'s would also proliferate. Depending on the text, the author chose to begin new episodes in new paragraphs with similar linguistic forms, which we see in the formula changing discourse topics in the MH letters and in the many NH paragraphs that begin with expressions of orientation, e.g., *maḥḥan=ma* 'and when'. These can be thought of as series of paragraphs (cf. CHD L-N:96-97, 99), but whether the authors conceived of them as such is open to question. It may be that the author was merely signaling that the next discourse topic was beginning. The length of the text influences my interpretation of these structures. I find that the discourse-topic-changing formulae in the shorter paragraphs of the MH letters are easier to understand as series members than are the orientation-expressions in the longer paragraphs of the NH Annals of Mursili. In any event not all paragraph-initial forms with *-ma* in Middle Hittite or Neo-Hittite, and none of those in Old Hittite, are series members in the special sense used here

and in CHD. Among the MH and NH forms there is still a residue that do not have series-like paragraph-initial forms but are expressions of orientation or are cases of subject switch (11/27 in Middle Hittite, 9/68 in Neo-Hittite). The point is that the use of *-ma* in this position was already present in Old Hittite, and that the series-marking use of *-ma*, which increased greatly after Old Hittite, may have aided forces of general proliferation in expanding the use of *-ma* in paragraph-initial position.

Orthotonic personal pronouns plus *-ma* also occur much more frequently in Neo-Hittite than do such pronouns with *-ma/-a* in Old Hittite. The reason for this is twofold. First, *-ma* underwent the same proliferation with orthotonic personal pronouns that occurred with other categories. Second, clause-initial orthotonic personal pronouns occur at a higher rate in general in the NH texts than in the OH texts.⁷ Orthotonic personal pronouns occur in initial position or modified initial position in 6.0% of the clauses in the Apology of Hattusili. While I have not counted the number of such pronouns in modified or unmodified initial position in the OH texts, they certainly do not number 46 (~6.0% of 771 clauses). Orthotonic personal pronoun plus (*-ma/-a*) was nevertheless already in use in Old Hittite.⁸

Clauses with *-ma* conveying clearly detectable counterexpectation are rare in the OH texts, with only 1 possible example (#7) in the corpus and 1 sure example outside the corpus (chapter 2, example (115)), but they are much more common in NH texts, where there are 30 times as many attestations. This may be due in part to the subjectivity of the reader and in part to the more easily understandable nature and abundant material of the NH texts as compared to the OH texts. While the data indicate that this use of *-ma* increased over time, it seems to me that counterexpectation is of such a nature that one example implies many more. Since *-ma* occurred in a context with counterexpectation, this use was probably already well-established in Old Hittite. Although counterexpectation is not one of the most frequently occurring categories, it is nonetheless notable because it is such a robust pragmatic relation, because *-ma* was clearly used to signal it in the oldest period of

the language, and because it shows one of the greatest increases in textual frequency from the early to the late period of the language.

For most categories, namely contrast, subject switch, emphasis, new subject, orientation, conditional protases, repeated form, and new referents (even though incompletely collected), there are less spectacular, but substantial, increases in the frequency of their occurrence with *-ma* (as noted above).⁹ This is to be expected, given the increase in *-ma*'s frequency itself, since the types of pragmatic contexts in which the particle occurs held fairly steady over the period of attested Hittite.

The increased occurrence of *-ma* in Middle and Neo-Hittite indicates increasing grammaticalization of the particle. *-ma* already had a more or less well-defined range of grammatical functions in Old Hittite; by the Neo-Hittite period this range of uses had been expanded somewhat. While the use of *-ma* was not obligatory in any context, it was certainly favored in some (see §5.3). We see a similar increase in the occurrence of *nu* 'and'. The frequency of this connector in the OH sample was 12.7% (98/771 clauses). By Neo-Hittite it occurred in 54.8% of clauses (1138/2077), 4.3 times as many (compared to 4.7x for *-ma*, 2.25x for *-ma/-a*). The increasing grammaticalization of such particles may have played a part in the increasing rigidification in the Hittite clause over time.

Two categories for which data was not comprehensively collected in the NH sample, pair-marking and variant syntax, permit only conjecture rather than conclusion about changes in their frequency. Pair-marking with *-ma*, a clear example of which can be seen in chapter 3, example (38), seems to me to be a basic use of the particle, relating its own clause to the clause preceding it. I would expect its frequency to have at least remained stable. And by extrapolating from data from the Apology of Hattusili, we can predict the increased frequency of *-ma* with variant syntax. In this text there are 10 such clauses, or 2.7% of 368 clauses, as compared to a rate of 1.0% of all OH clauses.

While the frequency of *-ma* with most categories increased over time, the 5 categories with which *-ma* occurred most often remained rather stable. These categories

are subject switch (OH 6.0%–MH 6.2%–NH 13.4%), contrast (OH 4.2%–MH 6.2%–NH 9.5%), orientation (OH 4.7%–MH 2.1%–NH 7.4%),¹⁰ new referents (OH 3.4%–MH 5.0%–NH ≥5.1%), and repeated form (OH 3.2%–MH 3.2%–NH 5.0%; this category correlates highly with contrast). This is interesting, because it shows that *-ma* was used in a nucleus of contexts already in Old Hittite, and that these core contexts even then involved subject/topic, focus, and background. It also indicates that the greatest changes in the use of *-ma* from Old to Neo-Hittite came from its increased frequency, with a corresponding penetration into niche uses.

The remainder of this section contains the statistics for *-ma*'s occurrence in each pragmatic category from Old Hittite to Neo-Hittite, with pertinent information included as appropriate.

(7)

Distribution of <i>-ma</i> in Pragmatic Categories									
	32 <i>-ma</i> 771 32- <i>a</i> , clauses 68- <i>mal-a</i>			70 665 <i>-ma</i> clauses clauses			408 2077 <i>-ma</i> clauses clauses		
	#	%ofptc	%tot	#	%ofptc	%tot	#	%ofptc	%tot
Contrast									
<i>-ma</i>	11*	34.4	1.4	41	58.6	6.2	198	48.5	9.5
<i>-a</i>	21	58.3	2.7						
<i>-mal-a</i>	32	47.1	4.2						

*incl's *IŠTU É ABI-ŠU=ma ka[rpianzi]* (#9) as an example of weak contrast.

	#	%ofptc	%tot	#	%ofptc	%tot	#	%ofptc	%tot
Repeated form									
<i>-ma</i>	11a)	34.4	1.4	21	30.0	3.2	104	25.5	5.0
<i>-a</i>	14b)	38.9	1.8						
<i>-mal-a</i>	25	36.8	3.2						

a) 8 from Laws; b) 10 from Laws (8 *karū-kinuna*)

	#	%ofptc	%tot	#	%ofptc	%tot	#	%ofptc	%tot
Counterexp.									
<i>-ma</i>	(1*)	(3.1)	(0.1)	14	20.0	2.1	63	15.4	3.0
<i>-a</i>	-	0.0	0.0						
<i>-mal-a</i>	(1)	(1.5)	(0.1)						

*1 possible example, #7; 1 example outside corpus, chapter 2, example (115).

Series-marking	#	%ofptc	%tot	#	%ofptc	%tot	#	%ofptc	%tot
-ma	-	0.0	0.0	15	21.4	2.3	76	18.6	3.7
-a	1	2.8	0.1	6 series			17 series		
-ma/-a	1	1.5	0.1	<-1 series					

Including 3 examples of LOGOGRAM-Ca (as cases of -a) from conditional protases in the Laws would add a few members to series-marking (~6) in [≤]3 series.

Pair-marking	#	%ofptc	%tot	#	%ofptc	%tot	#	%ofptc	%tot
-ma	7	21.9	0.9	13	18.6	2.0	≥43	≥10.5	≥2.1
-a	18*	50.0	2.3						
-ma/-a	25*	36.8	3.2						

*incl.'s 11 *karū-kinuna* pairs.

The data are compromised for pair-marking, presumably a basic function of -ma, in which -ma marks the second of two clauses that together form some greater event or situation, and this yields an unclear status for this function. The OH attestations of -a are potentially skewed by a high number of formulaic *karū-kinuna* pairs (11/18), and the data for NH have not been collected comprehensively.

New referents	#	%ofptc	%tot	#	%ofptc	%tot	#	%ofptc	%tot
-ma	13	40.6	1.7	33	47.1	5.0	≥105	≥25.7	≥5.1
-a	13	36.1	1.7						
-ma/-a	26	38.2	3.4						

It is also unclear how -ma's occurrence with new referents changed since new referents in NH clauses with -ma were not collected comprehensively. From the statistics for OH and MH (and if the data for NH new subjects is any indication), it looks as though the incidence for this category would be higher (than it is) in NH, but note that the absolute frequency is nevertheless highest for NH.

New subject	#	%ofptc	%tot	#	%ofptc	%tot	#	%ofptc	%tot
-ma	5	15.6	0.6	12	17.1	1.8	65	15.9	3.1
-a	9	25.0	1.2						
-ma/-a	14	20.6	1.8						

'Emphasis'	#	%ofptc	%tot	#	%ofptc	%tot	#	%ofptc	%tot
<i>-ma</i>	7	21.9	0.9	12	17.1	1.8	69	16.9	3.3
<i>-a</i>	6	16.7	0.8						
<i>-ma/-a</i>	13	19.1	1.7						

Variant syntax	#	%ofptc	%tot	#	%ofptc	%tot	#	%ofptc	%tot
<i>-ma</i>	7	21.9	0.9	6	8.6	0.9	≥18	≥4.4	≥0.9
<i>-a</i>	1	2.8	0.1						
<i>-ma/-a</i>	8	11.8	1.0						

Again, incomplete collection of the NH data compromises the conclusion about the change in a context, but see above. It is possible to say that the absolute frequency of this combination minimally held steady over time.

Orth.Pers.Pro	#	%ofptc	%tot	#	%ofptc	%tot	#	%ofptc	%tot
<i>-ma</i>	-	0.0	0.0	3	4.3	0.5	52	12.7	2.5
<i>-a</i>	5	13.9	0.6						
<i>-ma/-a</i>	5	7.4	0.6						

Orientation	#	%ofptc	%tot	#	%ofptc	%tot	#	%ofptc	%tot
<i>-ma</i>	20	62.5	2.6	14	20.0	2.1	153	37.5	7.4
<i>-a</i>	16	44.4	2.1						
<i>-ma/-a</i>	36	52.9	4.7						

Cond.prot's	#	%ofptc	%tot	#	%ofptc	%tot	#	%ofptc	%tot
<i>-ma</i>	5	15.6	0.6	7	10.0	1.1	53	13.0	2.6
<i>-a</i>	2	5.6	0.3						
<i>-ma/-a</i>	7	10.3	0.9						

Including 3 examples of LOGOGRAM-*Ca* (as cases of *-a*) from conditional protases in the Laws would bring the total for OH *-ma/-a* to 10 – 14.7% – 1.3%.

Paragraph-initial	#	%ofptc	%tot	#	%ofptc	%tot	#	%ofptc	%tot
<i>-ma</i>	3	9.4	0.4	27	38.6	4.1	68	16.7	3.3
<i>-a</i>	1	2.6	0.1		13.8% of prgs			43.9% of prgs	
<i>-ma/-a</i>	4	5.9	0.5	<– 2.5% <i>-ma</i> , 0.8% <i>-a</i> , 3.3% <i>-ma/-a</i> of prgs					

The high frequency relative to *-ma*-clauses in MH is skewed because of the frequent occurrence of *-ma* with the formula that changes the discourse topic.

Subject switch	#	%ofptc	%tot	#	%ofptc	%tot	#	%ofptc	%tot
<i>-ma</i>	17	53.1	2.2	41	58.6	6.2	279	68.4	13.4
<i>-a</i>	29	80.6	3.8						
<i>-ma/-a</i>	46	67.6	6.0						

§5.3 Confirmation of Method

The method I have thus far employed in this study has relied primarily on positive ‘internal’ results, that is, those correlations that appear to exist between *-ma* and various pragmatic contexts, as measured by *-ma*’s frequency in those contexts relative to all occurrences of *-ma*. To determine whether these results have ‘external’ validity, as evidenced by *-ma*’s frequency in the context relative to all occurrences of the context, I examined one text in close detail, paying particular attention to those categories with which *-ma* seemed to correlate.

I selected the Apology of Hattusili because the text is nearly complete and quite well understood, and because it reflects the NH average of both size and frequency of *-ma*. It contains 17.7% of NH clauses in the corpus, with 368, as compared to a projected average of 16.7% as 1 of 6 NH texts. The frequency of *-ma* both in the Apology and in the NH corpus in general is 19.8%. So this text seems very well-suited to represent an average text.

I analyzed each clause of the text with regard to the pragmatic categories presented in chapter 3, whether or not *-ma* was present, and thus could tell the total number of clauses showing each pragmatic category.¹¹ The following table shows the frequency of *-ma*’s occurrence in each category relative to the total number of clauses exhibiting the category.

(8)	No. of Clauses with <i>-ma</i> and Category	No. of Clauses with Pragmatic Category	Frequency
Contrast	33	61	54.1%
Counterexpectation	11	24	45.8%
Pair/Series marking	24	91	26.4%
Orthotonic personal pronoun	12	22	54.5%
Orientation	21	62	33.9%
Conditional protases	0	5	0.0%
Paragraph-initial	8	13	61.5%
Subject switch	55	222	24.8%

Comparing the frequencies in the table to *-ma*'s general frequency in the Apology, 19.8%, shows clearly that *-ma* is very strongly associated with contexts exhibiting contrast, counterexpectation, orthotonic personal pronoun, and paragraph-initial forms, occurring 2-3 times more frequently in one of these contexts than in clauses in general. *-ma* is also strongly associated with orientation, but it is less strongly associated with pair- and series-marking and with subject switch, at least according to the statistics.

Conditional protases are not common in the Apology, and *-ma* occurs in none of them. As a substitute, I gathered statistics for conditional protases in the Bronze Tablet, another complete and very well understood NH text. According to the index, there are 26 examples of *mān* 'if' in the Bronze Tablet; this would not include clauses without *mān* but under the scope of a preceding *mān*. *-ma* occurs in 9 of these 26 clauses, giving a frequency of 34.6%, as compared to the particle's general frequency of 29.5% in the text, and showing a 'less strong' association of *-ma* with conditional protases.

Although the statistics show that *-ma* does not occur much more frequently in clauses exhibiting pair- and series-marking, subject switch, or conditional protasis than it does in clauses in general, I would still argue that there is a strong association between *-ma* and these categories, because when the two cooccur, the result is quite salient. Series members marked with *-ma* form a more robust and cohesive series than do members not so marked, and subject switch seems more salient with *-ma* than without. The hypothetical

situation expressed in conditional protasis is highlighted better when *-ma* is present, and this is even aided by the construction-like status of *-ma*'s delayed attachment. With these categories, 'expressive' pragmatic salience is not reflected by the statistics.

-ma was not used in all instances of any pragmatic category, for its use was still a choice made by the author, but judging by its occurrence in about one out of two instances of several categories, it seems to have been moving in the direction of required marking in some contexts.

§5.4 *-ma* in the Chicago Hittite Dictionary

In its article on *-ma* (CHD L-N:91-99), up to now the most extensive treatment of the conjunction, CHD describes its function in this way: *-ma* 'relates words or clauses to each other through pairing or opposition' (p.91). The article organizes *-ma*'s uses in a clear and practical way based on its syntactic distribution, presenting the 'marking of correlation' between individual words and phrases, through clauses, and on to paragraphs. The entry shows that *-ma* cannot function as a typical coordinating or subordinating conjunction since it connects independent clauses, dependent clauses, dependent-main clauses, and paragraphs (p.99).

As I understand it, I agree with CHD's description of *-ma*'s function as one of relating clauses but would add that *-ma* also signals difference or change. Regarding its occurrence in clauses with different statuses of dependency, I would note that *nu* also occurs in these environments, with a rather similar function in terms of linking. So perhaps for Hittite it is worthwhile to think about clause linkage as involving primarily connection rather than grammatical dependency.

Under usage *a.* of its article, CHD gives examples with *-ma* 'marking the correlation of single words within adjacent clauses' (p.92). Usage *a.* also deals with series of two members and of more than two members, which I have labeled pairs and series, respectively. Rather than claim that *-ma* relates opposed words in the examples in *a.*, I

would suggest that *-ma* relates clauses that are contrastive. The focus of contrast would exist without *-ma*, and repetition in form between the two clauses would highlight the contrast. What is important, in my opinion, is that *-ma* is often chosen to relate such clauses. Similarly, examples with *-ma* 'marking correlation of clauses without focus on a particular pair of words' are presented under usage *b*. (pp.93-94). Most examples under *b*. 1'-4' do contain opposed forms, however, and are also contrastive.

Usages *b*. 5'-7' primarily concern relating dependent clauses with other dependent clauses or with main clauses, often with a change in grammatical subject (pp.94-95). In my opinion it is the change in subject, sometimes in combination with other pragmatic factors such as contrast, counterexpectation, orientation, or series-marking, that favors the use of *-ma* in these environments (cf. note under usage *b*. 6', p.95).

Under usage *b*. 8' the examples with *namma = ma* 'over and above, in addition' seem contrastive to me and classifiable as series. Moreover, the adverb modifies the orientation, although it perhaps changes the orientation of the text of the discourse rather than that of the events of the discourse (cf. chapter 3, example (69)).

Usage *c*. concerns *-ma*'s that mark 'an explanation or elaboration (which interrupts the normal flow of the context)', and it is indicated as a NH use (p.96). Ruggero Stefanini (p.c.) has independently suggested to me a similar use for *-ma* wherein the particle signals an interruption of the flow of the narration proper in order to introduce parenthetically background information, either 1) temporal, causal, or otherwise circumstantial information having relevance for the past, relative to the time of the narration, or 2) consequential information having relevance for the future, relative to the time of the narration. This use is more precisely specified than CHD's, but the two seem to be consonant with one another. I have noted only a few instances of this use in the texts analyzed for the present study. These are Neo-Hittite, which is consistent with CHD's characterization. They include the assertions in the Apology of Hattusili wherein Hattusili claims that the favor of Ištar was on him (as in chapter 3, example (78)), as well as a passage from the Annals of Mursili, where

-ma appears to mark the end of such background information and the return to the main plot of the narrative.

(9) AM II.7.A Vs. II 1-7; #1080

n=aš úit n=aš=mu GÌR.MEŠ-aš kattan ḫaliyat[tat]
 n=aš=za ĪR-anni daḫḫun n=aš šullānun
 namma=šmaš=kan ERÍN.MEŠ išḫiḫḫun nu=mu ERÍN.MEŠ
 piškiuan dāir n=at=mu laḫḫi kattan
 paišgauwan tiēr 𐎶UTU-ŠI=ma / INA <KUR> URUḪatti arḫa úwanun
 { my sun *-ma* to land Hattuša away I came }
 nu INA URUĀnkuwa gimmantariyanun §

‘And (a representative of the people I was moving against) came, and knel[t] down at my feet. / And I took them into servitude and I treated them angrily. Furthermore I obligated them (to provide) troops, and they began giving me troops. And they began going with me on campaign. And My Majesty / returned to <the land of> Ḫatti and wintered in Ankuwa §’

The narrative proceeds from Mursili’s dealings with the unidentified people he is subjugating to their actions of compliance, and the verb forms correspondingly change from past tense to past tense plus supine. This would be unremarkable were it not for the next clause concerning Mursili’s return to Ḫatti, for in this clause with *-ma* and with past-tense verb, he resets the time of events back to a point after the subjugation but presumably before the people began providing him troops, i.e., a point along the primary plotline. Hence the clauses concerning provision of troops and their campaigning with Mursili become background information of the consequential type.

I do not claim to have identified all passages with such transitions, but they seem to be relatively few. They nevertheless embody a distinct use of *-ma*. Note that again *-ma* links clauses in a context of change. The characterizations of this use given above recall those proposed by Starke and Luraghi for OH *-ma* (cf. §2.6). While I do not agree that such a use is evident in the Old Hittite we have, it is evident in NH data.

CHD's usage *d.* concerns *-ma*'s that mark 'anaphora (to resume and more completely describe or define a word just mentioned; on the resuming word at the head of its clause)' (p.96), thus *anaphora* as a Classical literary figure rather than a contemporary linguistic concept. This could be considered a specific type of example that I have grouped with others under the category of repeated form. Coincidentally, perhaps, in 5 of the 6 examples listed under usage *d.*, the repeated word is a noun in an oblique case, which I would further classify as modifying the orientation.

The usage given in *e.* concerns those *-ma*'s 'marking continuation', and is described thus in *e. 1'*: 'often *-ma* has no detectable sense of opposition, but serves to relate a large segment of new material to what has preceded. In most instances *-ma* in this usage is attached to the first word of a new paragraph or section' (p.96). The second part of usage *e.* lists specific adverbs (and one conjunction) occurring with *-ma* in the continuation function, often paragraph-initially, sometimes just clause-initially: *anda = ma* 'in addition', *appa = ma* and *appanda = ma* 'and after(wards)', *parā = ma* 'and furthermore', and *mahhan = ma* 'and when' (pp.96-97; glosses mine). This usage corresponds in large part to my paragraph-initial category, as well as to my more general orientation category: note that the adverbs given above are textual or temporal setting expressions, which are commonly placed at the head of discourse chunks (Chafe 1994:168, 202).

I disagree with CHD's claim that '[t]he paragraph-introducing, continuative use (*e*) is an extension of the series-marking use seen in a 1' a'' (p.99). On this view, Hittite speakers presumably conceived of multiple paragraphs as a string of opposed structures, and apparently formed paragraph beginnings similarly to highlight the opposition. As I pointed out in §5.2, however, the origin of this 'paragraph-introducing, continuative use' was *-ma*'s typical connective function, not series-marking. The part series-marking would have played was to expand a function of *-ma* that was already in use, namely, beginning paragraphs with expressions of orientation or instances of subject switch.

The syntax of *-ma* is presented under CHD's section *f*. The usual placement of *-ma* at the head of Wackernagel's Law clitics is noted, as are exceptions in the order among these clitics, references being given to Houwink ten Cate (1973) and involving there sequences of *-a=ma* (see §2.2, §5.5), as well as to a form with *-ma* appended to the 2.sg. enclitic pronoun *-ta*, *li-iš-ši-ya-la-at-ta-ma* 'but for you oracular? (words)' (KBo 3.21 ii 6-7, cited from CHD L-N:72). The latter example recalls *mahhan=wa=ma* at HKM 10 ay. 34, which may, however, be an error involving the wrong sign: the sequence is transcribed by Alp as *mahhan=wa=kan* without comment (Alp 1991a:134), although the autograph clearly shows MA (Alp 1991b:11). I suppose it would be odd with all the Hittite data at our disposal if we were never to find scribal errors of this type, but these are not the only examples with *-ma*'s occurring later than usual in the enclitic string, and two others involve *-ma*'s attaching to enclitic pronouns (see §5.5).

The syntactic quirk of delaying *-ma* to the second word in the clause is also presented, along with many examples with *takku* 'if', *mān* 'when; if', (indeterminate) relative *kui-*, and *našma* 'or'. The article notes the existence of clauses in which *-ma* occurs twice, but I would quibble with their assertion that this occurs often (p.99). CHD gives 4 examples; I have found 3 examples in my sample and 1 potential example in the Instruction for the Royal Bodyguard (Güterbock and van den Hout 1991). Undoubtedly there are more examples, but they are infrequent.

The article also notes that '[i]n the construction employed with double questions, ... the *-ma* is often delayed beyond the second word in its clause, being appended to that element in the second question which is central to the opposition to the first alternative' (p.99). The two examples they cite in which this is the case contain Sumerograms, and consistent with what I showed in §3.2.3, Hittite readings really do underlie (at least most of) these forms (cf. Friedrich 1960:22 §3). Thus in *n=at ANA DINGIR-LIM IŠTU KÙ.GI=ma pianzi* 'or shall they give it to the deity with gold?' (as opposed to silver) (KUB 22.70 obv. 51-53; cited from CHD L-N:92), *-ma* may well have occurred on the

second word in the clause when it was read in Hittite. Such an interpretation is much less likely with *nu* BAL *arahza=ma kuiški DÜ-zi* ‘or will someone rebel outside (i.e., foreign insurrection)?’ (KUB 5.4 i 35; again cited from CHD L-N:92). The Sumerogram BAL ‘rebellion’ is present, but so is the Hittite adverb *arahza* ‘outside’. They do not seem to form a compound, but they are opposed to BAL *andurza* ‘rebellion inside’, so *-ma* genuinely seems to occur on the third word of the clause. This example shows that although *-ma* most often occurs after the first accented word of the clause, it sometimes occurs after the first semantic unit, and this very often with Sumerograms. See §5.5 for more on unusual occurrences of *-ma*.

The compilers of CHD undoubtedly had more than the 411 examples of *-ma* analyzed here from which to develop their article on the conjunction. They are able, therefore, to note some occurrences of *-ma* that I did not find in my corpus. One type of occurrence is the use of *-ma* in double questions mentioned just above. Another sort of occurrence is the elision of *-ma*’s vowel, as in *tāi=m=uš=za* ‘but she takes them to herself’, *ienzi=m=uš* ‘but they make them’ (p. 92), and *lukkatta=m=uš* ‘but at dawn ... them’ (noted in Neu 1983:5 n.16) (glosses approximate here).

We have different opinions about some uses of *-ma*. We agree that the conjunction relates the information in its clause to information that has come before, but in my opinion, it also signals difference. We agree that some uses of *-ma* involve opposition and that others do not, but I do not distinguish contrastive clauses where one member in each is opposed from those where more than one member in each are opposed. Our views on the rise of paragraph-initial *-ma* differ.

My method differs from CHD’s, as well, in that mine focuses more on functional categories, whereas CHD’s follows syntactic structures as a template for discussing the use of the conjunction. But in general, our views are complementary. CHD has presented an excellent summary of uses and occurrences of *-ma* in several syntactic environments, and I have proposed specific pragmatic motivations, several of which CHD has noted, for the

conjunction's occurrence in those syntactic environments. It is important to note that, aside from minor or infrequent occurrences of *-ma*, I have observed in my sample everything CHD has observed in its far wider-reaching sample. This fact confirms my method of analyzing thoroughly a limited number of sizeable texts from discrete linguistic periods.

§5.5 Unusual Placement of *-ma*

The syntactic placement of *-ma* is very regular, nearly always occurring as described in §1.4.1. Irregular placement does occur, however, as the examples below demonstrate.¹²

There are those examples in which *-ma* occurs in an irregular position in the enclitic string. One subset of this type concerns sequences of *-a = ma* in Old Hittite, the examples of which were discussed briefly in §2.2:

(10) Laws I §24 (A Vs. I 55'); #4

SAL-š= a =ma kušan ITU.I.KAM VI GÍN K[Û.BABBAR] pāi
 { woman.G -a -ma wage.A month.1.DET 6 shekel silver he shall pay }

'but he shall pay a woman's wage (for) one month (of) 6 s[ilver] shekels'

(11) KBo 17.18 Vs. II 10 and KBo 17.43 Vs. I 9' (cited at Neu 1980:100, 104)

LÚNAR-šiyaš= a= ma arāi
 { musician.N -a -ma rises }

'and the musician rises'

(12) KUB 30.10 Vs. 20¹³ (Prayer of Kantuzzili)

ḫingan= a= ma= pa anda ḫuišwanni=ya ḫaminkan
 { death.Nn -a -ma PV in life.DL also bound.Nn }

'and death is bound up also with life'

Since I understand *-ma* and *-a* as suppletive allomorphs (contra Houwink ten Cate 1973), in these examples I see reinforcement of *-a* by *-ma*, with the more vital member of the pair strengthening the weaker, moribund member. I view the resulting *-a = ma* as

synchronically analyzable, but this cannot be proven. In support of the suggestion of reinforcement, one may note that a hypothetical sequence without *-ma*, **hi-in-ga-na-pa*, would be interpretable as *hingan=apa* ‘death’ (plus enclitic preverb). The indication of clause connection would have thus been lost or, maximally, would have seemed ambiguous. Reinforcement by *-ma* would have prevented any confusion.

Other cases where a morpheme is used to reinforce itself are known, e.g., the Surselvan (Rhaeto-Romance) reflexive *sesez*, where the original reflexive *se* has been reinforced with an emphatic version of itself (Kemmer 1992). One may also note the example of Vulgar Latin *cum mēcum* ‘with me’ (Penny 1991) (as reflected in Spanish *con migo* ‘with me’) which is not syntactically parallel to *-a=ma*, but was presumably synchronically analyzable at some point.

Two other examples, in which *-ma* occurs later than usual in the enclitic string, are discussed briefly in §5.4, namely:

(13) KBo 3.21 ii 6-7 (cited at CHD L-N:72)

§ liššiyala= tta= **ma** nepišaš daganzipašš=a
 {oracular[?].pNn you.DL *-ma* heaven.G earth.G and
 uddār kattan arḥa pētummanzi
 words.Nn with away to take }

‘§ But the oracular[?] words of heaven and earth are for you to take along’

(14) HKM 10 ay. 34-35¹⁴

mahḥan=wa=**ma** am muk / *INA* KUR URU Iṣḥupitta arḥun
 {when QU *-ma* I in land Iṣḥupitta arrived }

‘ “but when I arrived in the land of Iṣḥupitta” ’

In both cases, *-ma* would of course ordinarily occur as the first enclitic.

Other unusually placed *-ma*’s occur later than expected, in these examples, on the third constituent of the clause, instead of on the second.

(15) KBo 5.9 i 19-20 (cited at CHD L-N:93)

[n]u tuk mahḥan=ma dUTU-ŠI IŠTU AWAT ABI-[K]A EGIR-an / šahḥun
 { CC you.OB when -ma my sun from word father-your after sought }

‘but when I looked after you according to the word of your father’

(16) KBo 6.34 + KUB 48.76 iii 42-43 (cited at CHD L-N:93)¹⁵

[n]=ašta IŠTU IM.ŠU.NÍG.RIN.NA GIM-an=ma! welku! / ša[r]ā ŪL úizzi
 { CC-PV from oven as -ma grass up not comes }

‘but as grass sprouts not from an oven’

(17) KUB 5.34 i 35 (cited at CHD L-N:92)

§ nu BAL araḥza=ma kuiški DÛ-zi
 { CC rebellion outside-ma someone.N will make }

‘§ or will someone make rebellion outside?’

(18) KUB 30.39 Vs. 6 (with restoration from KBo 10.20 I 7-8, which is cited at Friedrich and Kammenhuber 1975ff. 1:237)

§ mān LUGAL-uš araḥza=ma kuwapiki tamēdani URU-ri gimmanda[(riyazzi)]
 { if king.N outside-ma some.DL other.DL city.DL winters }

‘§ but if the king winters beyond in some other city’

When *-ma* occurs late in a clause with another conjunction, as in (17)–(18), it seems to me much more emphatic than prototypical *-ma* (cf. Götze 1928:267). But its occurrence with *mahḥan*/*GIM-an* ‘when; as’ in (15)–(16) raises the suspicion that the influence of a fixed phrase (*mahḥan=ma*) is at work, and this suspicion is not dampened by the fact that *-ma* in (17)–(18) is appended to the same adverb, *araḥza* ‘outside, beyond’. Another probable attestation in which (a partially broken) *-ma* attaches to the third word of the clause (*kē* ‘these [neut.acc.]’) occurs in the Madduwatta text (see Götze 1928:20, l.79). *-ma* does show some affinity for neuter demonstrative pronouns in Old Hittite, so this example may also involve a phrase. In any case, it would be interpreted as emphatic.

Still other infrequently occurring *-ma*’s are placed earlier in the clause than usual.

(19) KBo 5.3 i 19-20 (cited at Houwink ten Cate 1973:133 n.77)

nu= tta= **ma** mān / SAG.DU ^dUTU-ŠI QATAMMA ŪL nakkiš
 {CC you.DL -*ma* if person my sun in that way not important.Nc }

‘**but** if the person of My Majesty is not (equally) as dear to you’

(20) KBo 5.3 iv 18’ (=34’ of ed. (Friedrich 1930:132), cited at Houwink ten Cate 1973:133 n.77)

§ n[u=š]maš= **ma** kuit imma kuit ḥatrāmi
 {CC you.pDL-*ma* what ‘-ever’ what I write }

‘§ **But** whatever I write to [y]ou (pl.)’

In each example *-ma* occurs at the end of an enclitic string attached to *nu* (but still not to *nu* itself!). I can accept the highly unusual placement of *-ma* in these examples, but both cases are contestable.¹⁶

While the syntax of *-ma* in the examples above is not that usually seen, *-ma* nonetheless functions in all of them in one or more of the ways identified as typical uses, e.g., contrast, subject switch, orientation, etc. Such may not be claimed for this example.

(21) IBoT I 36 öy. I 19-20 (translation after Güterbock and van den Hout (1991:5))

mān andurza=*ma* I-za INA É= **ma** kuiški URUDUzakkeš ŪL karpanza
 {if inside -*ma* 1.AB in building-*ma* some.Nc bronze:doorbolt.Nc not lifted.Nc }

‘*but* if on the inside on one side in a building(=*ma*) some doorbolt is not lifted’

Here the second *-ma* may be emphatic or contrastive, but this is not clear from the text, which is somewhat broken, as well as graphically disorganized (cf. Güterbock and van den Hout 1991:5, 46). In the autograph of the tablet, the horizontals of the second *-ma* are drawn out from its vertical, and a break occurs close enough after the vertical that one wonders whether another distended horizontal occurred therein, such that the reading was originally GAL, giving É.GAL ‘palace’. Another promising explanation is that the phrase I-za INA É=*ma*, with the initial ablative of ‘one’, I-za (= I-*edaz(a)*), is appositional to *andurza=*ma** (Gary Holland, p.c.).

Although *-ma* appears in syntactically unusual positions, as presented above, it nonetheless conforms quite regularly to the rules for its occurrence, with only 2 of the above examples occurring in the 3513 clauses of my corpus. The rate of regular occurrence is 99.6% (508 / 510 *-ma*-clauses). The unusually placed *-ma*'s may indicate more variation in the spoken language than that which is preserved in tablets, or they may just be cases of scribal or even speaker error. Whatever the case may be, in such variation we see the seeds of language change. Whether they sprout and take root is a matter of chance.

§5.6 Comparative and Etymological Issues

The function of *-ma* has frequently been likened to that of other clitic connectors, specifically, Greek *dé* and Thessalian *má* (cf. §1.2), and the function of Hieroglyphic Luwian *-pa*, also a clause connector, has been compared to that of *-ma* (Carruba 1969, Meriggi 1980). It is true that upon cursory examination the functions of the three non-Hittite forms show similarities to those of *-ma*.

Hieroglyphic Luwian (HL), a sibling language of Hittite attested mainly in monumental inscriptions in an indigenous script dating from ca. 1250 to 700 BCE, exhibits the typical IE Anatolian trait of clitics placed in Wackernagel's Law position. One of these, *-pa* 'and, but', attaches to the first stressed word in a clause and occurs first in a sequence of clitics. It is considered to have a mildly adversative value (e.g., Meriggi 1962:96, glossing with Greek *dé*).¹⁷ A review of HL *-pa* in the Karatepe bilingual shows that the enclitic occurs in pragmatic environments like those in which Hitt. *-ma* occurs. In (22) we see a series with repeated form and opposed verbs, and the second and third series members are marked by *-pa*:

(22) Karatepe bilingual §§LVI-LVIII (320-330) Hu. (Hawkins 2000 1:1:56)

(clauses wishing prosperity for the city's inhabitants)

ma- w^a/_i- za lha-sá-tu-'
{much QUOT us may they beget}

ma- pa-w^a/_i MAGNUS+r^a/_i-nú-w^a/_i-tu-'
{much -pa QUOT may they make big}

ma- pa-w^a/_i (CRUX)pa+r^a/_i-na-w^a/_i-tu-u (LITUUS)á-za-ti-w^a/_i-tà-ia mu-ka-sa-sá- há-'
{much -pa QUOT may they serve Azatiwatas.DL Muksas.G and}

DOMUS-ní-i (DEUS)TONITRUS-hu-ta-[ti] DEUS-na-ti-há
{house.DL Tarhunzas.AB gods.AB and}

'Much may they beget for us, and (-pa) much may they raise, and (-pa) much may they serve Azatiwatas and Muksas' house with (the help of) Tarhunzas and the gods!'¹⁸

In example (23) we see several of the pragmatic contexts that in Hittite would favor the occurrence of *-ma*.

(23) Karatepe bilingual §§XXVI-XXVIII (134-144) Hu. (Hawkins 2000 1:1:52)

(clauses describing Azatiwatas' accomplishments)

lNEG₂-w^a/_i REL-ia (*274)ha-ta-la-i-ta lFRONS-li-zi REX-ti-zi
{not QUOT which.pa smote former.pN kings.N }

lá-mu || REL-zi lPRAE-na lá-sá-ta
{me who.pN before were}

lá-mu-pa-w^a/_i+ r^a/_i (LITUUS)á-za-ti-w^a/_i+r^a/_i-sá (*274)ha-ta-li-i-ha
{I pa QUOT them Azatiwatas.N smote}

'(And I smote fortresses to the west) which former kings had not smitten, who were before me, but (-pa) I, Azatiwatas, smote them'

Here *-pa* occurs with an orthotonic personal pronoun in an emphatic assertion that switches subject and contrasts with the previous subjects and their actions. Other Hieroglyphic Luwian environments with *-pa* that are like Hittite environments with *-ma* are pair-marking, the less common subject switch in apodosis, and the quite rare intraclausal contrast. The most common uses of *-pa* (in this text) are series-marking and occurrence with the clause-initial adverb REL(-i), which Hawkins translates 'so' (cf. Hawkins 2000 1:1:60, 62, 66); some of these mark the beginning of new episodes. A comprehensive

study of HL texts would undoubtedly uncover other similarities and dissimilarities between HL *-pa* and Hitt. *-ma*, but minimally we can observe that both particles function as adversative connectors in their respective languages.

Hittite *-ma* has been likened to Greek *dé* from the beginning of Hittite studies (Hrozný 1915:34 via equation of *dé* with Thessalian *má*). This is due to characteristics clearly common to both, their status as clitics and their function as connectors expressing a relation ranging from continuative to adversative (cf. Denniston 1966:162ff.).¹⁹

A linguistic approach is taken by Bakker (1993), who describes functions of Greek *dé* from a functional perspective based in part explicitly and in part implicitly on the work of Chafe. Extending the work of Ruijgh, which in turn follows (at some distance) on the work of Kühner-Gerth,²⁰ Bakker primarily sees the enclitic as a boundary marker, ‘dividing a discourse into larger or smaller segments’ (p.276),²¹ a view accepted by Morpurgo Davies (1997). In describing the various types of boundary that *dé* marks in narrative, Bakker gives examples of the particle in different environments, and these are in many cases the same as those in which *-ma* is found, e.g., switch reference (corresponding to my subject switch); preposed temporal subclauses, participial phrases, and adverbial combinations of preposition and *dé* (all corresponding to my orientation); segmentation and identification (corresponding in part to my repeated form, in part to contrast, and in part to series-marking); and oppositional *mén-dé* pairs (corresponding to my pair-marking). Bakker’s progressive/continuative boundary in oral (epic) discourse could correspond approximately to my series-marking. There are also examples of contexts where I have observed *-ma* in principle, if not in detail: perspectival shift; frame-creating preposed purpose clauses; and such transitions as occur with *mén-dé*.

The Thessalian enclitic *má* is considered to have the same function as Greek *dé* (e.g., Buck 1955:106, 150; Bechtel 1921 1:194), and in fact is often glossed with *dé* (e.g., Buck p.364). Since *má* is similar in form, function (clause-connection that is often adversative), and syntax (clause-second—although not always postpositive), it has often

been adduced as a potential Greek cognate of Hitt. *-ma* (cf. §1.2). Although a thorough comparison of Thess. *má* and Hitt. *-ma* remains to be undertaken, a review of the selection of Thessalian inscriptions in Buck (pp.220-227) shows that the particle does occur in some pragmatic environments like those in which *-ma* occurs. Here in example (24) we see a switch in (accusative) subject (of infinitive) from *tamías* ‘treasurers’ to *psáphisma* ‘decree’, which begins a distinct but evidently necessary part of closings in decrees—the same or nearly the same formula occurs three times in Buck’s Thessalian inscriptions.

(24) IG IX.ii.517 ll.45-46; about 214 BCE (Buck 1955:222)

(... and the decrees ... to be set down into two stone steles ...)

kai tàn onálan tàn en táne ginuménan tòs | tamías dómen àt tân koinân pothódoun •

tò *mà* psáphisma tóne kûrron émmen kàp pantòs khrónoi •
 {the *má* decree this valid to be down all time}

‘and the treasurers to give the expenditures arising from this from the common income.
 And this decree to be valid for all time.’

Although in example (25) the subject technically switches from 3.sg. to 3.pl., the more salient relation is the opposition of the direct objects granted to the allied individuals—land in addition to citizenship.

(25) IG IX.ii.234 ll.1-4; 3rd century BCE (Buck 1955:226)

...a pólis Tharsalíoun toís kai hoús ex arkhâs sumpoliteuoménois ... édouke tàn politeían
 kattáper Tharsalíois toís | e[x arkhâs pol]iteuoménois,

edoukaern *mà* em Makouníais tâs ekhoménas toû Louérkhou | (g)â[s móran ...] ...
 {they gave *má* in Poppy Fields of the holdings of Louerkhos land mora ...}

‘...The city of the Tharsalians granted citizenship to those who already from the beginning have been allied ... just as to the Tharsalians who have been [cit]izens fr[om the beginning], and they granted a (600-[ple]thra) [mora] of the lan[d] held (by) Louerkhos in the Poppy Fields (for each youth to have as patrimony for all time)’

Another example from Buck shows function similar to *-ma*'s, specifically a structure with *mén-má* pair marking: *tàm mèn ían...tàm mà állan* 'and the one...and the other', where *má* marks the second member of the pair (p.221; presented in Garrett 1990:249).

However similar the functions of HL *-pa*, Greek *dé*, and Thess. *má* may be to that of Hitt. *-ma*, it is only Thess. *má* that can be relevant in terms of language history. The similarity of the last two forms has inspired proposals of their cognate status since Hrozný (1915:34; cf. Tischler 1977ff. II:85-86), but the etymology of *-ma* is far from certain. Scholars have tended to derive *-ma* from pronominal stems, **me-/mo-*, **sem-/sm-/smo-* with *s*-mobile, or to align it with the possible Thessalian cognate; Greek *mén* 'on the one hand' has also been suggested as a cognate. Comparisons have also been made between *-ma* and seemingly appropriate forms in non-IE languages, e.g., Etruscan and Akkadian. Tischler (ibid.) offers a concise summary of proposals. To these may be added Melchert (1985:202), who posits a PIE form **-mō* and considers a source in **me/o-* possible but uncertain,²² and Garrett (1990:248-249), who sees a source in a PIE **moh₂* but does not assign semantics to the form.²³ With the current state of our knowledge, it would appear that all that can be done on this score has been done.

Although unsure of their ultimate derivation, we may have more confidence that forms in other IE Anatolian languages are cognates of Hittite *-ma*: Palaic *-ma*, a clause-connector with possible adversative meaning; Lydian *-m*, another connector that is not precisely understood; and Lycian *me*, whose affiliation with the others is somewhat questionable since it functions as a general clause-connector like Hittite *nu* (Carruba 1969, 1970, Gusmani 1964, Meriggi 1980). Although the Palaic and Lydian forms are still obscure, but their enclitic syntax accords each membership in the group.

Since the etymology of *-ma* is in question, it is difficult to know whether to relate *-ma* to other Hittite words: *mān* 'when; if', and *(-)man*, expressing the optative, potential, or irrealis (Tischler II:115-117); *maḥḥan* 'as, when' may be derived from *mān* (+ *ḥanda*

‘(to the) fore’) (Tischler II:86-89, Puhvel 1984ff. 3:94). There has been limited success in positing *-ma* (or its pre-form) as the non-initial element in other Hittite words.

The particle may occur in *imma* ‘indeed’, *namma* ‘then; again; further(more)’, *našma* ‘or’, *āšma* and *kāšma* ‘lo, behold’. The derivations of all but *našma* are uncertain.²⁴ *našma* is commonly accepted as syncopated *naššu=ma*, which is attested several times, and it has often been noted that in the disjunctive correlative construction *naššu* typically marks the first member, while *našma* marks the second and following members, which is perfectly consistent with the function and syntax of *-ma*. (See CHD L-N s. vv. for variations.) Similarly, including *-ma* in the formation of *namma* accords well with the latter’s prototypical occurrence *after* something else. Puhvel purposely leaves the etymology of *imma* undetermined, but suggests two possibilities for *āšma* and *kāšma* (and *kāša* ‘lo’): relation to the pronominal stems *a-* ‘this, that’ and *ka-* ‘this’, or derivation, at least in part, from Hattic material.

While one of these may be the case for *kāšma*, a third possibility exists wherein the word was formed analogically in (pre-)Middle Hittite times during the general expansion of *-ma* into post-consonantal environments. In this scenario, *kāša*, whatever its provenance, was reanalyzed as *kāš=a* and so was susceptible to reformation with the then newly fashionable post-consonantal *-ma*. As far as I know, *kāšma* is not attested in Old Hittite, while *kāša* occurs 5 times in the corpus I used. In the MH Mašat letters the occurrences of *kāša* outnumber those of *kāšma* ~70 to 13 (15 to 2 in the letters I used), while in my NH corpus, *kāša* occurs twice to *kāšma*’s 10 times—by Neo-Hittite *kāša* persists, but *kāšma* has become more frequent. At any rate, the derivation of most of these Hittite forms remains uncertain.

§5.7 Summary

In this chapter, I have analyzed the findings of the three synchronic descriptions of *-ma* and identified the changes that resulted from them. The frequency of *-ma* in Neo-

Hittite was seen to have increased almost five times over that of OH *-ma*, and more than twice over the frequency of *-ma/-a*. The suppletion characterizing the pair gave way to dominance by *-ma* by the time of Middle Hittite, ultimately leaving *-a* only in fossilized forms. I suggested that *-ma*'s ascendance began after apocope of the final vowel of the ablative ending **-azzi* caused *-ma* to occur after a consonant.

-ma's intraclausal syntactic distribution became more regular over time, as the particle was no longer required to be delayed to the second word of the clause after clause-initial *mān* 'if'. An increase in the delay of *-ma* to the second or third word of the clause very often involved Sumerograms and/or Akkadograms, so the delay was most likely to be merely graphic. Analysis of *-ma*'s hosts and of the cases of its substantival hosts produced results consistent with the idea that the Hittite clause became more rigidly structured over time. In contrast to its more regular syntax within the clause, *-ma*'s occurrence in interclausal syntax became more diverse, as it came to be used more in chains of dependent clauses and in apodoses.

In pragmatic contexts *-ma*'s frequency increased significantly, but especially in occurrence with non-initial members of series, with orthotonic personal pronouns, and at paragraph-beginnings. Increases in *-ma*'s occurrence with clauses expressing counterexpectation are also noteworthy. None of these is a new use for *-ma*, and I proposed scenarios according to which they could have become more common. The increase of *-ma* both in its frequency and in the number of environments in which it occurs indicates that the particle became more grammaticalized from Old Hittite to Neo-Hittite. Despite this proliferation, the contexts in which *-ma* occurred most often remained very stable over time: subject switch, contrast, orientation (but see note 10), referent introduction, and repeated form, with its high correlation with contrast.

I presented a confirmation of my method by showing that in a single text *-ma* is strongly associated with contrast, counterexpectation, orthotonic personal pronouns, and paragraph-beginnings. The association with orientation-establishment was also strong.

The statistics did not support the notion that *-ma* is strongly associated with some categories: pair- and series-marking, conditional protases, and subject switch. However, the first two are indisputably salient contexts for the use of *-ma*, so here it may be a case of true ‘expressiveness’ that spurs the association of the particle with the context. I believe the same to be true for *-ma* and subject switch, but this position is not well supported by statistical evidence and may be controversial.

With regard to the remaining sections of the chapter, I responded to CHD’s article on *-ma*, indicating the similarities and differences in our views of the particle, but concluding that our approaches are complementary. My primary disagreement with their position that *-ma* is a marker of correlation is that it places too much importance on examples with elements in opposition. In another section, I presented several examples of unusually placed *-ma*’s. These are extremely interesting in that they indicate the existence of an ‘emphatic’ *-ma* with freer syntax that is, unfortunately, only infrequently attested.

Finally, I showed that *-ma* has some functions like those of Hieroglyphic Luwian *-pa* (series-marking, subject switch, contrast) and of Thessalian *má* (contrast). Comparisons with the latter have inspired etymologies that are possible but not probative. Derivations of words that may have *-ma* as their second element also remain in doubt.

Notes to Chapter 5

¹As with the tables showing *-ma*'s frequency in chapters 3 and 4, example (1) includes attestations that were identifiable but unsuitable for analysis. Subsequent tables in this chapter include only attestations deemed suitable for analysis, so tallies may differ.

²The tally of 57 *-a/-ya*-clauses differs by 12 from the 45 given in chapter 2, example (46). Included here are [1] the second member of a comparative 'as...so' pair from the Laws; [2] an instance of apparent word-scope *-a/-ya* from the Laws; [3-4] a correlative pair from the Laws; [5-6] a correlative pair from KBo 22.1; [7-11] two correlative pairs and the second member of a correlative pair from StBoT 8; and [12] an attestation in broken context from StBoT 8 (cf. chapter 2, example (56)).

³Writing with phonetic vs. logographic forms has been much discussed in the literature on dating Hittite texts, with results usually showing that older texts contain relatively more phonetic forms and that later copies contain relatively more logographic equivalents (Carruba 1969, Otten and Souček 1969, Houwink ten Cate 1970, Neu and Rüster 1973, Heinhold-Krahmer et al. 1979).

⁴*-*azzi=a*, with *-a*, would not have occurred due to the phonological distribution of *-a/-ma*; even if the form had been possible, it would presumably have been indistinguishable from *-*azzi=ya*, with *-a/-ya*.

⁵Holland (1980) found clause-initial verbs in only 3% of clauses in later texts. As far as I know, a statistical study of Hittite clause structure has yet to appear.

⁶The frequencies compared here are the occurrences of OH *-ma/-a* and NH *-ma* relative to the total number of clauses for the respective period, rather than the frequency of *-ma(/-a)* relative to just the number of clauses with *-ma(/-a)*. It may be noted that if the frequencies of OH *-ma* alone were compared those of NH *-ma*, the increases would be even greater.

⁷The authors' addressing the audience in the Treaty with Kupanta-^dKAL and in the Instruction to the LÚ.MEŠSAG favors second-person forms, and the self-explanation in the Apology of Hattusili and in the Bronze Tablet is conducive to the use of first-person forms.

⁸In Old Hittite, *-ma* would have been restricted to occurring after vowel-final orthotonic personal pronouns, i.e., *apē* 'those [nom.]' (*apē = ma* is attested at least 4 times) and *apēdani* 'that (one) [dat./loc.]'.

⁹Since the frequency of NH *-ma* is 2.25 times that of OH *-ma/-a*, then if the distribution of *-ma* among the pragmatic categories held steady, the frequency of the categories in which it occurred should have increased correspondingly (2.25x). But considering their frequencies with regard to *-ma*'s distribution, only the categories of series-marking, paragraph-initial, orthotonic personal pronoun, counterexpectation and conditional protases increased; contrast and subject switch held their ground at about 2.25x the OH frequency; emphasis and new subject decreased by about 10% relative to *-ma*-clauses, 'merely' doubling in frequency relative to all clauses; and orientation and repeated form, decreasing by about 30% relative to *-ma*-clauses, increased by 'only' 50% or more relative to all clauses. New referents could be added to this last group; statistics for variant syntax and pair-marking are still inconclusive.

¹⁰Paragraph-initial *-ma*, mostly occurring in the discourse-topic-changing formula, displaced orientation as one of the most common uses in the MH letters.

¹¹Data collection for new referents was unfortunately not undertaken, and reassessment of clauses with repeated form, emphasis and variant syntax is required before results for these categories can be considered valid. Pair- and series-marking were tallied together in this analysis.

¹²This collection was gathered from texts I have worked through, as well as from citations in secondary literature, but it is not comprehensive. That it is so small attests to the very regular placement of *-ma*.

¹³I do not interpret the *-ma*'s in this passage from the Kantuzzili prayer as marking each clause in a bipartite structure (cf. CHD L-N:93 a.2'). Instead, I consider each to exhibit its typical anaphoric orientation, relating its clause to the preceding discourse (rather than to

each other). This text is typically considered as Old Hittite set down in Middle Hittite times (Oettinger 1979:568, Yoshida 1990:11, CHD P:366 (OH or MH in MH script)).

¹⁴This example was not accepted as data for Middle Hittite, but probably could have been. The statistics would have been affected minimally. Since the clause comes at the beginning of a quote, about all we can tell about its pragmatic context is that it constitutes an expression of orientation.

¹⁵Review of the autograph renders this attestation somewhat questionable, in that the sequence of signs appears to be GIM AN KU_i Ú EL LU, with LU written over an erasure. Perhaps it was corrected to KU_j on the tablet to give *ú-el-ku*, but it is difficult to tell. The uncorrected KU_i could merely be a shortened MA, but could it have also been an anticipatory scribal error, the KU_i written before Ú-EL-, then left as MA?

¹⁶Upon review of the autograph of KBo 5.3, both attestations of *-ma* appended to the end of an enclitic string headed by *nu* are disputable. At KBo 5.3 iv 18', all that is visible of the putative NU is the head end of the horizontal, but even so, the Winkelhaken that NU's have in this text should be visible. If this sign is not NU, then example (20) becomes less interesting (but could remain interesting depending on the restoration).

At KBo 5.3 i 19, the interesting *-ma* cooccurs with an erasure, and the next word happens to begin with MA (*ma-a-an*), so it is possible that scribe wrote the MA of *ma-a-an* close to the enclitic string, but then remembered that he should right-justify the word, as he had done in the previous line. In that case, *-ma* would not occur here. Perhaps only collation of the tablet itself (or of a photo) can decide whether MA was (incompletely) erased or whether it was written over the erasure.

¹⁷The formal and functional equivalent in Cuneiform Luwian has both an orthotonic and an enclitic variant, *pa* and *-pa* (Laroche 1959:76-77).

¹⁸For MAGNUS+*r^a/i-nu*- I follow Ruggero Stefanini's interpretation (p.c.), in which the city's inhabitants first beget children and then raise them, understanding a more literal sense of 'make big'.

¹⁹Denniston's work is much cited but seemingly widely disliked; in his defense, his description is actually very practical from the point of view of a reader in that it offers semantic equivalents for *dé* in different environments.

²⁰Kühner, R., and B. Gerth. 1898-1904. *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*. Zweiter Teil: *Satzlehre*. 2 v. Hannover. // Ruijgh, C. J. 1971. *Autour de "te" épique: Études sur la syntaxe grecque*. Amsterdam.

²¹Bakker's notion of boundary-marking for *dé* seems to correspond approximately to my description for *-ma*: 'linking with overt signal of difference'.

²²Melchert has since retracted his proposed etymology of Hitt. *imma* from PIE **id-mō* (1994b:160), but this may not affect the derivation of Hitt. *-ma* from PIE **-mō*.

²³Garrett's reconstructions account for Hitt. *-ma* (from unaccented **moh₂*), Lycian clause-connective *me* (from accented **móh₂*), and Thessalian *má* (from ablaut variant **meh₂*).

²⁴References for *imma*: Tischler 1977ff. I:355-356, Puhvel 1984ff. 2:359-361; for *namma*: Tischler II:266-268, CHD L-N:378-391; for *našma* and *naššu*: Tischler II:279-282, CHD L-N:401-406; for *āšma*: Tischler I:84, Puhvel 1:216-218; for *kāšma*: Tischler I:535 and s.v. *kāša* I:532-533, Puhvel 4:118-119.

Chapter 6

Conclusion

In the preceding chapters I have presented evidence that showed that Hittite *-ma* occurs in conjunction with a number of pragmatic categories: contrast, counterexpectation, pair- and series-marking, introduction of new referents, and emphasis, as evidenced in variant word order and with orthotonic personal pronouns. In general, these categories may be considered focal. *-ma* also occurs with subject switch, which often can be considered a change involving topicality. Finally, *-ma* occurs with backgrounding, as in adverbial phrases and dependent clauses that adjust the orientation, including conditional protases. *-ma*'s use paragraph-initially may be included here.

In chapter 2, I showed that Old Hittite *-ma* occurred in clauses with focal elements like new and contrasted referents, with expressions of setting, including conditional protases, and with topic switch, although we may more profitably consider *-ma*'s cooccurrence with subject switch. These contexts frequently show repeated form, either of vocabulary or of syntax, or of both. The difference that *-ma* signals is rarely discrete, for most often more than one of these pragmatic contexts is present.

I also demonstrated on the basis of their similar function that *-ma* and *-a* were suppletive allomorphs, as suggested by Melchert. They indicate overtly that there is in their clause at least one difference from the preceding discourse. In contrast, *-a/-ya* tended to occur in contexts of close connection.

Further, I showed how *-ma/-a* served to mark contrasting conditional protases in the Laws in a systematic way. Finally, I responded to Starke's and Luraghi's views of *-ma*, offering evidence against them, while supporting my interpretation of its function.

In chapter 3, I presented evidence for Neo-Hittite *-ma*'s continued use in the contexts identified in Old Hittite, as well as for its increase in use in other contexts that in Old Hittite were less common. In addition to use with contrast, referent introduction,

orientation establishment, and subject switch, *-ma* was used in paragraph-initial contexts, in contrastive contexts showing counterexpectation and pair- and series-marking, and in emphatic contexts as indicated by variant syntax or orthotonic personal pronouns. Repeated vocabulary or syntax was often present in these contexts.

A comparison with *-a/-ya* showed that it was still more often associated with contexts of close connection, whereas *-ma* seemed to be linked to contexts of contrast and orientation establishment.

I also observed that *-ma* had nearly completely replaced its OH allomorph, *-a*, which lived on only in morphologically frozen forms. I further demonstrated that Hittite words really do underlie forms written with Sumerograms and Akkadograms.

In chapter 4, I examined *-ma* in the Middle Hittite of the Maşat letters and showed that the use of *-ma* in contexts that were common in Neo-Hittite had already been established by the time of Middle Hittite. Use in contexts establishing the orientation was less common, but *-ma* was often found in an epistolary formula that changed the discourse topic. *-ma* was also found to occur in and link clauses with emphatic expressions like imperatives, forceful questions, and strong denials. Linking the first two to the preceding discourse could be considered connecting the epistemic and the speech-act domains as analyzed by Sweetser, offering another type of pragmatic ambiguity for *-ma*. By the time of Middle Hittite, *-ma* had almost completely taken over the function of *-a*. This enclitic may still have been marginally productive in Middle Hittite but was primarily used in relic forms: with orthotonic personal pronouns and in the connective temporal adverb *kinuna*.

In chapter 5, I identified the changes that emerge from a comparison of the three synchronic descriptions of *-ma*. The connector substantially increased in frequency from Old Hittite to Neo-Hittite, by almost five times when taken alone, and by more than two times when taken together with its OH allomorph, *-a*. By Middle Hittite, *-ma* had assumed the functions of *-a* after the former's distribution expanded into post-consonantal environments. This may have occurred when apocope of **i* caused *-ma* to occur after the

affricate <ʒ> in ablative forms. Syntactically, NH *-ma* was being placed more regularly in Wackernagel's Law position as the requirement for delay to the second word of the clause was being lost in clauses with *mān*. Interclausally, *-ma* occurred more frequently in sequential protases, as well as in apodoses, the latter usually with a change in subject.

-ma also showed substantial increases in frequency in all comprehensively analyzed pragmatic contexts. Those contexts with the largest increases involved series-marking, orthotonic personal pronouns, paragraph-beginnings, and counterexpectation. *-ma* occurred in all of these contexts in Old Hittite, but at a low rate, and I suggested possible paths of development that might explain how *-ma* came to be used more frequently in these contexts in Middle and Neo-Hittite. Despite *-ma*'s increased frequency in the categories just mentioned, the five most frequent categories in which it occurred from Old Hittite to Neo-Hittite were quite stable: subject switch, contrast, orientation (but see chapter 5, note 10), referent introduction, and repeated form, which correlated highly with contrast.

The proliferation in *-ma*'s occurrence in general and in the specific interclausal environments and pragmatic contexts noted above is consistent with the view that *-ma* became more grammaticalized over the period of attested Hittite.

To confirm the results of the method I used in my analysis, i.e., determining which categories occurred most frequently with *-ma*, I checked the occurrence of *-ma* against all occurrences of several pragmatic categories in one text. *-ma* was found to occur in clauses with contrast, counterexpectation, orthotonic personal pronouns, and at paragraph-beginnings at rates two to three times higher than in clauses in general. *-ma* also showed a strong association with clauses establishing the orientation. Strong association of *-ma* with pair- and series-marking, conditional protases, and subject switch was not borne out by the data, but the salience of *-ma*'s use with the first two is beyond doubt. I would argue that *-ma*'s association with subject switch is also stronger than the data indicate.

I responded in detail to the article on *-ma* presented in CHD. I disagree with their interpretation of *-ma* as a marker of correlation and believe this view resulted from giving

priority to forms standing in opposition. Inasmuch as their lengthy and detailed article is ordered primarily by syntactic environment and contains uses of *-ma* that did not occur in my sample, our accounts of the particle are complementary.

I presented examples of *-ma* occurring in positions other than that licensed by Wackernagel's Law. These are intriguing attestations because they indicate that the spoken language allowed variation in the placement of *-ma*.

Finally in chapter 5, I showed that *-ma* and Hieroglyphic Luwian *-pa* share some functions (series-marking, subject switch, contrast) and reiterated the fact that *-ma* and its potential cognate in Thessalian, *má*, minimally share the function of signaling contrast. Etymologies have been proposed both for *-ma* and for most Hittite forms in which *-ma* is alleged to be the second member, but they are not certain.

In light of the evidence presented, I find that *-ma*'s primary function was to link its clause (or sentence) to the preceding context while overtly signaling difference between them. Its meaning, inextricably tied to its function, was connective and adversative, thus confirming the particle's description by most scholars as an adversative conjunction. Of course, this characterization is an abstraction and is divorced from contexts where its meaning and use actually had value.

Now, each clause in a connected, coherent discourse will, of course, contain some *information* (in the sense used in §1.3.2) because the speaker (or author) taking part in such a discourse will typically avoid informational redundancy (in which case no information is asserted) (Givón 1984:240-241), so my characterization may seem rather pallid. However, it is reminiscent of Schwyzer's description of Greek *dé* (1950 2:562), adduced by Melchert (1985) and cited above in §1.2: 'Es bezeichnet, daß (gegenüber dem Vorhergehenden) etwas Anderes, Neues kommt'. I think it is just such a meaning that would allow for the pragmatic ambiguity that we see with *-ma*, from strongly contrastive (as in chapter 3, example 38) to merely additive (as in chapter 4, example 17). Similarly, such a function allows for *-ma*'s occurrence in contexts that ordinarily have very different

pragmatic statuses, expressions of focus (as in chapter 4, example 16a) and expressions of setting (as in chapter 2, example 42). (Cf. Holland 1984 on the relative-complementizer *kuit* and Sweetser 1990 on *and*, *or*, and *but*.)

Inasmuch as *-ma*'s function is to link its clause and signal difference, it stands in relief from its clause-connecting cousins, the almost 'positively' additive *-a/-ya* 'and', and the more neutral linker *nu* 'and'. While I have examined some functions of the former, each deserves investigation on its own account.

Regarding the previous accounts of *-ma*, specifically those that labeled *-ma* a referent-introducing form, an emphatic particle, a backgrounding form, or a contrastive focus particle, it is possible to say that no one was completely right, but that no one was entirely wrong. On the one hand, it seems such labels were applied without considering all the data. On the other hand, though I do not find that *-ma* marks these categories in all cases, I could agree that *-ma* marks them optionally.

There is evidence for a secondary function of *-ma*, i.e., *-ma* as a marker of emphasis. Such evidence concerns those examples in which *-ma* occurs in a clause with *nu*, or in which *-ma* occurs later in the clause than in its usual initial or delayed position (§2.2, §3.2.2, §4.2.2, §5.5). In these cases the clause-connective function of *-ma* is hard to detect, and it is difficult to avoid the inference that *-ma* is raising its host to focal prominence in the clause (cf. Götze 1928:167, Houwink ten Cate 1973:133). If this *-ma* was indeed emphatic, then along with focality it probably connoted difference and was thus distinguished from other emphatic enclitics, the specifying *-pat* and the inclusive *-a/-ya* (with word-scope). A closer determination of the semantics of emphatic *-ma* will be limited by the small number of its occurrences, however, and it will probably be impossible to decide whether the two types were polysemous or pragmatically ambiguous for Hittite speakers.

The difficulty with regard to this emphatic *-ma*'s meaning is symptomatic of the obvious problem with attempting pragmatic analyses of dead languages: limited knowledge

of the language under analysis. We may never be able to resolve the difficulties encountered in a hapax or an obscure passage. We will probably never know whether a newly introduced referent would have been known to the audience or not (Prince's *Unused* and *Brand-new*, respectively). We cannot be sure of degrees of focality, as in chapter 4, example (16), where a *šaša*-bird was spotted—was this interesting or extraordinary to the addressee of the letter? Which props used in rituals were identifiable to the audience, and which were not? For that matter, who was the audience for such a text? For most texts?

Despite these limitations, I hope to have demonstrated that by applying contemporary pragmatic concepts to a dead language like Hittite, it is possible to obtain interesting and informative results about the function of an element in such a language.

Bibliography

- Alp, Sedat. 1979. Das hethitische Wort für "Palast". In: *Piero Meriggi dicata*. Onofrio Carruba, ed. (Studia mediterranea ; I) pp.17-25.
- Alp, Sedat. 1991a. *Hethitische Briefe aus Maşat-Höyük*. (Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, VI. Dizi, Sa. 35) Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Başimevi.
- Alp, Sedat. 1991b. *Maşat-Höyük'te bulunan çivi yazılı Hitit tabletleri; Hethitische Keilschrifttafeln aus Maşat-Höyük*. (Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, VI. Dizi, Sa. 34) Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Başimevi.
- Ankara Arkeoloji Müzesinde bulunan Boğazköy tabletleri*. Istanbul 1948.
- Archi, Alfonso. 1979. L'humanité des Hittites. In: *Florilegium Anatolicum: Mélanges offerts à Emmanuel Laroche*. Paris: Editions E. de Boccard. pp.37-48.
- Bakker, Egbert J. 1993. Boundaries, topics, and the structure of discourse: An investigation of the Ancient Greek particle *dé*. *Studies in language* 17:275-311.
- Beal, Richard H. 1988. The ^{GI}ŠTUKUL-institution in second millenium ^Ḫatti. *Altorientalische Forschungen* 15:269-305.
- Bechtel, Friedrich. 1921. *Die griechischen Dialekte*. Bd. 1: *Der lesbische, thessalische, böotische, arkadische und kyprische Dialekt*. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung.
- Beckman, Gary. 1996. *Hittite diplomatic texts*. (Writings from the Ancient World, Society of Biblical Literature ; v. 7) Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Bolkestein, A. Machtelt. 1991. Functional grammar and Latin linguistics. *LALIES* 12:75-115.
- Brugman, Claudia. 1986. Sisterhood is more powerful than you thought: Scopal adverb placement and illocutionary force. *Papers from the Parasession on Pragmatics and Grammatical Theory. 22nd Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*. pp.40-53.

- Buck, Carl Darling. 1955. *The Greek dialects: Grammar, selected inscriptions, glossary*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Carruba, Onofrio. 1969. *Die satzeinleitenden Partikeln in den indogermanischen Sprachen Anatoliens*. (Incunabula graeca; v. 32) Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo.
- Carruba, Onofrio. 1970. *Das Palaische: Texte, Grammatik, Lexikon*. (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten ; Heft 10) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Carruba, Onofrio. 1985. Die anatolischen Partikel der Satzeinleitung. In: *Grammatische Kategorien: Funktion und Geschichte. Akten der VII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Berlin, 20.-25. Februar 1983*. Bernfried Schlerath, ed. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert. pp.79-98.
- Catalogue of Hittite Texts* online. 1999: www.asor.org/HITTITE/CTHHP.html.
- Chafe, Wallace L. 1976. Givenness, contrastiveness, definiteness, subjects, topics, and point of view. In: Li 1976, pp.25-55.
- Chafe, Wallace. 1994. *Discourse, consciousness, and time: The flow and displacement of conscious experience in speaking and writing*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Dancygier, Barbara, and Eve Sweetser. 1997. *Then* in conditional constructions. *Cognitive linguistics* 8:109-136.
- Dancygier, Barbara, and Eve Sweetser. 2000. Constructions with *if*, *since*, and *because*: Causality, epistemic stance, and clause order. In: *Cause-condition-concession-contrast: Cognitive and discourse perspectives*. Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen and Bernd Kortmann, eds. (Topics in English linguistics ; 33) Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Dardano, Paola. 1997. *L'aneddoto e il racconto in età antico-hitita: La cosiddetta "Cronaca di Palazzo"*. (Biblioteca di ricerche linguistiche e filologiche ; 43) Rome: Editrice "Il Calamo".
- Delbrück, B. 1888. *Altindische Syntax*. (Syntaktische Forschungen ; V) Halle a. S.: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses.

- Denniston, J. D. 1966. *The Greek particles*. 2nd ed., 1954, with corrections. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dressler, Wolfgang. 1969. Eine textsyntaktische Regel der idg. Wortstellung. *KZ* 83:1-25.
- Ehelolf, Hans. 1926. Das Motiv der Kindesunterschiebung in einer hethitischen Erzählung. *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 10:766-769.
- Eichner, Heiner. 1971. Urindogermanisch **k^we* 'wenn' im Hethitischen. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 29:27-46.
- Fauconnier, Gilles. 1994 [1985]. *Mental spaces: Aspects of meaning construction in natural language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Firbas, Jan. 1966a. Non-thematic subjects in contemporary English. *Travaux linguistiques de Prague* 2:239-256.
- Firbas, Jan. 1966b. On defining the theme in functional sentence analysis. *Travaux linguistiques de Prague* 1:267-280.
- Firbas, Jan. 1986. On the dynamics of written communication in the light of the theory of functional sentence perspective. In: *Studying writing: Linguistic approaches*. Charles R. Cooper and Sidney Greenbaum, eds. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage. pp.40-71.
- Firbas, Jan. 1992. *Functional sentence perspective in written and spoken communication*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Friedrich, Johannes. 1926, 1930. Staatsverträge des Hatti-Reiches in hethitischer Sprache. (Hethitische Texte ; Hefte II, IV). *Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Aegyptischen Gesellschaft* 31:1, 34:1.
- Friedrich, Johannes. 1929. Zum hethitischen Irrealis und Potentialis. *Kleinasiatische Forschungen* 286-296.
- Friedrich, Johannes. 1930. See Friedrich 1926, 1930.

- Friedrich, Johannes. 1940. *Hethitisches Elementarbuch. Erster Teil: Kurzgefasste Grammatik.* (Indogermanische Bibliothek. 1. Abt., 1. Reihe, 23. Bd.) Heidelberg: Winter.
- Friedrich, Johannes. 1952-66 [1991]. *Kurzgefaßtes hethitisches Wörterbuch: Kurzgefasste kritische Sammlung der Deutungen hethitischer Wörter (Unveränderter Nachdruck der Ausgabe 1952-1966).* (Indogermanische Bibliothek. Zweite Reihe: Wörterbücher) Heidelberg: Winter.
- Friedrich, Johannes. 1959. *Die hethitischen Gesetze: Transkription, Übersetzung, sprachliche Erläuterungen und vollständiges Wörterverzeichnis.* (Documenta et monumenta Orientis antiqui ; v. 7) Leiden: Brill.
- Friedrich, Johannes. 1960. *Hethitisches Elementarbuch. 1. Teil, Kurzgefaßte Grammatik (Zweite, verbesserte und erweiterte Auflage).* (Indogermanische Bibliothek. 1. Reihe: Lehr- und Handbücher) Heidelberg: Winter.
- Friedrich, Johannes. 1969. Churritisch. In: *Altkleinasiatische Sprachen.* (Handbuch der Orientalistik, 1. Abt., 2. Bd., 1. u. 2. Abschn., Lfg. 2) Leiden: Brill. pp.1-30.
- Friedrich, Johannes, and Annelies Kammenhuber. 1975ff. *Hethitisches Wörterbuch (Zweite...Auflage).* Heidelberg: Winter.
- Garrett, Andrew James. 1990. *The syntax of Anatolian pronominal clitics.* Harvard University. Ph.D. diss.
- Garrett, Andrew. 1992. Topics in Lycian syntax. *Historische Sprachforschung* 105:200-212.
- Garrett, Andrew. 1996. Wackernagel's Law and unaccusativity in Hittite. In: *Approaching second: Second position clitics and related phenomena.* Aaron L. Halpern and Arnold M. Zwicky, eds. (CSLI lecture notes ; no. 61) Stanford, Calif.: CSLI. pp.85-133.

- Givón, Talmy. 1983. Topic continuity in discourse: An introduction. In: *Topic continuity in discourse: A quantitative cross-language study*. Talmy Givón, ed. Amsterdam: Benjamins. pp.1-41.
- Givón, Talmy. 1984, 1990. *Syntax: A functional-typological introduction*, v.I-II. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Götze, Albrecht. 1925. Hattušiliš: Der Bericht über seine Thronbesteigung nebst den Paralleltexten. (Hethitische Texte ; Heft I) *Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Aegyptischen Gesellschaft* 29:3.
- Götze, Albrecht. 1928. Madduwattaš. (Hethitische Texte ; Heft III) *Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Aegyptischen Gesellschaft* 32:1.
- Götze, Albrecht. 1930. Neue Bruchstücke zum grossen Text des Hattušiliš und den Paralleltexten. (Hethitische Texte ; Heft V) *Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Aegyptischen Gesellschaft* 34:2.
- Götze, Albrecht. 1933. Die Annalen des Muršiliš. (Hethitische Texte ; Heft VI) *Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Aegyptischen Gesellschaft* 38.
- Götze, Albrecht, and Holger Pedersen. 1934. Muršilis Sprachlähmung: Ein hethitischer Text mit philologischen und linguistischen Erörterungen. *Det Danske Videnskabernes Selskab. Historisk-filologiske meddelelser* 21:1.
- Goetze, Albrecht. 1959. Review of von Schuler 1957. *Journal of cuneiform studies* 13:65-70.
- Greenberg, Joseph H. 1966. Some universals of grammar with particular reference to the order of meaningful elements. In: *Universals of language*, 2nd ed. Joseph H. Greenberg, ed. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press. pp.73-113.
- Gren-Eklund, Gunilla. 1978. *A study of nominal sentences in the oldest Upaniṣads*. (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia indoeuropaea upsaliensia ; 3) Uppsala University. Doctoral diss.
- Gurney, O. R. 1990. *The Hittites*. 2nd ed., repr. with rev. London: Penguin.

- Gusmani, Roberto. 1964. *Lydisches Wörterbuch mit grammatischer Skizze und Inschriftensammlung*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Gusmani, Roberto. 1980-86. *Lydisches Wörterbuch mit grammatischer Skizze und Inschriftensammlung. Ergänzungsband*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Güterbock, Hans G. 1945. The vocative in Hittite. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 65:248-257.
- Güterbock, Hans G. 1961. Review of Friedrich 1959. *Journal of cuneiform studies* 15:62-78.
- Güterbock, Hans G. 1962. Further notes on the Hittite laws. *Journal of cuneiform studies* 16:17-23.
- Güterbock, Hans G. 1982. Einige sumerische und akkadische Schreibungen im Hethitischen. In: *Zikir Šumim: Assyriological studies presented to F. R. Kraus on the occasion of his seventieth birthday*. G. van Driel et al., eds. (Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten. *Studia Francisci Scholten memoriae dicata* ; v. 5) Leiden: Brill. pp.83-90.
- Güterbock, Hans G. 1983. Noch einmal die Formel *parnaššea šuwaizzi*. *Orientalia* n.s. 52:73-80.
- Güterbock, Hans G., and Harry A. Hoffner, eds. 1980ff. *The Hittite dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*. Chicago: The Institute.
- Güterbock, Hans G., and Theo P. J. van den Hout. 1991. *The Hittite instruction for the royal bodyguard*. (Assyriological studies ; no. 24) Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.
- Hagenbuchner, Albertine. 1989. *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter*. (Texte der Hethiter ; Hefte 15-16) Heidelberg: Winter.
- Hahn, E. Adelaide. 1944. The shift of a Hittite conjunction from the temporal to the conditional sphere. *Language* 20:91-107.

- Hale, Mark. 1987. Notes on Wackernagel's Law in the language of the Rigveda. In: *Studies in memory of Warren Cowgill (1929-1985)*. Calvert Watkins, ed. (Untersuchungen zur indogermanischen Sprach- und Kulturwissenschaft, 3) Berlin: de Gruyter. pp.38-50.
- Halliday, M. A. K. 1967. Notes on transitivity and theme in English, part 2. *Journal of linguistics* 3:199-244.
- Halliday, M. A. K. 1985. *An introduction to functional grammar*. London: Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A. K., and Ruqaiya Hasan. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Hawkins, John David. 2000. *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions*. (Studies in Indo-European language and culture ; new ser., 8) Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Heinhold-Krahmer, S., et al. 1979. *Probleme der Textdatierung in der Hethitologie* (*Beiträge zu umstrittenen Datierungskriterien für Texte des 15. bis 13. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.*). (Texte der Hethiter ; Heft 9) Heidelberg: Winter.
- Helck, Wolfgang. 1963. Urhi-Tešup in Ägypten. *Journal of cuneiform studies* 17:87-97.
- Held, Warren H., Jr. 1957. The Hittite relative sentence. *Language dissertation*, no. 55. Baltimore: Linguistic Society of America.
- Hoffner, Harry A., Jr. 1973a. The Hittite particle *-pat*. In: *Festschrift Heinrich Otten : 27. Dezember 1973*. Erich Neu and Christel Rüster, eds. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. pp.99-117.
- Hoffner, H[arry]. A., Jr. 1973b. Studies in the Hittite particles, I. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 93:520-526.
- Hoffner, Harry A., Jr. 1986. Studies in Hittite grammar. In: *Kaniššuwat: A tribute to Hans G. Güterbock on his seventy-fifth birthday, May 27, 1983*. Harry A. Hoffner, Jr. and Gary M. Beckman, eds. (Assyriological studies ; no.23) Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. pp.83-94.

- Hoffner, Harry Angier, Jr. 1997. *The laws of the Hittites: A critical edition*. (Documenta et monumenta Orientis antiqui ; v. XXIII) Leiden: Brill.
- Holland, Gary Brian. 1980. *Problems of word order change in selected Indo-European languages*. University of California, Berkeley. Ph.D. diss.
- Holland, Gary B. 1984. Subordination and relativization in early Indo-European. *Proceedings of the Tenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* 609-622.
- Holland, Gary B. 1986. Nominal sentences and the origin of absolute constructions in Indo-European. *KZ* 99:163-193.
- Holland, Gary B. ms. The form and function of Hittite *kuit*. Dept. of Linguistics, University of California, Berkeley.
- Hopper, Paul J., and Elizabeth Closs Traugott. 1993. *Grammaticalization*. (Cambridge textbooks in linguistics) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Horn, Laurence R. 1985. Metalinguistic negation and pragmatic ambiguity. *Language* 61:121-174.
- Houwink ten Cate, Philo H. J. 1970. *The records of the early Hittite Empire (c. 1450-1380 B.C.)*. (Uitgaven van het Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut te Istanbul ; 26) Istanbul: Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut in het Nabije Oosten.
- Houwink ten Cate, Ph. H. J. 1971. The Hittite computer analysis project. In: *Acta Orientalia Neerlandica: Proceedings of the Congress of the Dutch Oriental Society held in Leiden on the occasion of its 50th anniversary, 8th-9th May 1970*. P. W. Pestman, ed. Leiden: Brill. pp.37-42.
- Houwink ten Cate, Philo H. J. 1973. The particle *-a* and its usage with respect to the personal pronoun. In: *Festschrift Heinrich Otten : 27. Dezember 1973*. Erich Neu and Christel Rüster, eds. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. pp.119-139.
- Hrozný, Friedrich. 1915. Die Lösung des hethitischen Problems. *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft zu Berlin* 56:17-50.

- Hrozný, Friedrich. 1917. *Die Sprache der Hethiter: Ihr Bau und ihre Zugehörigkeit zum indogermanischen Sprachstamm, ein Entzifferungsversuch*. (Boghazköi-Studien ; 1) Leipzig: Hinrichs.
- Hrozný, Frédéric. 1922. *Code hittite provenant de l'Asie Mineure (vers 1350 av. J.-C.)*, Ire partie. Paris: Geuthner.
- Imparati, Fiorella. 1964. *Le leggi ittite*. (Incunabula graeca ; v. VII) Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo.
- İstanbul Arkeoloji Müzelerinde bulunan Boğazköy tabletleri*. Istanbul 1944-54, Ankara 1988.
- Jeffers, Robert J. 1976. Hittite conjunctions. *KZ* 90:152-165.
- Jeffers, Robert J. 1987. On methodology in syntactic reconstruction: Reconstructing inter-clause syntax in prehistoric Indo-European. In: *Papers from the 7th International Conference on Historical Linguistics* [1985]. Anna Giacalone Ramat, et al., eds. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins. pp.305-323.
- Josephson, Folke. 1972. *The function of the sentence particles in Old and Middle Hittite*. (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia indoeuropaea upsaliensia ; 2) Uppsala: Skriv Service AB.
- Justus, Carol. 1976. Relativization and topicalization in Hittite. In: Li 1976, pp.213-245.
- Justus, Carol F. 1981. Visible sentences in cuneiform Hittite. *Visible language* 15:373-408.
- Kammenhuber, A[nnelies]. 1969. Hethitisch, Palaisch, Luwisch und Hieroglyphenluwisch. In: *Altkleinasiatische Sprachen*. (Handbuch der Orientalistik, 1. Abt., 2. Bd., 1. u. 2. Abschn., Lfg. 2) Leiden: Brill. pp.119-357.
- Kammenhuber, A[nnelies]. 1970. Keilschrifttexte aus Boğazköy (KBo XVI) [review]. *Orientalia* n.s. 39:547-567.

- Kammenhuber, Annelies. 1979. Zwischenbilanz zu den hethitischen Enklitikaketten. In: *Florilegium Anatolicum: Mélanges offerts à Emmanuel Laroche*. Paris: Editions E. de Boccard. pp.185-196.
- Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi*. Leipzig, Berlin. 1916ff.
- Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi*. Berlin. 1922ff.
- Kemmer, Suzanne. 1992. Grammatical prototypes and competing motivations in a theory of linguistic change. In: *Explanation in historical linguistics*. Garry W. Davis and Gregory K. Iverson, eds. (Current issues in linguistic theory ; v. 84) Amsterdam: Benjamins. pp.145-166.
- Kimball, Sara E. 1999. Hittite historical phonology. *Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft* 95.
- Kroon, Caroline. 1994. Latijnse *maar*-equivalenten in narratief proza. In: *Nauwe betrekkingen: Voor Theo Jansse bij zijn vijftigste verjaardag*. R. Boogaart and J. Noordegraaf, eds. Amsterdam: Stichting Neerlandistiek VU/Münster: Nodus. pp.129-136.
- Lambrecht, Knud. 1994. *Information structure and sentence form: Topic, focus, and the mental representations of discourse referents*. (Cambridge studies in linguistics ; 71) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Laroche, E[manuel]. 1951. Fragments hittites de Genève. *Revue d'assyriologie* 45:131-138.
- Laroche, E[manuel]. 1957-58. Comparaison du louvite et du lycien. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 53:159-197.
- Laroche, Emmanuel. 1959. *Dictionnaire de la langue louvite*. (Bibliothèque Archéologique et Historique de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie d'Istanbul ; VI) Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve.
- Laroche, Emmanuel. 1960. *Les hiéroglyphes hittites*. Pt.1: *L'écriture*. Paris: CNRS.

- Laroche, Emmanuel. 1971. *Catalogue des textes hittites*. (Études et commentaires ; 75) Paris: Éditions Klincksieck.
- Laroche, Emmanuel. 1972. *Catalogue des textes hittites, premier supplément*. *Revue hittite et asianique* 30:94-133.
- Lebrun, René. 1980. *Hymnes et prières hittites*. (Homo religiosus ; 4) Louvain-la-Neuve: Centre d'Histoire des Religions.
- Li, Charles N., ed. 1976. *Subject and topic*. New York: Academic Press.
- Li, Charles N., and Sandra A. Thompson. 1976. Subject and topic: A new typology of language. In: Li 1976, pp.457-489.
- Luraghi, Silvia. 1990. *Old Hittite sentence structure*. (Theoretical linguistics) London: Routledge.
- Meacham, Michael. ms. Interpreting and dating KUB XXXI 101. University of California, Berkeley.
- Melchert, H. Craig. 1984a. Notes on Palaic. *KZ* 97:22-43.
- Melchert, H. Craig. 1984b. *Studies in Hittite historical phonology*. (Ergänzungshefte zur Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung ; Nr. 32) Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht.
- Melchert, H. Craig. 1985. Hittite *imma* and Latin *immō*. *KZ* 98:184-205.
- Melchert, Craig. 1994a. Anatolian. In: *Langues indo-européennes*. Françoise Bader, ed. Paris: CNRS. pp.121-136.
- Melchert, H. Craig. 1994b. *Anatolian historical phonology*. (Leiden studies in Indo-European ; 3) Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Meriggi, Piero. 1962. *Hieroglyphisch-hethitisches Glossar*. 2., völlig umgearb. Aufl. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Meriggi, Piero. 1967. *Manuale di eteo geroglifico*. Pt. II: *Testi-la serie: I testi neo-etei più o meno completi*. (Incunabula graeca ; v. XIV) Roma: Edizioni dell'Ateneo.

- Meriggi, Piero. 1980. Schizzo grammaticale dell'anatolico. *Atti della Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Memorie*, ser. VIII, v. XXIV, fasc. 3. Roma.
- Morpurgo Davies, Anna. 1997. Particles in Greek epigraphical texts: The case of Arcadian. In: *New approaches to Greek particles: Proceedings of the colloquium held in Amsterdam, January 4-6, 1996, to honour C.J. Ruijgh on the occasion of his retirement*. Albert Rijksbaron, ed. (Amsterdam studies in Classical philology ; v. 7) Amsterdam: Gieben. pp.49-73.
- Neu, Erich. 1970. *Ein althethitisches Gewitterritual*. (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten ; Heft 12) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Neu, Erich. 1974. *Der Anitta-Text*. (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten ; Heft 18) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Neu, Erich. 1980. *Althethitische Ritualtexte in Umschrift*. (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten ; Heft 25) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Neu, Erich. 1983. *Glossar zu den althethitischen Ritualtexten*. (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten ; Heft 26) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Neu, Erich. 1984. Review of *Florilegium Anatolicum: Mélanges offerts à Emmanuel Laroche*, 1979, Paris: Editions E. de Boccard. *Archiv für Orientforschung* 31:97-100.
- Neu, Erich, and Christel Rüster. 1973. Zur Datierung hethitischer Texte. In: *Festschrift Heinrich Otten : 27. Dezember 1973*. Erich Neu and Christel Rüster, eds. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. pp.221-242.
- Neu, Erich, and Christel Rüster. 1975. *Hethitische Keilschrift-Paläographie II (14./13. Jh. v. Chr.)*. (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten ; Heft 21) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Oettinger, N. 1979. Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbums. *Erlanger Beiträge zur Sprach- und Kulturwissenschaft* 64.
- Otten, Heinrich. 1951. Ein althethitischer Vertrag mit Kizzuvatna. *Journal of cuneiform studies* 5:129-132.

- Otten, H[einrich]. 1953. Die inschriftlichen Funde. *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orientalischen Gesellschaft zu Berlin* 86:59-64.
- Otten, Heinrich. 1957. Zwei althethitische Belege zu den Hapiru (SA.GAZ). *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 52:216-223.
- Otten, H[einrich]. 1958. Bemerkungen zu den hethitischen Instruktionen für die LÚ.MEŠSAG. *Archiv für Orientforschung* 18:387-390.
- Otten, Heinrich. 1973. *Eine althethitische Erzählung um die Stadt Zalpa*. (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten ; Heft 17) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Otten, Heinrich. 1981. *Die Apologie Hattusilis III.: Das Bild der Überlieferung*. (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten ; Heft 24) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Otten, Heinrich. 1988. *Die Bronzetafel aus Boğazköy: Ein Staatsvertrag Tuthalijas IV.* (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten ; Beiheft 1) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Otten, H[einrich], and Vl[adimír] Souček. 1966. Neue hethitische Gesetzesfragmente aus dem Großen Tempel. *Archiv für Orientforschung* 21:1-12.
- Otten, Heinrich, and Vladimir Souček. 1969. *Ein althethitisches Ritual für das Königspaar*. (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten ; Heft 8) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Penny, Ralph. 1991. *A history of the Spanish language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pinkster, Harm. 1990. *Latin syntax and semantics*. London: Routledge.
- Prince, Ellen F. 1981a. Topicalization, focus-movement, and Yiddish-movement: A pragmatic differentiation. *Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* 249-264.
- Prince, Ellen F. 1981b. Toward a taxonomy of given-new information. In: *Radical pragmatics*. Peter Cole, ed. New York: Academic. pp.223-255.
- Prince, Ellen F. 1992. The ZPG letter: Subjects, definiteness, and information-status. In: *Discourse description: Diverse analyses of a fund raising text*. William C. Mann and

- Sandra A. Thompson, eds. (Pragmatics and beyond ; new ser. 16) Philadelphia: Benjamins. pp.295-325.
- Prince, Ellen F. 1997. On the functions of left-dislocation in English discourse. In: *Directions in functional linguistics*. Akio Karmio, ed. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins. (Studies in language companion series ; v. 36) pp.117-143.
- Prince, Ellen F. 1998. On the limits of syntax, with reference to left-dislocation and topicalization. *Syntax and semantics* 29:281-302.
- Pritchard, James B. 1969. *Ancient Near Eastern texts relating to the Old Testament*. 3rd ed. with suppl. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Puhvel, Jaan. 1984ff. *Hittite etymological dictionary*. (Trends in linguistics: Documentation ; 1, 5, 14) Berlin: Mouton.
- Reinhart, Tanya. 1981. Pragmatics and linguistics: An analysis of sentence topics. *Philosophica* 27:53-94.
- Risselada, Rodie. 1993. *Imperatives and other directive expressions in Latin: A study in the pragmatics of a dead language*. (Amsterdam studies in Classical philology ; v.2) Amsterdam: Gieben.
- Rosenkranz, Bernhard. 1973. Die hethitischen Schreibungen für „und“. In: *Symbolae Biblicae et Mesopotamicae Francisco Mario Theodoro de Liagre Böhl dedicatae*. M. A. Beek, et al., eds. (Studia Francisci Scholten memoriae dicata ; v. 4) Leiden: Brill. pp.320-326.
- Rüster, Christel. 1972. *Hethitische Keilschrift-Paläographie*. (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten ; Heft 20) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Rüster, Christel, and Erich Neu. 1989. *Hethitisches Zeichenlexikon: Inventar und Interpretation der Keilschriftzeichen aus den Boğazköy-Texten*. (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten ; Beiheft 2) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

- von Schuler, Einar. 1957. *Hethitische Dienstanweisungen für höhere Hof- und Staatsbeamte: Ein Beitrag zum antiken Recht Kleinasiens. Archiv für Orientforschung, Beiheft 10.*
- von Schuler, Einar. 1965. *Die Kaškäer: Ein Beitrag zur Ethnographie des alten Kleinasien.* (Untersuchungen zur Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie (Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie. Neue Folge. Ergänzungsband) ; Bd. 3) Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Schwyzler, Eduard. 1950. *Griechische Grammatik auf der Grundlage von Karl Brugmanns Griechischer Grammatik.* Vervollständigt und hrsg. von Albert Debrunner. 4., unv. Aufl., 1975. (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft ; 2. Abt., 1. T., 2. Bd.) Munich: C. H. Beck.
- Sommer, Ferdinand. 1920. *Hethitisches.* (Boghazköi-Studien ; 4. Heft) Leipzig: Hinrichs.
- Sommer, Ferdinand. 1932. *Die Aḫḫijavā-Urkunden. Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Abteilung. Neue Folge 6.*
- Sommer, Ferdinand, and Hans Ehelolf. 1924. *Das hethitische Ritual des Pāpanikri von Komana (KBo VI = Bo 2001): Text, Übersetzungsversuch, Erläuterungen.* (Boghazköi-Studien ; 10. Heft) Leipzig: Hinrichs.
- Souček, Vladimír. 1961. *Bemerkungen zur Schlussformel der hethitischen Gesetze (parnaššēa šuwāizzi).* *Archiv orientální* 29:1-29.
- Starke, Frank. 1977. *Die Funktionen der dimensionalen Kasus und Adverbien im Althethitischen.* (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten ; Heft 23) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Stefanini, Ruggero. 1964. *Una lettera della regina Puduhepa al re di Alasija (KUB XXI 38).* *Atti e memorie dell'Accademia Toscana di Scienze e Lettere "La Colombaria"* 29:1-69.

Stefanini, Ruggero. 1992. On the tenth paragraph of the Bronze Tablet (ii.91-iii.3).

Archivio glottologico italiano 67:133-152.

Sternemann, Reinhard. 1966. Temporale und konditionale Nebensätze des Hethitischen.

Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung 11:231-274, 377-415.

Sturtevant, Edgar H. 1933. *A comparative grammar of the Hittite language*. Philadelphia:

Linguistic Society of America.

Sturtevant, Edgar H. 1936. *A Hittite glossary*. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: Linguistic Society

of America.

Sturtevant, Edgar H., and George Bechtel. 1935. *A Hittite chrestomathy*. 2nd printing,

corrected, 1952. Philadelphia: Linguistic Society of America.

Sweetser, Eve. 1990. *From etymology to pragmatics: Metaphorical and cultural aspects*

of semantic structure. (Cambridge studies in linguistics ; v. 54) Cambridge: Cambridge

University Press.

Szabó, Gabriella. 1971. *Ein hethitisches Entsühnungsritual für das Königspaar Tuthaliya*

und Nikalmati. (Texte der Hethiter ; Heft 1) Heidelberg: Winter.

Tischler, Johann. 1977ff. Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar. *Innsbrucker Beiträge zur*

Sprachwissenschaft ; Bd. 20.

Ungnad, Arthur. 1920. Das Personalpronomen der dritten Person in der hethitischen

Satzverbindung. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 74:417-422.

Ungnad, Arthur. 1925. Zur Syntax der hethitischen Konjunktionen. *Zeitschrift für*

Assyriologie 36(=N.F. 2):103-106.

Wackernagel, Jacob. 1892. Über ein Gesetz der indogermanischen Wortstellung.

Indogermanische Forschungen 1:333-436.

Ward, Gregory L., and Ellen F. Prince. 1991. On the topicalization of indefinite NPs.

Journal of pragmatics 16:167-177.

Watkins, Calvert. 1963. Preliminaries to a historical and comparative analysis of the syntax

of the Old Irish verb. *Celtica* 6:1-49.

- Watkins, Calvert. 1985. Indo-European **-k^we* 'and' in Hittite. In: Sprachwissenschaftliche Forschungen: Festschrift für Johann Knobloch. Hermann M. Ölberg and Gernot Schmidt, eds. *Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft* 23:491-497.
- Weitenberg, Joseph Johannes Sicco. 1984. *Die hethitischen U-Stämme*. (Amsterdamer Publikationen zur Sprache und Literatur ; 52. Bd.) Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Weitenberg, Joseph J. S. 1992. The uses of asyndesis and particles in Old Hittite simple sentences. In: *Per una grammatica ittita, Towards a Hittite grammar*. Onofrio Carruba, ed. (Studia mediterranea ; 7) Pavia: Gianni Iuculano Editore.
- Yoshida, Kazuhiko. 1990. *The Hittite mediopassive endings in -ri*. (Studies in Indo-European language and culture, N.S. ; 5) Berlin: de Gruyter.

Appendix

Occurrences of *-ma* and *-a* in the Old Hittite Corpus

Please see the Notes on Translation and Glossing in the front matter.

Occurrences of *-ma* have example numbers from #1 to #34; for *-a* the example numbers range from #35 to #62. When a passage contains both *-ma* and *-a*, the passage is presented with the *-ma* group.

#1-#2: Laws I §10 (A Vs. I 16'-19')

§[(tak)]u LÚ.ULÙ^{LU}-an kuiški hūnikzi t=an ištarnikzi nu apūn
 [(šāk)]¹tāizzi¹¹ pēdi=šši=**ma** LÚ.ULÙ^{LU}-an pāi nu É-ri=šši
 anniškizzi kuitmān=aš lāzziatta mān=aš lazziatta=**ma**
 nu=šše VI GÍN KÙ.BABBAR pā[(i)] LÚA.ZU=ya kuššan apāš=pat pāi §

‘§ If someone injures a person and does him harm, he shall take care of that (person). And in his place he shall provide a person (who) shall work in his household until he (the injured person) recovers. And when he recovers, (the injurer) shall pay him 6 shekels of silver, and to the doctor that same one (the injurer) shall pay the fee. §’

¹[(ša'-a-ak)]-°

#3: Laws I §23 (A Vs. I 51'-53')

§[(ta)]kku ÌR-aš hūwāi n=aš ANA KUR Luwiya paizzi kuiš=an āppa 'uwat¹[(ezzi)]
 nu=šše 6 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR pāi takku ÌR-aš hūwāi n=aš ANA KUR kūruri an[da]
 paizzi kuiš=an āppa=**ma** uwatezzi n=an=za apāš=pat dāi §

‘§ If a male slave runs away and he goes to the land of Luwiya, whoever brings him back, (the owner) shall give him 6 silver shekels. If a male slave runs away and he goes in[to] an enemy

country, whoever (=ma) brings him back, that same one shall take him for himself. §’

• See note 24.

#4: Laws I §24 (A Vs. I 54'-55')

§[(ta)]kku ÌR-aš našma [(GEME)]-aš huwāi išḥaš=šiš=an kuēl ḥašši wemi[(yazi)]
 LÚ-naš kuššan ITU.I.KAM XII GÍN KÙ.BABBAR pāi SAL-š=a=ma kušan
 ITU.I.KAM VI GÍN K[Ù].BABBAR] pāi §

‘§ If a male slave or a female slave runs away, at whose hearth his or her owner finds him or her, / he (the harbinger) shall pay a man’s wage (for) one month (of) 12 silver shekels, but he shall pay a woman’s wage (for) one month (of) 6 (six) s[ilver] shekels. §’

#5-#5.5: Laws I §40 (A Vs. II 18'-22')

§takku LÚ[(GIŠT)UKUL ḥar(akzi)] Û LÚ ILKI tittianza nu LÚ ILKI tezzi
 kī GIŠTUKUL[(L)-l(i=met k)]i=ma šahḥa<n>=mit A.ŠÀ^{HLA} ŠA LÚ GIŠTUKUL anda
 šittariezzi
 GIŠTUKUL-li=ya ḥar[(zi š)]ahḥann=a iššai takku GIŠTUKUL-li=ma mimmai
 LÚ GIŠTUKUL-š=a! A.ŠÀ^{HLA} ḥarkantaš taranzi n=an=za LÚMEŠ URU-LIM
 anniškanz[(i)]
 takku LUGAL-š=a NAM.RA^{HLA}-an pāi nu=šše A.ŠÀ^{HLA}-an pianzi t=aš GIŠTUKUL-li
 kiš[(ari)] §

‘§ If a GIŠT[UKUL] man [di]es (or disappears) and an *ILKU* man is designated, and the *ILKU* man says, / “This is my GIŠTUKUL-[l]i (obligation), but this (other) is my *šahḥan* (obligation),” and he registers the field(s) of the GIŠTUKUL man, / he shall both hold the GIŠTUKUL-li and perform the *šahḥan*. But if he refuses the GIŠTUKUL-li, / they shall declare the field(s) of the GIŠTUKUL man vacant, and the men of the city shall work it for themselves. / But if the king gives a person, they shall give him the land, and it shall become a GIŠTUKUL-li (arrangement). §’

• See notes 23 and 35.

#6, #36-#37: Laws I §41 (A Vs. II 23'-26')

§ takku LÚ ILKI ḥarakzi Û LÚ GIŠTUKUL tittianza LÚ GIŠTUKUL tezzi
 kī GIŠTUKUL-li=met kī=ma šahḥa<n>=met nu A.ŠÀ^{HLA} ŠA LÚ ILKI anda šittariezz[(i)]
 GIŠTUKUL-li ḥarzi šahḥann=a iššai takku šahḥan=a mimmai,
 A.ŠÀ^{HLA} ŠA LÚ ILKI ANA É.GAL-LIM danzi šahḥan=a ḥarak[(zi)] §

‘§ If an *ILKU* man dies (or disappears) and a GIŠTUKUL man is designated, and the GIŠTUKUL man says, / “This is my GIŠTUKUL-li (obligation), but this (other) is my *šahḥan* (obligation),” and he registers the field(s) of the *ILKU* man, / he shall hold the GIŠTUKUL-li and perform the *šahḥan*. But if he refuses the *šahḥan*, / they shall take the field(s) of the *ILKU* man for the palace. And the *šahḥan* shall cease. §’

• See note 23.

#7: Laws I §44b (A Vs. II 34'-35')

§ takku LÚ.ULÙ^{LU}-an kuiški parkunuzzi [(k)]uptarr=a uk[(tūriaš pēda)i]
 takkuw=at=an parna=ma kuēlka peššiezzi alu[(wanzatar DI.KUD LUGAL)] §

‘§ If someone (ritually) purifies a person, he shall convey also¹ the remnants to the incineration dumps.

But if he throws them away onto someone’s property (lit. house), (it is) sorcery, (and is) a case for the king. §’

¹Following Friedrich (1959:31, 116), I interpret -a/-ya in *kuptarr=a* ‘remnants’ as having word-scope; cf. §2.4.1 and example (70).

#9: Laws I §46 (A Vs. II 38'-42')

§ takku URU-ri A.ŠÀ^{HLA}-an iwāru kuiški ḥarzi takku=šše A.ŠÀ^H[(^{LA} dapian)za]
 piyanza luzzi karpīezzi takku=šše A.ŠÀ^{HLA}-š=a te[(pauieš¹ pi)yanteš]
 luzzi natta karpīezzi *IŠTU É ABI-ŠU=ma* ka[rpianzi]
 takku iwaruaš išḥāš A.ŠÀ kulēi ārki na[(š)ma]
 LÚ^{MEŠ} URU-LIM A.ŠÀ^{HLA}-an pianzi ta luzzi karpiezz[i] §

‘§ If in a city someone holds land as an inheritance gift, if al[l] the land is given to him, he shall render the *luzzi* service. But if the small(er portion of the) fields (is) gi[ven] to him,

he shall not render the *luzzi* service, **but** [they shall] re[nder] it from the house of his father. If the heir subdivides unused² land, o[r]

the men of the city give land (to him), he shall render the *luzzi* service. §’

• See note 28.

¹te[(-e-pa-u-i-eš

#10: Laws I §47b (A Vs. II 45'-48')

§ takku LÚ ^{GIŠ}TUKUL-aš A.ŠÀ^{HLA}-ŠU ḥūmandan kuiški wāši luzzi [(karp)]iezzi
 takku A.ŠÀ^{HLA}-n=a mekkī wāši luzzi natta karpīezzi
 takku A.ŠÀ^{HLA} kulēi=ma ārki našma LÚ^{MEŠ} URU-LIM pianzi
 ta luzzi karpīezzi §

‘§ If someone buys all the land of a ^{GIŠ}TUKUL man, he shall render the *luzzi* service. But if he buys (only) the large(r part of the) land, he shall not render the *luzzi* service.

But if he subdivides unused² land or the men of the city give (him land), he shall render the *luzzi* service. §’

[#11]: Laws I §71 (A Rs. III 58-60)

§ takku GUD-un ANŠE.K[(UR.RA ANŠE.GÌR.NUN.N)]A ANŠE-in kuiški wemiezzi
 [(n=an LUG)]AL-w[(an¹ āška ūnnai ta)]kku utniya=ma wemiezzi
 [(n=an LÚ.MEŠŠU.GI-aš ĥinkanzi n=an=za)]tūrizzi mā₁n=an₁[²

‘§ If someone finds a (stray) ox, horse, mule (or) donkey,
 he shall drive it to the king’s gate. **But** if he finds (it) in the country,
 they shall present it to the elders. (The finder) shall harness it for himself. When it [...]’
¹LUG)]AL-w[a-(an ²ma-₁a-na-an₁

#13, #44: Laws I §99 (A Rs. IV 56’-58’)

§[(tak)]u ÌR-aš É-er lukkezzi išhāš=šiš=[(a še)r=ši]t[?] šarnikzi
 [(ŠA Ì)]R KA×KAK-ŠU UZNĀ-ŠU kukku[(raškanzi) n(=an E)]GIR-pa išhi=šši
 [(pian)]zi takku natta=ma šarnik[(zi) n(u apūn=pat šuwi)]zzi §

‘§ If a male slave sets fire to a house, **and** his owner makes compensation for [hi]m,
 they shall cut (off?) the slave’s nose and ears [and] give him back to his owner.

But if (the owner) does not make compensation, he shall forfeit that very (slave). §’

- Against the readings of Hoffner (1997:96), Hrozný’s autograph seems to me to show Ì]R in l.57’, and there does seem to be a trace of a vertical in l.56’ (if it is not a representation of a crack or an artifact), allowing *i*]r[?], but my resources were more limited than Hoffner’s (p.XI). The restorations for ll.57’-58’ of this law, supplied from B (KBo 6.3 Rs. IV 56-58), seem a bit much for the space on A (KBo 6.2).

#15: Anitta A Vs. 1-4

^mAnitta DUMU ^mPithāna LUGAL ^{URU}Kuššara QÍBÍ-MA
 nepišz¹=aš=⟨š⟩ta ^dIM-unni āššuš ēšta
 n=ašta ^dIM-unni=ma mān āššuš ēšta
^{URU}Nēšaš LUGAL-uš ^{URU}Kuššaraš LUGAL-i × × × ×[] §

‘Anitta, son of Pithana, King of Kuššara, speak:

He was dear to the Storm-god of Heaven.

But as he was dear to the Storm-god,

the king of Neša [...] to the king of Kuššara ... §’

¹nepišz(-) has been analyzed as either a genitive form or an ablative. See Neu (1974:47-50) for arguments for a genitive (with antecedent bibliography), accepted by Tischler (1977ff. II(7):311). CHD (L-N:448) and Melchert (1994:112) judge it to be an ablative.

#16, #46-#48: Anitta A Vs. 39-Rs. 48

karū mUḥnaš LUGAL URUZālpuwa dŠiu<n>=šumm[in]
 [UR]UNēšaz URUZālpuwa pēd[aš]
 [app]ezzian=a mAnittaš LUGAL.GAL dŠiu<n>=šu[m(min)]
 [(U)RUZ]ālpuwaz āppa URUNēša pē[taḥḥun]
 [mḤ]uzzian=a LUGAL URUZālp[uwa] ḥuś[uwantan]
 [U]RUUNēša uwatenun URUḤattuša-x x[
 [ta]k?kišta š=an tālaḥḥun mān=aš
 appezziyan=a kištanziattat š=an dḤalmaš[uitti]
 dŠiuš=miš parā paiš š=an išpandi
 nakkit dāḥḥun pēdi=šši=ma ZÀ.AḤ.LI-an ani'e'[nun] §

'Earlier Uḥna, King of Zalpuwa, t[oo]k
 (the statue of) ou[r] god Šiu from Neša to Zalpuwa.
But [lat]er I, Anitta, Great King, con[veyed]
 (the statue of) o[u]r god Šiu from Zalpuwa back to Neša.
And [Ḥ]uzzia, King of Zalp[uwa] I brought / alive to Neša. Ḥattuša ... []
 [in]flicted?. I left it. **But** when it / later suffered starvation, my god Šiu
 delivered it [to] the Thr[one] god. **And** in the night
 I took it by force. **And** in its place I so[wed] weeds. §'

#17-#18: Anitta A Rs. 73-79

§ mān x x [(laḥḥa pāun)]
 nu LÚ URUPurušḥa[(nda katti=mi ḥenku-x¹)]
 šu=mu I GIŠŠÚ.A AN.BAR I PA.GAM AN.BAR [(ḥengur udaš)]
 mān āppa=ma URUNēša [uwan(un)]
 nu LÚ URUPurušḥanda katti=mmi [(pēḥutenun)]
 mān tunnakišna=ma paizzi ap[(āš=a)]
 pēram=mit kunnaz ešari §

'§ When I [] went to battle, / the man of Purušḥanda with me offer^o[].
 He brought me one iron throne and one iron scepter as gift(s).
And when I [cam]e back to Neša, / I brought the man of Purušḥanda with me.
And when he goes into the throneroom, that one / sits before me on the right. §'
¹See note 17a.

#20: KBo 22.1 Vs. 7', 12'-13'

§ mTāš LÚIŠ¹ URUKūluppa ...
 VI PA ZÍD.DA ZÍZ ANA NINDA.KASKAL daškizzi
 § ki=ma ḥenkuwaš=šaš L NINDA^{HLA} ...

'§ Tā, the chariot-fighter of Kuluppa ... / has been taking [list of people]
 (and) as provisions ... 6 half-measures of emmer meal.
 § But this is (part) of his allotment: 50 (loaves of) bread ...'
¹With Beal (1988:280).

#20.5: KBo 20.10+ Vs. I 4-6

GAL DUMU.É.GAL LÚ ^dIM-an anda¹ peḥutezi LÚ ^dIM ANA LUGAL ḥ[e]kta¹
 ta anizzi mān zinniz[i]=^rm'a ANA LUGAL ḥekt[a]
 appa=ea ḥek^rt'a LUGAL-uš tunna paizzi ...

'The head page brings in the man of the Storm-god. The man of the Storm-god b[o]ws to
 the king, / and he performs (the ritual action). And when he finishes, he bow[s] to the
 king, / and he bows again.¹ The king goes into the inner room ...'
¹With Garrett (1990:17).

#21: StBoT 8 Nr. 2 Vs. I 2'-5'

[]× DUMU.É.GAL nu=kkan apāš kalul[upi=šmi ...] / [k]ān[ki]
 § [a]nda=ma namma II GAL lāleš AN.BA[R ...]
 anda DUMU.É.GAL pētai I-EN ANA LU[GAL ...]

'... the page. And that one [h]an[gs ... on their] / fing[er].
 § And [i]n addition another 2 large tongues (of) iro[n lie? And them?]
 the page carries in. One to the ki[ng he gives? ...]'

#22: StBoT 8 Vs. I 7'-8'

§ [ug]=a arḥari nu ḥurtiyallan ḥarmi ḥurtiyali=ma
 [AN.B]AR-aš nēpiš I-EN kitta URUDU-ašš=a I-EN kitta

'§ But [I] am standing and I have a bowl. And in the bowl
 lies one heaven of [ir]on, and one of copper lies (therein).'

#23-#26, #55-#56: StBoT 8 Vs. I 21'-32'

§ apūš ḫantezumni tēḫḫi weš=a namma anda
 [p]aiwani II ḫantašepuš ḫarwani GIŠ-aš ḫarkanzi=ma=an
 ḫantašepēš anduḫšaš ḫaršārr=a GIŠŠUKURḫi.A=ya
 šākuwa=šmet išḫaškanta wēššanda=ma
 išḫarwantuš TÚGḫi.A-uš putaliyantešš=a
 § anda=kan ḫalīnaš teššummiuš tarlipit šuwamuš
 II-[ki] pētumini tarueni=ma=at ēšḫar DUMU.É.GAL-iš
 ḫant[aš]epan LUGAL-i kišarī dāi
 teššumm[e]nn=a pāi SAL.LUGAL=ya Q[A]TAMMA pāi
 NINDAšarrui=ma=ššan ERÍNMEŠ-az ēšzi
 § šer=šemet=a [G]ÍR ZABAR kitta apatt=a=[a]n? anda / pētumeni ...

‘§ I lay those in the forecourt. And we go back in. / We have two ḫantašepa divinities of wood. But the ḫantašepa divinities / have both human heads and lances. / Their eyes (are) bloodied. And they are wearing / blood-red garments and (are) girded.
 § Twice we bring in clay cups / full of *tarlipa* liquid. And we call it blood. The page / sets a ḫantašepa divinity in the king's hand / and gives (him) a cup. To the queen he gives likewise. / But on a *šarruwa* bread sits a troop.
 § And over them lies a bronze dagger. And (all) that we carry in. ...’

#27: StBoT 8 Vs. II 31'-35'

... [u]g=a=šmaš=šan ERÍNMEŠ-an šēr
 III-ŠU waḫnūmi L[UGAL-uš? II]I-ŠU SAL.LUGAL-ašš=a III-ŠU ERÍNMEŠ-an
 allappahḫanz[i ERÍNMEŠ]-ti=ma=ššan šēr GÍR ZABAR
 kitta MUŠENḫāran[an] ERÍNMEŠ-an[n]=a LUGAL-aš SAL.LUGAL-ašš=a šēr=šemet
 waḫnumeni ...

‘... And I wave the troop over them
 three times. The k[ing th]rice and the queen thrice spit on
 the troop. But above [the troo]p lies a bronze
 dagger. We wave the eag[le] and the troop over the king and queen. ...’

#28: StBoT 8 Vs. II 41'-44'

... [t]a LUGAL SAL.LUGAL-ašš=a
 kitkar=šamet dāi MUŠENḫāran[a]nn=a parā ḫilam[na]
 pētumeni ta šašueni
 § mān lukkatta=ma LUGAL-uš ara[ḫz]a nāwi ×[]

‘... and sets (it) at the heads of the king and queen. And the eagle we carry out
 [to] the gate. And we sleep.

§ **And** when it dawns, the king (has) not yet [come?] out ... ’

#29: StBoT 8 Rs. III 3-6

§ ta namma MUŠENḫāranan nēpiša tamaḫḫi
 āppan-anda=ma=šše kē mēmaḫḫi natta=an ūk
 tamaḫḫun LUGAL-š=an SAL.LUGAL-š=a tamaš ...

‘§ Then I release the eagle into heaven
 and after(wards) I say these (words) to it: “Not I have
 released it, the king and queen have released it. ...” ’

#29.5: StBoT 8 Rs. III 24-28

... pattarr=a ḫarmi nu=ššan NUMUN-an []
 [.?. an]da kitta GIŠzupāri kitta I MÁŠ.GAL-ri
 garauni=ši muriyaleš ganganteš kett=a
 gar[auni=š]i muriyaleš ganganteš anda=ma IX muriy[ala]n
 išgarandan ūk kuin ḫarmi §

‘... and I have a basket, and seed / lies [in]side; a torch lies (inside). On one he-goat’s
 horn grape-rolls (are) suspended. And on the other side
 [on i]ts hor[n] grape-rolls are suspended. **But** in addition (there are) 9 grap[e-ro]lls
 attached which I hold. §’

#30: StBoT 8 Rs. IV 6-8

... a[tu]eni akueni LÚ.MEŠA.ZU-š=a katti=mi ta(-) × [
 uwaweni m[ā]n¹ lukkatta=ma nu LÚA.ZU ügg=a paiwani
 nu išhanāš [tarl]ipa<n>=ššan teššumin ḫāššann=a umeni

‘... We eat (and) drink. And the medicine men (are) with me. And? ... [
 we come. **But** when it dawns, the medicine man and I go
 and we observe the *tarlipa* of blood, the cup, and the hearth.’
¹ma[-a-a]n

#31-#32, #59: StBoT 8 Rs. IV 11-13

§ [m]ān LUGAL-uš SAL.LUGAL-ašš=a taranzi ta DUMUMEŠ-an parna paimi
 [takk]u natta=ma taranzi nu natta paimi karū=ma
 [ŠÀ?] É DUMUMEŠ-an paišgaḫat kinun=a natta kuwāpikki pāun §

‘§ [W]hen the king and queen say (so), I go to the house of the children.
But [i]f they do not say (so), then I do not go. **But** previously,
 I used to go [in?] the house of the children, **but** now I have not gone at all. §’

#33-#34, #61: StBoT 8 Rs. IV 23-30

§ III NINDA ḫaršaeš išpantuzzi=ya marnuan kitta
 mān luggatta=ma nu LÚÚ.ḪÚB-za ügg=a
 paiwani t=u<š>=šta šarā tumeni LUGAL-uš SAL.LUGAL-š=a ašanzi
 ta kalulupu<š>=šmuš gāpinit ḫulāliemi
 ŠA QATI-ŠUNU ug=a ḫāḫḫal ḫarmi šīnann=a ḫarmi
 GĪŠḫarpa=ma I-anta LUGAL-aš GĪR=ši kitta SAL.LUGAL-š=a I-anta
 kitta ta šīni tēmi dā LUGAL-aš SAL.LUGAL-š=a aīn / × wāīn pittuliu<š>=šmušš=a ...

‘§ Three thick breads and the *marnuan* libation lie (ready).
But when it dawns, a deaf man and I / go, and we take them up. The king and queen are
 (there). / Then I wind their fingers with the thread,
 (i.e. fingers) of their hand(s). **And** I hold a twig and I hold a figurine.
But woodpiles, one lies at the king’s foot and one lies (at) the queen’s.
 And I say to the figurine: “Take the king’s and queen’s pain, / [?] woe, and worries!”’

#35: Laws I §7 (A Vs. I 9'-10')

§ takku LÚ.UL^{LU}-an *ELLAM* kuiški dašuwahhi našma KA×UD-ŠU lāki
karū I MA.NA KÙ.BABBAR peškir kinun=a XX GÍN KÙ.BABBAR pāi pama=šše=a
šuwāizzi §

‘§ If someone blinds a free person or knocks (out) his tooth,
previously they would pay 1 mina of silver, **but** now he shall pay 20 shekels of silver, and
he shall look[?] to (his own) house (to provide it) for him. §’

For #36-#37, please see #6.

#38: Laws I §42 (A Vs. II 27'-29')

§ takku LÚ.UL^{LU}-an kuiški kuššanizzi n=aš laḥḥa paizzi n=,[(aš aki)]
takku kuššan piyān šarnikzil [NU.GÁL]
takku kuššan=a natta piyān I SAG.DU [(pāi)] §

‘§ If someone hires a person and he goes on campaign and he dies,
if the wage (has been) paid, [there is no] compensation,
but if the wage (has) not (been) paid, he shall give one person (lit. head). §’

#39: Laws I §49.55-57 (A Vs. II 55'-57')

... man ḥūmanteš=pat maršēr[]
[n]ašma¹ LÚ^{MEŠ} NÍ.ZU kišantati kāš=man kūn ēpz[i]
[k]āš=a=man kūn ēpzi man LUGAL-waš GÍŠ×² pešš[ir] §

‘... they would indeed all be dishonest,
or they would become thieves. This one would seize that one,
and that one would seize this one. [They] would overturn the king's authority[?]. §’

¹From Hrozný's autograph.

²With Hoffner (1997:60 with note 197).

[#40]: Laws I §50.61-62 (A Vs. II 61'-62')

... / mān ^{URU}Arinna XI ITU-aš tiezzi nu apē[¹ É-ZU]
kuel=a GÍŠeyan āški=šši šakuwān a[rāuwan] §

‘... / When in Arinna the eleventh month arrives, then [the house of] that one[?],
whosever *eyan* tree[?] (is) visible[?] at his gate, (shall be) e[xempt]. §’

#41: Laws I §64 (A Rs. III 43)

§ takku ANŠE.KUR.RA tūriyawaš kuiški tāiezzi uttar=šed=a kī=pat x?[] §

‘§ If someone steals a draft horse, his case(=ma) (shall be) the same (lit. this same) [?]. §’

• See notes 24 and 39.

#42: Laws I §80 (A Rs. IV 14-15)

§ takku UDU-un UR.BAR.RA-ni kuiški peššiezzi išhaš=šiš UZUḫ dāi
apāš=a KUŠ UDU dāi §

‘§ If someone throws a sheep to a wolf, its owner shall take the fat,
but that one shall take the sheepskin. §’

• See note 38.

#43: Laws I §98 (A Rs. IV 53’-55’)

§ takku LÚ-aš ELLUM É-er lukkezz[(i É-er) EG(IR-pa we)]tezzi
andan=a É-ri kuit ḫarakzi LÚ.U[(LÚ^{LU}-ku GUD-ku) UD(U-ku)] ‘e’-eš-za nakkuš
n=at [šarnik]za §

‘§ If a free man sets fire to a house, he shall [r]ebuild the house.

And that which perishes inside the house, whether it be people or cattle or sheep, (it is)
damage?; / he shall [make compensation for] it. §’

For #44, please see #13.

#45: KBo 22.1 Rs. 26’-32’

§ LÚ.MEŠNAŠI ŠÍDITI₄-ŠU natta punuštēni
ta LÚḫappinandaš ištēni
parna=šša paiši ēzši eukši piyanazzi=⟨y⟩a=ttā
LÚašiwandan=a šiēt dātti
DIN-ŠU natta punušši ...

‘§ You do not question his provision bearers. / You do (the will) of the rich man,
you* go to his house, you eat, you drink, and he rewards you,

but (from) the poor man you take (what is) his?. / You do not investigate his case. ...

*From this point to the end of the passage as it is given here, the addressee(s) are 2.sg.,
having previously been 2.pl.

For #46-#48, please see #16.

#49: Anitta A Rs. 52-54

§ URUŠalatiwara mēni=met nēh[hun]
 1 URUŠa₁latiwaraš=a mēnaḥḥanda GIŠtu-u?-x[-
 [URU-ria]z ERÍN^{MEŠ}-ŠU ḥuittiyati š=an URUNēš[(a pēḥut)enun] §

‘§ [I] turn[ed] my face to Šalatiwara. And Šalatiwara drew its army out o[f the city like?] a t. against (me), and [I] brou[ght] it to Neša. §’

#50: Zalpa A Vs. 9-11

kāni=wa tunnakkiš inutten nu=w[a ANŠ]E-iš a₁rkat₁ta
 UMMA LÚ^{MEŠ} URU-LIM kuwapit arumen nu ANŠE-iš [ark]atta []
 UMMA DUMU^{MEŠ} weš=a kuwapit arumen nu SAL-z[a?]] DUMU x[ḥa-]’a¹-ši

“Here you have heated the room, and the [donk]ey mates.”
 Thus (spoke) the men of the city: “Whither we have arrived, the donkey [mat]es [].”
 Thus (spoke) the sons: “**But** whither wé have arrived, a woman [be]ars [] child [].”

#51: Zalpa A Vs. 16-19

... nu AMA-ŠUNU
 [o o -u]š² natta ganešzi nu=zza DUMU.SAL^{MEŠ}-ŠA ANA DUMU.NITA^{MEŠ}-ŠA paiš
 [ḥante]zziaš DUMU^{MEŠ} niku<š>=šmuš natta ganeššir appezziyaš=a=ššan
]x-uš-za neku<š>=šummuš daškēuen[i n]u lē šaliktumari

‘... And their mother / does not recognize [the]m², and she gave her daughters to her sons.
 [The old]er sons did not recognize their sisters. **But** the youngest (son)
 [said²: “Let] (us) [not] take our sisters. [] Do not approach² (them). ... ’

#52-#53: Zalpa A Rs. 7’-9’

§ LUGAL-š=a IŠME š=aš yanniš URUḤaraḥšu=aš ārša Û ERÍN^{MEŠ} URUZalpa
 menaḥḥanda uit š=an LUGAL-uš ḥullit mḤāppiš=a išparzašta
 mTamnašsun=a ḥušuwantan IŠBATU š=an URUḤattuša uwatet §

‘§ But the king heard (about this), and he marched. He arrived at Ḥaraḥšu. And the army of Zalpa / came against (him). And the king defeated them. **But** Ḥappi escaped; but Tamnaššu they took alive. And (they) brought him to Ḥattuša. §’

#54: StBoT 8 Vs. I 3'-6'

§[III-i]š LUGAL-un SAL.LUGAL-ann=a ḥuyanzi III-kiš=a=šmaš šī[n]an
[pa]rā ēpzi GUD-n=a=šmaš III-iš parā ēpzi LUGAL-uš
[III-]iš GUD-un I šinann=a allappahḫi SAL.LUGAL-ašš=a=an III-iš / [al]lappahḫi ...

‘§ [Thri]ce they run (to?) the king and queen. **And** thrice to them he [e]xtends
a figurine, and an ox he extends to them thrice. The king
spits (on) the ox and one figurine thrice, and the queen spits on them (lit. it) thrice. ...’

For #55-#56, please see #23-#26.

#57: StBoT 8 Vs. I 36'-38'

LUGAL-uš ERÍN^{MEŠ}-an III-š[U alla]ppahḫi SAL.LUGAL-ašš=a III-šU all[app]ahḫi
šāwatarāš=a ḥalzā'i DUMU.É.¹GAL LUGAL-aš SAL.LUGAL-ašš=a kī[ššara-...]
ḫantašepuš teššumiušš=a dāi ...

‘The king [sp]lits (on) the troop thric[e], and the queen sp[i]ts thrice.
And the horn-player calls (out). The page takes
the ḫantašepa divinities and the cups [from] the ha[nds] of the king and queen. ...’

#58: StBoT 8 Vs. II 19-20

§ mān MUŠEN^hāranan ḥušuwandan appanzi
n=an udanzi ug=a uīlna[š ER]ÍN^{MEŠ}-an iyami

‘§ When the catch an eagle alive, / they bring it (in). **And** I fashion [a tr]oop [of] clay.’

For #59, please see #31-#32.

#60: StBoT 8 Rs. IV 19-22

... ḥalkiaš ḥaršār iṣḫiyanda
ZÍZ^{HLA}-ašš=a ḥaršār iṣḫiyanda kē=šan ḥūmanda
[p]addanī tēḫḫi n=e LUGAL-aš SAL.LUGAL-ašš=a kitkar=šamet tēḫḫi
šēr=a=ššan GAD-an peššiemi š=uš LÚ-aš natta aušzi §

‘ ... “heads” of barley (are) bound / and “heads” of wheat (are) bound. All these
I put in a basket and set them at the head of the king and queen.
And over (them) I throw a cloth, and no man will (lit. a man will not) see them. §’

For #61, please see #33-#34.

#62: StBoT 8 Rs. IV 34-36

ḫalīnaš zēri ḫarmi t=an anda III-iš LUGAL-uš SAL.LUGAL-š=a
zeriya allapaḫḫanzi ištāpulli=šet=a šulīaš / ta ištāpḫe ...

‘I hold a clay goblet, and into the goblet the king and queen
spit thrice. **And** its lid (is) of lead / and I close (it). ...’

§3.0.1 Example Numbers and Citations for NH -ma

Citations found in duplicates are indicated in parentheses when the source is not immediately apparent from the edition, or when it otherwise seems helpful.

AM I.A (KBo 3.4+)	1046 iv 46	1091 iii 23
1001 i 5	1047 iv 47	1092 iii 32
1002 i 5	AM II.5.B (KBo 4.4+)	1093 iii 37
1003 i 6	1048 ii 45	1094 iii 40
1004 i 8	1049 ii 56	1095 iv 19
1005 i 11	1050 ii 59	AM II.9.A (KUB 19.37)
1006 i 14	1051 ii 67	1096 ii 21
1007 i 16	1052 iii 15	1097 ii 24
1008 i 17	1053 iii 38	1098 ii 27
1009 i 19	1054 iii 40	1099 ii 28
1010 i 35	1055 iii 42	1100 ii 29
1011 i 36	1056 iii 43	1101 ii 32
1012 ii 9	1057 iii 43	1102 ii 33
1013 ii 15	1058 iii 52	1103 ii 44
1014 ii 33	1059 iii 57	1104 iii 12
1015 ii 34	1060 iii 59	1105 iii 23
1016 ii 36	1061 iii 70	1106 iii 30
1017 ii 42	1062 iv 17	1107 iii 32
1018 ii 50	1063 iv 18	1108 iii 33
1019 ii 52	1064 iv 28	1109 iii 34
1020 ii 53	1065 iv 42	1110 iii 41
1021 ii 57 (<B, KBo	1066 iv 43	1111 iii 42
16.1 iv 7')	1067 iv 56	1112 iii 46
1022 ii 71 (<B, KBo	AM II.7.A (KBo 5.8)	AM II.10 (KBo 2.5+)
16.1 iv 27')	1068 i 4	1113 i 4
1023 ii 77 (<B, KBo	1069 i 14	1114 ii 6
16.1 iv 35')	1070 i 18	1115 ii 7
1024 ii 78 (<B, KBo	1071 i 18	1116 ii 8
16.1 iv 36')	1072 i 21	1117 ii 14
1025 iii 21	1073 i 22	1118 ii 15
1026 iii 24	1074 i 26	1119 ii 16
1027 iii 24	1075 i 30	1120 iii 18
1028 iii 27	1076 i 32	1121 iii 20
1029 iii 30	1077 i 35	1122 iii 24
1030 iii 34	1078 i 37	1123 iii 42
1031 iii 39	1079 i 40	1124 iii 43
1032 iii 44	1080 ii 5	1125 iii 46
1033 iii 53	1081 ii 10	1126 iii 58
1034 iii 57	1082 ii 13	1127 iv 10
1035 iii 64	1083 ii 18	1128 iv 11
1036 iii 67	1084 ii 22	1129 iv 12
1037 iii 68	1085 ii 26	1130 iv 23
1038 iii 71	1086 ii 27	1131 iv 25
1039 iii 75	1087 ii 34	AH (Otten 1981)
1040 iii 79	AM II.7.C (KBo 16.8 +	1132 i 22
1041 iv 28	14)	1133 i 23
1042 iv 30	1088 ii 23'	1134 i 24
1043 iv 31	1089 ii 28'	1135 i 27
1044 iv 35	AM II.7.A (KBo 5.8)	1136 i 36
1045 iv 42	1090 iii 19	1137 i 41

1138	i 46	1191	iv 39	1242	§15 C ii 15
1139	i 54	1192	iv 42	1243	§15 C ii 19
1140	i 61	1193	iv 42	1244	§16 C ii 28
1141	i 70	1194	iv 46 (<M, KUB 1.8 26')	1245	§16 C ii 30
1142	i 73	1195	iv 52	1246	§16 C ii 32
1143	i 75	1196	iv 53	1247	§16 C ii 34
1144	i 76	1197	iv 55	1248	§16 C iii 4
1145	ii 2	1198	iv 56	1249	§16 C iii 5
1146	ii 10	1199	iv 57	1250	§16 C iii 6
1147	ii 12	1200	iv 59	1251	§16 C iii 10
1148	ii 14	1201	iv 66	1252	§17 C iii 12
1149	ii 16	1202	iv 71	1253	§17 C iii 14
1150	ii 20	1203	iv 79	1254	§17 C iii 15
1151	ii 21	1204	iv 81	1255	§17 C iii 16 (<A ii 12)
1152	ii 26	SvKK (cf. CTH 68 and chapter 3, note 1)		1256	§18 C iii 26
1153	ii 28			1257	§18 D iii 48
1154	ii 31	1205	§2 D i 5	1258	§18 D iii 55 (<A ii 32)
1155	ii 33	1206	§2 E i 8	1259	§18 D iii 64
1156	ii 34	1207	§2 E i 9	1260	§19 A iii 4
1157	ii 34	1208	§3 E i 11	1261	§19 D iv 3
1158	ii 35	1209	§3 E i 11	1262	§19 D iv 4
1159	ii 37	1210	§3 D i 16	1263	§19 D iv 6
1160	ii 39	1211	§3 D i 18	1264	§20 D iv 13
1161	ii 41	1212	§3 D i 19	1265	§20 D iv 13
1162	ii 41	1213	§4 D i 22	1266	§21 D iv 21
1163	ii 44	1214	§4 D i 24	1267	§21 D iv 26
1164	ii 46	1215	§4 D i 25	1268	§26 A iv 10
1165	ii 54	1216	§4 D i 32	1269	§26 A iv 15
1166	ii 61	1217	§5 D i 34	1270	§26 A iv 16
1167	ii 65	1218	§5 D i 40	1271	§27 A iv 30
1168	ii 69	1219	§5 D i 42	1272	§27 A iv 32
1169	ii 74	1220	§6 D i 44	(1273 removed = 3069)	
1170	ii 79	1221	§6 C i 7	1274	§27 A iv 35
1171	iii 8	1222	§7 C i 12	LPK (KUB 21.38)	
1172	iii 10	1223	§7 C i 15	1275	Vs. 11'
1173	iii 12	1224	§7 C i 18	1276	Vs. 12'
1174	iii 14	1225	§8 C i 24	1277	Vs. 15'
1175	iii 28	1226	§8 C i 27	1278	Vs. 16'
1176	iii 38'	1227	§9 C i 30	1279	Vs. 17'
1177	iii 40'	1228	§9 C i 31	1280	Vs. 21'
1178	iii 45'	1229	§9 C i 34	1281	Vs. 53'
1179	iii 54'	1230	§10 C i 36	1282	Vs. 61'
1180	iii 59'	1231	§10 C i 36	1283	Vs. 65'
1181	iii 63'	1232	§10 D ii 19	1284	Rs. 1
1182	iii 66'	1233	§10 D ii 20	1285	Rs. 4
1183	iii 69'	1234	§10 D ii 23	1286	Rs. 10
1184	iii 75'(<B iii 42', = KUB 1.4 iii 41'/29')	1235	§11 D ii 27	1287	Rs. 10
1185	iv 2	1236	§11 D ii 30	1288	Rs. 11
1186	iv 5	1237	§11 D ii 36	1289	Rs. 12
1187	iv 7	1238	§11 D ii 40	1290	Rs. 14
1188	iv 21	1239	§13 C ii 9		
1189	iv 26	1240	§14 C ii 11		
1190	iv 37	1241	§15 C ii 13		

ILMS (CTH 255.1.A)1291 i 6' (<B, KUB
26.13 i 6')1292 i 7' <B, KUB
26.13 i 7')

1293 i 19'

1294 i 19'

1295 i 30'

1296 i 34'

1297 i 36'

1298 i 37'

1299 i 38'

1300 i 39'

1301 ii 27'

1302 ii 32'

1303 iii 5

1304 iii 11

1305 iii 16

1306 iii 306

1307 iii 22

1308 iv 7

1309 iv 13

1310 iv 19

1311 iv 28

1312 iv 31

1313 iv 41

1314 iv 42

BT (Bo 86/299)

1315 i 9

1316 i 11

1317 i 14

1318 i 15

1319 i 18

1320 i 20

1321 i 21

1322 i 22

1323 i 27

1324 i 29

1325 i 30

1326 i 31

1327 i 32

1328 i 32

1329 i 33

1330 i 34

1331 i 35

1332 i 37

1333 i 38

1334 i 40

1335 i 43

1336 i 44

1337 i 44

1338 i 45

1339 i 46

1340 i 47

1341 i 48

1342 i 49

1343 i 49

1344 i 50

1345 i 52

1346 i 53

1347 i 56

1348 i 59

1349 i 60

1350 i 61

1351 i 64

1352 i 67

1353 i 88

1354 i 90

1355 i 94

1356 i 97

1357 ii 2

1358 ii 8

1359 ii 22

1360 ii 28

1361 ii 31

1362 ii 32

1363 ii 34

1364 ii 36

1365 ii 37

1366 ii 39

1367 ii 40

1368 ii 41

1369 ii 42

1370 ii 43

1371 ii 50

1372 ii 52

1373 ii 53

1374 ii 54

1375 ii 57

1376 ii 67

1377 ii 69

1378 ii 73

1379 ii 79

1380 ii 81

1381 ii 87

1382 ii 88

1383 ii 96

1384 ii 99

1385 iii 1

1386 iii 7

1387 iii 10

1388 iii 11

1389 iii 16

1390 iii 17

1391 iii 21

1392 iii 22

1393 iii 25

1394 iii 26

1395 iii 28

1396 iii 30

1397 iii 36

1398 iii 38

1399 iii 39

1400 iii 42

1401 iii 71

1402 iii 75

1403 iv 6

1404 iv 9

1405 iv 12

1406 iv 13

1407 iv 14

1408 iv 16

1409 iv 27

1410 iv 27

1411 iv 44

1412 iv 51

**Unsure or in Broken
Context****AM I.A (KBo 3.4+)**

3001 ii 46

AM I.B (KBo 16.1)

3002 ii 7 (=A i 49)

3003 ii 29

3004 ii 38

AM II.5.B (KBo 4.4+)

3005 i 2

3006 i 18

3007 i 32

3008 ii 7

3009 ii 18

3010 ii 23

3011 iii 11

3012 iii 65

3013 iv 5

3014 iv 65

3015 iv 66

3016 iv 66

**AM II.7.C (KBo 16.8 +
14)**

3017 ii 15' (~A ii 41)

3018 ii 36' (≤A ii 62)

AM II.7.A (KBo 5.8)

3019 iii 5

3020 iii 8

AM II.9.A (KUB 19.37)

3021 ii 3

3022 ii 13

3023 ii 48

3024 ii 51

3025 iii 7

3026 iii 50

3027 iv 16

AM II.10 (KBo 2.5+)	3042 §27 A iv 33	ILMS (CTH 255.1.A)
3028 iii 6	3069 §27 A iv 34	3058 i 3' (<B, KUB
3029 iii 7	3043 §27 A iv 43	26.13 i 3')
3030 iv 17	3044 §28 G ii! 5	3059 i 20'
AH (Ottén 1981)	LPK (KUB 21.38)	3060 ii 6'
3031 iii 29	3045 Vs. 7'	3061 ii 40'
SvKK (CTH 68 and cf.	3046 Vs. 9'	3062 iii 2
chapter 3, note 1)	3047 Vs. 14'	3063 iv 47
3032 §18 D iii 60 (<A	3048 Vs. 22'	3064 iv 48 (<B, KUB
ii 37)	3049 Vs. 23'	26.13 iv 11')
3033 §22 C iv 32	3050 Vs. 25'	3065 iv 49
3034 §22 E iv 28	3051 Vs. 29'	3066 l.Rd. 2
3035 §22 E iv 29	3052 Vs. 32'	3067 l.Rd. 4
3036 §23 F iv? 4	3053 Vs. 34'	BT (Bo 86/299)
3037 §24 F iv? 9	3054 Vs. 38'	3068 ii 26
3038 §24 F iv? 13	3055 Vs. 40'	
3039 §24 F iv? 39	3056 Vs. 41'	3069 SvKK §27 A iv ..
3040 §26 A iv 14	3057 Rs. 18	34
3041 §27 A iv 25		

§3.2.5 Syntax with respect to Neighboring Clauses

The 37 examples of environment 2 are ##1001, 1016, 1028, 1029, 1037, 1039, 1050, 1061, 1073, 1076, 1081, 1105, 1133, 1161, 1167, 1194, 1200, 1223, 1235, 1266, 1267, 1288, 1291, 1315, 1316, 1318, 1362, 1367, 1372, 1374, 1377, 1378, 1381, 1393, 1394, 1402, 1407.

The 6 examples of environment 1b with subordinators in both clauses are ##1129, 1224, 1246, 1253, 1255, and 1290?. The 26 with one or no subordinator are ##1125, 1144, 1209, 1215, 1234, 1242, 1243, 1244, 1256, 1260, 1270, 1292, 1295, 1296, 1301, 1307, 1308, 1309, 1311, 1312, 1313, 1314, 1386, 1403, 1404, and 1406.

§3.3.1.1.1 Strong Contrast; Repeated Form

The 114 examples showing strong contrast are ##1020, 1023, 1026, 1027, 1029, 1032, 1033, 1035, 1039, 1042, 1045, 1046, 1052, 1061, 1068, 1069, 1077, 1082, 1092, 1096, 1097, 1098, 1099, 1100, 1102, 1104, 1105, 1114, 1115, 1116, 1117, 1118, 1121, 1125, 1148, 1150, 1153, 1155, 1157, 1159, 1166, 1167, 1173, 1175, 1178, 1180, 1183, 1184, 1191, 1192, 1193, 1194, 1196, 1198, 1199, 1200, 1210, 1211, 1212, 1216, 1221, 1223, 1225, 1229, 1230, 1235, 1236, 1241, 1245, 1249, 1251, 1258, 1259, 1262, 1263, 1264, 1265, 1269, 1270, 1271, 1289, 1291, 1292, 1294, 1299, 1300, 1301, 1302, 1303, 1306, 1307, 1316, 1322, 1339, 1353, 1360, 1366, 1368, 1369, 1377, 1378, 1382, 1383, 1386, 1388, 1389, 1390, 1393, 1394, 1397, 1398, 1403, 1405, 1407.

The 84 examples showing weak contrast are ##1010, 1014, 1015, 1016, 1017, 1025, 1030, 1038, 1043, 1050, 1053, 1055, 1074, 1076, 1094, 1095, 1103, 1106, 1107, 1109, 1119, 1123, 1126, 1127, 1130, 1131, 1134, 1139, 1144, 1152, 1165, 1172, 1188, 1190, 1195, 1202, 1203, 1219, 1227, 1228, 1232, 1237, 1239, 1240, 1242, 1248, 1252, 1254, 1275, 1277, 1278, 1282, 1293, 1297, 1298, 1310, 1315, 1318, 1321, 1324, 1326, 1327, 1329, 1331, 1333, 1334, 1335, 1337, 1338, 1341, 1342, 1344, 1346, 1347, 1349, 1350, 1351, 1364, 1372, 1380, 1385, 1387, 1392, 1412.

The 104 examples showing repeated form are ##1015, 1016, 1020, 1026, 1027, 1052, 1069, 1082, 1096, 1097, 1098, 1099, 1100, 1101, 1102, 1114, 1115, 1116, 1117, 1118, 1119, 1125, 1139, 1153, 1155, 1157, 1173, 1180, 1182, 1184, 1191, 1192, 1193, 1194, 1195, 1196, 1198, 1210, 1211, 1212, 1221, 1227, 1228, 1229, 1239, 1240, 1242, 1247, 1248, 1249, 1251, 1263, 1264, 1265, 1271, 1282, 1299, 1301, 1302, 1303, 1320, 1321, 1322, 1323, 1324, 1325, 1326, 1327, 1328, 1329, 1330, 1331, 1332, 1333, 1335, 1336, 1338, 1340, 1341, 1342, 1343, 1344, 1345, 1346, 1347, 1348, 1349, 1350, 1351, 1352, 1353, 1368, 1369, 1377, 1378, 1380, 1382, 1387, 1388, 1392, 1393, 1394, 1405, 1412.

§3.3.1.1.3 Series

There are 76 examples of series marking with *-ma*.

The 62 examples of series members marked with *-ma* are ##1015, 1016; 1096, 1097, 1098, 1099, 1100, 1101, 1102; 1114, 1115, 1116, 1117, 1118, 1119; 1146; 1152, 1153; 1192, 1193; 1195, 1197, 1198, 1199, 1200; 1202, 1203; 1211, 1212; 1227, 1228; 1232, 1233; 1238; 1246, 1247, 1248, 1249; 1293, 1294; 1297, 1298, 1299, 1300; 1313, 1314; 1324, 1326, 1327, 1329, 1331, 1333, 1335, 1338, 1341, 1342, 1344, 1346, 1347, 1349, 1350, 1351.

The 14 examples where only the final member of a series is marked with *-ma* are ##1032, 1035, 1053, 1055, 1112, 1150, 1180, 1244, 1260, 1264, 1295, 1312, 1389, 1412.

The 43 examples where the second member of bipartite structures is marked with *-ma* are ##1019, 1020, 1029, 1082, 1125, 1137, 1139, 1144, 1155, 1156, 1157, 1159, 1167, 1184, 1194, 1209, 1215, 1224, 1225, 1236, 1242, 1245, 1251, 1254, 1262, 1282, 1291, 1296, 1301, 1307, 1308, 1310, 1311, 1321, 1334, 1337, 1360, 1378, 1386, 1394, 1403, 1405, 1406.

§3.3.1.1.4 Counterexpectation

The 63 examples with counterexpectation are ##1040, 1084, 1085, 1086, 1088, 1123, 1125, 1148, 1151, 1159, 1165, 1175, 1176, 1177, 1181, 1182, 1185, 1188, 1205, 1207, 1216, 1218, 1243, 1244, 1256, 1262, 1281, 1285, 1287, 1290, 1295, 1296, 1308, 1309, 1311, 1312, 1313, 1314, 1315, 1316, 1318, 1320, 1321, 1323, 1325, 1328, 1330, 1332, 1334, 1336, 1337, 1340, 1343, 1345, 1348, 1352, 1353, 1354, 1355, 1358, 1385, 1400, 1404.

§3.3.1.2 New Referents

In the 408 clauses with *-ma* there are at least 107 new referents in 105 clauses.

The 65 examples with new subject can be grouped as follows. The 23 examples with initial new subjects are ##1001, 1005, 1037, 1046 (also with new direct object), 1068, 1076, 1079, 1146, 1147, 1148, 1160, 1204, 1214, 1226, 1300, 1303, 1334, 1336, 1337, 1377, 1401, 1408, 1409.

The 21 examples in which the new subject occurs non-initially in the border-setting formula are ##1098, 1099, 1102, 1155, 1227, 1322, 1324, 1326, 1327, 1329, 1331, 1333, 1335, 1338, 1341, 1342, 1344, 1346, 1347, 1350, 1351.

The remaining 21 examples in which the new subject occurs non-initially are ##1006, 1008, 1018, 1063, 1071, 1091, 1111, 1135, 1145, 1154, 1177, 1189, 1197, 1230, 1244, 1254, 1315, 1378, 1387, 1391, 1399.

The 42 new non-subject referents are ##1012 (2 new non-subject referents), 1017, 1025, 1027, 1030, 1033, 1038, 1045, 1046 (also with new subject), 1047, 1052, 1060, 1069, 1103, 1113, 1125, 1149, 1150, 1151, 1153, 1163, 1164, 1183, 1195, 1210, 1211, 1212, 1220, 1257, 1282, 1287, 1294, 1304, 1353, 1355, 1358, 1366, 1379, 1383, 1385, 1388.

There are 48 non-distributive relative clauses; 3 of these have breaks that compromise information about activation status: ##1048, 1275, 1276.

Of the 45 remaining clauses, 13 have referents with semiactive status: ##1024, 1152, 1162, 1196, 1198, 1202, 1203, 1232, 1357, 1359, 1370, 1392, 1396.

Of the 32 clauses with new relativized referents, 7 have indeterminate relative forms: ##1204, 1300, 1303, 1366, 1401, 1408, 1409; 12 clauses have previously mentioned referents that are made more specific: ##1017, 1030, 1033, 1045, 1046, 1071, 1103, 1149, 1189, 1197, 1210, 1391; and 13 clauses simply have relativized referents that are new: ##1005, 1006, 1047, 1111, 1160, 1164, 1183, 1220, 1282, 1287, 1304, 1334, 1337.

§3.3.1.3.2 Orthotonic Personal Pronouns

The 52 examples with orthotonic personal pronoun are ##1050, 1073, 1094, 1134, 1138, 1158, 1176, 1178, 1181, 1183, 1185, 1187, 1189, 1200, 1201, 1206, 1224, 1231, 1232, 1234, 1235, 1247, 1248, 1253, 1255, 1259, 1260, 1261, 1266, 1267, 1268, 1269, 1272, 1274, 1276, 1286, 1288, 1292, 1305, 1307, 1309, 1313, 1361, 1362, 1364, 1367, 1368, 1369, 1372, 1402, 1404, 1407.

Four examples with other orthotonic pronouns are ##1177, 1294, 1298, 1355.

§3.3.2 Orientation

There are 153 clauses with *-ma* that adjust the orientation.

There are 94 examples with initial expressions of orientation, categorized as follows. An asterisk indicates cooccurrence with an orienting subordinating conjunction.

The 35 examples with initial expressions of temporal orientation are ##1002, 1006, 1028, 1031, 1034, 1036, 1044, 1054, 1056, 1058, 1061, 1062, 1075, 1104, 1130, 1135, 1184, 1213*, 1222*, 1237, 1239, 1240, 1282, 1287, 1289*, 1293, 1297, 1310, 1363, 1376, 1378, 1382, 1393, 1403, 1406.

The 20 examples with initial adverbial expressions of spatial orientation are ##1041, 1081, 1096, 1097, 1098, 1099, 1100, 1101, 1102, 1110, 1118, 1119, 1126, 1131, 1145, 1155, 1210, 1227, 1228, 1245 (the adverb here is in second position after *mān* 'if').

The 24 examples with initial oblique-noun expressions of spatial orientation are ##1078*, 1111, 1125*, 1150, 1296, 1322, 1324, 1326, 1327, 1329, 1331, 1333, 1335, 1338, 1341, 1342, 1344, 1346, 1347, 1349, 1350, 1351, 1354, 1397.

The 15 examples with initial expressions of metaphorical or other orientation are ##1047, 1105, 1108, 1114, 1115, 1116, 1117, 1121, 1149, 1177*, 1223, 1233, 1280, 1379, 1380.

There are 65 examples where the entire clause functions to reorient the discourse. An asterisk indicates cooccurrence with a clause-initial expression of orientation.

The 1 clause with past perfect tense but without subordinating conjunction is #1068. The remaining 64 clauses have subordinating conjunctions.

The 44 examples with *mahhan* 'when, as' are ##1003, 1004, 1009, 1011, 1013, 1018, 1021, 1022, 1051, 1057, 1059, 1063, 1064, 1065, 1066, 1067, 1070, 1072, 1079, 1087, 1089, 1090, 1091, 1093, 1124, 1132, 1140, 1143, 1144 (under scope of *mahhan*), 1168, 1169, 1170, 1174, 1177*, 1179, 1182, 1208, 1209 (under scope of *mahhan*), 1217, 1317, 1356, 1370, 1373, 1375.

The 16 examples with *kuit* 'since, as, when, given that' are ##1007, 1060, 1078*, 1125* (under scope of *kuit*), 1129, 1138, 1186, 1187, 1215 (under scope of *kuit*), 1218, 1222*, 1224, 1279, 1284, 1286, 1289*.

The 3 examples with *kuitman* 'while' are ##1128, 1142, 1361.

The 1 example with *kuwapi* 'when' functioning as a subordinating conjunction is #1213*.

There are 53 examples that function as conditional protases. An asterisk indicates cooccurrence with a clause-initial expression of orientation.

The 32 clauses with *mān* 'if' are ##1221, 1229, 1230, 1241, 1245* (the adverb here is in second position), 1246, 1247, 1248, 1249, 1251, 1252, 1254, 1255, 1258, 1259, 1261, 1263, 1265, 1268, 1271, 1274, 1283, 1290, 1360, 1366, 1382*, 1384, 1390, 1391, 1395, 1399, 1405.

The 9 clauses under the scope of a preceding *mān* are ##1242, 1244, 1256, 1270, 1309, 1313, 1403*, 1404, 1406*.

The 12 clauses under the scope of a preceding conditionally construed *našma* 'or (if)' are ##1234, 1243, 1260, 1295, 1296*, 1301, 1307, 1308, 1311, 1312, 1314, 1386.

§3.3.2.1 Paragraph-Initial *-ma*

The 68 examples with paragraph-initial *-ma* are ##1004, 1006, 1007, 1009, 1011, 1013, 1014, 1018, 1021, 1022, 1031, 1034, 1036, 1044, 1051, 1054, 1056, 1058, 1059, 1062, 1064, 1065, 1067, 1075, 1087, 1089, 1093, 1110, 1117, 1120, 1122, 1124, 1128, 1132, 1140, 1143, 1154, 1168, 1174, 1187, 1204, 1208, 1213, 1217, 1220, 1222, 1230, 1240, 1241, 1252, 1277, 1279, 1284, 1317, 1322, 1324, 1335, 1341, 1346, 1361, 1370, 1373, 1375, 1376, 1379, 1391, 1408, 1411.

§3.3.3 Subject Switch

The 11 examples with subject switch alone are ##1024, 1080, 1133, 1136 (may be interpreted as beginning new episode), 1161, 1171, 1319, 1365, 1371, 1374, 1396.

§3.4.1 Frequency, Phonological and Syntactic Distribution of NH *-a/-ya*

§3.4.1 Example Numbers and Citations for NH *-a/-ya*

Citations found in duplicates are indicated in parentheses when the source is not immediately apparent from the edition, or when it otherwise seems helpful.

AM I.A (KBo 3.4+)

4001 ii 18
 4002 ii 19
 4003 ii 20
 4004 ii 51
 4005 ii 72 (<B, KBo
 16.1 iv 29')

4006 iii 65

4007 iii 80

4008 iii 89

AM II.5.B (KBo 4.4+)

4009 ii 63

(4010 unused)

4011 iii 24

4012 iv 35

4013 iv 48

4014 iv 51

AM II.7.A (KBo 5.8)

4015 i 2

4016 i 11

4017 i 20

4018 ii 16

4019 ii 29

4020 ii 39

**AM II.7.C (KBo 16.8 +
14)**

4021 ii 22'

AM II.7.A (KBo 5.8)

4022 iii 38

4023 iv 10

AM II.9.A (KUB 19.37)

(4024 unused)

4025 iii 38

4026 iii 44

(4027 unused)

AH (Otten 1981)

4028 i 26

4029 i 29

4030 ii 50

4031 ii 50

4032 ii 78

4033 iii 20

4034 iii 27

4035 iii 48'

4036 iii 57

4037 iv 3 (<B iii 48',
 = KUB 1.4 iii 47'/35')

4038 iv 14

4039 iv 15

4040 iv 17

4041 iv 28

4042 iv 36

4043 iv 52

4044 iv 69

4045 iv 69

4046 iv 73

4047 iv 75

4048 iv 76

4049 iv 79

4049.5 iv 86

**SvKK (CTH 68 and cf.
chapter 3, note 1)**

4050 §3 D i 14

4051 §8 C i 28

4052 §9 C i 29

4053 §10 C i 37

4054 §11 D ii 39

4055 §13 C ii 5

4056 §13 C i 7

4057 §16 C iii 7 (<A ii
 3)

4058 §16 C iii 8

4059 §17 C iii 18

4060 §18 C iii 22

4061 §18 D iii 58

4062 §18 D iii 60

4063 §20 D iv 10

4064 §21 E iv 13

LPK (KUB 21.38)

4065 Vs. 16'

4066 Vs. 59'

4067 Rs. 5

ILMS (CTH 255.1.A)

4068 i 11'

4069 i 16'

4070 i 24'

4071 iv 4

4072 iv 11

4073 iv 35

4074 iv 37

4075 iv 38

BT (Bo 86/299)

4076 i 62

4077 i 68

4078 i 77

4079 i 81

4080 i 91

4081 i 99

4082 ii 4

4083 ii 5

4084 ii 8

4085 ii 13

4086 ii 15

4087 ii 17

4088 ii 19

4089 ii 21

4090 ii 23

4091 ii 47

4092 ii 48

4093 ii 64

4094 ii 74

4095 ii 75

4096 ii 81

4097 ii 82

4098 ii 84

4099 ii 95

4100 iii 11

4101 iii 32

4102 iii 34

4103 iii 43

4104 iii 47

4105 iii 57

4106 iii 57

4107 iii 65

4108 iv 25

**Unsure or in Broken
Context****AM**

5001 II.5.B (KBo
 4.4+) iv 11

5002 II.7.A (KBo 5.8)
 iii 9

5003 II.9.A (KUB
 19.37) ii 49

AH (Otten 1981)

5004 ii 33

5005 iii 60

5006 iv 85

(5007 unused)

**SvKK (CTH 68 and cf.
chapter 3, note 1)**

5008 §26 A iv 10

5009 §27 A iv 22

5010 §27 A iv 28

LPK (KUB 21.38)

5011 Vs. 6'

5012 Vs. 9'

5013 Vs. 33'

5014 Vs. 36'

5015 Vs. 39'

5016 Vs. 45'

5017 Vs. 54'

5018 Vs. 56'

5019 Vs. 57'

5020 Rs. 2
 5021 Rs. 13
 5022 Rs. 22
ILMS (CTH 255.1.A)
 5023 i 5' (<B, KUB
 26.13 i 5')
 5024 i 5'
 5025 ii 7'
 5026 ii 8'

5027 ii 37'
 5028 iv 43
BT (Bo 86/299)
 5029 iii 18
 5030 iii 70

**Second member of
 correlative pair**

5031 AM II.5.B (KBo
 4.4+) ii 75
 5032 AM II.10 (KBo
 2.5+) iii 41

§3.4.2 Functional Contexts of *-a/-ya*

(87) Contrast

The 10 examples of *-a/-ya* with strong contrast are ##4008, 4039, 4044, 4045, 4049, 4054, 4053, 4065, 4069, 4097.

The 19 examples with weak contrast are ##4001, 4006, 4012, 4013, 4014, 4019, 4022, 4025, 4026, 4034, 4041, 4048, 4081, 4085, 4088, 4090, 4102, 4107, 4106.

The 2 examples that are somewhat contrary-to-expectation are #4030 and #4074.

(87) Orientation

The 18 examples of orientation are ##4014, 4020?, 4023, 4029, 4038, 4051, 4052, 4056, 4061, 4064, 4067, 4077, 4081, 4086, 4089, 4098, 4103, 4104.

The 14 examples of conditional protases are ##4007, 4057, 4058, 4060, 4068 (*namma*), 4071 (*našma* scope), 4072, 4073, 4074, 4076, 4083, 4087, 4095, 4100.

The 14 examples of *-ya* in paragraph-initial position are ##4049.5, 4052, 4060, 4068, 4075, 4077, 4080, 4082, 4089, 4098, 4099, 4101, 4103, 4105.

(88) New Referents

There are 29 new referents in 23 clauses. (An 'r' indicates a new relativized referent; an 's' indicates a new subject.) The examples are ##4003, 4019r, 4025rs, 4028, 4043, 4046, 4048, 4049.5rs, 4050, 4052s, 4058, 4059, 4063r, 4068rs, 4073s, 4075r, 4079s, 4080, 4084, 4086s (2 new referents), 4096rs, 4101r,s (2 new referents), 4104 (5 new referents).

(89) Repeated form

The 21 examples showing repeated form are ##4001, 4029, 4034, 4044, 4045, 4046, 4048, 4049, 4049.5, 4065, 4069, 4079, 4085, 4088, 4090, 4091, 4094, 4097, 4102, 4107, 4106.

(89) Series

The 11 examples of series marking with *-ya* are ##4044, 4045, 4047, 4048, 4064 (final member only), 4072, 4084, 4085, 4086, 4093 (final member only), 4108 (final member only).

The 17 examples with *-ya* marking the second of a pair of clauses are ##4012, 4013, 4014, 4028, 4029, 4036, 4040, 4042, 4046, 4051, 4053, 4056, 4062, 4063, 4065, 4069, 4096.

(90) Special Focus

There are 16 examples of special focus (emphasis).

The 2 examples identified as having the variant word order of the possessive construction are #4073 and #4099.

The 14 examples with orthotonic personal pronouns are ##4039, 4044, 4047, 4049, 4053, 4055, 4057, 4065, 4069, 4070, 4071, 4074, 4092, 4094. Three other examples with initial demonstrative pronouns are ##4045, 4078, 4105.

(90) Subject Switch

The 10 examples where subject switch is the only *-ma*-oriented context present are ##4004, 4009, 4011, 4015, 4018, 4032, 4033, 4035, 4037, 4066.

(92) Close Connection

The 33 examples where *-a/-ya* connects clauses having a close connection are ##4001, 4002, 4012, 4013, 4015, 4016, 4017, 4018, 4022, 4025, 4026, 4034, 4040, 4041, 4046, 4049, 4051, 4054, 4053, 4056, 4062, 4063, 4064, 4065, 4069, 4085, 4088, 4090, 4092, 4097, 4102, 4107, 4106.

The 37 clauses with *-ma* showing close connection are ##1029, 1061, 1069, 1082, 1139, 1144, 1157, 1167, 1173, 1175, 1223, 1224, 1225, 1236, 1237, 1239, 1240, 1242, 1264, 1267, 1293, 1297, 1299, 1301, 1310, 1314, 1368, 1369, 1377, 1378, 1380, 1383, 1386, 1393, 1394, 1403, 1406.

§3.5 Conclusion

There are 29 examples with *-ma* showing only one of the pragmatic environments examined. The 8 with contrast are ##1010, 1042, 1043, 1095, 1107, 1109, 1127, 1306. The 6 with orientation modification are ##1002, 1041, 1057, 1072, 1108, 1142. The 2 examples with new referents are #1012 and #1257. The 1 example of a series member is #1238. The 12 examples with subject switch are ##1024, 1080, 1133, 1136, 1141, 1171, 1319, 1365, 1371, 1374, 1396.

§4.0.1 MH Text Sections Included for Analysis

Maṣāṭ Letters (1027 lines)

HKM	line #'s*		
		35	1-9
1	4-13	36	3-11, 29-36; 39-48+4
2	4-13; 17-22+5	38	3-13
3	3-13; 17-23+3	46	3-27+2
4	4-9	47	3-43, 48-55
5	3-14	48	4-23
6	3-25+1	51	2-11
8	3-19	52	3-18; 22-46
9	3-8	54	4-28
10	3-41; 44-52	55	3-17, 21-37
13	3-14	56	5-19; 23-29
14	3-14	57	6-24
15	4-13	58	3-24; 27-31
16	5-15	59	4-11
17	4-27	60	4-18, 21-26; 30-37
18	16-20; 23-28+5	63	4-26
19	4-25; 29-30+3	64	16-26
20	4-12	65	4-19; 22-27
21	3-15; 17-26	66	3-7, 13-44+5
22	4-8; 12-16	68	4-24+4
24	47-59	70	4-13
25	4-21	71	3-20, 24-31; 35-37+3
26	3-14	72	3-15, 27-36
27	3-10; 13-16; 20-25+4	73	10-15; 19-30
30	4-10; 15-18, 22-25+4	74	3-19
31	3-19; 22-30	81	4-15; 29-32
34	5-12		

*A comma indicates that lines within one letter have been excluded. A semicolon indicates that a *Zweitbrief* follows.

§4.0.1 Example Numbers and Citations for MH *-ma* in the Maşat Letters

Ex.#	HKM	6035	36 öy. 10	6070	73 öy. 14
6001	2 a.k. 10	6036	36 a.k. 29	Unsure or in Broken	
6002	6 öy. 6	6037	36 ay. 33	Context:	
6003	6 öy. 7	6038	36 ay. 44	7001	7 ay. 21
6004	6 öy. 9	6039	46 öy. 6	7002	17 s.k. 4
6005	6 ay. 17	6040	47 öy. 6	7003	24 öy. 4
6006	8 ay. 18	6041	47 öy. 8	7004	33 ay. 33'
6007	9 öy. 6	6042	47 öy. 27	7005	37 öy. 4
6008	10 öy. 7	6043	47 öy. 34	7006	37 öy. 13
6009	10 öy. 11	6044	47 öy. 35	7007	41 ay. 25'
6010	10 öy. 14	6045	47 a.k. 38	7008	43 ay. 14'
6011	10 öy. 17	6046	47 ay. 49	7009	44 a.k. 2'
6012	10 ay. 23	6047	47 ay. 50	7010	45 öy. 9'
6013	10 ay. 33	6048	47 ay. 51	7011	45 öy. 12'
6014	10 ay. 36	6049	47 ay. 52	7012	47 öy. 17
6015	13 a.k. 13	6050	52 öy. 14	7013	47 ay. 43
6016	14 öy. 10	6051	52 öy. 17	7014	47 ay. 46
6017	16 a.k. 11	6052	52 ay. 40	7015	48 ay. 31
6018	17 öy. 6	6053	55 öy. 13	7016	50 öy. 4
6019	17 a.k. 24	6054	55 öy. 14	7017	50 öy. 8
6020	17 ay. 26	6055	55 öy. 15	7018	65 s.k. 1
6021	18 ay. 17	6056	55 ay. 27	7019	75 ay. 24'
6022	18 ü.k. 28	6057	56 öy. 8	7020	80 öy. 12'
6023	19 öy. 7	6058	58 öy. 8	7021	80 ay. 9'
6024	19 öy. 11	6059	63 ay. 22	7022	81 a.k. 18
6025	19 öy. 12	6060	66 a.k. 26	7023	81 ay. 22
6026	24 ü.k. 57	6061	66 ay. 33	7024	84 ay. 4'
6027	25 öy. 8	6062	68 öy. 5	7025	84 ay. 14'
6028	26 öy. 9	6063	68 öy. 7	7026	88 a.k. 12'
6029	26 öy. 11	6064	68 ay. 18	7027	89 a.k. 18
6030	27 s.k. 1	6065	68 ü.k. 23	7028	90 4'
6031	30 öy. 7	6066	68 s.k. 1	7029	95 ay. 4'
6032	31 öy. 8	6067	72 öy. 7	7030	95 ay. 14'
6033	31 öy. 13	6068	72 öy. 9		
6034	35 öy. 8	6069	72 ay. 30		

§4.5.1 Example Numbers and Citations for MH *-a/-ya* in the Maşat Letters

Ex.#	HKM	8013	22 ay. 14	9001	7 öy. 8
8001	2 ay. 17	8014	47 öy. 18	9002	17 ay. 30
8002	2 s.k. 1	8015	52 ay. 42	9003	45 öy. 5'
8003	3 s.k. 2	8016	55 ay. 32	9004	45 a.k. 16'
8004	10 ay. 39	8017	60 ay. 21	9005	50 öy. 12
8005	14 öy. 8	8018	65 öy. 10	9006	53 öy. 4
8006	15 öy. 8	8019	65 ü.k. 26	9007	65 ü.k. 25
8007	17 öy. 8	8020	66 öy. 20	9008	65 ü.k. 25
8008	17 öy. 18	8021	66 ay. 43	9009	84 öy. 25'
8009	17 öy. 19	8022	66 s.k. 2	9010	88 öy. 8'
8010	21 öy. 5	8023	74 a.k. 12	9011	89 öy. 12
8011	21 öy. 8	Unsure or in Broken		9012	89 öy. 13
8012	21 ay. 14	Context:		9013	89 ay. 23